1 2	TABLE OF CONTENT
3	Call to Order and Roll Call 4
4	Adoption of Agenda 6
5	Consideration of 179th Council Meeting Verbatim Transcriptions 10
6	Executive Director's Report
7 8 9	Updates on Island-Based Fishery Management Plans (FMPs) and Current Amendments (Spiny Lobster Amendment, Buoy Gear Amendment)
10	Discussion 21
11 12	Trawl and Net Gear and Descending Devices Amendment to the Island- Based FMPs
13	Discussion
14	Descending Devices Presentation and Discussion 60
15	Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) Report 65
16	Discussion- SEDAR 80 Queen Triggerfish 74
17	SSC Report- Cont 87
18	Discussion SEDAR 57 89
19	SSC Report- cont 99
20 21	Proposed Rule to Designate Critical Habitat for the Threatened Nassau Grouper
22	Discussion 107
23 24	Proposed Rule to List the Queen Conch as Threatened Under the Endangered Species Act
25	Discussion 117
26	Fishermen Anecdotes 126
27	Puerto Rico's Fishing Villages after Disaster 145
28 29 30	Caribbean Fishery Management Council, Scientific and Statistical Committee Practices and Procedures Concerning Objectivity and Conflicts of Interest
31	Discussion
32	Pelagic Fish Amendment to the Island-Based FMPs
33	Discussion
34	Managing Trap Fisheries in the USVI: Review of Pertinent State
35	and Federal Regulations
36	Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC) Update 205

1	Discussion	208
2	Recreational Fisheries	217
3	Discussion	222
4	Outreach and Education Advisory Panel Report	227
5	Discussion	232
6	Social Network Activities Report	236
7	Discussion	237
8	Liaison Officers Reports	238
9	Nicole Greaux- Saint Thomas/Saint John	238
10	Wilson Santiago- Puerto Rico	241
11	Discussion	242
12	NMFS/NOAA Office of Law Enforcement	244
13	Enforcement Reports	251
14	USVI DPNR	251
15	Office of Law Enforcement- Miguel Borges	252
16	Discussion	254
17	U.S. Coast Guard	254
18	Discussion	256
19	CFMC Advisory Bodies Membership	257
20	Other Business	258
21	HMS	258
22	Public Comment Period	267
23	Next Meetings	268
24		

#### Table of Motions

<u>PAGE 39</u>: Motion to adopt Action 1, Alternative 3, I move to adopt Action 1, Alternative 3, prohibit the use of trawling gear for all fishing in federal water around Saint Croix, Saint Thomas and Saint John and Puerto Rico as the preferred alternative. Motion presented by Carlos Farchette and John McGovern. <u>The motion carried on page 40</u>.

PAGE 42: Motion, move to have Action 2, Alternative 2, Subalternative 2b as preferred, specific for the Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix EEZ. Motion presented by Carlos Farchette and John McGovern. The motion carried on page 49.

15 <u>PAGE 62</u>: Motion, move to have action 3, preferred Alternative 2 16 for all three islands. Motion presented by Carlos Farchette and 17 Vanessa Ramírez. The motion carried on page 63.

<u>PAGE 84</u>: Motion, move to present P\* at 0.40 for the queen triggerfish. Motion presented by Vanessa Ramírez and Carlos Farchette. The motion carried on page 85.

PAGE 93: Motion, the Council requests staff start an Amendment to the Island-based FMPs to update OFLs, ABCs and ACLs projected from the SEDAR 57 Spiny Lobster Update Assessment for 2024-2026 using the constant-catch (i.e., average) values recommended by the SSC. Motion presented by Carlos Farchette and James Kreglo. The motion carried on page 94.

30 <u>PAGE 98</u>: Motion, move for a three-year average of queen 31 triggerfish for Puerto Rico only. Motion presented by Carlos 32 Farchette and Vanessa Ramírez. The motion carried on page 98.

34 <u>PAGE 258:</u> Motion to Anthony Elizo and Gino Fernández as members of the DAP. Motion Presented by Vanessa Ramírez and Carlos Farchette. 36 The motion carried on page 258.

#### 15 everybody. This is the 180th regular CFMC meeting. And we are going 16 to have a moment of recognition for Berto in a moment, but before 17 that, I would like to make the roll call. Cristina. 18 19 MIGUEL ROLON: Starting Cristina, roll call. 20 21 CRISTINA OLÁN: Good morning. Cristina Olán, CFMC Staff. 22 23 LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Buenos días. Liajay Rivera, Council Staff. 24 GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Buenos días. Graciela García-Moliner, 25 Council staff. 26 27 28 MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Buenos días. María López, NOAA Fisheries. 29 30 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Good morning. Vanessa Ramírez, Commercial 31 Fisherman, Puerto Rico. 32 33 JAMES R. KREGLO: Good morning. James Kreglo, Council Member Saint 34 Thomas, Virgin Island. 35 36 JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Good morning, buen día. Jean-Pierre Oriol 37 for the Department of Planning and Natural Resources. 38 39 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Good morning. Carl Farchette, Council members, 40 Saint Croix District. 41 42 SAMUEL D. RAUCH III: Good morning. Sam Rauch, Deputy Director 43 National Marine Fisheries Service. 44 45 MARCOS HANKE: Good morning. Marcos Hanke. Puerto Rico, Chairman. 46 47 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Miguel Rolón, Council Staff. 48

CARIBBEAN FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

180TH REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING

Isla Verde, Puerto Rico

DECEMBER 06, 2022

The Caribbean Fishery Management Council convened on Thursday morning, December 06, 2022, and was called to order at 9:02 a.m.

Call to Order and Roll Call

2022. We are in the Embassy Suites in Puerto Rico. Welcome

Good morning, everyone. It's 9:02 AM December 6th,

1

2

3

4 5

6 7

8

10 11

12

13

14

by Chairman Marcos Hanke.

MARCOS HANKE:

DIANA T. MARTINO: Good morning. Diana Martino, Council staff.

JOHN MCGOVERN: Morning. Jack McGovern, NOAA Fisheries.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Kate Zamboni, NOAA Office of General Counsel in the Southeast Section.

CLAY PORCH: Good morning. Clay Porch, Southeast Fishery Science Center.

Good morning. Sarah Stephenson, Southeast SARAH STEPHENSON: Regional Office.

ORIAN TZADIK: Orian Tzadik, NOAA Fisheries.

MIGUEL BORGES: Miguel Borges, Office of Law Enforcement.

HOWARD FORBES: Howard Forbes, DPNR Enforcement. 

MARÍA DE LOS A. IRIZARRY: María Irizarry, Council Staff.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Gerson Martínez, acting Chair for DAP Saint Croix

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Alida Ortiz Outreach and Education Advisory Panel.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Julian Magras, DAP Chair Saint Thomas/Saint John.

NELSON CRESPO: Morning everyone. Nelson Crespo, DAP Chair of Puerto Rico.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Rich Appeldoorn, SSC Chair.

EDGARDO ORTIZ: Buenos días. Edgardo Ortiz, visitante. 

RUSSEL DUNN: Russ Dunn, NOAA Fisheries. 

ALEX TERRERO: Alex Terrero, NOAA Fisheries, Saint Thomas.

SEAN R. MEEHAN: Good morning. Sean Meehan, NOAA Fisheries, Saint Pete.

SEAN A. MORTON: Good morning. Sean Morton NOAA Fisheries in Charleston, South Carolina.

ANDREW MCGRAW-HERDEG: Hi, good morning. Andrew McGraw-Herdeg at United States Coast Guard, Sector San Juan Fisheries.

1 TIM SARTWELL: Good morning, Tim Sartwell, NOAA Fisheries.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Good morning. Nicole Angeli, Director at U.S.V.I, Division of Fish and Wildlife.

MELISSA CROUCH: Good morning, Melissa Crouch, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

**NICOLE GREAUX:** Good morning. Nicole Greaux, CFMC Liaison for Saint 10 Thomas/Saint John

UNKOWN: El presidente de la Villa Pesquera de Loiza.

JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: Jannette Ramos-García, OEAP Member, Puerto Rico Sea Grant Program, also.

WILSON SANTIAGO: Good morning. Wilson Santiago, Puerto Rico Fisheries Liaison.

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Attendees we have in Zoom. We have: myself, Liajay Rivera. Christina Olán, Graciela García-Moliner, Guillermo Cordero, Refik Orhun and Virginia Shervette.

MARCOS HANKE: That's all. Thank you, Liajay. Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Before you go to logistics. To those people driving with cars in the parking. We have a special rate. There's a lady outside, so, you can pay \$10 and that's good for the rest of the day. Lunch will be served at 12 o'clock sharp, isn't it?

DIANA T. MARTINO: Mm-hmm.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, it's right across. Actually, when you make a right there's the place where they will serve lunch today. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

## Adoption of Agenda

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. We have the agenda. We are going to address now the adoption of the agenda. And on the agenda, we are going to recommend and add presentation from Jannette and Wilson Santiago after 4:45 p.m. today. Also, after 4:15 PM on the second day, we going to have a sharp presentation from HMS following up on the request by fishermen and the letter sent, mainly about Skipjack Tuna. Any other things for other business or comments about the agenda? We need a motion to adopt the agenda. Richard?

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Just a reminder that the SSC report is near the end and should we start running overtime, I'm not going to be here tomorrow. So, I'd like to make sure that however the schedule progresses today, that we at least have that part today.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: And that might also apply to the queen conch, if you want to switch that around. If you want me for that discussion, make sure it's today.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay.

**GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER:** Mr. Chair, you also have a change in the agenda. So, at 2:30 where you have the queen conch presentation switch, so that it would be Nassau Grouper first and then the queen conch. Graciela here.

19 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mm-hmm.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Graciela. Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, Miguel Rolón for the record. First, we want to recognize a minute of silence.

MARCOS HANKE: This is Marcos again. We are going to recognize and execute a minute of silence in recognition of a close friend, an example for the fishing community. Berto, do you have-- Christina. Yeah, let's wait for a second. She is going to upload something on the screen.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Necesitas la moción de aprobar la agenda antes de eso.

MARCOS HANKE: And in the meantime, I got a little lost here. I apologize. We need a motion to adopt the agenda.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Carl Farchette. Move to accept the amendments to the agenda and adopt the agenda.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Jean-Pierre Oriol, Second.

MARCOS HANKE: All in favor, say aye.

**GROUP:** Aye. Aye. Aye.

47 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Agenda is adopted. Like I was saying, we are going back to the minute of silence and recognition to Luis

Alberto "Berto" Román. It's a very well-respected fisherman. His legacy are around us, not just on the how good of a fisherman he is but a leader engaging into science, engaging into bridges among scientists and fishing community, and a great family.

I have the opportunity to talk to the wife. The whole family recognize, and now they see, because of the amount of love they receive after he passed away, how important was the job that Berto did on the West Coast. Let's do a minute of silence in remembering Luis Alberto "Berto" Román.

(Whereupon, a moment of silence was held in memory of Luis Alberto "Berto" Román.)

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Now Miguel has something to share with you guys.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. At this time- Somebody the other day told me, "Are going to have that urn every meeting?" Well, this is the last one for 2022 because we have a lot of people that have held the Council through the years that serve some recognition from the Council, and some of them are actually around the table.

Today we have Sarah in person. We are glad to see you at this meeting. Sarah and María are the key at the regional office people, the helps of develop our management plans. But today I would like to recognize a couple. What are they? He's going to kill me for this. But, Edgardo, please, you. ¡Parate aqui! So, where is your wife? Alida, over here please. [applause]

This couple is my favorite couple in marine sciences. I met Alida a long time ago. I have said that to many people. I crossed the channel, I went to marine science, and I saw this beautiful lady painting algae and I thought she was extraordinary. So, I said to her, "You have a talent. The algae looks like it's a real algae." And she said, "You're a dumbbell. This is real algae. I'm just wanting the algae that I collected this morning." So, she stopped what she was doing and helped me. And actually, she taught me how to do it. So, when I took my botany class, I was the expert. I was able to [inaudible] and everything. They looked good. They were also professors of our chairman.

And then this gentleman here, you don't know it but he's my expert for marine invertebrates. That poster you have in the back, every time that we mess it up, he calls me, and he said, "Miguel, that's not the name of the queen conch anymore. They have another name. The old name is back."

4 5

So, Dr. Edgardo Ortiz is probably one of the I highest level authority that we have in marine invertebrates in Puerto Rico. And I'm glad that he's our friend that he's from Puerto Rico. Sorry for that. And he is being recognized for his work. He's still working. They both retired. You are an emeritus professor for the University of Puerto Rico.

Alida was our first PhD for marine science department. And they have become probably one of the best people that understand marine sciences and education and outreach. When Diana proposed to me to have an outreach and education panel, "Yeah, that's a good idea. But we need to have somebody that is really knowledgeable and can do it. Let's talk to Alida." And she says, "Hey, yes, we will have an outreach and education panel." And that's what she did. And since that time, she be working with us.

So, at this time we like to recognize both of you with this token of appreciation. It is a, as I said before, we copied this from a Superman comic book. They have a city in a bottle, so, we have a reef in a bottle. I hope that you remember us, the Council, when you retire for the end time.

And so, we would like to thank all of you. So, a round applause for these two good people and I will allow them to say something.

DIANA T. MARTINO: She also founded Puerto Rico Sea Grant.

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Mm-hmm.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Oh yeah, yeah. She's the one who brought the Puerto Rico Sea Grant to Puerto Rico. She has done so, many things that we keep forgetting what she was. But she was also a member of our SSC for some time. She was the one who kept us with the habitat and information that we did for our management plans in check. So, both of you had to say something.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: I'm surprised. But really working in outreach and education for the Council has been, or it is, the best way that I can keep on having people understand, learn, appreciate what is our marine resources. And I am very, very grateful for the way the Council has put outreach and education in every one of our issues.

And Miguel I'm so, proud to have one of my students as president of the Council, you know, that's great. And even more happy that Edgardo, we are always together. So, when I do something, "okay, Edgardo, read it, change it, make it new." So, this is all.

4 5

 EDGARDO ORTIZ: Saludos a todos. Esto es una muy agradable sorpresa y en mi sentido personal, inmerecida. Nosotros siempre hemos estado dirigidos hacia el mejoramiento de toda nuestra población. Siendo particularmente precisos hacia la población estudiantil. Ósea, todos los estudiantes. Así que, en ese sentido, aunque nos hemos retirado de la Academia continuamos siendo maestros y nuestro compromiso ha sido y será con nuestros estudiantes dentro de nuestro pueblo. Y en ese sentido tenemos que destacar la labor tan grande que hace el Consejo de Pesca de Puerto Rico que desde sus inicios los hemos apoyado y los continuaremos apoyando. Así que, mil gracias por esta distinción que nos honra por mucho.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Diga todo eso en inglés. [laughter]

MARCOS HANKE: This is a unique opportunity for me to share with you guys and testify how important those two people are for all the souls that pass through the U.P.R. Humacao program. They not just add academic knowledge, but they teach us how to be critical to the process, to think beyond the lines that everybody thinks, looking for solution, being positive, being productive and respectful to the science.

They are the core of all these generations that pass through the U.P.R. Humacao and they are like our family. This is the way we study. We are very blessed to have them. Thank you very much. [applause]

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

### Consideration of 179th Council Meeting Verbatim Transcriptions

MARCOS HANKE: Marcos Hanke, for the record. The next part of the agenda is the meeting verbatim transcription. Is there any comment? Carlos?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I can just imagine what daunting task it is to transcribe these minutes. But I have a couple corrections. Page 18, line 45 and 46. Instead of saying sea orchids, this should be sea urchins.

 Uh, page 19, line seven and nine where Nelson Crespo was talking about the trammel nets. They put trauma nets, so, it'll be replaced that with trammel, t r a m m e l. On that same paragraph where Crespo, was talking about have to do something with the dangerous gear. They have year, so, replace year with gear, G E A R.

- Uh, page 19, line 32 with the SSC. Went through the tear process.
- This will be tier, T I E R. And page 65, line 44, where I was 2 talking about recreational fishers. I said rec fishers, so, they 3
- misspelled rec. They put W R E C K, it should be rec, R E C, 4
- 5 fishers. Rec fishers. Page 66, line 33, where Sennai Habtes was
- 6 talking about the HMS permits and BAYS tuna, they put base as B A
- 7 S E, it should be BAYS all caps, B A Y S for Bigeye, Albacore
- 8 Yellowfin and Skipjack.

And page 171, line 39. When María was talking about, or I was 10 11 talking about to María about the motion for the trap reduction, I 12 actually rescinded my motion, but they put resend. So, replace 13 rescind for resend. And with that, I move to accept the verbatim 14 minutes with corrections.

15

16 MARCOS HANKE: That's all Carlos. Okay. Anybody else? All the 17 corrections are noted. Thank you very much. I think we are ready 18 for a motion to accept the verbatim transcription.

19

20 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Seems that only one read the minutes.

21

22 MARCOS HANKE: We don't need that.

23

24 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, no. It's just that only one person read the 25 minutes, so, thank you very much.

26

27 CARLOS FARCHETTE: I did.

28

29 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yep.

30

31 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you Carlos. We need a motion to accept-

32

33 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Vanessa Ramírez for the record. Motion to accept the transcript with the corrections already put in the motion. 34

35

36 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you.

37 38

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Second? 39

40

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Second. 41

42 Thank you, Jean-Pierre. All in favor say aye. MARCOS HANKE:

43

44 **GROUP:** Aye. Aye.

45

46 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you everyone. Miquel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe that today we have the honors of having Samuel D. Rauch III. He is the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs. And for those of you who are not familiar with the chain of commands, so in NOAA Fisheries he is one of the top ones in Washington. So, I'm glad that Sam is with us today.

4 5

Sam, would you like to address the group? A few words?

**SAMUEL D. RAUCH III:** So, thank you very much. I am Sam Rauch. I am the Deputy Director of the National Fisheries Service, which of my duties I oversee all the regional offices, including the Southeast region, but also all the other ones around the country at a number of headquarters offices.

In DC we were split with three senior career deputies. I oversee the regulatory programs as I just mention. There is another deputy that recently retired, Paul Doremus, who oversees the budget, law enforcement, international affairs, and some other programs. And then there's the chief scientist, Cisco Werner, who oversees the Science Centers and all the science enterprise. And then we all answered to the political head of the National Fisheries Service. Janet Coit.

It is my pleasure to be here today. I periodically visit the Councils, although I've not been able to visit this Council for many years because of the pandemic. I'm pleased to be here today. I am trying to get back to visit all the Councils. I still now have Alaska to go, but I'm pleased to do this one.

The work of the Councils is incredibly important to the United States. We have one of the best fishery management processes in the world. We have the highest number of sustainable stocks, and we can prove it in an open, transparent process that the Councils manage.

It is thanks to the work that you all do here, that we can do those things and it is not easy to be a Council member, and I do appreciate it from the entire administration. The preparation that you guys undertake, the hard deliberations, the commitment to science and conservation allows us all to do this. This is an important work that we do here today. Whether we're representing the commercial fisheries or the recreational fisheries or other important interests, we do it. You all do it with dedication and I appreciate that and thank you for that.

The other thing that I do in DC is I lead the National Fisheries Service Equity and Environmental Justice Initiative. We just put

out a draft strategic plan early in the summer. I got comments from many folks. We are currently taking all those comments into account. Comment here is closed. We hope to issue a final one shortly. Beginning of next year. And then we will transition to more regionally specific step-down plans where the Southeast Regional office, Southeast Science Center, we'll get together and talk about how you can take these national principles and apply them in important local areas because you can't, you can't deal with everything on our national policy, most of the equity and environmental justice issues are regional. They arise regionally. They need to be solved regionally. They need to be addressed regionally.

4 5

So, it's my pleasure to be here and I look forward to a good Council meeting. Thank you, sir.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Sam. And I want to make a little comment, a segue after your participation. I want to recognize the positive attitude and availability from Sam Rauch to the Caribbean Council throughout different capacities that he has been performing NOAA Fisheries. And the level of professionalism and empathy to the Caribbean is amazing. And I really want to say thank you in the name of all the fishermen and fishing management people of Puerto Rico. Thank you very much. Miguel?

#### Executive Director's Report

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you. And also, I want to add that Sam was the only one, or the first one, to ever help us internationally. I know you remember the Panama meeting. Because it's hard to be sitting in Washington and be able to understand every problem, every issue, every chime that you have across the nation from Samoa to Puerto Rican and Virgin Island. So, for that, we are very grateful because the Council have been working in the international component of the fishery since the get-go in the seventies. And Sam was the first one who helped us move forward. So, with that, we really, really appreciate that part.

Now my report, Mr. Chairman. The executive directors met. We meet every two years, every three years. And we met recently and went through best practices, and we found that some of us were doing things well and others were doing things the old way. Mostly administrative stuff. So, we have our executive committee and we met. The executive committee is composed of the Chair, Vice Chair, fiscal officer and myself.

We went through a series of topics that we address. For example, in the case of the staff, we talk about the analytics, leave. All

the administrative things that pertain to the staff. So, we are correcting those things that we identify in the executive committee. But there's one that needs the approval of the Council at this time.

There have been discussions everywhere about compensation to Council Members and Advisory Body Members when we are having a virtual meeting of less than a day. When we are having an inperson meeting of less having a day. And remember, in a virtual meeting, two hours is half a day because you compress everything in the agenda. So, we discuss it, and the recommendation of the committee is to keep the present status that we have, the way that we compensate Council Members and Advisory Body Members. For this, we need a motion. Mr. Chairman, probably we can discuss a little bit more in the motion. So, at this time, I yield to the Chair to request a motion from the group regarding the issue of compensation to Council Members and Advisory Body Members.

MARCOS HANKE: Anybody can help me with the motion. Language?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: The language would be to keep the present status quo for the compensation of Council Members and Advisory Members of the Council.

Somebody says, "So moved" and we move forward.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. Please move.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Carlos Farchette, second.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Any discussion?

MARCOS HANKE: Any discussion?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: For the record we're talking about in some cases, they don't pay you for traveling. Okay. In others, they don't pay you for virtual meetings. But the issue is that when I remove a commercial fisherman for an hour or two, that commercial fisherman loses money and sometime maybe little bit of money or a lot of money.

If I remove, for example, Gerson Martínez from his day of fishing, there's a lot of money involved. And if I remove one hour of Marcos, he lost his whole day for the charter. So, the Council, this Council at least, recognized that a long time ago, and we decided to compensate for both traveling and actually meeting days. The same holds true for the Advisory Body Members. We have DAPs,

these advisory committees. We have the scientists, SSC and TAP, those people are always very busy in a university and so forth.

So, the Council, in the seventies actually, discussed this and I decided to operate the way we do. Which is, we compensate the Council Members travel, with authorization of the Chair. Staff members and other travel authorization of the Executive Director. We split that to keep everything in order. That's all I will have for this discussion, Mr. Chair.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for keeping a strong record. Is any further discussion? Hearing none. Is there any opposition? No? All in favor, say aye.

**GROUP:** Aye. Aye. Aye.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Now we are going to pass to the part of the agenda.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, no. Todavía no he terminao'.

MARCOS HANKE: This is Marcos. Go ahead, Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: I have a bunch of stuff, but I compressed it into two. The SOPs disappear in 2015, but that's okay because I talked to some of the people in charge in Washington and they told me, "Miguel, the way that you should do it is, you write memo to the record and when the time is appropriate, you can then amend your SOPs."

UNKNOWN: Um, sorry, Miguel, can you repe-- Sorry.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. The SOPs. The standard operation procedures of the Council it's a document that from the get-go, from the starting of the Councils, we were supposed to put it together. And that standard operation procedures talks about the composition of the Council, conduct of the way that we operate, [inaudible] benefits, all and all.

 So, our Council were asked, all the Councils were asked to submit our SOPs for the reviewer in Washington, but our Council went to a place that nobody knows what it is. Sometimes I'm thinking Twilight. Somebody from a Twilight zone will come, the Council SOPs are somewhere, but they're not here. And the solution to that is, some Council, what they do, they amend the SOPs, and they publish the SOPs. In our case, they told us, you know, "You put it on the record." And then the executive committee, "Now, we are going to review all the memos that we have on the record and then

update our SOPs." They will be published in our webpage. So, when the time comes, we can submit that again to NOAA for review.

And the SOPs are important because that's the instrument that we use to, number one, abide by the laws and the regulation that are the ones that we are required to follow. And also, provides a document where anybody can see it, "Ah, this is the way the Council operates." We also have a handbook, administrative handbook, that also describes the way that we operate. So, it's an important document.

At this time, what the secretary director asked me to do, and we all agree, was to just mention for the record that we are not forgetting our SOPs. And of course, anything that goes into the SOP has to be clear by NOAA legal counsel and sometimes by commerce lawyers, because we had to, as I said, be sure that we follow the laws and the regulation. But for example, one thing that we wanted to change is that Dr. Roy Crabtree a long time ago that he couldn't meet sometimes because obligations with the other two Councils. So, we wanted to be flexible. The meeting in August was supposed to be the meeting that incorporates August 10 and 11. Why? Because August 10 is the last day of a Council member when their time is up for the three years. And August 11, is the time where the new Council member comes in, to swear in, to be a Council member for the next three years. But we have that flexible, but we have to change that in our SOPs.

The administrative committee was deleted, and we need to address that. So, that's something that is transparent to the Council members and all that. But the Chair and myself, we have to be mindful of this and probably for the spring meeting we will have a new bill, an updated SOP for your consideration at that time.

 And the last thing I want to talk about is harassment. I took a training on harassment, and all of you are supposed to take a training on harassment. Doesn't mean that after the training you know how to harass people. It's that after the training, you're supposed to avoid harassing people. And I remember, this was a long time ago, there were some guys in the oil field and one lady was complaining about harassment. He said, "Remember for this guy, harassment is a phrase not a word." So, in this case, the guidance that we receive at the CCC meeting is that everybody that belongs to the Council in a way—well, not in a way. Anybody that is a member of the Advisory Bodies or member of the Council, and the staff should take this training. It's 45 minutes. I took it, Carlos took it too.

It's kind of a little bit thick. I don't see many fishermen leaving what they're doing to take this course. But if a harassment situation comes in, ignorance doesn't excuse you from having that. That's why it is important. Then harassment covers everything. Like, for example, if I go like this to the Chairman and he doesn't like it. That's harassment. If I say something that is inappropriate to anybody, staff member, or anything, that's harassment. But it's a little bit more than that. So, I encourage you to see it.

4 5

So far, nobody has told us what happens if a Council member doesn't take the course in harassment. So, do we kick him out, we do something with him. Well, at this time, personal guidance is on a voluntary basis, but in our Council, it will be required for new members to take this course. You have until February 28th to take it. We sent an email with all the emails of the members of the Council and the Advisory Bodies, and you'll be contacted. But if you want to take it now and you don't have the information, please let us know so, we can send you the information.

And I said, in the case, when they interviewed me, they asked me, "Miguel do you have minorities in your Council?" I said, "Well, we are all minorities. Puerto Ricans, Virgin Islanders, women. I'm the only man in the staff sometime. Doubting myself. So, it is important, and this is the message I was told to tell you, the harassment course is available. Please take it and it is a way to, let's say, help you avoid this situation that is embarrassing. These situations are embarrassing, but illegal.

And it's kind of funny. Bullying is not illegal. You can bully people and it's not illegal, but if you harass them, you can be processed. So, there are people working on this, and I don't have to say more about it, Mr. Chairman, you know, the course is there. If you need any assistance, please let us know.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Let's pass to the next item on the agenda, which is the core of this meeting today at 9:30. We're going to start with updates on Island-Based Fishery Management Plans and the current amendment on spiny lobster amendment, and buoy gear amendment. María, are you going to present that?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: So, good morning. This is María López, NOAA Fisheries. I will present the current actions and the status of island-based FMPs. Then we have the trawling gear amendment, that will be me as well. And then we have the pelagic amendment, that will be Sarah Stephenson. And then trap reduction plan, that will be me. And then you guys have a discussion on pelagics, continued discussion on pelagics.

MARCOS HANKE: Please proceed. Thank you, María.

## Updates on Island-Based Fishery Management Plans (FMPs) and Current Amendments (Spiny Lobster Amendment, Buoy Gear Amendment)

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you. So, this is María López of NOAA Fisheries Regional Office, and this is a slide that has all the actions that the Council has discussed recently with the status and additional information for your consideration.

So, I don't know if any everybody can see it. It's a little-- Okay, the first thing is that during the last Council meeting, we were still not effective on the island-based FMPs, but now we are. So, the plans are effective. We have a Fishery Management Plan for Federal Waters of Puerto Rico, one for Saint Croix, and one for Saint Thomas and Saint John. And we are very excited that we have these plans in place.

As you all know, these plans replace the spiny lobster FMP, the reef fish FMP, the Corals FMP, and the queen conch FMP. That final rule was effective on October 13th, 2022. And we are operating right now under the island-Based FMPs, which means that every amendment that is going to be taking place, it's going to be amending one or all of those plans. One, two, or all of those plans, depending on what the Council wants to do.

Okay. So, the first actions that are in red are the ones that, since August, have changed. The status has changed. So, I wanted to highlight that for you.

The generic framework amendment to all the island-based FMPs for the spiny lobster reference points. These are updates based on the SEDAR 57, the assessment. And that was submitted by the Council on September 26th by 2022, which means that the plan is ready for NOAA Fisheries to take over and then prepare the proposed rule. So, that happened in September and that proposed rule, right now, is being evaluated in headquarters. So, we are going to be seeing that proposed rule soon and there's going to be a comment period open for you to comment. So, that will be available at the Council website, the information, also in our website. So, if you are interested to comment on this one, you're going to be able to do that.

The next amendment that is also at the proposed rule stage is the generic amendment to all the island-based FMPs again, and this is the buoy gear definition and use. As you all recall, this is the

one that had an action to prohibit buoy gear for the recreational sector, and also allows up to 25 hooks on buoy gear for commercial fishers. So, this amendment was completed, and it was submitted, by the Council, on November 2nd, 2022. The next stage is the draft of the proposed rule, which we are already, staff on the Southeast Regional Office, is currently working on.

4 5

So that's another one that is going to come out soon for your consideration for commenting on that proposed rule and we will let you know when.

The next amendment that we're all working on is the generic amendment to the island-based FMPs. Again, to all of the three FMPs. And this is the trawl net gear and descending devices. As you may recall from our last Council meeting, this amendment may prohibit the use of all trawl gear in the EEZ or in the Council marine managed areas. May prohibit the use of gillnets, trammel nets, purse seine in the EEZs and may require the use of descending devices when fishing for reef fish in the EEZ.

So, where we are with that right now it's we have a draft of chapters one or two for the Council to select prefer alternatives, if they desire to do that. And we're going to be presenting that right after this presentation. So, we'll have more details about that soon.

 The next amendment is also to all the island-based FMPs, and this is the pelagic management measures. This one is the one that you saw an options paper during the last meeting, and this is the one that may establish recreational bag limits or commercial trip limits and or recreational and or commercial size limit for pelagic stocks that are new to management under each one of the island-based FMPs. The IPT, which is their interdisciplinary planning team, had their first meeting and a draft for this document is being developed for the Council review.

Now, there are things that are still needed from this Council in terms of guidance on the scope of actions, and Sarah Stephenson from the Southeast Regional Office is going to be presenting that during this morning, as well, for your consideration.

 The next actions are actions that have been discussed by the Council that are not in a stage of development, but the Council is interested in pursuing this or has expressed interest in the past in pursuing these actions. However, this depends of course on the Caribbean Council's priorities.

One of them is the development of federal permit system. This is something that we discussed during the past Council meeting. It will revive an action that was tabled in 2016 because as you will recall there was a lot of interest, but we were also waiting for the island-based FMPs to be in place so that a federal permit system will operate under those island-based FMPs. In this action

4 5

the Council was interested in evaluating general permits, limited permits, or any other combination of permits. The IPT was created. Again, the interdisciplinary planning team. They had their first meeting, and from that meeting, it was an introductory meeting for this action, what came out of that meeting is that there is a need for guidance from the Council on the scope of action. Because as we recall, there were many different topics that Council members brought as to what was the interest of the Council in terms of federal permits. And as you all know, federal permits are a little bit complicated and it's very, very important for the Council to narrow the scope of the action so that the IPT can work on something and bring something to the Council for their consideration. So, this is not going to be discussed at this meeting, but it will be discussed at the April 2023 Council meeting.

The next action that the Council has discussed is a trap reduction plan, fish trap reduction plan, for the U.S. Virgin Islands EEZ. This one is one that would evaluate compatibility with the U.S.V.I. trap reduction program. This is an action that has also been discussed in the past more specifically in December 2019. That was right before the pandemic. This one, the Council, during our past Council meeting, requested a presentation with the issues that were brought back, back in 2019 at this meeting. So, we will have that presentation and see where the Council would like to move forward with this.

The next action that was discussed is the timing of seasonal or area closures for the Red Hind Grouper in the Puerto Rico EEZ. So, this was a discussion about changing the timing for the closures that were set in the West coast of Puerto Rico for the Red Hind Grouper. There was a discussion paper presented at the Council meeting in December 2021, and what the Council decided to do at that time was to have informational workshops with fishers and data requests. However, this is still to be decided.

And the last action that I'm presenting to you today is the modification of Red Hind seasonal closure in the San Croix EEZ. This action was a request from fishers from Saint Croix because they wanted to evaluate, modifying the Lang Bank Red Hind closure to allow fishing for pelagic species during the closure. This is an action that was requested from the Council at the April 2022

meeting, and also involves some conferring from staff with HMS, which is the status of this. So, this is another one that still needs to be-- it's still pending.

So, with that, I just wanted to give you an update of where we are with everything, so that you know where we're going to be moving forward and to see what your interest is in moving forward with those other actions that are still going to be pending. Um, I don't know if this is something that needs to be decided right now, but it's something for your consideration. As I mentioned, there are like 1, 2, 3, 4, basically, five actions right now. Two of them in the proposed rule stage, two in the first development stage, one that you will choose preferred alternatives. And the other one, which I think is a big one, which is the federal permit, that will need a lot of your guidance for the next upcoming meeting.

Okay. I'll take any questions.

#### Discussion

MARCOS HANKE: Marcos Hanke, for the record. Anybody from the Council would like to comment or make a question. Uh, Vanessa?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. As I see, since October, these plans are effective. How are we doing to take all this new information to the fishermen and also to train the law enforcement to be sure that they have all these plans clear?

MARCOS HANKE: Alida.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: I have one questions first for María, and then I will make a note on Vanessa's comment. María, we are now working on the development of the, either fact sheets, or some other type of product that it's easier to understand and has the information of each item-based bound. And we are working with chapter five, like you said.

Do we have to wait until these amendments are ready or approved to publish what Vanessa might be asking?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you, Alida. This is María López. So, I think it will be important and for the interest of the public to have a document right now with enough information so, that not just the public can follow the new regulation. Remember, many things stayed exactly the same. There were other things that change and particularly those things that change will be important for them to have. I think the amendments may take a little while. The

proposed rule for the spiny lobster, maybe the first one that will come out soon. So, I would think, like, probably in a couple of months, maybe three months, we should see final, depending on how much time it will take to have the documents ready, then I would say that we could wait for that one. However, I think perhaps if you can prepare something that it's a little bit more general, so that they have that guidance, I think that will be great. And then we'll keep some spaces for the other two things.

4 5

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Okay. So, I'll keep working on the original document and the one for each island. And then Vanessa, besides these materials, we are also planning workshops in the fishing communities with the island-based information.

So as soon as we get all the calendar together, we will talk to you and to each one of the DAPs for the workshops.

MARCOS HANKE: Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Vanessa, the workshop that we are trying to put together, we planned them before the COVID pandemic. So, we hope that in 2023 pandemic will ease off. So, Alida and the outreach and education group are preparing a series of workshops. And at the beginning of 2023, the first quarter, we are going to meet with all the three DAPs. So, we were going to Puerto Rico, Saint Croix, Saint Thomas/Saint John and Alida will give a presentation on the implementation of the island-based FMPs. And the key is to explain to the group in general terms, section five. That other plan that covers all the material that they need to cover.

In the future, then once we have that information, this is a continuum, it doesn't mean that once we have this, that's it. We will be plugging in, maybe talking, using the same tools, but as María just mentioned, you know, these amendments that we have here.

 In addition, public hearings. Different from workshops and other public meetings, the public hearings are required, as you know. So, we want to make sure that when people go to the public hearings, they will have a chance before the public hearings to be able to understand what this is all about. And for that, we're probably knocking on your door to see what the best places are, how many fishermen can attend, and so forth.

The Liaison Officers. Wilson in Puerto Rico, in your particular case, Nicole in Saint Thomas/Saint John, Mabel in Saint Croix will be key also to help us identify the best tools for engaging the fishers. And thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's all for this topic.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. Go ahead.

MIGUEL BORGES: Vanessa, to answer your question with enforcement-

MARCOS HANKE: Name on the record, please.

MIGUEL BORGES: Yeah, Miguel Borges, law enforcement, for the record. We've done at least two trainings with DNER for all the officers in Puerto Rico. We did one for the West coast and one for the East Coast officers. It was given by Michelle Schärer and myself. So, she did a lot of species ID, and I did regulations, federal regulations, and some more enforcement type work. So, we did already two, that was two weeks ago.

So, we plan to do more with other enforcement agencies like FURA and others that are in the water and municipal. So, that's what we've done so, far.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Just a little comment before I passed the word to Graciela. With the Coast Guard-- thank you for being here, by the way. Miguel Borges has participated over many, many years on a fish ID training and a training that they do for the new cadets that are coming in the Coast Guard. I think at this moment, with the island-based FMP, it will probably be appropriate to prepare presentation, when is the timing, to include in the training these new happenings, right?

Probably Graciela will be on this case because of the island-based FMP, the person to do that coordination with you guys. Just for you to keep that on mind, that we have a venue already every year, the training happening. Maybe we can use that venue to inform everybody, for everybody to be on the same page. Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Alida, I've been thinking about one of the issues that we keep confronting, the lack of information in certain areas when we're developing the actions for the different amendments that we're carrying out. So, you know, would there be a possibility of developing some kind of outreach material for people to be aware of what we're missing of the cooperative research program that is available for collaboration among scientists and fishers so, that people become involved in the process and when the time comes to do the analysis, we have additional data that we can use in coming to a determination.

The lack of information doesn't restrict us from being precautionary and doing what the Council needs to do. But I think that it's a, you know, it's a good opportunity now that we've gone through the island-based FMP to focus on the data that is missing

from each island and how we can collaboratively come to terms with providing that information to everyone.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Um, Graciela thank you so much for that information. I think it's really valuable because it goes beyond the fishing person, the fisher. It goes to the entire community and to the municipality and the differences between each one of the islands. And in Puerto Rico, between the West and the East, and the North and the South.

So, what I would think is that whenever this meeting is finished, I meet with you and then I'll bring the draft I already have for the general chapter five, and then we can do specifically, other activities or other materials, that they don't have to be the same, for all the islands.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. María, we have and follow up presentation from you guys.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Are we done with this topic? Okay.

MARCOS HANKE: I'm asking.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, we are.

# Trawl and Net Gear and Descending Devices Amendment to the Island- Based FMPs

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yeah, you are. Okay.

Okay. This is María López NOAA Fishery, Southeast Regional Office. And the next topic that we're going to be discussing is a generic amendment to the island-based FMP to the Puerto Rico, Saint Thomas and Saint John and Saint Croix Fishery Management plans, trawling and net gear and descending devices. Can you guys see well, or do we need to lower the lights? You're good. Okay. Next slide.

This is an amendment that we discussed back in April this year, and there are three actions that are addressing this amendment. One action is a prohibition on the use of all trawl gear in U.S. Caribbean Federal Waters, as a precautionary approach to prevent potential negative impacts on sensitive habitats that are present in the U.S. Caribbean EEZ, such as coral habitats, sponge habitats. And on target and non-target species through direct harvest or bycatch.

The action number two is a provision on the use of gillnets, trammel nets, and purse seines. Right now, there are no federal regulations regarding the use of gillnets or trammel nets for the harvest of Council-managed pelagic species, which let me remind you that they are new for management under the island-based FMPs.

And then there's a third action that was added by the Council at the August meeting, August 2022 meeting. And this is one that would require descending devices be available and ready for use to minimize bycatch mortality of Council-managed reef fish.

So, what we're going to do in this presentation is briefly go through each one of these actions and the background that that was provided for these actions. And then we are going to go through each one of the alternatives that are included in the draft amendment. And then if the Council desires, they can take preferred alternatives, they can choose preferred alternatives at this time and then we'll take that back to the IPT, so the IPT can continue working on this amendment.

Go ahead, Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: María, how do you prefer to do it? We wait until you finish your presentation and then go back.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes. Let's finish. Let me finish. Thank you.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. Thank you.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Next slide. Okay. so, let's talk about action one. This is the trawl. Any type of trawl, right now, are an authorized gear type in the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone around Saint Croix, Saint Thomas, Saint John and Puerto Rico, for using the commercial fisheries that are not managed under any of the island-based FMPs, which we're going to call in for this purposes of this presentation, non-federally managed species. However, there is no evidence that trawl gear is or has been used for fishing in the federal waters of the U.S. Caribbean, except for exploratory fishing or research that was conducted many, many years ago.

 Now, Puerto Rico territorial fishing regulations prohibit the use of trawl gear and drift nets in its jurisdictional waters. And this is just for reference. However, the U.S. Virgin Island do not have a specific regulation prohibiting the use of trawl gear in their territorial waters, at least that we are aware of.

Now, the Council is interested in a potential prohibition on the use of any trawls in Council marine managed areas, which are the seven areas that are seasonally closed areas that are managed by the Council that are present in Puerto Rico, in Saint Croix, and Saint Thomas and/or in the EEZ around Puerto Rico, Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix for several reasons. Right.

4 5

Can you go to the next slide please?

Okay. So, these are the reasons, this is the rationale that was provided by the Council, and they're mostly related to a direct impact that allowing trawling activities could have on sensitive habitats that are present in the U.S. Caribbean EEZ that made it very particular and special. So, the complex mosaic of coral on the insular shelf left little space available for trawling that would not have direct impacts on coral. It has the potential for damaging coral habitat included deep-water corals, as well as sponge habitat and deep-water sponges present in the area. And this was part of the discussion provided by you in December 2021.

There's also concern that trawls could entangle protected species present in the U.S. Caribbean EEZ, for example, sea turtles. And there was also concern about direct impact that the use of trawls in the U.S. Caribbean EEZ has potential to negatively affect certain habitats, designated essential fish habitat and habitat areas of particular concern for managed species under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

 There were also some economic considerations related to the use of certain trawling gear types. For example, damage or lost gear. As well as implication for the bycatch of managed and non-managed species in the U.S. Caribbean EEZ. There were also interest in potential implications, if any, that continued to allow trawling for non-federally managed species as an authorized gear type in the EEZ, including in the Council seasonally managed areas, may have on whether the existing Council marine areas qualify as conservation areas under Executive Order 14008.

Next slide.

Okay, and remember, this is the background based on what has been discussed in the past by the Council. Nothing in here is new. So, now regarding gillnets and trammel nets. Gillnets and trammel nets, and I added the definition in Spanish or how you guys call it in Spanish "filete" for the gillnet/single wall, "trasmallo or mallorquín" for the trammel net or "tremall, chinchorro de ahorque" they hang vertically in the water, and they can or cannot be fixed

to the bottom. This is for reference. Purse seines are large walls of netting deployed around an entire area of school or fish.

Now, the federal regulations at 50 CFR 600.725, which is where the authorized list of gears for fisheries under each one of the island-management areas, list gillnets as an authorized gear type in the U.S. EEZ around Saint Croix, Saint Thomas, Saint John and Puerto Rico, only for: the commercial harvest of federally managed and non-federal managed pelagic species and for the commercial harvest of other non-federal managed species in each of the island-management areas. For purse seines and trammel nets, they're not authorized for any fishery, specifically authorized, for any fishery in any of the three island-management in areas.

Next slide please.

Now, as a reminder, the use of gillnets, trammel nets, as well as pots, traps, and bottom longline is prohibited year-round in the seven Council-managed seasonally closed areas. Bajo de Sico, Abrir La Sierra, Tourmaline in Puerto Rico. And in the U.S. Virgin Islands we have Grammanik Bank, the Mutton Snapper spawning Agregation Area, Hind Bank, and the Red Hind Spawning Aggregation Areas East of Saint Croix. However, there are no specific prohibitions on the use of trawl gear in these or other areas with the exception of the Hind Bank Marine Conservation District in Saint Thomas where all fishing is prohibited year-round. And I have a reference in there to appendix A because if you have your document, you can find all of that information in there.

Now, as you recall, since 2005, the use of gillnets and trammel nets have been prohibited for the harvest of federally managed reef fish and for spiny lobster due to the potential for bycatch. And there's reference in there to the regulations where this can be found. Now, surface gillnets and trammel nets are allowed for the harvest of other species. And in this case, I wanted to highlight baitfish, right? Although it doesn't say in the regulations that is baitfish, but it is usually what people use the surface gillnets and trammel nets in federal waters.

Next slide, please.

For purse seins and trammel nets and other non-authorized gear. A person could petition the Council to use this gear types. And at that time, if that happens, if there's a petition, the Council and NMFS if could take action whether to allow or prohibit the use. And in here, we put a reference to those regulations, which says, "A person or vessel is prohibited from engaging in fishing or employing fishing gear when such fishing gear is prohibited or

restricted by regulation under an FMP or other applicable law. However, after December 1st, 1999, an individual fisherman may notify the appropriate Council, or the Director, in the case of Atlantic highly migratory species, of the intent to use a gear or participate in a fishery not already on the list. 90 days after such notification, the individual may use the gear or participate in that fishery unless regulatory action is taken to prohibit the use of the gear or participate in the fishery, for example, through emergency action and interim regulations." We have all heard about this before and several times, including when we were discussing the buoy gear. So, this is just for your reference.

Next slide.

Now the third item that was included in this amendment is the descending devices. At the August 2022 Council meeting, which was the 179th meeting, the Council made the request to include another action in the amendment. They discuss concerns from fishermen about reef fish that are released either due to regulatory or economic discards.

And let me remind you, regulatory discards are those fish that are required by regulation to be discarded, but also include fish that may be retained but not sold. And economic discards are fish that are discarded because they are undesirable to the harvester. And this category of discards generally includes certain species, sizes and/or sexes with low or no market value.

So, this fish that are released because of these reasons but do not survive, were concerning for the fishermen. In their discussion, the Council focused on injuries from barotrauma.

Barotrauma is the rapid expansion of gases in a fish as it quickly reeled up from depth. There are signs from barotrauma such as bulging eyes, the stomach protruding from the mouth, and bubbling scales. We saw a presentation during last time with examples of this. Now to improve the survivorship of that released reef fish the Council consider a measure that would encourage the use of best fishing practices to minimize the impacts from the capture, and therefore discuss the use of descending devices as a tool to reduce that fishing mortality for that reef fish from barotrauma. So of course, this is a device that should be used when the fish are showing signs of barotrauma.

Next slide. Okay, thank you.

So, this is something that was done, as we mentioned before, done also by the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council and the South

Atlantic Fishery Management Council. And the Council was interested in following those steps that were taken by our colleagues in those fishery management Councils to require that descending devices be available and ready for use for certain fisheries and reduce that bycatch mortality.

So, the Council pass a motion for staff to develop Action 3, proposing to add a requirement to have a descending device available and ready for use on a vessel when fishing for or possessing Council-managed reef fish. The Council decided that it will also work on education and outreach activities with fishing communities regarding descending devices, their development and the use.

Okay, let's go to the next slide.

So, that was all the background on these actions. Now let's talk about the statement of the purpose and need that was prepared by the interdisciplinary planning team. The purpose of this amendment is to prevent potential damage to habitats from certain gear types, including essential fish habitat, protect species associated with such habitats, as well as to promote best fishing practices and enhance the survival of released fish in the EEZ around Puerto Rico, Saint Croix, and Saint Thomas and Saint John.

The need for this amendment is to minimize potentially adverse effects of fishing to habitats an associated species and to minimize the mortality of bycatch species.

Okay, next slide.

Now let's go into details of each one of the actions. Action 1 is the one that deals with trawl gear.

So, we have three alternatives that are proposed. Alternative 1 is usually the no action, which means that there are going to be no changes. So, that means that everything that is in the regulations as of now, it stays the same, which means that the trawl gear will continue to be authorized for commercial and recreational harvest in federal water around Saint Croix, Saint Thomas, Saint John and Puerto Rico. I think I should have not put recreational in there, so, I'm going to cross it out.

Okay. Alternative 2-- and I apologize for that. Alternative 2, prohibit the use of trawling gear for all fishing in Caribbean Fishery Management Council's seasonally closed areas, marine managed areas year-round in federal waters.

And the alternative 3, it will prohibit the use of trawling gear for all fishing in federal waters around Saint Croix, Saint Thomas and Saint John and Puerto Rico. So, the difference between Alternatives 2 and 3 is that one will prohibit the trawling activities in the marine managed areas. And number 3 is in all federal waters.

4 5

Next slide.

 So, we typically include in our documents a comparison of the alternatives to assist the Council in making a decision. So, very quickly, as you know, Alternative 1 is status quo and would not change any regulations applicable to use of trawls in federal waters of the three island-management areas. Alternative 2, would prohibit all trawl gear around Council MMAs, while Alternative 3, as I mentioned earlier, it would be around to all EEZ waters of the three island-management areas.

Now because trawl gear has not historically been used in the U.S. Caribbean EEZ and is not currently used, basically Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 could be considered administrative actions and are not expected to have any additional physical, biological, ecological, social, and economic effects when you compare them to Alternative 1, which is the status quo.

However, by preventing any future use of the trawl gear, both of the Alternatives, 2 and 3, could be more beneficial to the biological, physical environment because it could prevent any potential bycatch and or habitat effects from the use of trawl gear in federal waters around the three islands or, alternatively, in the Council MMA, with the former being more beneficial in protecting the fishery and habitat resources throughout the U.S. Caribbean. Prohibiting the use of trawl gear applicable to all fishery components of the island management area, which will be Alternative 3, would prevent future use through a petition for its use, which is what we discussed earlier today, and which something that could occur under Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, which is the one that only deals with the marine managed area. So, it will be more beneficial to the physical, biological, and ecological environment.

Okay. I don't know if anybody has any questions on that, or I can continue.

MARCOS HANKE: Just to make sure that every everybody's following along with you. Vanessa. I have a question?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: You want us to decide preferred alternative or recommend preferred alternative at this time?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: That's up to you, Marcos. If you would like to do that right now, we can certainly do that.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Let's go with Vanessa first, and

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Of course.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. I'm going to make a question. I don't know if someone in this room have the answer, but did we know how many commercial fishermen can get impact by this action?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: This is María López. Well, currently there is no trawling in federal water, so, we're assuming no one. Mm-hmm.

MARCOS HANKE: For the record. For the record, to be very clear, this is Marcos. Because there are many actions that we are evaluating and talking about, make sure that you refer to the action that you're making the question or referring to for the record to be clear. Okay. Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yes, I propose, because I myself have a very short memory. Can we just go one by one and then go back? And then María can ask the Council, these are the alternatives. Would you like to choose a preferred one at this time? Can we do that? Then we go one by one, and that way we will be able to, not only have question answered by María, but also introducing to the record any thought, any comment that you may have before you make a final decision as to your preferred alternative. Uh, María, can you refresh the memories of everybody? What happens after the Council selects the preferred alternatives?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: This is Mari López. Several things could happen. So, one of the things that we are looking for is if you select a preferred alternative, we will bring that back to the IPT and the IPT would flush out the document. We still have to prepare the description of the fishery, description of the environment. Not really a lot has changed because, obviously, we have a fresh island-based FMP. So, there's a lot of information there, and we will be referring to that one in [inaudible] by reference, however, the description of the fisheries, for example, not necessarily just for trammel net, because really there's not much about that, but for other components, for example, the gillnet and the trammel net, which we know that those are gears that are used in state

waters to harvest many species, so that is very important to be described. We have some information in here that we think will assist you in making this decision right now, but if you feel that there's not enough information for you to make a decision, then that's no problem. We'll take it back to the IPT and then we continue developing until we can bring more.

4 5

So, what happens then? We take it to the IPT if everybody's ready and then for the next Council meeting, we will have a full fledge amendment with everything. You guys can take final action and we will bring a draft of the codified text. That codified text is what ends up going on the regulations that makes those changes for your approval. And then after that, if everything moves forward, then that's when NMFS takes over in terms of the proposal, so we can prepare the proposal.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: María, what is IPT?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: The interdisciplinary planning team is the group that is in charge of drafting the amendments and making all the analysis and is composed of people from NOAA Fisheries and the Council. They have different expertise. For example, we have biologists, we have people from enforcement, lawyers, scientists from the Science Center. We have biologists and staff from the Council. And with all of that expertise together, we are able to provide complete and full analysis for the Council to consider these actions with the best available information.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yes, I know that the staff is knowledgeable about the plans that you are developing.

So, Mr. Chairman then, can we just go to the first one and then María can guide the Council in terms of what is needed, what is required at a particular point. And if you wanted to take a preferred alternative usually the way that we do it, is you can discuss a little bit before, but you can have a motion and then, at the discussion, you develop the record as to why that is important or not, as to why you want to select that as your preferred alternative.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. And I want, for the record to be very clear, that this is not new for the Council. We have been discussing this throughout the years, and this is mature enough and some of them very mature to make a preferred alternative. Maybe. Let's see what happened. But I want to the record to reflect that this is not new for us, right? María already stated—

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Correct. We have seen already an options paper on this. The only action that was not included was descending devices, and we'll discuss that today. So, what I would do is I would encourage Council members to take notes if there's anything specific that you want to discuss at the end, and we'll go one by one. Okay.

6 7 8

2

3

4 5

All right. So, with that, I'm going to move to action two. Can you go to the next slide please.

9 10 11

12

13

Okay. so, this is the one with that deals with the gillnets, trammel nets and purse seines in the EEZ around Puerto Rico. So, in here we're going to have four alternatives. I just divided this slide, so it wasn't that dense in there.

141516

1718

19

20

2122

23

2425

So, Alternative 1 is the no action, which is basically to retain the authorized net gear types for commercial and recreational harvest in federal waters around Saint Croix, Saint Thomas, Saint John and Puerto Rico. Gillnets, currently, are an authorized gear type for the commercial harvest of managed, Council-managed and non-managed pelagic species, and for the commercial harvest of non-federal managed species in each of the island-management areas. Trammel nets and purse seines are not listed as an authorized gear type for any fisheries in the U.S. Caribbean EEZ. This is the status quo. This is the current regulations. This is what we have always had.

262728

2930

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42 43

44 45

46

47

48

Alternative 2 would prohibit the use of gillnets in federal waters around Saint Croix, Saint Thomas and Saint John and Puerto Rico. There are two sub-alternatives. You can do that prohibition that applies to all fishing in the EEZ, everything. So, that means that we're not talking about HMS here. We're talking about the species that are considered managed by the Council or species that are not managed by the Council. For example, remember that we have new Fishery Management Plans and we used to have a ton of reef fish and now we have less species, so, there are going to be species that didn't make it to be included in the Fishery Management Plan for several reasons, but they're still caught by fishermen. So, this is mostly what we're referring to when we're talking about non-FMP species. And then, sub-alternative 2b is for all fishing in the EEZ except for the following fish species belonging to the halfbeaks. Halfbeaks, which is the Family Hemiramphidae, to the Gar (Family Belonidae) and flyingfish (Family Exocoetidae). And these are species that are usually caught as baitfish. A surface gillnet used in the EEZ around Puerto Rico, Saint Croix or Saint Thomas and Saint John to fish for any baitfish must be tended all the time. That part is not really new. This is something that it's in our regulation still.

4 5

Now, why are we adding particularly those species? We're mimicking here what we have in the U.S. Virgin Islands regulations. That's what they have in the regulation as to what they allowed for baitfish. So, we can talk later if this is something that will work for you or not. I'm going to go to the next slide to show the other alternatives three and four.

Next slide please.

Alternative 3 deals with the use of trammel nets for all fishing in federal waters. Basically, will prohibit the use of trammel nets for all fishing in federal waters. And Alternative 4 prohibits the use of purse seines for all fishing in federal waters in Saint Croix, Saint Thomas and Saint John.

Okay. So, just as a reminder, gillnets and trammel nets may not be used in the EEZ to fish for reef fish or for spiny lobster. Okay? A gillnet or trammel net can be used to fish for any other species; however, it must be tended at all the time. So, that's what our regulations currently have. So, what the Council was interested in doing, particularly with gillnets and trammel nets, is to extend this prohibition to pelagic species, but also extend this prohibition to other species in order to protect species that are managed as well. Okay. And as you know, gillnets are already prohibited for use in the Council Closed Areas or Council MMAs.

Next slide.

Okay. So, I'm going to show you, and this is in Vanessa's interest. This is just a summary of the use of these two particular two gears in Puerto Rico landings in the U.S. Virgin Islands, Saint Thomas and Jon Croix. And I'm going to show you a table after this one. So, for gillnet and trammel nets Council-managed species that are reported in Puerto Rico commercial landings with gillnet from federal waters include barracuda, cero and king mackerel, blackfin and little tunny.

Now I want to make the distinction that when we query this data from zero to nine nautical miles and from 9 nautical miles to 200, which will be the definition of federal or unknown, because landings are also reported as unknown, there's a possibility that those landings that are reported that came from waters that are past the nine nautical miles may include harvest from waters that are around the Puerto Rico offshore islands that belongs to Puerto Rico jurisdiction. So, we are going to be looking at those as that occur in federal waters, but I want you to keep that in mind because it could be a possibility that those are state landings.

4 5

Now for commercial landings from 2012 to 2021 of Council-managed species from EEZ waters around Saint Thomas and Saint John caught with gillnet include some reports, and when I say some reports, it's basically nothing, for red hind, coney, yellowtail snapper blue runner, all landings were minor and confidential, so, I don't have a table to show you, but they were very minor. For the EEZ around Saint Croix species reported commercially with gillnet from 2012 to 2021, the only Council-managed species is redtail parrotfish, and it's also confidential data because it's basically nothing, and two non-managed species, which is ballyhoo, which is showing 6,211 pounds in total, and needlefish, with a hundred pounds. So those are baitfish species.

Okay, next slide please. Thank you.

Okay, and this one here is so you can see the landings. This is only for Puerto Rico, as I said, around 2014 to 2019, divided by state, federal, and, no, I don't have a table for Saint Thomas, Saint John or Saint Croix because it's not like this one. We don't have that data. You guys have also different regulations. The U.S. Virgin Island doesn't allow the use of gillnets and trammel nets other than just for baitfish, so it's normal that there will be no landings associated to those gears.

So, in Puerto Rico, the way that we divided this is the species that are managed and not managed. As you can see from gillnet, most of the harvest that occurs for gillnets, obviously occurs in state waters, right? And the species that we have in there, we have barracuda, the mackerels, right? the blackfin, the little tunny, and the Wahoo. Wahoo and dolphin are confidential, so that means that it was very, very little reported in there.

For federal waters, as you can see, there's 1,117 pounds reported from 2014 to 2019 in federal waters. So, compared to what is caught in state waters, that's very minimal. And then 733 for the cero mackerel. For the other species, there's really nothing in there. Now there's, for non-managed species, we have obviously most of that harvest occur in state waters and that makes sense because these are species that are associated to be closer to the coast. As you know that federal waters, you know, start at nine nautical miles, so that's a little far away to be catching bait species but my understanding, from what you guys have told us, is that these are more, you're fishing for something else, and you see the opportunity to get baitfish species while you're fishing in federal waters, then you go and do that. So that's why there is an alternative that provides for allowing to continue to do that.

So, these are some of the species that are that are caught in state waters and in federal waters. And some of them that come to view is obviously the ballyhoo, the jacks and the skipjack. I'm sorry, not the skipjack, the snook, which is kind of weird, but yeah, so, that's what our landings are saying. Now. If you look at trammel nets basically all of the landings, come from the state waters because trammel nets are a gear that is allowed to be used in state waters.

8 9 10

2

3

4 5

6

7

Okay, I'm going to move to the next slide, please.

1112

13

14

And I'm almost done. Okay. So, the same way that we did with action one, we're just going to compare the alternatives in here, so we can assist you in making a decision if that's what you would like to do.

15 16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

29

30

31

So, for gillnets, Alternative 1 is, you know, the status quo, there will be no changes to gillnet regulations in the EEZ around the three Islands. And what this means is that this will be less we call the biological and beneficial to what ecological the islands, but more beneficial environment of socioeconomic environment than Alternative 2, Sub-alternative 2a, which is the one that prohibits all fishing. And this is because fishers will still be allowed to be using this gear for harvesting all the species, like, you know, commercial and recreational manage and non-managed pelagic species. And when we say it's more beneficial to the socioeconomic environment than other ones that are more restrictive, it's because those fishers that are engaging in using those gears in federal waters can continue to do so. So, then, they will not be affected if we don't do this. But again, as you saw on the landings, there's very, very minimal harvest in federal water but there's still some harvest.

32 33 34

35

36

37

Okay? And then the administrative effects will be slightly higher under Sub-alternative 2a than Alternative 1. This is basically we're doing an amendment, we have to set regulations, but there's going to be, you know, enforcement associated with it. So, that's considered administrative.

38 39 40

41

42 43

44 45

46

47

48

Now with respect to certain species of baitfish, Alternative 1 and Sub-alternative 2b are not different. 2b is the one that bans all the use of gillnet for all fishes, except for the baitfish families that we mentioned, as both will continue to allow gillnets for catching those species with no additional effects to the biological environment, socioeconomic environment, or administrative environment because that's basically what we're doing right now. As you can see in the landings, those are most of the species that are caught, we're assuming for use as the bait. Then the physical

effects are not expected from the use of gillnets just because, you know, this is a gear that works on the surface.

2 3 4

1

Okay. so, let's go to the next slide.

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

2122

23

2425

2627

28

2930

31

From Alternative 3 and 4, which are the ones trammel nets and purse seins-- and I understand there's a lot of information in here, so, please bear with me and mark your questions if you have some at the end. For trammel nets and purse seins, as I mentioned, they're not authorized to be used in federal waters. So, the effects to physical, biological, ecological, and socioeconomic environments for Alternatives 3 and 4, which are the ones that prohibit the use of those two gears, they're not expected to be different from those at the status quo. Why? Because they're not currently authorized for using federal waters for any fishing, right? Also, we see that, from what we saw from the table, that the landings from the trammel nets seems to be constrained to Puerto Rico state waters, where this gear type is allowed. You saw that there's no significant landings in federal waters and obviously in the U.S. Virgin Islands, these gears are not allowed to be used. However, Alternative 3 and 4 could be slightly more beneficial to the biological/ecological environment of the three island-management areas because they could further restrict potential future use of these gear types through a petition to the Council. Remember, like a gear type that is not listed as authorized can still be petitioned by a fisher to be used. Um, so, that is something that the Council was looking into, perhaps, not continue to allow. Administrative effects are expected to be slightly higher for Alternatives 3 and 4 than for Alternative 1. Of course, because we have to do that amendment and we have to set regulations and then there's going to be prohibitions that the enforcers will have to abide to.

32 33 34

Next slide.

35 36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44 45 And this is the last one of the actions. This is the requirement to use descending devices. This one has two alternatives. Do you either have it or you don't. So, Alternative 1, no action. Descending devices are not required to be on board a vessel fishing for or possessing species in the reef fish component of the Puerto Rico Saint, Saint Croix, Saint Thomas and Saint John. So, basically, status quo. Alternative 2 require the descending device be on board a commercial or recreational vessel and readily available for use while fishing for or possessing species in the reef fish component of the Puerto Rico, Saint Croix, Saint Thomas and Saint John Fishery Management Plan.

Now we included a definition for purposes of this amendment, of what that descending device means, and this mimics the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, what they did. And we have talked about this in the past, and my recollection is, you have said that this is something that would apply, but I want you guys to keep this in mind in case we need changes. This is the moment to do it.

4 5

For the purpose of this requirement, a "descending device" means an instrument to which is attached a minimum of a 16-ounce weight and a length of line that will release the fish at the depth from which the fish was caught or a minimum of 50 feet. So number are important for you to consider here in case you think we need to make changes. The descending device attaches to the fish's mouth or is a container that will hold the fish. The device MUST be capable of releasing the fish automatically, by the actions of the operator of the device, or by allowing the fish to escape on its own. Since minimizing surface time is critical to increasing survival, descending devices shall be readily available for use while engaged in fishing.

So, this alternative doesn't say that you have to use it, that you're required to use it. You need to use it; you have to have it available to use if a fish is exhibiting barotrauma.

Okay next slide.

And this is the comparison of the alternatives. Alternative 2, which is the requirement for having it rigged and ready, will be more beneficial to biological and ecological environment of reef fish than the status quo, which is what we currently have, because it would require the descending device to be rigged and ready for use, which could decrease fish mortality of Council-managed reef fish from barotrauma. In the short term, socioeconomic effects from Alternative 2, which is a prohibition, are expected to be larger than from Alternative 1, which is doing nothing, due to the cost and effort for fishers to obtain and keep on board a descending device. Administrative effects from Alternative 2 would also be higher than Alternative 1 because of the regulations to affect the requirement and the additional efforts to enforce these regulations for a reef fish fishermen, both commercial and recreational, in federal waters of the three management areas and to conduct outreach and education activities.

Next slide.

Okay, so, this is from the presentation that was given by Marcos Hanke last time. He showed popular types of descending devices.

So, one of the things that the Council was also interested is because it's very easy to make a descending device, this could be made with things that you already in your kit, in your fishing kit. Um, there's a lot of information in terms of how to do it. So, of course in the previous slide I highlighted socioeconomic, short term socioeconomic effects because obviously there will be a cost incurred in doing this. However, that doesn't mean that there are no programs that you can apply to that the Council can probably find out if there are places that you can apply to that probably have descending devices at no cost.

4 5

And there is also education. I put in here two educational videos that are super, super good. One of them the sources is South Atlantic Fishery Management Council from the North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries is a how-to video and how rig and use these descending devices. And the other one is from the Florida Fish and Wildlife Commission on how to make a descendant device. And obviously we have the expertise from fishermen over here, which have used it. When we were at the MREP meeting back in August, there were kids that were participating in the meeting that were already using the descending devices that will be really happy to show everybody how to use that.

So of course, if this is something that is done, there will be a period where, you know, there's going to be a lot of education and outreach activities that will have to be conducted in order to educate the fishers on how to do something like that so, we can comply with regulations.

Now let's do the last slide.

And this is the next steps. The next steps are to indicate if any changes are needed to the scope of the action or alternatives, select preferred alternatives, if you want to do that. And then if we're moving forward with this, task the IPT to continue development of the amendment for final action in April 2023. And that's it.

# Discussion

MARCOS HANKE: María, can we go action by action to follow the instructions on the next steps for each of them with you.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: María. What I propose the Council to do is, if you know what you want, let's say to discuss, the question, do you want trawl gear to be used in the EEZ or not? If your decision is not, and actually that's the way that you discussed it before, then you can have a motion to prohibit the, whatever. in the EEZ.

And then in the discussion, we ask the staff, María, here, where in the document that will fit. And then you develop the discussion at that time. Because otherwise you will be entangling, Alternative b or, you know, the whole thing that you mentioned before. So, let's stick to the issues that you consider are important in the discussion of a motion to do this.

And also, you already did this before, and that's why you have the result of that decision which is this document that you have here. So, just to refresh your memory of the new Council members, for every action that you have, it is required to have three alternatives. Of course, the no action, and then two more that are different approaches to the same issues.

So that's why you have seen today, an excellent document by the way, a presentation on the action that you have. We have two actions. Action one and— excuse me, three actions and the first one is this one that we have on the screen. So, María.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. So, the way that we set this up, I think it would be easy to, because they're divided by topics, right? So, this one is just trawling gear, right? And of course, you know, this is an amendment. We have three actions, and they relate to each other, you know, because they will have some sort of impact or no impact. But I think, if we start with action one and then you guys can move forward.

One of the things I want to highlight in here, I think I said it in the beginning, I don't know if you remember, trawling gear is not allowed in Puerto Rico state water. So that will be something, it's a compatible, I think it will make it something compatible between federal. And I'm not sure in U.S. Virgin Islands, if you have anything in the regulations, like, at least I couldn't find it, but I would assume, right, that perhaps it's not something that occurs in your waters as well.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos Farchette.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Did you call me?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Oh. Yeah. So, I have a motion for action one.

Okay. So, it will be I move to adopt Action 1, Alternative 3, prohibit the use of trawling gear for all fishing in federal water around Saint Croix, Saint Thomas and Saint John and Puerto Rico.

MARCOS HANKE: Do we have a second?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Wait, wait as the preferred alternative.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: As preferred.

MARCOS HANKE: Do we have a second? Jack McGovern. Second the motion. Discussion? Jack, go ahead.

JOHN MCGOVERN: Yeah, I just want to point out that María provided some good rationale for this alternative in action one. And we have only chapters one and chapter two in here but there is rationale in the amendment as it is now, and it's the rationale that the Council provided previously. They indicated that there, you know, there isn't really a lot of room for trawl because of all the coral that's there, and that this action would protect deep-water corals, sponge habitat and protected species. So, I think there's good rationale for this.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. This speeds up the process a lot. We don't need to go over and over. Do you want to say something Kate? No? Well, is there any opposition? Don't see anybody with the hands up for the opposition. All in favor say, aye.

**KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI:** Uh, wait, did somebody check on Zoom? Are there any Council members participating on Zoom?

MARCOS HANKE: No. No. They're all present.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Okay. Pardon me.

MARCOS HANKE: No, all here. Thank you for making sure we are on the right path here. All in favor say, Aye. Louder.

GROUP: Aye. Aye. Aye.

MARCOS HANKE: Well even louder, but I heard everything. Thank you very much. The record is clear. Everybody is in agreement.

Next one. Next action.

**VANESSA RAMÍREZ:** Mr. Chair, Vanessa Ramírez for the record. I abstain.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Vanessa Ramírez, abstain from on this vote.
We have then one abstention and the rest of the group--

ANDREW MCGRAW-HERDEG: Sorry, Mr. Chairman, for the record, Coast Guard will be abstaining from all votes today and tomorrow. I'm a non-voting representative.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. Coast Guard doesn't vote, so, don't worry about it.

ANDREW MCGRAW-HERDEG: Okay, thank you.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: The record is that we have one absent, one abstained. The rest approved the Motion. Puerto Rico is absent.

MARCOS HANKE: Kate, are we clear on the record? Yes?

15 Next action.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. This action is the use of gillnets and purse seins in the EEZ, around Puerto Rico, Saint Croix, Saint Thomas and Saint John.

I want to remind something, if there's an island that doesn't want to move forward with one of the alternatives or want to choose something else, you can do that. Okay? Because we have three Fishery Management Plans now, so you can do that.

MARCOS HANKE: We recognize this is Marcos. We recognize the flexibility, but like I said before, we discussed this very deeply and extensively before, that's why the Council is ready to say something.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yes, Miguel for the record. But this is important, whenever you have a motion, the motion should say for the three island areas, this is my motion. And then at that time people can say, "No. In Saint Croix, I want something different." That's what María is talking about. Because we are addressing simultaneously three FMP that have been approved. So, in the motion we can reflect that by saying that the motion intends to be applied—Our preferred motion intends to be applied in the three areas of jurisdiction of the island-based FMP.

MARCOS HANKE: Point well taken. Thank you very much. Next action, María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. For this one, you can choose multiple alternatives in here because as you saw the alternatives deal with, one deal with gillnets, the other ones deal with trammel nets and the other one with purse seins. So, you can do that. Alternative 1 will just leave it as is, right? So Alternative 2 prohibit the

use of gillnets in federal waters around Saint Croix, Saint Thomas and Saint John and Puerto Rico. This is federal waters. Okay? So, Sub-alternative 2a for all fishing in the EEZ, that means that you're not allowed to use gillnets for any fishing. And again, we're not talking about HMS, we're just talking about Councilmanaged species and species that are not managed by the Council. And then Sub-alternative 2b for all fishing, except for the following fish species belonging to those three groups.

4 5

And also, if you want to make changes to that, we can do that as well. So, I think that could be part of the discussion as well. And then the other two alternatives are, can you go to the next slide, please? Real quick. The third one prohibits the use of trammel nets for fishing in federal waters. And number four, prohibit the use of purse seins. Purse seins are really not used and then trammel nets, as you saw from the landings, they're really not used, but trammel nets are used in state water. So, they will continue to use. Um, if this is something that the Council wants to do, they will continue to use trammel nets in state waters. This doesn't affect state waters. Of course, it's not going to be compatible, but it's not compatible anyways. Go ahead, Miguel, sorry.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: María. Just a question. Can we make it simple by saying, if that's what the Council would like to do, a motion to prohibit use of nets in the EEZ, including gillnet, trammel nets and purse seins or do we have to split it.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: I would prefer for the record, for a clear record, if the Council specifies what is the prefer alternative from what they have in here by island.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. Which one of the-- that's the guide then.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: You can choose multiple. So, if you want to start with Alternative 2, just the gillnets, and then say, if you want to do Sub-alternative 2a or 2b, or if you don't want to do it.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, María. Carlos. Carlos, I think have-

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah, I have a motion. So, action two, I move to adopt action two, Alternative 2, Sub-alternative 2b as preferred. Or just action two, Sub-alternative 2b, or do I have to use that Alternative two.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, Carlos and María. So, the motion will be, for action two, the preferred alternative for the three island areas will be Sub-alternative 2b, right? Is that correct, Carlos?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Correct. 2b. As preferred.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: To be or not to be.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Huh. And also, I need to go to-- and then do this one? Okay.

Um, before I go there, can you go back again, because I noticed that in the alternative 2b, you have the use of this gear for batfishes like gar and flyingfish, but I did notice that in the Puerto Rico chart you had harvest of ballyhoo in the EEZ. So, I don't know if you're confusing gar with ballyhoo or needlefish. I'm not sure. Gar is a totally different fish.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos, the Family Hemiramphidae include the species of ballyhoo.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: It includes?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Okay.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: One point, for the record. The reason why you have the families is because we are addressing some species that specifically are within the family, but they also will address all those species in the family. And that's why it was written this way by the staff.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. María?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes. I just wanted to mention that the reason that this has been very specific is because the Council's intention is to prevent the use also of juvenile species as bait, so it's important to be a little more specific because if you say, except for baitfish, you know, it could open up the door for certain species that you really don't want to be caught a bait. Although we do have, you know, obviously, prohibitions on reef fish, etcetera, but there are other groups that are not included in there.

46 MARCOS HANKE: I think, Carlos, did you finish? To keep the record straight, let's finish with the motion because I'm not very clear

that you finished. Do you want to include anything else on that first motion?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Well, no, not for this, but I need something for the other, for alternative four. But when María mentioned juveniles and I'm concerned about juveniles for every species out there. But we'll leave that alone.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. Mr. Chair, the way you're doing this is the right way. You go one by one, but make sure that you cover everything. So, the first motion addresses action two, alternative 2, Sub-alternative 2b, and that's very clear for the record because remember, you are selecting your prefer alternative, and there is a language after that that is needed. Then the staff will take care of it, the IPT will take care of it.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Right? yeah. Did I include that for all three island FMPs? Okay.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Is everybody clear with the motion, which is-

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Second motion.

MARCOS HANKE: And I'm going to ask now if there is a second for the motion presented by Carlos. Yeah, Jack. We are going for discussion. María?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yeah, María López. I just want to clarify that if the language is not very clear in the Sub-alternative, as long as we have a good rationale, we can always modify a little bit and then we'll bring it back to you for your consideration, if it needs a little bit more clarity. But I think the rationale is good.

MARCOS HANKE: I think it's good. And the language is per is clear enough. Yes. Thank you, María. And all in favor? Any opposition?

Okay, let's do this. Let's do Council member, per, Council member voting. Let's start with Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to make a comment first. Okay. in this case, I will abstain again because we already know that any action that we take in federal waters, many of them, go directly also to state waters just because, sadly, the department is not evaluating things and they're practically adopting many of the regulations that we have in federal waters.

So, as we know, we still have like a hundred commercial fishermen, at least at the West side of the island where I work. This was a situation that was discussed in Puerto Rico state, in a public hearing in 2019 and we brought fishermen there. One of the things was, practically, they are old people that are still working. Most of them are 65 or more, and it's the only kind of art that they know. So, if we make an action like this in federal waters maybe soon it's going to apply also to state water. And I'm worried of all these families that are going to get direct impact because of this. This was already discussing state. So, I will abstain again. And for me, if it was me, I prefer no action.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Mm-hmm. But we need the record clear. You want to abstain from this rule?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

18 MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Thank you. Next, James.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Okay, so, what Carlos proposed is Alternate 2 and 2b, correct? Yeah, I'd say I have to abstain also. Same thing, I know most of all our fishing is closer in shore, in state waters, territorial waters, but also, Vanessa makes a good point that a lot of times once the federal regulation is made, then it's brought into local waters also. So, I have to abstain.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Let me say something for the records. Miguel here. You, as a Council member, you have a responsibility to work with the EEZ. We know what happened. It's like when we talk about the listing and everything later, and that's good for your rationale, but you also have a responsibility when you swore in that you defend the EEZ. So, in this case, you have to tie that consideration. Don't change your vote from abstain. This is for the future, for this discussion, but it is important for you to bring this rationale to the record as to why you abstain. So that's excellent.

Also, you have the responsibility or not responsibility, you have the prerogative of explaining your vote when you have a no. In addition, whenever we have a vote and we have a descending vote of something that goes to the secretary, you have what they call the minority report. That's an explanation of why my no goes into the report. And that no, the explanation or rationale for that no, will follow the document. So, I just, because you are too new, Vanessa, I've been around for some time now, but as a present just for the record to let you know.

MARCOS HANKE: Kate I'm going to keep with the vote, count and expressions. But first with Kate.

**KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI:** Okay. Kate Zamboni for the record. I just wanted to make sure you know; you have more choices than abstain or vote Yes. Like you could vote no if you disagree with the motion.

MARCOS HANKE: Well, thank you very much Jean-Pierre.

**JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL:** Morning everyone. So, I just want to be clear on the vote itself, this is for all fishing and the EEZ, correct?

MARCOS HANKE: Mm-hmm. With the nets.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Right. So, because the Island-Based Fishery Management Plans are now adopted, I'm actually only comfortable, on voting for those things that relate to the Saint Thomas, Saint John, and Saint Croix because our existing regulations, this proposed Sub-alternative 2b, actually matches a little bit more closely, or very closely actually, to what we have in terms of the restrictions on nets and sizes and what you could actually use it for. So, 2b fits very well for Saint Thomas, Saint John, and Saint Croix and we now have adopted the island-based plans, and I don't want to necessarily speak for Vanessa and what's going on off of the Puerto Rico water. So, if the vote is specific right now, then it's for all the EEZ, but not specific to the individual ones, then I'm going to say no for my vote as the language is proposed and then recommended that at least later on there could be a motion for the EEZ as it relates to the Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix Fishery Management Plans, then I would be in favor to say yes.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mr. Chairman, if I may. That's something that was discussed at the beginning, and it remains the question. You can divide the question, or you can just withdraw the language or modify the language of the motion to address the three areas one by one. Is that what the Council would like to do? So, probably before Jean continued with the voting as the proponent of the motion, if you intend to amend it. It's very easy to do. It's just that he or she will say, "My motion, at this time, will be for the EEZ surrounding Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix." And then you build on that one. Then you have another one for the water surrounding the EEZ, the Puerto Rico area. In the EEZ Puerto Rico area, this is my motion. And that way you have a clear record—

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Correct.

1 2

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: --as to why you do it. Is that what you're referring to?

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Yes, exactly. And that's why I asked the question very first as to, again, right now the motion is clear that it was made for all fishing in the EEZ. So, unless that motion is withdrawn by the sponsor, then my vote would be-- because this is just a discussion point right now. So, my vote would be no.

MARCOS HANKE: Kate.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: I think Miguel explained it very well, but you may move to amend the original motion. And if the original motion or and seconder agree, then it becomes what we call a substitute motion, and they vote on that. We can do that in the middle of the vote. What is the procedure now for Carlos to follow?

**JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL:** Yes. Then I'd like to introduce a substitute motion that we are adjusting that we separate the alternatives between the three different island-based plans.

**KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI:** Can I help you with your substitute motion? Because I think what you want to amend in the original motion is that alternative 2b, be selected as the preferred, but have it specified that it would apply to the Saint Thomas and Saint John FMP and the Saint Croix FMP only.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Okay. So, moved.

**KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI:** Well, and then you have to find out if the original motioner agrees.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Second. I second that. I agree with that.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: shortcut.

**KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI:** You would, Carlos, you would state whether or not you agree with the motion as proposed to be amended.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I agree with the motion at amend.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: And then we have to find out if the seconder to the original motion agrees.

JOHN MCGOVERN: I'll second that. Okay.

**KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI:** Mr. Chair, you now have a substitute motion on the floor.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Jack McGovern was the one that second. He also agreed. We going to start the vote. We are now voting on the Subalternative 2b as to be prefer for the V.I. area. Correct? Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you Mr. Chair. Could we have the motion in the--

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Lo puedes escribir, la moción.

MARCOS HANKE: Let's wait until they put the motion on the screen. And from now on, Liajay, on the next motions, let's put it on the screen. It's going to be easier for everybody to follow up.

In the meantime. Carlos, you have a question?

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Yeah. So, years ago we separated all three 20 islands in a geographical EEZ. So, when we say "for each island-21 base" it would be that geographical EEZ. Okay. Fine.

MARCOS HANKE: Correct. Thank you.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Hey, people before you make the motions. Robert rules is—poor Robert is twisting his—if you abstain for the motion, doesn't mean that you cannot have the motion. You can have a motion just to destroy the motion. So, it is up to you. Carlos can have the same motion again, apply to the EEZ surrounding Puerto Rico, and then you vote around the motion. But it's up to you. You have those alternatives to make the motion.

 MARCOS HANKE: I think it's a good recommendation for the record to be clear, for this discussion to be clear and we pass through the whole body. The motion is a little small. We need it a little bigger on the screen, please.

**MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:** Abemos muchos viejitos acá atrás y no vemos. 39 Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos, the motion on the screen is the motion that you intend to present, and it was second by Jack McGovern.

44 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Tienes que leerla pa'l record.

46 MARCOS HANKE: I will read the motion. Motion, move to have action 47 two, Alternative 2, Sub-alternative 2b, as preferred spec-- I 48 cannot read from here.

```
1 2
```

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Specify.

4 MARCOS HANKE: Specify for the Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint 5 Croix EEZ. Motion presented by Carl Farchette and Jack McGovern.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Discussion?

9 MARCOS HANKE: Yes, we are going to go for discussion. Julian 10 Magras.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Yes, Julian Magras for the record. I am in full support of this, as the DAP Chair for Saint Thomas/Saint John. Now that it's read clearly like this, I support this for the Saint Thomas/Saint John District. And thank you commissioner for clarifying that because that was very important because I think the other way there was some issues and by putting it out like this I am in full support for the Saint Thomas/Saint John District. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Any, any more discussion? We already have the discussion on the previous round.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Yeah. Just for point of information for me. So, we say for the Saint Thomas, Saint John and the Saint Croix EEZs. Is that geographically, correct? I just want to make sure.

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah, that's correct.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Okay. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record, I say yes, specifically for the Virgin Islands.

JAMES R. KREGLO: James Kreglo, yes.

**JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL:** Jean-Pierre Oriol, yes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Carl Farchette, yes.

JOHN MCGOVERN: Jack McGovern, yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Marcos Hanke, yes. The motion carries. One absent, which is Puerto Rico. The DNR representative is not present at the meeting.

Carlos, like Miguel suggested, can you make the same motion for Puerto Rico?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. I want to put a motion for Puerto Rico. Alternative 1, no action.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Second.

MARCOS HANKE: We are discussing the motion. This is Marcos Hanke, for the record. This is contrary to the rationale that we discussed on the past, totally contrary to what we discussed in the past, on the rationale that we have to address the federal waters and the rationale that we develop now. And I fully respect, I think is right. I can respect what you're saying, but we are not really being --

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos.

MARCOS HANKE: One second, Miguel. We are not really protecting or adopting things that happen on the federal waters that are totally different than the state waters. And that implication we have to address differently with the state government. But at this point, my position is that the record developed before is not compatible to this motion.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos that's a Robert rule point of view. She's entitled to make a motion as she sees fit and the motion has been presented and adopted. And then, you, as a voting member, decides to vote yes or no. If the motion is defeated, then you go to another motion. That's it.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, that's why we are discussing now, and I'm putting my point of view on it after the second. And anybody else want to discuss the motion?

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, my concern on this motion is areas like Tourmaline and Bajo de Sico that lie in the federal water portion of these places. For any U.S. flag vessel that tracks fish in abundance, and they come into your waters, they can really cause some damage to habitats in those areas, particularly coral habitats.

MARCOS HANKE: Anybody else before I add to what Carlos says.

**JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL:** Can I just ask María to put up the table of the amount of landings again. Because, again, it seems like, I think, one of them was 6,200 pounds of recorded landings. So, my

whole point is, I actually feel that this should have a lot of discussion because it seems like there is some activity. I'm actually, for the compatibility between the state territorial waters and federal waters, just so that there's consistency, particularly in my district of Saint Thomas. One of the things that always worries me is the fact that if our fishers are in B.V.I. waters with gear that aren't supposed to be in B.V.I. waters, then we also run the risk of actually having them threatened for their livelihood. And so, my thing is that if there's that much activity in terms of landings, and again, I don't know what percentage that is, I believe that this, at least, Specifically, warrants discussion. from the representatives on the Council because it's not like Saint Thomas, Saint John where, you know, there's relatively no landing, there's no data to support that. But there's actually a lot of landings here, I think, that we actually have to discuss.

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah. To the point, like María said, those landings most likely are conf -- because they are con -- you know, they cannot really make the line. But based on the knowledge about how the fishing is performed are in state waters. That's number one and number two we need to make sure that is clear on the record. On the past, you guys were really worried with the damage of the habitat that we fish in Puerto Rico in federal waters for deepwater snappers and so on, that those gear are going to have an effect. We need to make -- I want the group to be mindful of that and be clear that we need to take everything in consideration and prioritize, right? And to see what is appropriate for one thing or the other.

And I don't want to go too deep into this. As a chairman, I cannot go, I would be much louder. I have my beliefs, but I am respecting the desire and opinion of the group. Go ahead.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mr. Chairman, you can also pass the Chair to the Vice Chair, and you can let it out, whatever you want to say.

MARCOS HANKE: No, it's okay.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: It's up to you. But listen, one of the things about being the executive director—somebody told me "You still want to be an executive director?" —is that I'm supposed to be mindful of the record and the use of Robert rules. I'm neutral, I don't care one way or the other, it's up to you. But it's important that each member or the Council understands the prerogative, the way that you—because you operate in many other assemblies and everything, but it's important to understand. Graciela wanted to clarify something about the table. Graciela.

1 2

4 5

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, for many of the species that you see on the-- Graciela, for the record --on the table, they do not occur in the EEZ. However, mullets, for example, do go off to the shelf edge, which can be part of the EEZ, for their reproductive activity. And that's a, you know, seasonal cycle. So, some of these can be harvested from the EEZ.

However, we should mention also that most of the trips are multispecies, multi-year trips, so they might be fishing for the baitfish or the forage fish in the state waters and fishing for other species in the EEZ. So, that information also has to come out. So, in terms of the species, yes, some of them will occur in the EEZ, but, you know, we have to be mindful of the way that the landings data are reported. And that includes going for the baitfish in state waters, fishing for something else in the EEZ. And we cannot, at this stage, make the distinction.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Thank you, guys.

MARCOS HANKE: Miquel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, no, María, que quería decir algo.

MARCOS HANKE: María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: This is María López. Thank you for the discussion. So, we can always go back to the IPT if there's a need to redevelop some of these alternatives. I want to remind the Council that gillnets are prohibited in federal waters for the harvest of reef fish and for spiny lobster. They have been prohibited for use for many, many, many years. They're also prohibited for use in the Council-managed areas for many years as well. The interest from the Council, in the beginning, to deal with gillnets was because we were starting to manage pelagic species and it was important to keep that consistency for what we were allowing to use with gillnets, with this new group of species that were coming into management.

So, that was the primary reason that this was recommended in the past. And then, as you can see from the landings, and specifically talking about Puerto Rico over here. So, the species that are managed, that belong to the pelagic group are the ones that are in the top of the table. And of course, yes, as we mentioned, there are some landings that are reported. Some of these landings may occur in federal water, some of them may be reported as occurring in federal, but they are in state waters.

And again, this is part of the analysis that the IPT economists and our social scientists will conduct as to how many people will be affected based on these landings and other information that they have, if there will be a prohibition on the use of this gear type because that means that they will not be able to use the gear type. So, that's part of the analysis, like more fleshed-out analysis, that we can bring back to the Council during the next Council meeting.

4 5

The Council is not ready to make a decision on a preferred alternative for Puerto Rico or would like to bring something else, like, for example, another Sub-alternative. The IPT will say, "Okay, well instead of saying all fishing or all fishing just excepting baitfish, let's just do it for pelagic species" or something like that. As long as there's a good rationale for doing that, anything can be included.

You guys have been fleshing out what is the rationale? You know, because obviously there's going to be people that will be affected by this, that they're not going to be able to. But I also want to remind the Council about the rationale for why they were prohibiting the use of gillnets in the past for reef fish and spiny lobster. And it's, of course, because they were concerned about the potential for these gear types to catch fish that are under the size, that are small fish. For example, in quantities that may contribute to the overfishing on the species. So, by taking this action, with the gillnets in particular, the Council was interested in protecting and providing that protection from the potential of overfishing for those pelagic species that are new to management.

But we're available to do whatever the Council desires to do at this time.

MARCOS HANKE: We are on the phase of discussion of the motion. Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah, I have kind of a question on this chart because I don't understand how you have snook and mullet and mojarra out nine miles, outside of nine miles of Puerto Rico waters. I don't understand that.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Carlos, if I may. Remember, María, mentioned this before. For those of us who have been dealing with fish for a long time, seems to be kind of a mistake. Okay? But we deal with the data as they come, and that's what it is there. But we are close to lunch time, and you have a motion on the floor, you want to call the question, or you want to continue that, or you want to withdraw it. What do you want to do?

1 2

Because according to Robert rules, you have to vote on the question and the motion is very clear. Can we go back to the screen where the motion is proposed.

You have Jack.

MARCOS HANKE: Jack.

JOHN MCGOVERN: I would support what María suggested in restructuring this alternative to have a Sub-alternative that allows for protection of pelagics off of Puerto Rico. I mean, I think we still have to vote this up, but I would support doing that.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, Vanessa, you are the owner of the motion. Do you think that that will provide more information for your decision making, or do you want to stick to your motion at this time?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thanks, Miguel. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. As Carlos says, we already know that the data is not correct. And we know that we have that big problem in Puerto Rico data. The best data available, is not the best. So, I think that it wasn't changed because the same data is the one that is going to be used. So, I maintain my motion. No action.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. You have to call the question and vote on it.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And I have a question. Kate, can I pass the Chairmanship to Carlos at this point.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Él no lo quiere. [laughter]

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Yes sir, you can. If he accepts it.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos.

**MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:** Carlos que no huyas que vas a ser el Chairman 42 por unos minutos.

44 MARCOS HANKE: You're going to be the Chairman for a little.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Go ahead. Marcos.

MARCOS HANKE: I think that we are here to protect the federal waters and we have to make everything possible to balance everything that we entitled to. We discussed in the past that we wanted to do this because we want to protect the habitat of species that are very important to us, like deep-water snappers, where those gears can be used, and traps can be used, and other gears can be used on the deeper water that are not being used now, that are more, like, into the bigger fishing scheme that we don't use. We don't recognize that for Puerto Rico, for our area. Right. And that for me is super important to make sure that we have some regulation or something that reflect our use, the way the fishing is performed and how important also the habitat that other fishes use.

For me, that level of concern, which for me is secondary, if the state government will adopt or not into the future, is not even close to how important it is to protect the habitats for multiple species that live on the deeper water. That's one of the key points. And as a Council member, for me to see this record development drifting a very different way, I can respect the opinions, I truly do, but for me, the protection of the whole ecosystem-based management, which is based on the habitat, and this prohibition of the trawling gear especially, is addressing exactly that. If we don't pursue that, it's going to really hurt, not just the few people that do the other kind of net fishing on the state water that we are assuming that maybe the state water going to incorporate, that we don't know. But, right now, we are just preventing a true protection for habitats that many important fishing resorts live on. And that for me is super frustrated. I'm frustrated about it because I see a major industry being hurt or potentially being hurt into the future that, for example, are represented by Nelson, deep-water snapper people and so on. And this is one of the points. I would like to keep the discussion and after you guys heard me about this point, I want to hear the Council. I want to know what is going on.

Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Anyone else? Kreglo.

JAMES R. KREGLO: James Kreglo. Yeah, there was a good point brought up, which I haven't heard again, but I know in the past we've had other vessels come into our waters, especially the EEZ, from the states. And the one I can recall is sword fishing. But if, like I said, if we have vessels come in and start doing purse seins, trawling, all that sort of thing where they move from another area to our area, that's going to because a lot of

problems. So, it's probably better to head it off and then if we have a situation deal with at that point. And that's a--

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. That's a secondary effect of it. But the primary effect is actually the gears that we culturally, traditionally have been developed, that damage less environment, are more sustainable and we want to pursue that idea of creating something that is compatible to ecosystem-based management. And that's my point. And thank you for understanding what I say before.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you.

**MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:** Mr. Chairman. Do you want to have a roll call vote?

16 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Roll call vote. Oh wait. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez for the record. Hearing the discussion in here, I maybe can retire the motion and then put this in the agenda for the next meeting. And I hope that also the Puerto Rico DNR could be here also and bring the information and clarify and talk about this during the next month for the next meeting. Thanks.

25 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Miquel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, the seconder agrees to withdraw the motion.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** JP.

**JAMES R. KREGLO:** Second agrees, James Kreglo.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. So, now, Mr. Chairman Farchette, do you want to instruct the staff to do what María mentioned before, to go back and add that language, so you will see it at the April meeting?

38 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: You don't need to have a motion, just we understand from the record that the Council will pursue what María suggested and Jack, and then for the next meeting in April, you will have a language as appropriate as possible for this item.

- Before that, I just-- Puerto Rico is not here represented. I don't think that Jack or Andy received a letter from Puerto Rico
- 47 appointing the designee. You didn't receive that? A letter from
- 48 Puerto Rico appointing the designee to the Council. We have not

received that officially, isn't it? Okay. Until that letter comes in, Puerto Rico doesn't have a representation at the table.

The last time that that happened, I was instructed to write a letter to the governor of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, because the Virgin Islands didn't show up at the meeting. Because there's a commitment and then I receive a reply from the governor of Virgin Islands and a reply from the governor of Puerto Rico that it will never happen again.

I have a request from Ricardo López, not a request, a question, a chat with some communication with Vanessa. Ricardo López is the director of the Fisher Research Laboratory in Puerto Rico, under DNR, and he's worried about it because he understands that the presence of Puerto Rico is very important for the Council. So, I believe that probably the regional office or the Chair, we can send a letter to the governor to that point and then see what happens between here and April. Damaris Delgado, who retired from DPNR, she's now in another position. She advised me that she left a written statement as to the need for the DPNR to send a letter to regional administrator, in that case Dr. Andy Strelcheck, designating the representative of Puerto Rico.

And for the new Council members, the representatives of the governments around the nation are those people with the top highest rank in charge of fishery management of the marine resources. In the case of the Virgin Islands, we have the commissioner, right here. And besides being an owner, it is important to have somebody at his level participating. So, in the case of Puerto Rico, the highest level is the secretary of DNR. Because they're very busy they have an alternative to appoint two designees. And that's the letter that we are waiting to have. So, hopefully we'll have that for April and the Chair, and I will put together a letter. Probably we will ask Kate to review it, make sure we don't go into deeper waters than we should, and then we send the letter.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Okay? I'm going to hand back the chairmanship to Mr. Marcos, but I'm keeping his-- [laughter]

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Carlos. And I think that's another reason why, and I really thank Vanessa to bring in the rationale that is important for the Puerto Rico DNR to be present at this discussion. Thank you. María.

 MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. So, with that said, because this action has the trammel nets and also the purse seins, and I believe that this is going to be the same discussion that will benefit from Puerto Rico, etcetera. So, we think it's better to take this

action, this particular action, take it back to the IPT, so we can rearrange the alternatives a little bit, add the pelagic additional option for just the pelagic, etcetera, and then bring it back to the Council for the next meeting.

Now, I will suggest then, for action three, which is the descending devices. If there's no objection, maybe the Council can make a decision on that one if they want.

MARCOS HANKE: I think that it's-

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: you ready for that?

MARCOS HANKE: We are ready for that, Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, you're saying that Saint Croix, Saint Thomas, Saint John can't go ahead with Alternative 4 for the purse seins as the preferred motion, or should we, do you want me to wait for that?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes, you can. So, what I think we are going to do is just rearrange alternatives a little bit better to have more options. But if that's still your preferred for when we come back in April, then that's fine. Because maybe the IPT can maybe a little bit more specific on the alternatives, so that it's clear that this could be by island and no other options. We can't even call it a preliminary preferred as well, or you can just keep it as preferred. Kate, I defer to you on that one.

**KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI:** Yeah, I mean, at this point you can identify what's been preferred by the Council, but that can change.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Right.

**KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI:** In April, the Council can change the preferred alternative, and it will likely, because there'll be other actions where the preferred hasn't been identified, it won't be ready for final action yet.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Absolutely and thank you for that. This is not final action. So, if when we come in the April meeting and there are more information and you want to change, then absolutely. You can do that. But we're going to try to have a more full document with more description based on all the guidance that you provided for the April meeting.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Point of clarification. So, for the Virgin Island specifically, I mean the purse seins, the gillnet and the trammel nets will be compatible regulations basically because you already have a prohibition on the use of those gears for all species.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Oh, can I answer that? Yeah, except the baitfish because we do use purse seins in territorial waters on Saint Croix for bigeye scad, so that's something I have to look at.

MARCOS HANKE: Be mindful to state your name. Carlos was the one you're speaking before. And I think we are ready for a break. This extended a little bit too long. I know that we are close to lunch, but there is some text here that people need to a five-minute break, and we'll be back in five minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MARCOS HANKE: Good morning, everyone. Before lunch we'll start the meeting again and we'll try to include the presentation about descending device and that will benefit and inform the group about this issue and maybe will help us on the preferred alternative presented by María for us to choose and be better informed.

Can you state your name and start the presentation, please?

## Descending Devices Presentation and Discussion

**MELISSA CROUCH:** Yes, I can. Melissa Crouch with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. Everybody hear me, okay? All right.

So, thank you for having me today. I'm a special projects coordinator for our division of Marine Fisheries Management. I wanted to discuss an effort that the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission facilitates to foster collaboration across the Southeastern United States, to specifically improve coordination of outreach initiatives that are focused on best fishing practices. And we also try to increase the proper use of descending devices and other barotrauma mitigation tools throughout our region.

All right, so, as a reminder, barotrauma is pressure related injuries, and it's one of the top factors that contributes to release mortality in reef fish. Injuries can occur when fish are pulled up rapidly from depths, greater than 50 feet typically, and that quick change in pressure causes gas expansion in the swim bladder, and lots of internal organ damage. You might see

protruding stomach, bloated belly, descendant intestines, bubbling scales, bulging eyes. So, we can see the images here on the slide. and the severity and the frequency can change based on species and fishing techniques and water temperature. So, using barotrauma mitigation tools like descending devices or venting tools can help fish recover from the effects of barotrauma. And we do suggest the tools are only used if there's obvious signs of barotrauma in fish.

4 5

All right. And so, we have had some discussion on descending devices this morning, and just a brief overview to kind of remind folks of what these are and then, how they can be made. So, there's two standard types, either descending devices or venting tools. And descending devices are the main focus of this presentation. They're weighted tools. They're capable of releasing fish at a depth sufficient for the fish to recover from barotrauma effects. So, moving from left to right on the screen, we have a mouth clamp descending device, and then an inverted hook descending device, weighted containers such as fish elevators or the crate that's on the screen. And then on the far right, is not a descending device, but a venting tool. So, I just wanted to note with these devices we do have resources to show folks how to make these themselves at home. Specifically, the inverted hook type of descending device. So, lots of folks have large hooks, extra weights around, and it's fairly easy to show fishers how to make a descending device of their own at home. Um, and there's also availability of different programs that are available at least to Florida Fishers to be able to obtain a descending device at a lower cost. So, we have lots of options out there that we try to outreach and create awareness to our stakeholders in Florida about.

And just as an aside, barotrauma mitigation tools are required in federal waters off of Florida. The FWC for our state waters in Florida, we're working to create regulations that require the appropriate use of barotrauma mitigation tools in our state waters. But even aside from the regulations that we're looking at, we're also still really heavily focused on outreach and education initiatives that are super important for anglers to be able to actually use these devices effectively and to make their own device.

So, Florida is recognized as a leader in development of outreach and education programming on best fishing practices. What we focus on in our messaging to our fishers is really there to improve survival of the fish that they're releasing. so, we promote the use of correct gear and proper handling techniques and that way fishers release fish as quickly as possible with minimal harm. And our ultimate goal is to empower our stakeholders with knowledge and resources to act as stewards of their marine environment. And

then that also helps ensure fishing opportunities. So, we try to achieve that goal at FWC through strategies with outreach and education focused on proper handling, minimizing that handling time and the appropriate use of tools. So, this definitely is specifically focused on barotrauma mitigation. Because if anglers and fishers are not using those tools correctly, then it's really a moot point. We really want them to use those tools correctly, shorten that handling time to be able to make a difference in that discard mortality.

4 5

So, some of the outreach strategies that we've used to implement our core messaging and to get the word out to our fishers that barotrauma is an issue, descending devices are an option, and that it doesn't have to cost a ton of money for them to use one or to gain one and make one include several different types of strategies, right?

So, we've done research in the past at FWC to learn about what anglers think about descending devices in Florida. So, we've done a couple studies in the past five years to look at that. We have seen that fishers may find descending devices complicated and time consuming to use, but it was shown, in that research project, that education can build user confidence and proper tool use. So, that education and outreach is really important in those regulations being implemented.

Back in 2020, we coordinated a series of angler surveys and focus groups, and they helped us to learn that anglers really do value in-person communication when it comes to having education contact. And that in-person aspect was vital, and we needed to continue that in order for anglers to kind of grasp the concept of how to use a descending device.

Um, we also engaged the public through different strategies beyond in-person demonstrations, informal presentations. We also have a lot of electronic and print resources. So, how-to videos like what was mentioned earlier, showing folks directly how to do something has been super important for FWC to be able to get the word out about barotrauma and how to mitigate it.

All right. And then the last major thing that Florida Fish and Wildlife has been doing and how we've been working around barotrauma issues and descending devices is that we have a team of folks from around the Southeastern United States that we collaborate and meet together. We call this our descending Device Outreach Coordination Team. So, this team includes these partners that are shown here on the screen, and our purpose is to share outreach strategies, coordinate messaging, and most importantly,

to streamline our efforts across the region to help increase the survival of released fish through proper use of barotrauma mitigation tools and best fishing practice.

All right. And then this is the final slide. So, reducing duplicate efforts by streamlining our messaging in the Southeast is really the huge major goal here. So, we have done, as a team who comes together and works together, we've done a collaborative event at ICAST, which is the International Convention of Allied Sport Fishing Trades in Orlando, Florida. Very high-profile event. Just an example of how this team has collaborated. So, we don't want to reinvent the wheel and constantly be coming up with new, you know, new ideas are great, but if somebody is doing something that works, let's work together and let's use that strategy. So, this team really focuses on using that research, public outreach, online and print resources and innovative marketing initiatives to kind of steal each other's ideas and do effective outreach and education in our region.

So, we would love to know if anyone wants to join that team, if the Council's interested in having any participation on this team. And then I'm happy to answer any questions about how FWC does descending device outreach and education. And with that concludes my presentation.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. Because we have a presentation by María, about descending device. Carlos wants to present a motion about it. This is super pertinent because it helps on this structure and the discussion of the motion, and I want to encourage. As a Chairman, I will talk to Alida Ortiz to engage with you because one of the logos that I want to see on this effort of the descending device coordination is the Caribbean Council. And we have been expressing the desire of this kind of coordination, and it's totally compatible with the consistent based margin across the board. And you're going to be hearing from us and thank you so much for your presentation. Carlos.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Okay. I have a motion. Do we need a screen? Okay, here we go.

I moved to require descending devices on both commercial and recreational vessels fishing for reef fish in the EEZ. Readily available. Okay. Slower. Yeah.

So, she's looking for the language. Yeah. Okay.

So required descending devices on both commercial and recreational vessels. Yeah. Both of them. b o t h. Yeah.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: If you want to say, just say, move to select Alternative 2 and then we can read it. Because, if that's what you want, then the text is a little different.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Preferred Alternative 2?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Preferred Alternative 2. If that is what you want?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, I'm going to start this over. Move to have preferred Alternative 2 on-- Alternative 2, require. Yeah. Okay. Here we go. Yeah. For all three islands. Right. Well, I guess I have to put there, or do I really have to put there "while fishing for reef fish" Do I have to put that in there?

 MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: This is María. Sorry. Because Carlos is wanting to select as a preferred alternative, Alternative 2, you can read for the record, or I can read if you want, what Alternative 2 says, and then it can be copied in there.

MARCOS HANKE: Can you please do that before lunch?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes. alternative two says, "Require a descending device be on board a commercial or recreational vessel and readily available for use while fishing for or possessing species in the reef fish component of the Puerto Rico, Saint Croix and Saint Thomas and Saint John Fishery Management Plans.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay, perfect.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Vanessa Ramírez, second.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Any question, any discussion? Let's vote.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Vanessa Ramírez, yes.

**JAMES R. KREGLO:** James Kreglo, yes.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Jean-Pierre Oriol, Yes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Carlos Farchette, yes.

44 MARCOS HANKE: Marcos Hanke, yes.

JOHN MCGOVERN: John McGovern, yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Unanimous, one absent. DPR Puerto Rico is absent.

1 2

It's lunchtime. We going to come back at 1:15, 15 minutes earlier to restart the meeting. We will be back in business at 1:15 PM.

We will have to change a few things on the agenda, the order of it, and we are going to work with Miguel and the rest of the presenters, and we'll inform you once we come back.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on December 06, 2022.)

\_ \_ \_

### DECEMBER 06, 2022

### TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

MARCOS HANKE: Let's restart the meeting. Please take a seat. It's 1:22 PM. We are going to reshuffle. We're going to reorganize the series of presentations. We're going to start with Richard's presentation. Then we are going to go with the proposed rules for Nassau Grouper, critical habitat for Nassau Grouper, then the protected resource update from Southeast Regional Office, SERO. And we follow the agenda, the presentation for pelagic fish amendment to the island-based FMP for tomorrow. That's Sarah's presentation. And also, for tomorrow managing trap fisheries in the U.S.V.I. It will be moved for tomorrow, unless we have a time during this afternoon to present. No more words. Let's start with

### Scientific and Statistical Committee (SSC) Report

Richard's presentation or participation. Go ahead, Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Thank you, Marcos. This is Rich Appeldoorn for the record, SSC Chair. And we had a very busy and I think fairly successful three days of meeting just last week.

Next slide, please.

And so, here are the major things we talked about. The major things being SEDAR 80 on queen triggerfish for all three islands. And then an update of SEDAR 57 for Spiny Lobster, again, for all three islands. We looked at the terms of reference and the SSC assignments for the reviews of SEDAR 84. We had a review of the National SSC meeting or SCS7 as it's called. I'll give a little review of that. We talked about the queen conch listing under the ESA for about the last half hour of the last day, and I'm not going to talk about that under this report. And a little bit about conflict of interest. So, I'm really reporting about the meeting

last week, but also a two-day virtual meeting we had in October since we have not reported to the Council since that meeting.

2 3 4

Next.

5

7

9

10 11

12

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, getting right to the SEDAR 80, which is on gueen triggerfish. Our initial discussions were on the situation in Puerto Rico because there was more data there and the Center had developed the model, say, as far as they could go, but they really had questions a bit that they needed the SSC to have input on before they could finish that. And then that would be the basis for them moving forward to seeing the analysis for Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix. There were two potential approaches to do this. One is to choose a base model to estimate the center point, and I'll give a graphic of this, and then use our Sigma min under our Tier 3 criteria to look at the variation around that center point. And the other was to use an ensemble analysis, which is basically we vary all the parameters in a sensitivity analysis and all at the same time and let that generate the degree of variability. And it turns out that we actually had to do the first one, which is why it's in orange there, because at the moment the Center does not have the capability of running the stock synthesis model, the package that they are using this model for, to generate that ensemble analysis. But they say in the future that is something that will be coming.

252627

So, what am I talking about? Next slide.

2829

30

31

32

33

3435

36 37

38

39

40 41

42 43

44 45

The black dotted line in the center of that normal distribution is what we would call, center position, and that's what we were trying to estimate. Where is that black line located. And then we would use our minimum degree of standard deviation allowed, or in this case variance, to generate what that green line would look like. And so, that's, if you will, the minimum amount of variability around that black line. Since the Sigma min there is reasonably large for a Tier 3 situation, the assumption is this should capture the degree of variability around that center line. And we need that green line because the Council is going to choose the risk of overfishing. And that's the P\* value. And that would move, where we're going to set the ABC away from the MSY value to a slightly lesser value based on whatever the risk of overfishing that they will be accepting. So, that's why we had to do something to generate the variability there. And this is something that will come up to the Council because they're going to have to set the P\* values to go actually to get our ABC recommendations. And then finally to get down to the ACLs.

46 47 48

Next slide.

So, we had to look through a lot of things, and I'm going to go through these not in great detail, but I'm going to bring them all up. If only because, this is the record of what we discussed, and I wanted this stuff on the record. So, there were a lot of parameters in this model that are fixed. We had to make choices about what these things would be. And we wanted to know how sensitive everything was. So, one of these things is L Infinity, the maximum size they would achieve. And we had actually two sets of data. One for the U.S. Caribbean, but also one that included fish from the Carolinas, which grow larger and get much older.

And so, we wanted to see a full sensitivity analysis to L Infinity. what we really got was the comparison between the combination of U.S. and the Caribbean and Carolina data, or just the Caribbean data. And we went with just the Caribbean data on that. So, we didn't get the full range of sensitivity that we would like, but as the model is implemented, the real important factor was what was the maximum age that was coming out. And for this, we used the maximum age found in the U.S. Caribbean. And these are stuff that had been worked up by Virginia Shervette. And so, while we didn't get the full range of sensitivity analysis, it ends up, the real driver is the age factor and not necessarily the L Infinity.

Selectivity was a real important point as well. And the question is whether we should be using a logistic equation that just, you know, starts at a low value and then sweeps up and maximizes, or we should be using a dome shape factor that would come back down again. And there are factors such as gear, market and availability particularly with respect to depth that might suggest a dome shaped selectivity curve might be appropriate. And this is, like market is really important, in the Virgin Islands as something that potentially leads to a dome shaped selectivity function that might be used. Anyway, for Puerto Rico we use the logistic because it was more precautionary. There are still questions about whether dome shape would be more appropriate, but frankly we don't have enough data to tease that out. Uh, for Saint Thomas is -- I'll get to that in a minute, but they're dome shaped selectivity curves which seem to be more appropriate and that will be explored in the future.

We had two indices of abundance. One was catch per unit effort and one was from visual census work done at the National Core Reef Monitoring Program. Um, the SSC decided to reject the NCRMP based index of abundance. And I should point out that for this species, this is not something that's critical of that survey protocol but for this species and for Puerto Rico, it has a limited time series over the broader shelf. There is a question about how this fish is

distributed relative to the reef habitat, hard bottom habitat, that is targeted by NCRMP. queen triggerfish tend to spend a lot of time out in more sandy areas. That's kind of where they nest or rubble habitat or, rhodolith habitat. And so, was this representative also, there's a depth limit for how deep the divers can go, especially in Puerto Rico. And there's a feeling that there is a substantial amount of population deeper than that.

So again, were we representing habitat and depth appropriately for this species?

Next.

MSY is something else that is obviously critical because it's one of the key parameters that we're trying to get that center line. And initially we thought that this could be estimated with the data available. And upon looking at the results and the variability around that, the SSC decided that the data is not— there's not a sufficient number of variabilities in the data in conditions in the population. [inaudible] the variability in the data over time to be able to estimate that from the data itself. So, we chose an MSY proxy, which is the spawning potential ratio of 30%. And I put a little asterisk there because that decision drives much of what the model will do after that. Because once you choose that, then you're basically fixing a lot of other parameters. And steepness is one of those.

Steepness is the strength of the stock recruitment relationship. And again, we initially thought we could estimate this in the model. We did not think the model did a very good job. It was basically saying there was no stock recruitment relationship. And we don't think that's the case for something that's a nest building species that then protects the eggs and they advance at a very fairly advanced, you know, larval stage. So, there should be less mortality associated with that and therefore your relationship with the number of eggs actually spawned would be good. But on the other hand, if there's a deep spawning population, maybe that's what's feeding it in. Anyway, there was a lot of discussion about this, and we finally said, "Okay, based on forcing the model to accept an SPR30% MSY proxy forced the model to tune its steepness to that proxy," which we did. And when we did that, what was coming out of the model seemed to be a lot more reasonable. Initial equilibrium catch is also another parameter that goes in. And there were a number of things that were talked about in terms of whether things are at equilibrium. There was the diadema die-off that occurred during that time, and this species is one of the major predators that of diadema. So, a good chunk of its food supply disappeared. And prior to 1983, when we were starting the data

set, where we had good species-specific data set, we were coming off a much higher rate of fishing and higher catch rates of fishing in the late seventies in Puerto Rico. So, you know, what is our assumption about equilibrium there as well? So again, we let the model choose the initial catch based on its best fit after we forced it to deal with the MSY assumptions and steepness.

4 5

Next slide.

And then we needed estimates for management target recommendations. So, this would be for the most recent years, the correction factors that would be used in Puerto Rico when the correction factors had not yet been calculated. So, we used the average correction factors for the most recent years, and the averaging was done by coast. And then we needed to project the catch and forward. And so, we used the most recent catch to project that forward as we looked at what the model would say about OFL, which is really what we're trying to get to. And then from that ABC and the ACLs.

Next.

So given all these decisions that were made above, the SSC did accept the model as being both the best available data and acceptable for generating management advice. Now, this is Puerto Rico we're talking about only, at the moment. But we point out this is for short term data or advice only. We have, again, chosen a lot of the parameters and are using just two points of data, the catch per unit effort index and the length composition information. And so, it's really a minimum amount of information we have going into the model because we had to estimate or just, you know, select certain other things about how we do things. So, we're not comfortable with going too far with this analysis but we did accept it for that short term.

Okay. So, following that, we generated ABCs over a range of P\* values, the risk of overfishing, from a value of 0.3, which would be a 30% chance of risk of overfishing to 0.45 or 45% chance of risk of overfishing because we can't set ABC until the Council selects their P\* value. So, we did it over a range and so these would be available for the Council. And based on our experience with spiny lobster, where the Council came back and said we would much prefer a constant three-year average recommendation on these limits, rather than a changing value over time, we also calculated those. So, those would be available for the Council right away. So, as a result of those calculations, and I'll show those in a minute, with all the ABCs that were generated across these values of P\* would be acceptable to the SSC, which means once the Council

chooses their P\* value you will immediately get your ABC because we already made those calculations.

Okay. So, the final depends on the choice of P\* by the Council. So, that's a Council decision. However, the SSC cautions the Council that relative to the case that was done with spiny lobster, which you did take a value of 0.45, here we have a lot more uncertainties than we had with lobsters. And so, we'll point you to be a little bit more cautious. There are a lot of management uncertainties due to its current status as a, quote, "non-targeted" species. By this I mean, no one's going out specifically to catch queen triggerfish. So, trying to develop management that targets that, other than maybe a size limit, would be difficult. You'd actually have to target the fisheries where it's actually being caught. And we actually have good data that shows that the fisheries most related to catch a queen triggerfish in Puerto Rico are spiny lobster and queen conch. And that probably doesn't make sense until you think about how the fishery operates.

So, the divers that are going after lobster and queen conch are also carrying a spear gun, and if they come across the queen triggerfish of the appropriate size, they're going to shoot it. The trap fishery for spiny lobster also catches queen triggerfish and most of the trapped fishery in Puerto Rico actually targets spiny lobster, because that's where the high valued species is. But there's lots of other good species that enter those traps that they keep. So, that's the explanation why it links to something you wouldn't think conch and lobster for a fish.

So, if you really wanted to worry about how to manage that species. You'd almost have to manage those other two fisheries, other than giving like a size limit where you either keep it or put it back.

Um, last thing, that was pointed out to the SSC was that when the concept of P\* was originally derived the thinking was that the Councils would have P\* value with more like 0.3 and 0.35. That has generally not been the case. So, I'm not forcing the "you have to do that," but please keep in mind that's kind of what things were looking like. And this is a Tier 3. This is our minimum level to actually do a stock assessment. So, there's a lot of uncertainty here.

So, what does the model look like? Next slide.

So, this is what came out of the analysis. And this is, you know, I'm not sure actually that this is the final analysis, but they all look the same. So, what this is saying, so in blue is the past reconstruction of the fishery based on the available information.

Green is the projection of the fishery into the future, at which point the red is when the new, if you accept the recommendations, when the new ACLs would go into effect and what they would look like.

4 5 6

7

9

10

1112

1314

15

16

17

18

19

20

1

2

So, what this says is that if you're above this value called MSST, that's the minimum stuck size threshold. If you're above that, the population is not overfished. And if you're above the ratio of the spawning stock biomass to the MSY proxy that we had, you're not undergoing overfishing. And so, you can see from very early on, the population was estimated at being actually substantially overfished. And then it gradually improved. And then, in the early or mid-two thousand, or getting up toward 2008-9, we started coming in with what looks like a fairly healthy time. This is when the original ACL values were starting to come into play. And then the population has come down again and it's still legitimately healthy, but it's getting near that threshold. So, what we will see is that because we're above the MSST, it does allow for a little bit more fishing. But as we get into, as we're projecting those catches, but once we implement the new recommended values, we will bring that down back to the catch levels that would support MSY.

212223

2425

2627

2829

30

3132

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42 43

44

What do they look like, the actual values? I know this is confusing and I'll try to work you through it. So, these are the projections of ABC across the years, 2023 to 2027. Although realize that through the amendment process, they probably wouldn't go into effect if you accept that until 2024. As you go down the table, we're looking at P\* values that go from 0.3 to 0.45. And as you go down the table in a year, you will notice that the values get larger and larger. Which you'd be expect because you're accepting a greater risk of overfishing, which means you would be allowed to take more fish. And that last column on the right, that's part of the big table, gives the percent reduction that you would get from choosing a value of 0.45, which is probably the maximum you could choose, that's what was done for spiny lobster. So, if you chose the minimum P\* value of 0.3 here, the ABC would be basically two thirds of what you would get from a value of 0.45. And that's regardless of what year, that percentage is constant. So, it just means, the more conservative you want to be about the risk of overfishing, the lower the ABC is going to be. Makes perfect sense. These values are all, by the way, in thousands of pounds. And over on the far right are the recent landings. And you can see that those have dropped quite a bit. And the ABC, for most of the values of P\*, would be substantially above what the most recent landings have been.

45 46 47

48

So, I'm showing you these now and I'll share this graphically in a minute because I'm confident you're going to forget the values

later on because when you choose the P\* value you have to do this on the basis of what you perceive the risk of overfishing is going to be and not at what the potential ABC would be. Because if you do it the other way, you're just cherry picking the catch levels you want and then pretending you know what the risk of overfishing is.

4 5

So, here's what it looks graphically. These are three separate graphs. But these, the blue line on top is the OFL level. And, of course, that gets reduced to get down to your ABCs. And so, the first graph here is looking at the values of P\* between 0.3 or 0.34. So, the lowest values are the most conservative ones for assessing risk of overfishing. So, you can see they're all, you know, substantially lower than the OFL. Here's on the next line, the next set from 0.35 to 0.39, you can see basically they just moved up closer to that 0.45 level.

On the next slide is 0.4 to 0.45. They moved up even closer to that OFL level. So, and you see that these are all slight curves. They're not straight lines because we're gradually moving the catch, which can be greater than it is now, back town to where eventually it would match the predictions for our MSY proxy.

And then, we also conducted what would be the three-year running average for 2024, 2025 and 2026 assuming that if the Council wants to go with not a number that's changing over time, but with the flat three-year value. This is what that three-year average would look like, again, assuming that if you accepted this it would not go into effect until 2024. And again, it just shows that if you are more conservative, your average is going to be less than if you're less conservative.

Next slide.

We then turned our attention to the U.S. Virgin Islands for queen triggerfish. And basically said, the model for Saint Thomas, Saint John needs more exploration. And I'll give you a list of some of the stuff that we talked about. At the moment it was not deemed suitable for management advice, but we thought that with further analysis, this may prove fruitful.

Everybody at the meeting was of the opinion that it would be really great not to lose momentum on this issue and therefore no one wanted to kick this back to the SEDAR process. The representatives from the Center said they would look into their scheduling issues and see if they could schedule time to do this greater exploration somehow in their, what everybody thought was, already overworked schedule. But one would have to talk to the Center people to see,

and I don't think they've done that yet, this was just last week, but whether we can move forward with that. So, there's some hope there. For Saint Croix, the model was deemed not to be useful for management, and this was because the data there was just too limiting. Um, and so, the calculations for OFL and ABC will remain in Tier 4 for that stock.

6 7 8

9

10 11

1

2

3

4 5

You know, we're hoping, and I'll comment more on this, but, you know, the pandemic was not good for data collection. And so, the most recent years were missing a lot of information we would've already have. And that's one of the problems that was leading to having too few data, really for the Saint Croix situation.

12 13 14

Next slide.

1516

1718

19

20

2122

23

24

25

2627

2829

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

This is just a list of the most critical things we wanted to understand as we move forward for Saint Thomas, Saint John. I'm not going to go into these in detail. These are specific modeling kinds of issues, but you can see there's seven or eight of them there that we want to look at. Again, I'll talk about the use of the NCRMP data or not. This is an issue in Saint Thomas now where their coverage of the shelf is a little bit better, although still seems to be a shift from when-- initially in the early time series, we're only looking at a few places extensively, and then later, as in Puerto Rico, they move out into a broader shelf area. But then they also included using rebreather diving to get into mesophotic areas where we think a lot of the adults reside. When you do this, the index shows like a threefold increase in population size. So, we don't think the population in three years tripled its size. We think this might be accounted for by the extension of the survey into areas where the populations are more abundant. So that needs to be looked at. There are some issues there about the actual method used to weight length data coming in from different sources, how you estimate mortality, etcetera. So, there's a lot of things that need to go on. We're hoping the center will find the time to do that and you know, cautiously optimistic we might get management advice yet.

373839

40 41

42 43

44

45

46

47

48

So, that's SEDAR 80. And the next thing is going to be SEDAR 57. I would point out SEDAR 80 is a discussion we had over all of our meeting in October and most of our meeting last week. And it was contentious at a number of points about what we were doing and how many assumptions we were making and is this really going to be valid or just bear the choices that we are making, are we prepredicting the outcome, so to speak? And because it was contentious, we actually got through a lot of things. Through, you know, questions and answers and it took a long time but if the SSC and the Center personnel were ever going to get together with a

1 stock assessment kumbaya moment, this was probably it. So, I think our discussions, although really long, turned out to be really, really useful, informative, and will lead to improvements in the 3 future.

4 5 6

2

So, next slide will get to the spiny lobster.

7 8

9

10 11 So, this is an update assessment, and it follows the past procedure on how we did this. I'm not really going to go into that. What it did was use the last years of landings that we did not have before to estimate the provision -- Well use the last years of landings as before to estimate the provisional landings-

12 13 14

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Can we discuss the queen trigger and stop and then the lobster after.

15 16 17

18

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Yeah, we can. So, there's a request to discuss queen trigger before we move on to spiny lobsters. That's fine with me.

19 20 21

## Discussion- SEDAR 80 Queen Triggerfish

22 23

MARCOS HANKE: Open for discussion to Council members.

24 25

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, Mr. Chair, the guiding principle here is that you have to decide on how much risk you want to take. So, that's what we're expecting from the Council today, at least for Puerto Rico. Because that's the number one issue.

28 29

26 27

MARCOS HANKE: Miquel.

30 31 32

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Graciela, puedes poner el P\*, las opciones que menciono Richard, and then the Council can ask question and come up with a--

34 35 36

33

Okay. If you look from the top to the bottom, it'll give you an idea of the presentation that you are going to be considering. so, this is the--

38 39 40

41

37

Okay, so, this is for the discussion, so this is the time. If you have any question, please ask the question to Richard for clarification.

42 43 44

45

46

47

48

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Marcos, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. I don't have a question. I just want to make some comments about how this fishery is managed commercially in Puerto Rico, because I know that the numbers have changed a lot and Richard says practically most of our divers are practically going for queen conch and lobster, and it's because of the price. So, they don't have any benefits to bring the queen triggerfish because it's pay, practically. I have been in fish market since 2012, and at that time the pay was .50¢ per pound or \$1 per pound, if it was clean. So, 10 years later it's \$1 if it's complete and \$1.50 if it's clean. And when you compare that with the lobster and queen conch that it \$10 per pound, for them, it's much better to just go and target the queen conches and the lobsters.

4 5

There's also another situation that change the numbers. We know that the numbers that practically are using here are the one from the statistics reports from the state landing. And sadly, I have to say this, when they go in the closure for queen conch, they put that it was triggerfish, those pounds, so that also changed the numbers. And another thing also is that because they always have in their mind that if they put a lot of pounds of what they get better pay, they are going to lose their benefits from government. So sometimes they cash hundred pounds of queen conch, and they divide it. They put 50 queen conches, 50 queen triggerfish. So, that's something that is real and it's still passing in there. From my experience, and I am from Cabo Rojo, so we have more than 400 divers in there that go out practically daily.

If we want queen triggerfish, practically, we make the order. I have one fish market in my town that have an order for a restaurant of 300 pounds weekly. So, the commercial fisherman goes out and brings that order, just special for that fish market. But it's not that they want to bring it, it's just because the owner, if they don't bring it, then he will not take the other things just because he wants to also sell to that restaurant.

So, this is practically the situation that we have with the queen triggerfish. We have a lot, if you need more, I can ask my fisherman to bring the amount that you need. But the thing is, if the price is still so low after practically 10 years, commercial fishermen will not target queen triggerfish. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Vanessa. Always good feedback from the industry is helpful. Go ahead.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yes. A question to Vanessa, and also to the Council. Remember that this morning we were talking about island-based FMPs, so what is good for Puerto Rico might not be that good for Virgin Island. So, you're talking about Puerto Rico, in this case we're talking about island-based FMP.

So, the question here posed to the Council is, what percentage of risk are you willing to bet for the protection of the triggerfish?

From what I hear, it seems that the triggerfish is not as important, put it that way, economically speaking for the fishers of Puerto Rico at this time. So, we need to be mindful of that. That doesn't mean that the fish is good or bad or it's in good shape or bad shape, but at this time, what the SSC is providing to the Council are the numbers that will provide you--

4 5

That P\*, by the way, you can translate it into the risk that you want and are willing to take. And that's what that table has there. Based on the base information that they have, the Council, you need to tell us, the scientists on the staff, how much risks are you willing to take based on the information presented to you so far.

MARCOS HANKE: Jack.

JOHN MCGOVERN: I have a question for, excuse me, Richard, or maybe Clay.

I know, Richard, you said that spiny lobster, the P\* used there was 0.45, and the SSC felt like it should be less than that because there's a good bit more uncertainty with this assessment than with spiny lobster. Did the SSC talk about where or did the Science Center talk about where they felt that risk should be? I know it's a Council decision, but it would probably be good to give some information about that.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: So, no, we did not discuss that per se because it is a Council decision other than we're clearly suggesting it shouldn't be something as high as 0.45. And it was the Center people who were aware of the initial development of the P\* system where the thinking was it would be at this lower edge for these more uncertain assessments.

Spiny lobster was considered at the time something that had a lesser chance of over exploitation because of a number of things. But one of them, specifically, was the very large size that was at— was the minimum size that they were [shipping?]. And so, that was relative to, say, assessments that were done in Florida, whatever, you know, if it's okay there and we're even more strict, it should be okay here. Um, we don't have that confidence obviously with this species and, you know, but we don't have a track record to go by either.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Richard?

RICHARD APPELDOORN: You know, I'm not sure we can really help with that.

1 2

3

MARCOS HANKE: Richard, Miguel has a point and I have a follow up.

4 5 6 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Not a point but make it so we all understand. If you look at the table for the higher the P\*, the less available catches you have for landings.

7

RICHARD APPELDOORN: No, the other way around or other way around.

9

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Or is it the other way around? Can you explain that in very simple terms?

111213

14

1516

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Yeah. So, at the bottom of the graph is the P\* values, the highest you could possibly consider. And you're getting the highest values of catch you would be allowed to take. At the top of the graph is the lowest P\*, lowest risk of overfishing. So, a 30% risk of overfishing. And those give you the lowest values of recommended catch because you're being more cautious. You know, the more cautious you're being, the less fish you're going to take out. And so, that's, what that's saying. Again, note relative to recent landings, most of these P\* values are giving you values of fishing that are bigger than have occurred in the last five years. so, there's room to grow and that's what the model, for the most part, is saying.

2526

MARCOS HANKE: Clay.

272829

30

31

32

33

3435

36

37

38

39

40 41

42 43

44 45

46

47

48

CLAY PORCH: Yes, thank you. The way you need to look at the choice of P\* is what's going to happen if you do overfish? So, what are the consequences of overfishing? So, if you overfish long enough, then the population becomes overfished, then you have to have a rebuilding plan, you have to rebuild the population as soon as possible. And in some cases, I don't know about this fishery, but in some cases the only way to rebuild the stock as fast as possible would be to stop the entire fishery. So, let's say queen trigger might not be a target, but if when you're targeting other things, you're still catching a lot of queen trigger. It's conceivable, we haven't done that analysis, but it's conceivable that you would have to shut down the whole fishery for a time to rebuild the population. So, the point is to think about it in terms of if you did have overfishing, what would be the consequences and how badly do you want to avoid overfishing? so, if you pick P\* equals 0.45, you're saying, I'm not really that worried about overfishing. The consequences to my fishery aren't very great. If you pick something like a P\* of 0.3, it says, you are kind of worried about overfishing and if there is overfishing of queen trigger, either it could lead to eventual extrication of the stock or it could have some consequences for my fishery that I don't want to face.

1 2

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And on the same point, I would like to know, maybe Richard can give me the information or Graciela, we have a gear that doesn't select very much and catches a lot of triggerfish, which is traps, which is a different case for the spearfishing that they have the selectivity on their hands. Right? It is two different scenarios. I'd like to know which of those catch more triggerfish for me to follow up. Which level of risk we can follow or should follow. Which gear catch more triggerfish traps, poundage per year, traps or spearfishing.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Adyan, would you have that information available? It was presented, but I don't have it with me. Maybe Adyan can call it up. You could? The analyses are— she's looking at it now. So, analyses do look at both fisheries separately and then, you know, uses ways to combine data from the trap and dive fisheries to come up with an overall catch per unit efforts and size matrices that are used to put into the model.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. And another thing that I want for the whole group to understand is, on this table is the range of options accepted by the SSC that we need to choose from it? Or there is any of them that SSC-- I was at the meeting, but I want the group to know if there is something that the SSC, in the majority, decided on it, or is it just the range that we need to choose.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Well, you need to choose a value. We looked at a range because we didn't know what value you were going to choose. And we wanted to look at that range over, you know, a reasonable expectation. So, if we did it from say, 0.4 to 0.45, that would be like, we weren't-- it looks like we were suggesting that the value only had to be in that range. So that's why we went down to 0.3. Because again this is your basic minimum assessment and short term, a lot of uncertainty. So, we did not want to put only the values in high thinking that that was okay. We have them going that high because that range was included with spiny lobster. So, that's least what the Council was looking at last time, but we didn't want to presuppose an answer for the Council. And I would also point out that you probably don't want this graph up here while you're discussing this.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Carlos. Adyan, please let me know once you have the information.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah, I just heard about which gear catches more, but you have to remember that if it's not an important targeted species for Puerto Rico being caught in trap but not retained. So, I think retention is more important. So, what are

they keeping as to what they're releasing back into the water? You can be catching 80% more in trap, but you're releasing just about all, or not all, but—

RICHARD APPELDOORN: I don't know what the current situation is, but I know when I looked at that kind of data in the past, very, very little of anything is not retained in the trap fishery. So, I would think they go into the market just as Vanessa says. It's not going to sell for very much.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Well, a little follow up here because I know that in Saint Thomas, they—

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Saint Thomas is very different. Very, very different.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah. Okay. All right.

MARCOS HANKE: Just a follow up on his point. And this is where I was trying to make the distinction between the trap and the spearfishing. Now we are getting into the analysis of, once we release what's going to happen with those fish. The triggerfish on traps do suffer by barotrauma, even though they're capable of swimming down very often. We don't know the consequences and the true mortality of it, I just want the Council to be aware of that. There are other fishes that their look seems to be more sensitive to that barotrauma effect than triggerfish. Adyan, do you have the information, or we keep going and we get it later?

ADYAN RIOS: So, on the screen we have figure six from the Puerto Rico SEDAR 80-- Adyan Rios. On the screen we have figure six from the Puerto Rico SEDAR 80 stock assessment report. And we have landings by fishery with the trap in blue and the dive in red. And you can see that, you know, the majority comes from trap, but there is an increase over time of the proportion that comes from diving.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And that's the reason I want to say, for the group to be informed. There is a growing, even though on the West is not the case, and I know that it's the fact, on the East coast of Puerto Rico, there is an increase of use of queen triggerfish, and we need to be mindful of that. Nelson.

 NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelson Crespo, for the record. I'm curious if you are taking into consideration the last five years. During the past five years, we saw issues like Hurricane Irma and María, we got the earthquakes, the Greenland tidal wave, covid, and the last hurricane Fiona. That affects the

report because the fishermen are limited to go out fishing. I think we have to think twice when you are going to select the P\*.

MARCOS HANKE: I understand. What you're trying to say is that there was less pressure on this fishery due to those factors and based on your expertise and what you see out there?

NELSON CRESPO: Yep, that's correct.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. In the same line as Nelson says, I think that we should investigate or ask, I don't know if I can ask Wilson who's is right here, if he knows how many commercial fishermen, of traps, we have now after the hurricanes. We know that many of them lost their equipment and many of them also retire.

MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa, that's important. Wilson, you can look for this information, but we are just making -- I'm allowing this conversation to put a context of information based on the expertise of the people on the table to create a record to decide on the P\*. Clay, then Julian.

CLAY PORCH: Yeah. Just looking at this, even though most of the landings, half to two thirds were from the trap fishery, what I understand is that the discard mortality rate is pretty low. And if that's the case, then at least you have the answer to one question that if the stock were overfished and you had to cut back severely on the landings of gray trigger, it would not probably shut down the trap fishery because they can let them go and they would live. So, that's one thing. So, that to me means the primary question is whether queen trigger might be more vulnerable to an extinction risk or at least being heavily depleted because of their particular life history and I don't know if the SSC talked a lot about that.

So, in other words, based on the information I'm hearing, there's not a lot of risk in terms of shutting down the fishery. The question is, is there some special risk to that particular species? If you overfish it, you could be on a slippery slope to severely depleting it.

MARCOS HANKE: Richard.

**RICHARD APPELDOORN:** Well, there's two aspects to that. One is the fact about their mode of reproduction. They are nest builders, the female lazy eggs, the male will fertilize it and then he will guard

the eggs for a period of weeks or a week until they hatch as a fairly late stage, relatively speaking, larvae with fairly good swimming capabilities. Generally, those species do not have a long time period in the water. So, they're not putting out a large number of eggs that a broadcast spawner would be, but they're taking care of the number of eggs that they're producing, so it's minimizing a lot of the early mortality that eggs and larvae would normally have. So, that might make them a little bit more at risk because their fecundity is low, but they're really taking care of what they do produce.

4 5

The other factor is that there is a feeling-- well, what data we have, shows that large individuals are found fairly deep and therefore for the diving population or the divers just won't have access to those because of the depth. Some trap fishing can occur in those areas, so that's a place where maybe trap fishing is a little bit more putting it at risk than the divers would. But those kind of offset each other, so there wasn't really a strong feeling how that would play one way or the other. So, normally you would say, "Oh, less fecund fish more vulnerable" but that's not necessarily the case. This is a different reproductive strategy with the goal of ending up with the same on average, you know, replacement value of the parents. So, you know, I don't see it being particularly more vulnerable than other species and, you know, without specific studies on that--

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Richard and Clay. I think because of the time, and we have a strong record about this discussion, we need to start addressing numbers and decide the P\*. Council members you guys—Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: I strongly recommend you take this graph off for the rest of that discussion, so you're not picking the catch level you want.

MARCOS HANKE: I'm sorry. I was missing the participation of Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Julian Magras for the record, can you pull back up the screen for one minute please? The last slide.

So, I know this is the Puerto Rico fishery, but I work very close with my counterparts and just like Nelson would say, if you look at your recent landings of the last five years, you can see the landings have dropped significantly from 2016. The hurricanes were 2017, then you had two years of pandemic. So then, you move over to your actual, where the Council has to decide on the P\* and the percentage that's going to be used. All I'm trying to say here is,

you don't want to come up with a P\* that's going to end up driving these fishermen into an overfishing situation due to the fact that now they're recovering from the pandemic and the hurricanes, and their fishery has a potential to build back up to those actual numbers that they were harvesting before.

If you set the number too low, what you're going to because is them to go into an overfishing state and then accountability measures will be implemented. So, I'm just throwing that out there for when you guys have that discussion, take into mind what we are looking at and where those numbers actually came from. Thank you.

#### MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thanks, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. As Julian says, I also recommend that we should go up to the maximum, 0.45, because we can see in the numbers and also, we know that our fishermen are giving better numbers now, better reports. Also, the app is giving data that is more recent.

So, I would go for the 0.45, so we don't penalize them because they are given better data. And of course, we are practically, as Marcos says, in the East, we know that we have traps in that area. I think that the best way that we can work for the fishery, it's taking care of it of course, but we know that also we have the economic situation. So, I don't think that we should go lower than we have for 2014 because once they start making again the fishery, and as I said, many restaurants use the queen triggerfish to make turnovers, like it was with boxfish. So, we know that there's restaurants that are using it and we know that we have commercial fishermen with traps that go for the queen triggerfish but in the case of the divers, they only go for the — they select the size. So, I wish that all the Council members considered that for the motion to go to the maximum of 0.45. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: You can make the motion if you want to. Richard, then we get back to you, Vanessa.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Two things. One, we are doing exactly what I warned you not to do, which is looking at the catch levels and then deciding what kind of risk you have. And you're supposed to be assessing what kind of risk you have, the catch limits come out of that.

If you go to the previous slide, what this was saying is that, up until the end of the data series the fishery was in fact approaching the level where it would be undergoing overfishing, not overfished, but overfishing. But the projections based on the

low levels of recent catch, as Nelson and Julian rightly pointed out, have been low for lots of other reasons, is allowing the fishery to take more in any of these scenarios than what is being taken now. But then will gradually drive that thing back down to the level of our maximum sustainable year proxy, which is where you basically kind of want it to be. So, you know, we were very close to that before. If we're going to allow a lot more fishing, you could easily drive it below that line. So, you have to understand what we're talking about when we talk about the dynamics of the fishery and the risk of overfishing. This would suggest that the risk of overfishing is or could be high if you set your catch levels too high. Thank you.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa.

**VANESSA RAMÍREZ:** Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. I have a question. Is this number going to be considered for three or five years?

MARCOS HANKE: Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: We are estimating — if you go for the — Well, all our estimates are based on, if you go, let's see, two graphs down, two slides down. Just as an example, you can see there are five years from 2023 to 2027, included in that. If you accept this, it's going to take you a year to get the amendment through. So, it's really 2024 that you would be starting this regime. And we estimate if you're going with the affix value, so we did the averages for both, the OFLs and the resulting ABCs, for 2024, 2025, and 2026. So, three years. And then we're getting out into areas we're not happy with. Just because it's, you know, as I said, short term management advice.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Vanessa, remember this is counting the time that you amended the plan. And the more data comes into play, etcetera, we always -- this is flexible, we can amend it.

I remember, Stephen Monsanto, a long time ago was the Chair of the Council, and he always said, "Tell me how much I can get away with, without jeopardizing the resource." And this is the role you need to play. You know, looking at the table, looking at the information that you receive. What is the P\* value that will allow you to fish to obtain the best benefit to the nation without jeopardizing the sustainability of the resource. So, if your motion is 0.45, then the discussion will be, will that be a precautionary approach at the same time that we allow the socio-economy not to suffer as much.

This is more or less the summary that was presented by Julian in this case on what has been discussed. So, once you have the motion, then you have to have a discussion, so you can supply more information, more support for this.

MARCOS HANKE: Before-- one second, Vanessa. Clay, then Vanessa.

CLAY PORCH: Thank you, Chair. I was just going to say, from my perspective, I didn't hear a strong argument for a very low P\*. There doesn't seem to be a high risk to the population or a high risk that the fishery would have to be shut down if queen trigger were overfished. Except for one thing that concerns me a lot and that is that I heard that fishermen are intentionally misreporting queen trigger as conch. If that's a problem, then we're in a riskier situation. And you might argue for a lower P\*.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, but that also is a very important report from Vanessa, from her fishing area. It's not necessarily on the East Coast, for example, that they sell them. It's not across the board, is what I'm trying to bring to the table.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Guys, you are guessing. Okay. I haven't met a fisherman for 40 years that tells you exactly what their catch is. Okay? And it all depends on the situation. Let's put it that way. Your role is to see the numbers, everything that you have, all the experience that you have, and come up with almost a guesstimate. But you have to err on the size of the resources.

If the number that you have here allows you to do that, then you have to pick that one. The motion that is on the table, I guess, or proposed to be on the table, I don't know if somebody seconded the table, is 0.45. So, the question is, if we adopt a P\* of 0.45, is that something that the resource can sustain? number one. Taking into consideration everything that you said. After, when you go back home, be careful because they're going to kill you there.

The thing is that once you have clear for the record, what are the consequences of the P\*, what are your responsibilities from the scientific point of view and the management point of view under MSA, that's what you should be going with.

So, at this time, Mr. Chairman, for the record and Jack is raising the hand, so I'll stop here.

MARCOS HANKE: Jack and then Vanessa.

JOHN MCGOVERN: No, I just, we've heard a whole lot and I don't feel like 0.45 is supportable and that we have to be more

conservative, as Richard has said, for the resource. You know, it's not really a targeted species. There are possibly people discarding them. As Clay said, there might be a situation where you might have to shut down a fishery and it is a co-occurring species with other species. And so, I feel like we need to be more precautionary with a lower P\* value than 0.45.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Jack. Vanessa?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. After the discussion, I will suggest then, let's do 0.40.

MARCOS HANKE: Can you make it in a motion form?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes, I will move a motion to present P\* at 0.40 for the queen triggerfish.

MARCOS HANKE: Any second?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Carl Farchette, second.

MARCOS HANKE: Let's have further discussion on this. Anybody else wants to add any point or discuss this 0.40 motion proposed by Vanessa and second by Carlos Farchette? James.

 JAMES R. KREGLO: I'd like to say something. I don't know the Puerto-- Oh, excuse me. James Kreglo. I'm a diver. I've been spearfishing, in the V.I. would call them, old wife, but queen triggers since 1980s. And when I get orders, queen triggers, usually down here, for a number of reasons, one, ciguatera and a lot of people, if they've been hit with ciguatera, they don't want to eat a triggerfish again. They may take another chance.

 Also, I don't want to give you all the other points, but the other thing, if you've ever been diving and you're spearing triggerfish, we have something called "you've been kissed by triggerfish." Anybody here been kissed by Triggerfish? You know what that is? Yeah. And if you're a diver and you've been bitten a few times, I was bitten probably two months ago by one. And as a diver and spearfishing, I will shoot a lot of other fish before I shoot a triggerfish. I usually pass them up unless somebody specifically says, "I want a certain size trigger fish." That's my comment.

 MARCOS HANKE: Excellent comment. What I'm hearing from the group is, because of the flexibility on the gears that mainly catch queen triggerfish, on traps they are able or capable to release them with a fair amount of release, that are good for the fish, they are going to survive. And in case there is need to do something to

prohibit the landing of triggerfish, the spearfishermen, for sure, can stop shooting them. We also heard the good reproduction strategy that the queen triggerfish have to have bigger juveniles introduced after they are fostered by their parents, and they can go on better than other species. It is market driven, it's not an open source of market there. It's possible of product substitution like the gray triggerfish, like the black triggerfish and other things for filling "pastelillos" and other things. There's other fish that are used for that.

I mean, there are options for the fishing industry that doesn't add socioeconomic problems. Less effort, because of the less effort by hurricanes and other things that Nelson described, we most likely in the future are going to have high landings. All of those, guys, this is expected, and we have already an explanation for it or a partial explanation for it. In the future the highest catch — yeah, this is what I just said. And the other point that Kreglo just brought to the table, which is the ciquatera.

All of this is part of the rationale of why Vanessa is presenting the 0.40. I would like to ask Vanessa if I was able to put everything together as part of the rationale why she chose the 0.40. Does this make sense to you, what I heard from the group, and I just tried to put it all together?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes. That's a great summary of everything.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Is there any other question? Hearing none, let's vote. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Vanessa Ramírez, yes.

JAMES R. KREGLO: James Kreglo, yes.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Jean-Pierre Oriol, yes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Carl Farchette, yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Marcos Hanke, yes.

42 JOHN MCGOVERN: Jack McGovern, yes.

44 MARCOS HANKE: Motion carries. All in favor except one absent, 45 Puerto Rico DNR. Thank you.

Next on the agenda is -- go ahead.

## SSC Report- Cont.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: So, SEDAR 57 was next. As I mentioned, we're following the past procedures using the last year of landings to estimate the provisional landings for those years that we don't have either the full landing data set or the correction factors. And I'll point out right from the start, that there were only marginal changes in the predicted OFLs, ABCs and hence ACLs that would come out of that. These were looked at for each platform, so I'll go through each of those.

So, the next slide.

This is two slides showing the model output for Puerto Rico spiny lobster. Those values at the end in purple, or bluish I guess it is, represent the update, the expansion of the update. It actually shows both models all the way through, but the benchmark that we use is on top, so that's the one you see because it's almost exactly the same as the update.

And so, for Puerto Rico, we do have a situation here where we're basically right at the edge of where we want to be. We're right at the MSY limit in terms of biomass, that's the bottom graph. You can see we're approaching that dotted line. And for fishing mortality, again, we actually just sort of crossed it, but, you know, there's variability associated with these estimates. But it basically says we're near where that's supposed to be.

So, what comes out of this? next slide.

You'll see the top set of figures is the original benchmark, results. And the bottom set of figures is the update. And so, again, we're looking at the years 2024, 2025, 2026. You get both the OFL and what that average would be of those three years, which is what the Council chose to use last time. Three-year average. And what the ABCs would look and that average over those three years. This is all based on continuing the use of the P\* value that was chosen previously for spiny lobster.

 And at this point, I will mention that there's been a very slight update or will be coming from the Science Center on these numbers. Apparently, there were some tweaks in the model they did, but the changes are on the order of 1%. So, the numbers you're looking at here are going to be very reflective of the levels we're talking about here.

46 Uh, having said this, for Puerto Rico, there's a big butt. First 47 of all, we know that due to the pandemic, there is very little 48 length information from the last two years. And length data's the principal data input to the model. Not the only, but the principal one. So, this is an update, but it's an update without very much new information. So, there's some precaution that goes with that. And as I said before, we noticed that the population's effectively at the limit set by biomass and also fishing mortality.

So, having said that the DAP members were reporting, and this is not just Puerto Rico, but also the Virgin Islands, are reporting significant pulls in lobster catch. As to say, new recruitment, a big recruitment class seems to be coming in, it's being now reflected in the catch. If that's the case, this may be led to some unintentional overage in Puerto Rico because the model's saying we're already at the limit. And this is what was referred to initially as perverse feedback. If you set a quota level that's allowing your stock to get bigger you will constantly go over that because your stock is actually healthier than you say. And so, we're sort of stuck in this situation because we already had previously accepted this model as being valid.

So, our recommendation following that situation is that we recommend prioritizing spiny lobster for a new benchmark assessment. Not an update, but a whole new assessment, which we based on new length information that's now coming in, it would be based on, new estimates of selectivity from studies that are now ongoing, etcetera. So, we would be in a much better position to try and try to pin down where our, particularly, our MSY is and then the variability around that, relative to then setting OFLs and ABCs.

At the moment we're kind of stuck with this situation and hopefully if we can get a new benchmark in, we can avoid undue hardship, potential hardship on the fishery in Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico only. Um, so, to be continued that's the story.

Here's the model for Saint Thomas Saint John. You can see on the top graph the population and the projections are well below the fishing mortality that would be recommended at MSY. And the population is well above the biomass that would be at MSY. So, it's looking fairly healthy.

Here are the numbers that come out of that. And same as before. You're getting the OFL in the middle there and the ABC on the right, including the individual years that in this case, decline because you're allowed to -- Oh, sorry. Yeah. Next slide. Sorry. Here we go. So, the bottom is the update. The top is the original values. We're seeing in the middle, it's the OFL values. And in the right, we're seeing the ABC values that would come with that 0.45 P\* value. And again, the values here are declining because

we're saying, initially there's room in the fishery to expand, so go expand if you want to, but then as you fill that, we're going to bring it back down to that MSY suggested level. And so, that's good news. And so, we certainly recommended accepting the Saint Thomas Saint John update.

Next slide.

This is the situation in Saint Croix. Again, according to the model, the population looks healthy. And so, not a problem here.

So, next slide.

We're recommending accepting this update. And again, you get the OFL values in the center and that average OFL. And on the right, the ABC values and that average ABC, on the far right. And again, these values are high and dropped down because, again, we're saying there's room for the fishery to expand and therefore you could fish at these higher levels but then we would bring that back down to working toward the level appropriate to the MSY.

So, things were looking good for the Virgin Islands data in that regard. Puerto Rico is the one where we have this question and we don't know what will happen in the future, but we are concern for a potential of going into an accountability situation where maybe the population is actually healthy.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: These models are predicted on some constant level of recruitment. There's some variability around that, but I don't think they necessarily incorporate a big year class event, which seems to be what's happening. Again, we don't know how that will play out for the rest of the, well, the rest of the year we do, but next year and the year after. So, you know, there's a lot of, again, a lot of uncertainty in what will happen, but we did want to point out that there is that potential and that's why we want to get back to a full benchmark re-analysis of everything for spiny lobster. Particularly for Puerto Rico because that's the one at risk, as quickly as possible.

#### Discussion SEDAR 57

MARCOS HANKE: Richard, I have a question. At this point, what do you need? What are you expecting from the Council to decide or to follow up? I have something to say after you respond.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Yeah, that's not my call, but I assume you have to say whether you're going to accept these updates and therefore the OFL and ABC values and whether you want -- well, last time you wanted a three-year average and so, that's what we've calculated. Do you want to stay with the three-year averages?

I'll also point out for SEDAR 80 Queen Trigger. You did not say whether you want three-year averages or not, or whether you're accepting the results at all, for that matter.

MARCOS HANKE: The discussion is open to the Council. Council members, DAPs, anything to say? Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Yeah, Julian Magras, for the record. I would recommend that the Council move forward with the new lobster OFLs and ABCs that have been set forth here. We spent a lot of time discussing and looking at the landings, and we know there are some gaps out there still that need to be filled, and we will be working on getting those gaps filled here very soon, next year. I'm working with the Science Center and getting the information together, that's going to be needed for revisiting the lobsters in 2024 because they're going to go through the assessment process once more. But I would ask if the Council can move forward with the Saint Thomas, Saint John recommendations and I'll leave Saint Croix and Puerto Rico speak for their zone. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Council members? Graciela.

 GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: In terms of what the Council needs to do, Richard and Julian addressed the situation. But also, for the SEDAR Steering Committee, you need to make sure that if you want to have the lobster assessed again, that has to come into the schedule. So, those are things that don't have to be decided here. You can say that "Yes, we want," and then you'll go to the steering committee and find out what year you can schedule it.

Additionally, if there are gaps in the data that need to be addressed between now and the next assessment, then this is the time to do it. And again, it would be a collaboration with the Science Center and the fishers to fill in the gaps that we have in the data that we need for the next assessment.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And I have -- I'll go with you, Nelson. I have a question for Clay. We have the lobster reassess or the reevaluation in 2024 already in schedule. Correct? Okay. Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm strongly in favor of what Dr. Appeldoorn says. It's necessary to review the lobster in

Puerto Rico. And I really worry because on the last reports, the size of the lobster doesn't show big lobsters on that report. And I am under the impression that it is because of the lack or limited number of port samplers we have in the island. I see big lobster commonly. But for example, and I was talking with Wilson this morning about this, I have been fishing with traps for little bit more than one year and nobody has come to my area to do the port samplers. Same in Añasco. I can see the videos that Carlitos Velázquez post on his webpage, and he's showing huge lobsters and that's telling me that here there is something wrong and maybe this Council, maybe, can evaluate the possibility to assign more funds to have more port samplers in the Island.

4 5

### MARCOS HANKE: Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Yeah, just to actually support what Nelson's saying. I mentioned, actually for all three islands, we have very little new information that actually went into this because there weren't people out collecting length measurements primarily because of the pandemic. Which, you know, we hope is the situation that will be corrected now in the future, but he's right. Those low sample sizes, we're going to miss things like this. And that's one of the reasons, again, we'd like to have an update or a full re-analysis in the near future.

MARCOS HANKE: And this is very consistent historically. I had a conversation during lunchtime, addressing the conversation, one of the things that we have to facilitate or entertain into the future is to expand or to add capability on port sampling or to acquire that kind of data that is missing, and this is a reflection of that.

And also, as a Chairman, I would like to answer the question that Graciela stated, if you want the evaluation of the lobster 2024, I strongly say yes from what I'm hearing from everybody on the table. Is anybody in disagreement on the SEDAR assessment for that to be the case? Hearing none, nobody in opposition to that. You have your answer already, Graciela. The Council wishes for the lobster to be a priority as soon as possible on the SEDAR schedule. Go ahead.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: You also need to move forward with the presentation that Richard just gave you with the assessment that the SSC has done and whether or not you accept the-- So, you need a motion to move forward. We're talking about spiny lobster right now, so we can do spiny lobster first. You still need to address the situation with the year or the three-year running average for the queen triggerfish.

1 2

MARCOS HANKE: Any Council member would like to make the motion or-- who has a hand up? Gerson? Go ahead, very quick please.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Just to elaborate. We also, in Saint Croix, agree with the information you have for the overfishing levels and the annual allowable biological catch for the island of Saint Croix of lobster fisheries.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos, are you asking to speak? Graciela, can you help on the language of the motion that you just referred to.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: For the spiny lobster, you will be requesting that we update the information that we have with what the SSC has recommended as seen on the discussion.

MARCOS HANKE: Can you put the suggestion for the language on the screen to see if that is acceptable by any Council member to start the discussion and to move forward?

**GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER:** So, request to update the information on the island-based FMP for the spiny lobster based on SEDAR 57 for all three islands.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, moved.

MARCOS HANKE: Any second?

JAMES R. KREGLO: James Kreglo, second.

31 MARCOS HANKE: Open discussion. Any further discussion for this 32 motion? Richard.

 RICHARD APPELDOORN: Yes. What we're recommending, it says there "request to update the information" and what we're actually recommending is a full benchmark assessment. A new benchmark assessment.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Yeah, but we need to update with the information that you have, the new OFLs and the projection. And then we also need to do the assessment for the--

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Graciela, you can say, "updated the information and" add the phrase. You can add the phrase that Richard mentioned. It will add to the motion without—

MARCOS HANKE: Kate.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Kate Zamboni, for the record. I actually think it would be better to keep those as two separate motions. So, you have one to make the request to do the benchmark assessment and then a second one in terms of what is the Council going to do with the updated information that the SSC presented. So, I would keep those as two separate motions.

1 2

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah, we're going to do that then.

Any further discussion. So, you should really say, request to accept the update of information and the assessment.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos. The thing is, you're talking about two different things. Okay? So, the language that Richard is proposing, if you amend the motion, will read as—and that's what we need to answer.

18 RICHARD APPELDOORN: so, this is just talking about accepting the-

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. Can you help us with the language, Richard?

RICHARD APPELDOORN: The motion would be that the Council accepts the updated spiny lobster assessment from SEDAR 57 for all three islands.

MARCOS HANKE: SEDAR 57 is already referring to the lobster, right?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: ¿Graciela, los puedes ayudar para que ellos lo puedan escribir como él lo dice?

MARCOS HANKE: María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: So, what we need is the Council to accept the recommendation from the SSC and then decide what to do with that, which will be an amendment to the island-based FMPs to do this. So, that could be another motion, and we are prepared to do that as well.

 MARCOS HANKE: Okay. But the motion, the first motion that we are discussing now presented by Carlos and second, is still in play and is appropriate, or is it better for him to withdraw that motion and follow your instructions?

44 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, no, no. Marco.

MARCOS HANKE: I'm getting really confused with you guys now.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: The motion as is, is what you need to have at this time. The second part of the discussion today is the second motion that María just proposed. So, for the record, the motion is "the Council request staff start amendment to the island-base, blah blah" that's the second part.

So, Graciela, la tiene clara. La primera es aceptar la vaina esa y la segunda es que vamos a hacer con eso.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, that what it says. It says "to amend the spiny--

MARCOS HANKE: Adyan, please somebody help me here.

ADYAN RIOS: Adyan Rios, for the record, I just wanted to add or suggest additional clarification and request from Rich. So, for U.S. Virgin Islands, there was only one update model each and for Puerto Rico, just to clarify, the recommendation is the sensitivity model. Correct? Because there were two models presented for Puerto Rico. So, the one that incorporates the revised correction factors for 2020 and 202-- going forward. Rich?

RICHARD APPELDOORN: They'd be the values that I showed on the screen, which remember are going to be tweaked very slightly less than or like 1%. So, not a factor for discussion here, but the actual, you know, something near hundreds or maybe a thousand of pounds change.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Liajay, la moción es de Carlos y second by Kreglo.

MARCOS HANKE: Está invertido.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay, the owner of the motion is Carlos. Do you agree with the new language, Carlos?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes. Yes.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. So, for the record, the owner of the motion amends the language to read, the Council requests staff start an Amendment to the Island-based FMPs to update OFLs, ABCs projected from the SEDAR 57 Spiny Lobster Update Assessment for 2024-2026 using the constant-catch (i.e., average) values recommended by the SSC. Did you memorize it and know what we're talking about. So, James, do you agree with the new language?

JAMES R. KREGLO: James Kreglo, yes.

1 MARCOS HANKE: Jack.

**JOHN MCGOVERN:** Jack McGovern. It would be good to have ACLs in there as well. OFLs ABCs and ACLs.

MARCOS HANKE: It's suggested and added. Do you agree, Carlos?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, thank you very much. Further discussion? Don't see any hands. I think we finally got there, and let's vote.

Vanessa.

14 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Vanessa Ramírez, yes.

16 JAMES R. KREGLO: James Kreglo, yes.

**JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL:** Jean-Pierre Oriol, yes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Carl Farchette, yes.

22 MARCOS HANKE: Marcos Hanke, yes.

JOHN MCGOVERN: Jack McGovern, yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you all. There is one absent which is Puerto Rico, and the rest of the Council members are in favor.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Graciela, what else do we need to do at this time with the SSC report?

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Well, you need to, if you are-- we've requested to the Council that a new benchmark assessment for lobster be done as soon as possible. This would be through the SEDAR process. If you accept that, I don't know whether you need to make it a motion to then do that, or this is just something-

MARCOS HANKE: Richard to avoid the same route that we got into, can you suggest the language and put it there and somebody move if they agree?

42 RICHARD APPELDOORN: Yeah, I'm not sure I'm the one to do that.

44 MARCOS HANKE: Clay.

**CLAY PORCH:** Yeah, I almost would leave it vague in terms of assessment, because as some of us have discussed, we need to maybe think about revamping the SEDAR process a little bit for the

Caribbean to make it a little more nimble. I'm not sure Benchmark in the way it's applied for some of the other Councils is necessarily the best way to go here.

So maybe for this language we just say we want to make sure that it's a priority on the ticket. Right now, it is listed as an operational assessment, but that's just because of the way that SEDAR characterizes assessments as research, meaning no management advice coming from it, versus operational that have management. But among other things, I think we need to get SSC engagement a little earlier in the process. I don't think that happened as much for these last two assessments. So then, when the SSC got a chance to look at it, they said, "Oh, but let's look at this and let's look at that" after the fact. And we need to do that actually during the assessment because we just don't have the horsepower to do an assessment and then, you know, it gets reviewed again and then, a bunch of other things get tacked onto it. We need to all kind of do it simultaneously.

MARCOS HANKE: Just because of what you said-- Richard, you go now-- any of you after you make your participation can put the language there, please.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Well, the committee discussed this, and we were really adamant about it not being an operational, but it had to be benchmark. If I recall correctly, the rationale was a full review of data in-person meetings is really needed. And so, that's why the term benchmark was in our recommendation. But the key thing is to get it on the SEDAR agenda in a timely manner regardless of kind of assessment you're doing.

But, you know, Clay is right, the benchmark assessment is a much more involved thing, and it takes their time. And yes, we need to get this to SEDAR a little bit earlier. We did have substantial discussion peppered through all this, and the SEDAR 81, about things we could standardize for future modeling that would make this thing much more, well, not sorry, automatic, but smoother. And so, we agree with Clay that those things are coming forward. There were suggestions that were given to Shannon about that, and we think there's a basis there for moving forward with that kind of assessment.

MARCOS HANKE: Graciela and Clay.

 GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Kate, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that it's the direction of the Council that we need in terms of getting the lobster into the SEDAR schedule or some type of assessment. We need to talk to the Science Center, we need to

evaluate the situation, and it's very clear that the Council would like to move forward with an assessment, we just need to get the language straight in terms of what exactly are we needing and how we're going to conduct the assessment.

MARCOS HANKE: Clay, I will please ask you to help the Council with the language.

CLAY PORCH: Well, that's what I was saying. I don't know that I'd put the word benchmark, because that means something very specific to SEDAR in the way they conducted with the three workshops and all that. We might want to do something a little bit different here. So, it's already listed on the books as an operational, but that doesn't really matter. We can change the terms of how that assessment would be conducted to make sure it covers all the issues that the SSC is concerned about. So, again, I don't know that I would put the word benchmark specifically because that means something special to SEDAR, but I think you can certainly put that the assessment that's conducted in '24 would include and then you could put a list of the things you want to make sure that it includes. Does that help?

RICHARD APPELDOORN: I'm not sure I could specify the list of things, but it would really revolve around making sure we had lots of fishermen input on the data in particular, and we didn't see a way of that happening without having in-person, you know, live meetings for each platform.

CLAY PORCH: Yeah, we agree we'd like to have the in-person meetings but that doesn't mean it has to be with the benchmark assessment in-person data, in-person assessment, in-person review workshop. I think we can do it a little bit differently, so we don't have to follow the SEDAR formula for a benchmark.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Well, I'll leave that up to you. The SSC was concerned that we need to revisit this stuff in a much more rigorous way than we were doing now.

MARCOS HANKE: Clay, maybe the moment for the motion on that, because we are all adapting and learning this process is not a good moment now. I will invite the Council. I asked the Council if they rely on the coordination between Graciela and Clay to find the better way to address our request that the record is already strong, that we want to get the better information about lobster, and they are trying to find a way, a Caribbean way, of doing this and adapting to our needs. Is that fair enough for the Council? Is anybody in opposition to that? Hearing none, this is what we're going to say, you and Graciela and myself and Miguel and whoever

you guys' think is appropriate, will, and María, will be involved on this and will be reporting the outcome to the Council members. You want to say something?

**JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL:** Yeah. Thanks Mr. Chair. I would just recommend that we sit on offline and develop the language. There's nothing that says we have to present the motion right now. So, we've got another day and a half that we can still present that motion.

MARCOS HANKE: That's another option too. That's why I ask, right? Yeah. So, and I invite you to support the group on that.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Yeah.

**MARCOS HANKE:** Thank you. We will leave it like it is for now and we keep the discussion as appropriate in the future. Next presentation. There is still more?

RICHARD APPELDOORN: There's more. But most importantly under queen triggerfish the Council did not specify whether they want to go with the three-year average OFL, ABC determinations or whether they wanted to go with the moving values for each year. Remember for spiny lobster, you took the average.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos.

28 CARLOS FARCHETTE: I moved for a three-year average.

30 MARCOS HANKE: Any second?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Vanessa Ramírez, second.

34 MARCOS HANKE: Further discussion. This is for queen triggerfish, 35 correct, Carlos?

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Right, right. I'm sorry. Three-year average for queen trigger.

MARCOS HANKE: In all areas?

42 CARLOS FARCHETTE: In all three areas, yes.

44 RICHARD APPELDOORN: Okay, it's only two areas. We did not accept the model for Saint Croix.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. do you agree, Vanessa?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Further discussion? Anybody in opposition? I don't see any hands.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Actually, let me rephrase that. It's only for Puerto Rico that we accepted the model. We are hopeful the model will also eventually produce for Saint Thomas. We're not there yet. So, it's only for Puerto Rico. Sorry.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Three-year average of queen trigger for Puerto Rico only.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Second.

MARCOS HANKE: Anybody in opposition. Hearing no hands, no request for the floor. The motion carries. It was one absent. Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, the other thing is to make sure that we follow suit with the Quin trigger for Saint Thomas, specifically being the symbol of the Saint Thomas Fisherman Association for so long. The queen trigger needs to be further looked into for the Saint Thomas area, Saint Thomas/Saint John area. So, I think that we are in in the right direction working with the Science Center on that, so the Council, you know, has heard from Richard and the SSC, and that's the way to go.

MARCOS HANKE: We don't need any motion or anything from the Council. Thank you. Next on the agenda. Do you have anything else, Richard?

SSC Report- cont.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Yeah, there's lots more. But I'll go through it very quickly. So, if you go to slide 25.

 Alright. A quick summary on what's called SCS7. This is the group of SSC sort of throughout the entire Council system to getting together to look at things. We were looking at adapting fishery management to a changing ecosystem. It was really more generally EBFM. We had three sessions on how to incorporate ecosystem indicators into stock assessment, developing information needed to do that and EBFM in general and how assess developing recommendations for species exhibiting distributional changes. And really, I'll take a slightly cynical look at this. We really were kind of presented with two kinds of scenarios.

The next slide.

This is an example from Alaska and it's the collapse of the Eastern bearing sea snow crab population fishery. This hit the news about a month ago, I quess. In the upper slide was the distribution. So, high, red is good that's in 2018, by 2021, you don't see any red and there's a little bit of orange in the very, very Northern area. On the right it's the retreat of the cold-water area and this only goes up to 2015. So, by 2021, that cold area was reduced to a very, very small spot in the Northern area. They worked out the biology of all this and basically the snow crabs were starving because 

13 climate change.

Here's a situation in Puerto Rico. So, in Alaska they're talking about temperature changes over a span of 670 miles. In the U.S. Caribbean, we have a North South range of about 55 miles. We're not going to see these kinds of changes per se coming in. It's not that we're not going to have them, it's just that we're not going to have the large geographical range to pick up that signal.

their food base was collapsing with warming temperatures. So, this

is an example of the kinds of things they're talking about in

What we're more likely to see is something that's showing up in the South Atlantic. So, poor recruitment of reef fishes in the South Atlantic. So, those ones in red are showing a decrease in abundance, that's evident of low recruitment. Those in green are the ones that are having an increase and no problem with recruitment. If you look at the graph when they're spawning the ones in trouble are all spawning basically January, February, March, April. Maybe a little bit in November, December, but earlier in the year, the ones in green are doing fine. They're out in June, July and August.

If you go to the next slide, this shows the increase in temperature above past normal values. So, the more red it is, the hotter it's getting, and this is by a monthly basis. And you can see those first four months are much hotter than the normal baseline relative to those later months. So again, it looks like temperature in this case is driving a reducement in reproduction and or recruitment somehow. The mechanism has not been worked out. This is the kind of thing we could expect to see more readily in Puerto Rico, either because something like queen conch, which is now thought to be very sensitive to higher temperatures. So back reef areas where they still have back reef populations like in Florida, those are not reproducing. The four reef areas are doing fine because they're in deeper water. So, we may see distributional shifts of reproduction of something like queen conch into 60 feet of water versus 20 feet of water.

For something like some of the groupers where we think they need to reach a minimum cold temperature for them to trigger the spawning, if that cold temperature doesn't get down there, we may have problems that may drive them, again, into deeper waters and kind of re-shift where their spawning aggregations are taking place. We haven't seen that yet, but to be expected.

4 5

Next slide.

Apart from the presentation that we gave, which was very different from any of those, and I'm actually not going to go through that, I'm hoping maybe that can be given to the Council directly by Dr. Cruz Motta, who led that effort. We heard a presentation by Sarah Gaichas using ecosystem information and stock assessment advice process. And here she was not trying to generate models, or somehow [inaudible] this would come right into the model and say, "okay, this is how we adjust our values." She was talking about how we get an idea of where the fishery is in much more real time and how this affects uncertainty in our values and where you can plug that increase or decrease in uncertainty in the process. And a lot of it's based on what they developed as a state of the ecosystem report, which is they go out to the fisher, actually the DAPs I think it was, and they poll them with a series of questions for every species every year. It's an evolved process.

So, something like this is trying to be developed through the EBFM TAP led by Tarsila Seara, and so, you'll be hearing more about that in the future. But she was laying out here, you know, how do we deal with uncertainty? Where does this plug into the various decisions? That for her, the Mid-Atlantic Council had to deal with. And we were all very impressed with that as being something that was very, very useful and getting away from, how do we develop the models to do this? to kind of what can we do right now? because the models aren't there yet and will not be there for at least some while. And so, we recommended that the Council invites Sarah Gaichas to give basically her presentation, so you can see how she was using information from the fishery and trying to plug us in to look at how this affects the decisions that the Councils will make. Largely reflecting uncertainty, but-- So, that's the only real recommendation we had coming out of that meeting.

Um, and I'm going to skip a few slides. Go to slide 33.

Yes. So, here are just some of the recommendations that came out of this. Basically, we're all saying we're in a new dynamic environmental situation, and this is going to change a lot of the way we do things. So, we want to ensure that the Management Councils have the capacity to adapt fisheries to management and a

changing environment. So, we need to continue and expand efforts that are using monitoring and new technology to gain information. How do we process these and how do we throw these into retrospective studies, so we can look at changes over a longer period of time? Models have to be developed. So, that's still emerging, but we can still use management strategy evaluations as a way to explore what climate changes problems might ensue and how to incorporate those uncertainties or models that might look at this.

4 5

Um, Sarah Gaichas and her position, but certainly a lot of other people were talking about, we need to get multiple ways of detecting change. So, it's not just the science state of the S and the N, it's local knowledge and traditional knowledge has to be further brought into the process, which is what she was trying to do with her social state of the ecosystem reporting.

And there's going to have to be evolving standards because the whole system we're working with is changing. And interdisciplinary research teams are going to be needed for success, for training students and succeeding at what we need. In other words, you're going to have the stock assessors, you're going to have the EBFM people, they're going to have to get together and make sure that one's reflecting concerns of the others. So, I'll just leave it at that. There's some other data or some other comments in the presentation about where we are and whatnot but those are the major, I think, recommendations that would apply to our situation here in the Caribbean.

So, my second to last slide is on conflict of interest. Just to point out that we implemented at both our meetings, the new guidelines for conducting meetings. These were read at the start of each meeting with reminders each day that we're still following that. In a general sense, it was felt that these new guidelines have worked to facilitate a more directed and amicable discussion. So, we thank the Council for passing those on to us. However, there are some still issues of past accountability that we felt remained unaddressed. I'm not going to go into those, but they're there.

And then lastly. So, for those of you who haven't heard, I am resigning my position as Chair of the SSC, not as a member, but as a Chair effective tomorrow, but I won't be here tomorrow, so that's a little more effective today. There are various reasons for that, and mostly it's the fair amount of stress associated with running these meetings. You do deal with conflicts of opinion. On the one hand, you also have to extract the committee to respond to things and make decisions and push discretion and while you're doing that, you're not able to act in a deeper level with the issues. I can't

stop the meeting and say, let me think about this for a while. So, I'm constantly driving things as you well know. And there's a level of stress involved with that. I've been at this for 10 years. That's well beyond what the Chair of the Council's allowed to do. So, this is an accumulated thing. And you know, it's also involved the defense of some of the SSC members and those accountability measures. So, having said that I'm resigning that position. I want to thank the current, past members of the SSC. I want to thank or recognize the help of the Science Center, especially the stock assessment staff and especially Shannon, who's been particularly good at being patient, explaining clearly in ways that some other assessors cannot, what the issues are, what do they do, getting it through to not just the people with stock assessment experience on the SSC, but the others as well. Uh, the assistance of the Council staff, especially Graciela, for keeping me focused. And certainly, the current/past members of the Council whom I've had the pleasure to report our results forward and I look forward to continuing to work with the Council and the SSC as an SSC member. So, thank you all.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Richard. And I want to say that your leadership on the SSC is very much appreciated by all the fishermen and manager and everybody that is involved with the Council. Thank you very, very much for being patient, kind, and very professional on every level and aspect of the Chairmanship that you conducted. And for sure that kind of leadership is going to be with you even though you're not a Chairman anymore. Your presence there is extremely important. Thank you for your support and availability to stay on the SSC. Thank you very much.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Thank you very much, Marcos.

MARCOS HANKE: And now we are going to the point. You have the recommendations in there. I want to, because we don't have the time, addressing Tarsila and J.J.'s work that you make historic in other region similar approaches—

RICHARD APPELDOORN: But that can be done at another time. The only recommendation we actually made, was to have Sarah Gaichas present to you the kind of approach she was doing in Mid-Atlantic.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: And you don't necessarily need a motion, I guess, but sometime during the meeting decide whether that would be a good idea.

MARCOS HANKE: We can do it at another time. Let's go with the agenda. Graciela, very quick.

2 3 4

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, we've already approached Sarah and Mandy specifically from the Science Center because the movement of the EBFM Technical Advisory Panel and the development of the ecosystem models that Lenfest is providing with additional stakeholders. So, the idea would be to have a joint meeting of the SSC and the EBFM TAP, probably along the same days of the Council meeting. We've done this before or two days for the SSC and the EBFM TAP and then the Council meeting. So, we need to get dates on the calendar and have everyone involved in those aspects of fishery management involved during those two meetings.

MARCOS HANKE: Miquel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. Graciela and I talk about this before, you don't need another motion. But rest assured that Graciela will be coordinating this meeting to make as effective as possible. That will be in the first half of 2023. And now that I'm talking. I would like to personally thank Richard Appeldoorn. I remember when you came to the Marine Science Department and gave us your talk about when you were a candidate, and everybody thought "Meh, he's another 'gringo'". But he became another Puerto Rican. We adopted him. And through the years, not only have I learnt a lot through Richard Appeldoorn, I have a lot of respect for everything that you do. I saw your little kid when he was a kid, and now he's going to be another doctor. And for that, we are really grateful.

 At one time, this is the last anecdote, I was invited to go to a big meeting, and I couldn't make it because Washington called me for another meeting. So, I asked "Richard, can you go there?" So, he went, and he defended the University of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, like he was a native. After he came back, one of the coordinators called me and said, "Miguel, you didn't come, but you sent another guy who's worse than you." I said, "Well, that's who tell you. We have a lot of people that we respect." So, we are really grateful, Richard, for all your 10 years as an SSC member Chair, and for all your friendship during all these years, and professionalism. We are really in debt with that, and I'm sure that Graciela will be talking to you a lot through the years as a member of the SSC. So, I want to reiterate on behalf of the whole staff, our appreciation for everything that he has done for this Council. Thank you very much.

MARCOS HANKE: I will ask for a round of applause, please.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Thank you, Miguel. Thank you everybody.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. And next agenda item is going to be presented by Orian.

# Proposed Rule to Designate Critical Habitat for the Threatened Nassau Grouper

ORIAN TZADIK: Okay. Good afternoon, everyone. Buenas tardes a todos. My name is Orian Tzadik. I work with NOAA Fisheries in the Southeast Regional Office Protected Resources Division. Today I'm going to be presenting on two separate topics regarding the Endangered Species Act. First has to do with Nassau Grouper Critical Habitat proposed listing. And the second will be queen conch proposed listing under the Endangered Species Act.

All right, so, like I said, alright, great. So, we're going to start with the Nassau Grouper. As many of you know, the Nassau was listed under the Endangered Species Act as threatened in 2016 and under the Endangered Species Act, what happens is that next we have to designate critical habitat for the species.

And as a quick aside, the major reason that we're designating critical habitat is for something under the Endangered Species Act, section seven, which requires consultations from different federal agencies. So, it's basically for big projects that occur in the area, and we want to know what the effects would be on any endangered or threatened species.

So that's what this is all about, the critical habitat. So, after considering public comment and consulting with experts in the field the proposed critical habitat rules was issued in October of this year, and it is currently open for public comment until December 16th.

Next slide, please.

So, it's important to note that for the critical habitat of Nassau Grouper, we didn't just go to a map and circle anywhere that we thought a Nassau might exist. We instead chose two essential features to consider when making these kinds of designations. The first is based on designating habitat from nearshore to offshore to accommodate development and the growth of the species. And then, considering within that the benthic habitat that occurs. And then the other feature was known spawning aggregation sites.

Next slide, please.

There's a lot of text on this slide. I'm not going to read it, but I just want it in there for the record if anybody wants to go back to look for it. And this is a description of the two essential features. And you'll see on the first one, we're looking at contiguous areas from nearshore to offshore that are necessary for the development and growth of Nassau grouper containing a variety of natural or artificial benthic types that provide cover from predators and habitat for prey. And they consist of these following components, the nearshore shallow subtidal marine nursery areas, the intermediate hard bottom and seagrass areas, offshore linear and patch reefs, and then the structures therein. And then again, second essential features were these known aggregation sites and the immediate area next to them.

4 5

Next slide.

So, in the rule, you can go in and take a look. We have maps throughout the U.S. Caribbean and Florida of different units. And so, these maps are particularly focused on the first essential feature that I was talking about, that kind of shallow water to deep water connectivity area. So, the first is the Navassa Island unit, and that's what it looks like. It's basically a ring around the island.

Next slide.

Potentially of more interest to a lot of people in this room. We have the West Puerto Rico units. One for Mona, one for Desecheo, and one for Southwestern Puerto Rico. And if you guys know these habitats, you'll notice, again, we're looking at that area where we think we have recruitment of the larvae that then grow up and go out to the offshore reefs.

Next slide.

We did the same thing in Eastern Puerto Rico, and you can see those kind of shallow water habitats there. And then the Northern side of Vieques and the East part of Culebra and the Western part of Culebrita.

Next slide.

Same thing for the Virgin Islands. In this case, it happens to be kind of the East side of all the islands. Saint Thomas, Saint Croix, Saint John, and Water Island. And again, this does not include a few other areas where we know the spawning aggregations exist. Now, one important thing to consider here, when we zoom out, you'll see that all of these units are within the coral

critical habitat that's already been established. So, any one of these consultations that needs to happen, already needs to happen for these areas for corals. The kind of exception here is we're going to be putting in a few of the spawning aggregations.

Next slide.

 And you can see that it's not coming through very well, but the shaded areas are the coral critical habitat, and then the kind of the hexed areas on top of that are the nassau critical habitat. And you can see for the majority of the cases they line up on top of each other.

Next slide.

Part of the critical habitat ruling is that we have to do an economic analysis as well. If you want to go through the details, it's all in the proposed rule. But one thing I just really want to point out here is that last point there, where it says, "No significant impacts to a substantial number of small entities," right? So, we don't anticipate the designation of this critical habitat having any real economic implications towards small businesses or large ones for that matter.

Next slide.

Very quickly. I kind of need to mention this, that there were areas that were not considered, and that's basically areas that the Council manages, but that didn't include those essential features.

Next slide.

 All right. And so, if anybody has any information that they would like us to consider further with regards to critical habitat and nassau grouper, I encourage you to please go to regulations.gov. Uh, Liajay's going to put a link in the chat directly to the comments. And for us to consider any comments that anybody has, we have to do it in this forum and we're very much looking forward to anything that we may have missed. And we'd encourage you guys to submit anything if you have any further information. That's the end of the presentation for nassau. I can move on unless there's questions.

### Discussion

MARCOS HANKE: Just keep moving on. I just want to highlight in Spanish. If you want, I can do it, because there are fishermen from Naguabo here and attending the meeting.

Esa información que está en la pantalla es donde ustedes deben, para que sea de manera oficial, emitir sus comentarios.

**ORIAN TZADIK:** Exacto y para el reglamento final tenemos que contestar a esos cometarios. Pero solo tenemos que hacerlo si lo hacen de esta manera.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Just one quick question. So, right now, because again, it's in the public common period for the critical habitat designation, is NOAA Fisheries at all planning or looking at any, what's it called, like areas under the 4(d) rule right now? Or you guys are waiting until the public comment comes back in?

ORIAN TZADIK: Um, there is no current 4(d) rule process underway. If one was to be initiated, it would be a completely separate process from the critical habitat and the listing and everything. It's a totally separate process with separate public comments. However, if there's something that somebody would like to suggest for a 4(d) rule, you're more than welcome to put it in the public comment period at this time as well.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Okay, thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Please proceed with the other presentation.

# Proposed Rule to List the Queen Conch as Threatened Under the Endangered Species Act

ORIAN TZADIK: All right, let's go to queen conch. Next slide.

 Alright. So, very quickly just want to talk about the process here. So, I'm going to give a presentation on the potential ESA listing, the Endangered Species Act listing, for queen conch and the proposed rule. Then we're going to have a question-and-answer session, but that question-and-answer session is going to be restricted to the clarification on the listing process and the proposed rule itself.

 Um, please note, if you want to make a public comment on this topic, please do so, at the link provided there. Liajay's going to put it in the chat as well. Also, if anybody has a smartphone with them, you can do so with the QR code that you see on the screen.

And the public comment period in response to stakeholder request has been extended till December 15th of this year.

So public comments should be made online in this forum. Alternatively, you can mail them in. And comments that are given during the question-and-answer session or during the public comment that go to the Council will not be considered in the official record. And this is important because the official record, as I mentioned with the grouper, the official record, is where we then as NOAA Fisheries have to respond to the comments. Any comments that are received right now are not technically on the official record, and therefore I cannot respond to them.

I'd also encourage, I've been seeing a lot of posts on that have been sent to me via social media, and I would recommend that anybody who's got things to say, do it through the official forum, because again, the social media is not a recognized platform that we can actually engage in.

Kate.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Kate Zamboni, for the record. Just on the social media platforms, those can be very powerful tools for sharing information and getting the word out that the comment period is open. They can also be the source of misinformation, so I just would encourage that if anyone is using social media to convey anything about the proposed rule, avoid perpetuating incorrect misunderstandings.

ORIAN TZADIK: All right. Thanks, Kate. Alright. Next slide.

Alright. The first thing I wanted to do is just back up a second and talk about how a species gets listed under the Endangered Species Act in the first place. In this process, NOAA scientists use the best scientific and commercial information that is available as a basis for making a listing decision. Importantly, science scientists cannot include considerations for economic impacts at this time during the listing process. What we are required to do is evaluate five factors in particular. These are listed out in the Endangered Species Acts. Factor A, present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range; factor B, over utilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes; C, disease or predation; D, inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; and E, other natural or human made factors affecting its continued existence. Endangered Species Act requires The determinations that are based solely on scientific and commercial

information and evaluating these factors. And again, economic impacts are not considered at this time during the listing process.

Next slide.

Under the Endangered Species Act, scientists can choose to list something as either endangered or as threatened. And the biggest difference here has to do with the timeframe that we're talking about. So, an endangered species is a species that's considered endangered if it's endangered of extinction, and this is important, throughout all, or a significant portion of its range. So, an endangered species is interpreted to be presently at risk of extinction. If a species is listed as endangered, under section nine of the Endangered Species Act, there's automatically prohibitions that kick into gear, such as several types of takes. So, including harming, harassing, collecting, or killing and those become automatic.

However, if a species is listed as threatened, that's defined as any species which is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future. Again, throughout all or a significant portion of its range. The foreseeable future varies by species, and I'll go into how we did it for queen conch in a minute. So, this is a species—a threatened species is one that is not currently at risk of extinction but is likely to become so in the foreseeable future. Now with a threatened species listing, there are no protections, there's no regulations that go into play immediately.

 As JP mentioned earlier, there is something that's called a 4(d). Under section four of the Endangered Species Act we can provide provisions and regulations specific to the species that we deemed threatened. So, these are much more variable and much more customizable. And if we were to enact a 4(d) rule, that is a completely separate process from what we're doing right now.

So, the first-- well, I'll go through that in a second. Next slide.

Alright. So, the way that the species gets listed under the Endangered Species Act. This is the process that you see here. And I'll note on the side of the screen you'll see the red little stars. That's a theme throughout the presentation. When you see that, that designates a time that we are looking for public input and we will then address that kind of public input for the next step of the process.

So usually what happens is that NOAA Fisheries will receive a petition for a particular species. Within 90 days we then must

publish a finding that states the decision whether to accept the petition or not. If we don't accept it, it's called a negative 90 day finding. If we find a positive 90 day finding, we initiate something called a status review for the species. Within one year, after conducting the review, we can then decide whether the petition was warranted or not warranted. If it's not warranted, we publish a negative 12 month finding. If it was warranted, we publish a 12-month finding in the form of a proposed rule, and that's what we're discussing today.

9 10 11

12

13

14

15

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

After publishing the proposed rule to list the species, we consider public comments and any new data before making a final decision. That decision may also include withdrawing the proposed rule, if we find there's not sufficient evidence to justify the action. The final rule is then generally published within one year of the proposed rule.

16 17 18

Next slide.

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

Alright. So, let's bring it back to queen conch. So, for the queen conch, we had a status review and there's a QR code there on the top right, if anybody wants a link to the status review itself. It's very in depth and long document. The status review team consisted of seven science and policy experts from NOAA Fisheries. And importantly, the status review summarized the best available scientific and commercial information on the species and presented an evaluation of the queen conch status and the extinction risk. And this was then published as a NOAA technical memorandum. So, specific to this status review, this status review considered information from approximately 39 jurisdictions throughout the evaluating landings data Caribbean, from two different international databases, considered the best available data on on all sorts of biological processes, including reproduction, depensatory processes, and reproductive density thresholds. It looked at a population connectivity model that was developed in order to inform impacts of low localized adult densities. And it considered the best available information on existing regulatory measures.

38 39 40

41

42 43 This status review was then passed on to peer review, and it was independently peer reviewed by three separate experts in the field. And again, those are all public information. You can look at the peer reviewed comments through the QR code at the bottom of the screen there, on the right-hand side. And there's a link on the website as well.

45 46 47

44

Next slide please.

Out of the status review, there were several key findings that were used to inform the extinction risk analysis. The most significant threat to queen conch was evaluated as over utilization, and this is through commercial, artisanal and illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing.

Next was regulations. There are significant issues with compliance and morphometric regulations, enforcement and poaching throughout the range of the species. Next was depensatory processes. So, the majority of the places we looked at were found to be below the minimum adult density that's needed for reproduction of queen conch. We next saw broken connectivity, as I alluded to earlier, lower densities in certain places are not allowing for the same reproductive output, thereby breaking connectivity within the region. And last, we evaluated climate change as a serious impact to the species.

All these were used to inform the extinction risk analysis. It kind of cut off at the end there, but I think you got it. And the extinction risk analysis provided a status of moderate. So, it was discussed and agreed upon that the species is at a moderate risk of extinction. Which means it's on a trajectory that puts it to a high level of extinction risks in the foreseeable future. And as I mentioned, the foreseeable future is a term that's used in the Endangered Species Act but changes by species.

So, for the queen conch, the foreseeable future was decided on 30 years, and that has to do with different life history characteristics of the queen conch, as well as landing's data availability. The only exception was when we were evaluating the topic of climate change in which we used a little bit longer of a time horizon, and we were looking at a target date of 2100 for that.

Next slide.

 Alright. So, we evaluated the status review and then we got to the proposed rule, right? So, the key findings from the status review were used to inform the proposed rule listing determination, and the status review found that queen conch were at a moderate risk of extinction throughout the range of the queen conch. This is a very important that we're talking about the entire species here and not, you know, localized populations.

The external peer review comments were then addressed, and it was decided that the best available science indicates that the queen conch warrants the listing of threatened under the Endangered Species Act.

Now, I mentioned those five factors at the beginning of this presentation, and I want to discuss them briefly, one at a time in the order of their importance to this listing.

Next slide.

So, the most important factor was decided as factor B, the overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes. This is the most significant threat to queen conch which is overutilization for commercial purposes. Illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing, in particular, is a threat that's significantly contributing to the species extinction risk currently and into the foreseeable future. There's a lot of information on all of these slides and we purposefully put it all there, so that you guys can all look at this at your own time. But I'm going to kind of just blast through all these things pretty quickly. But I'm happy to discuss them further later if you want.

But as a few points to emphasize this, only about 10% of the jurisdictions that were reviewed were fishing at or below a sustainable exploitation rate and also have conch densities that are capable of supporting successful reproduction.

41% of the jurisdictions were exceeding that exploitation rate and have median densities below the threshold required for successful reproduction. And 33% of the jurisdictions were exceeding the exploitation rate and have median conch densities well below that minimum threshold needed for reproduction.

Very, very key to all of this also. Illegal, unregulated and unreported fishing is contributing potentially over more than 15% of the landings throughout the region. So, this is a big problem with this species.

Next slide, please.

The next most important factor was factor D, the inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanism. There are significant issues with regulatory compliance, efficacy of minimum size regulations to prevent juvenile harvest, limited enforcement of regulations, sparse and inconsistent population monitoring and substantial poaching.

So, things like minimum meat weight, shell length, and flared lip regulations indicate that immature queen conch are being legally harvested in 20 of the jurisdictions that were evaluated. The majority of these fisheries do not have requirements to land in

the shell, thereby undermining enforcement and compliance. 15 of the jurisdictions don't have regulations that include a seasonal closure, and some that do have seasonal closures don't necessarily concentrate on the queen conch. They have seasonal closures for other species, and then they include the queen conch. 21% of the jurisdictions do not have regulations that prohibit scuba gear, thereby limiting the efficiency of the deep-water refuge. And only a fraction of the jurisdictions are conducting periodic surveys to gather the relevant information on the status of the population.

4 5

Next slide.

 The last factor that was thought to be of importance with regards to this listing is factor E, and this is other natural or manmade factors that are affecting the species' existence. And in this case, we're talking about climate change. The available information indicates that climate change, specifically sea surface temperatures, ocean acidification, and potential changes in circulation patterns are likely to affect the reproduction, growth and survival of queen conch into the foreseeable future.

Things like carbon dioxide levels that are expected in the year 2100 are likely to negatively impact shell formation. The sea surface temperature in the Caribbean may exceed 31 degrees Celsius, and that will have negative implications for early life stage and reproduction. And possible changes in the circulation patterns would have significant implications for recruitment processes and reproduction.

Next slide.

The last two factors, again, had to be considered, but they were deemed as not contributing to the status of queen conch. While we recognize these exist, these factors do contribute, they were not thought to substantially impact the status enough to warrant listing. So, these are factor A, present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of the habitat and factor C disease or predation.

Next slide.

Alright. As I alluded to earlier, one question we've been asked quite a bit, will listing the queen conch under the Endangered Species Act create new prohibitions. Threatened species do not automatically receive protective regulations. Therefore, the listing of queen conch as a threatened species does not create any additional or more specific prohibition on queen conch trade or harvest.

4 5

Any new regulations that are deemed necessary and advisable for the conservation of the species would have to be done through a separate process, which is under Section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act called the 4(d)rule. So, 4(d)rules allow us to customize prohibitions and then regulate activities to provide for the conservation of that specific species. So, these can be very unique and very customized to the individual species that we're talking about.

Any future 4(d) rule would go through a complete separate notice and public comment period. So, this is not something that once we list the species, we can then just list a 4(d) rule. It would need a separate notice and public comment period.

As reference Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands currently do have queen conch fisheries in their territorial waters. There's also a federal queen conch fishery in Saint Croix in the U.S. Virgin Islands. The proposed rule does not establish any new prohibition on conch harvest in these or any other jurisdiction. For reference harvesting queen conch in Florida has been prohibited since the eighties.

Next slide.

I wanted to put this slide up to really emphasize what we're doing here and what we're listing. We're listing a species that exists throughout a pretty large range. What we're discussing here is a very small percentage of that range. So, while we can discuss strategies that would affect the populations in this particular region, we're more interested in the recovery across the range of the species.

Very quickly, if you look at the percent of total estimated conch habitat, Puerto Rico accounts for roughly 3.25% and the U.S.V.I. for less than half a percent. Percent of the total estimated abundance of queen conch, you're looking at Puerto Rico at 0.2% and U.S.V.I. roughly about 0.2% as well. Therefore, the U.S. Caribbean, in total, comprises roughly 3.7% of the total conch habitat and less than 1% of the current estimated conch abundance.

 This is just important to remember when we're going to discuss any sort of strategies to bring back the species. We're going to be talking about the species throughout the range, not necessarily only in this habitat.

Next slide.

Okay, so, what's next? So, the proposed rule is currently out, it's in the federal register. The public comment period has been extended, and that was in response to stakeholder input. What we're looking for, specifically new or updated information regarding any of the following factors would be of particular interest. So, one, information regarding queen conch landings and unregulated and unreported fishing. Two queen conch fisheries dependent or independent data, including stock assessments. Three, information on the status of the species, including surveys, density and abundance. Four, information regarding queen conch population structure, age structure and connectivity. information on queen conch range, habitat use and distribution. Six, data concerning any threats to the queen conch. Seven, information on efforts being made to protect the species throughout the range. And eight, queen conch fisheries management, measures or other pertinent information regarding the species.

16 17 18

19

20

21

22

1

2

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

As you saw with my presentation regarding Nassau grouper, the next step in the process, if this was to go final, would be the designation of a critical habitat for the queen conch. So, at this time, during this public comment period, we are also soliciting information on critical habitat. And again, this has to be within U.S. jurisdictions for the purposes of what we're doing right now.

232425

2627

28

And again, I'll reiterate any protective regulations that are under the section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act would need to be done through a separate process. However, if you would like to include factors that would inform that process during this public comment period, we're open to that as well.

293031

Next slide.

32 33

34 35

36

The final listing determination needs to be completed by September of 2023. This determination will consider all the public comments and then make a decision to complete or withdraw the listing. If the decision is to list the species, then the final rule must publish within one year of the proposed rule.

373839

40 41

42 43

44 45

46

47

And again, the final rule will consider and address public comments. Everyone that gets submitted through the appropriate forums will be addressed in the final rule. And again, this listing at this time cannot consider economic factors. After that, if that passes, then we will go through a critical habitat process similar to what you just saw with the Nassau grouper. That'll be done within a year of the final listing, so September 2024. And again, the 4(d) rule, if that is something of interest, then we will start that process after the final listing. So, that would have to start

after September of 2023. And just to be clear, we are not proposing any such regulations at this time.

Next slide.

Okay. So, this is just again to reiterate to please submit public. Through the appropriate avenues on regulations.gov. And again, Liajay has that link directly in the chat.

10 The next slide.

And again, that's the link there and that's the QR code if you want to go directly to it. The next slide is just asking for questions. So maybe we can leave this one up in case anybody wants to take their time with the public comments, maybe go back a slide.

## Discussion

MARCOS HANKE: At this time, we are open for questions. We're going to go with the participation. Okay. Let's go first with the Council members and DAPs. Gerson.

**GERSON MARTÍNEZ:** Good afternoon. Gerson Martínez, for the record. Both nassau grouper and conch, when you say critical habitats, when you're speaking about those, are talking about more closure of submerge lands or-- elaborate on that for me please.

ORIAN TZADIK: No problem. So, the critical habitat is primarily used for Section 7, which is consultations of other federal agencies. So, we, as the protected resources division, will, for example, if the Army Corps of Engineers wanted to dig, dredge a channel, they would have to submit a proposal through Section 7, a consultation through Section 7 that would come to our office and we would say, "That's critical habitat for coral, nassau grouper or conch" and that would inform that process. It's nothing to do with more closures.

Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: That's for the -- he asked two, he asked for the nassau grouper presentation, and he also asked for the conch. Can you elaborate?

 ORIAN TZADIK: That's critical habitat in general. That's what we mean by critical habitat. That's different, I think what you might be thinking of is essential fish habitat and that's a sustainable fi-- No, I'm not going to go there. I don't know. But that's

critical habitat. That's what that means. It's for the Section 7 consultations.

2 3 4

1

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. I have Jean-Pierre, then Nelson, Vanessa and Julian. No? Jean-Pierre.

5 6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: So, I'm trying to -- I'll just say that the use of the ESA for coral has impacted things for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. I will say that abundantly, because particularly the critical habitat designation of zero to 90 feet with no real carve out for anything, which means every single thing that has gone into the water has gotten through a Section 7 consultation, which has not been done in a timely manner. And so, that has had impacts on Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

141516

17

18

19

20

2122

But I was very glad that you had the graph that showed that 3.2% of the actual habitat area and less than 1% of the abundance for the species that we're looking at. And again, ESA is a tool, it's a great tool. I don't think it can be applied equally across the board to all species. And that's kind of where we're having this issue here because we're looking at the range of the Caribbean in totality, and yet there is less than 5% of the actual abundance area.

232425

2627

2829

30

31

32

33

3435

36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44 45

46

47 48 So I guess my question is actually more for Sam and how NOAA, when it receives a proposal like this and we're looking at jurisdictions that are primarily from the international community that we share this resource with, but yet the ESA itself, if used as a tool, although right now it doesn't result in any prohibitions or take restrictions or anything like that, it also puts a spotlight on something that could progress later on as well. That's basically what happened with us with Coral. But does NOAA have any mechanism now, let's say, even from its international programs or some type of standpoint where, "hey, we've done the research, we've come up with something that shows that we believe that this species is threatened or has a risk of extinction in some portion of the future. But a lot of the abundance actually and the connectivity issues, the U.S. Caribbean actually isn't responsible for it." And so, if we're looking at using the ESA, how do we now tailor whatever our international programs are to try and work with our partners in the international community to say "How can we stop. What better way can we improve or lessen the extension risk?" Because I don't think applying, like, let's say the numbers were much, much worse, applying the ESA in the U.S. Caribbean, particularly in Florida, lower portions of Florida, the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico is actually going to make a difference. Particularly when we have the catch limits, we have the reporting; we are doing all of these things already.

2 So, that's sort of my question is that the ESA as a tool works great for certain species. To me there's an issue here, but also, 3 we've identified that there is something that's at the threat of 4 5 a risk. How does NOAA then work with the international partners to 6 ensure that that extension risk is lowered?

7 8

ORIAN TZADIK: So, do you want to go?

9 10

MARCOS HANKE: One second? There was a question to-

11 12

Right. That's fine. Yeah. I'm happy to answer one ORIAN TZADIK: part and then do you want to answer this?

13 14

15 MARCOS HANKE: Okay.

16 17

18

19

20

21 22 ORIAN TZADIK: Yeah. Just quickly. There's a difference between threatened and endangered. So, an endangered species, you're right, it's one size fits all. All the prohibitions would apply across the board everywhere the same. Threatened species in the application of a 4(d) rule, we have that flexibility to make a distinction and to say certain things in one place, other things in another place. But I'll let Sam speak.

23 24 25

MARCOS HANKE: Sam?

26 27

28

29

30 31

SAMUEL D. RAUCH III: Yes. Thank you. Sam Rauch, Deputy Director, National Fishery Service, for the record. I appreciate the comment. Both we and Fish and Wildlife Service have numerous species that we list that are not in the United States EEZ at all. They're almost completely foreign or they are entirely foreign. The ESA still has tools that help us to recover those species.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44

45

46 47

48

So, first of all, it requires us to engage in those listings, even if it's not in U.S. waters. There are clearly trade mechanisms under the Convention for International Trade and Endangered Species that apply. So, once you list them as threatened or endangered, that has implications for international trade. There are, even once you get beyond that, we often use the fact of a listing in many of our position settings in international forum to reach agreement, to try to reach understandings with other countries on how to recover them collectively, recognizing that the U.S. alone cannot or cannot at all recover on our own. And still, we are required to list them and to begin the process of working on recovery, particularly with the U.S. as a marketplace. And there are provisions there under what's called CITES, Convention for International Trade and Endangered Species, that do create market mechanisms once it is listed.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Do you want to say anything else?

**ORIAN TZADIK:** Yes, just one more thing. Even in the absence of a 4(d) rule or any of the Section 9 prohibitions, part of the Endangered Species Act is developing a recovery plan. And that's, I mean, central to this whole thing. And so, what you're talking about could very well be one thing in one location and another thing in another location.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: So, I'm glad you brought that up because I think that from Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, the issue is the lack of that recovery plan, being that we are dealing with a designation from 2007 and it's now 2022. Revision, even on the critical habitat designations, because again, I think under the 4(d) rule in Puerto Rico, I think there's only two or three exemptions. In Saint Thomas, it's only the Saint Thomas Harbor. And so, zero to 90 really, really affects what's happening in island designations. And we've been looking for that recovery plan or even the discussion on it because we think that those are the types of things we need to revise based on what has worked and what has not worked over the 15 years that we've had the listing of, particularly, the Acropora species.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelson Crespo, for the record. These comments I'm going to make are based on--

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: We're still not in the face of comments. This time is question-and-answer to Orian about his presentation.

**NELSON CRESPO:** Okay.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: When he finishes, the comments that are going to be received are comment for the Council and the Council only. However, any comment you may have, you should send it to Orian to the address that they have here, so those comments can be incorporated into the official record that they have to respond to. So, just to make that clear.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Keep going on. If it is a comment related to the issue that you think the Council will benefit from hearing.

NELSON CRESPO: Okay, can I start my comment now? The comments I'm going to make are based on conversation I've had with fishers around the island and some legal accessory I received in the past weeks.

3

4

During the past weeks. I have been talking with conch fishermen from various sectors of the island and the frustration and impotence they feel regarding listing conch as threatened on the ESA.

5 6 7

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Nelson, those are comments, at this time, do you have any questions for Orian?

8 9 10

NELSON CRESPO: No.

1112

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. That's it. So, we need a five-minute break for the translator to go somewhere and then we can come back.

13 14 15

MARCOS HANKE: Five minutes break. We'll be back at in five minutes.

16 17 18

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

19 20

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for everybody for the little break. All very well needed. And we had Richard with the hand up.

212223

24

25

2627

2829

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

37

38

Thank you. This is Rich Appeldoorn. I just RICHARD APPELDOORN: wanted to reiterate some points that were kind of being made here about what might be potential regulations should they come in the future, and would these affect the Caribbean? And if you're going after extinction, 95% of the fishery, 90% whatever, it's coming out of like five countries. Okay? Colombia, Honduras, Nicaragua Cuba's not coming out of it, but they have a large population, Turks and Caicos in The Bahamas. If you want to stop anything about overfishing and get these populations in a more healthy state, basically you want regulations that target just jurisdictions. All but Bahamas, which is has banned exports for a while. What's driving those fisheries is export, with the exception of Jamaica, and -- well, let's just say with the exception of Jamaica, it's export into the U.S. So, if you really wanted to do something, you would be looking at how do we use that mechanism to enhance the populations of conch from where these landings are coming from.

39 40 41

42 43

44 45

46

47

48

And yes, there is a CITES mechanism for this, but it's very loose and it has a big loophole. You have a CITES scientific authority in each country, and they have to certify that the conchs that are being exported are coming from a sustainable population. Those committees run from ones that are super, super way— for mining—way too critical, as in Jamaica. You know, they closed the fishery because the 95% [confidence interval?] on the density was just below their cutoff threshold, whereas the mean estimate was almost

at unexploited levels. And then you have others that are basically run by the industry. So, they're going to rubber stamp whatever comes through.

And there, I've seen reports that are, you know, it's kind of like if you believe what they say, it's okay, but there's no data, no nothing to back up what they're saying. And so, you know, one avenue would be to put teeth into CITES and say, "if you're importing into the U.S., we want to see your actual assessment report of the data, the assessment and everything like that." Force them to actually do that kind of work.

I've mentioned this story in the past and he agreed that would be -- and so, that's something you, as an example, something that could be done. It would have a huge impact, at least in the short term, improving situation. The loophole to that one is that they could go to China for replacement market, I suppose. But as was mentioned, the U.S. would still have to engage in that kind of activity, so maybe there's a control on that. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa, then Miguel.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. First, I want to first recognize the presence of the commercial fisherman from the East and the West side of the island. Thank you for being here and my respect to you. Also, I have to make a question, from all these reports that are the ones that this action is based, which one or what was the last year that the study was made in the EEZ for Puerto Rico?

**ORIAN TZADIK:** There was a study from 2020 that was evaluated in that report. I might be misremembering there might be one more recent than that, but that was the last I remember seeing.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: The 2020 was in the EEZ zone.

ORIAN TZADIK: I'd have to look. I'm not a hundred percent sure. Rich was an author; he could probably tell me.

MARCOS HANKE: Richard.

**RICHARD APPELDOORN:** Oh, you're talking about Puerto Rico or just the U.S. Caribbean?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes. Well, the reports that are being used for this action. In the case of Puerto Rico, when was the last study made in the federal zone?

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Okay, the studies that have been done that have been primarily through the SEAMAP sampling program and the last study for that was 2012, I believe. The last one for Virgin Islands was 2010. However, there have been some studies that were done subsequent to those, that were looking at some parts of the population or weren't part of the SEAMAP thing. So, in Puerto Rico, there was a woman who was doing her dissertation work on a new sampling device, which was a camera sled array, and she went through a bunch of the areas that the SEAMAP used in Puerto Rico. And they found a much higher abundance of conch at those same stations.

Now, her study, I don't think went into the federal zone. The normal SEAMAP study does. In the Virgin Islands, I don't think they go in the federal zone because of the depth limitations on diving. In Saint Croix there was a study by, Doerr-Hill around Buck Island, a very extensive study, but mostly focused on Buck Island and the Eastern part of Saint Croix [inaudible]. That also is not part of the SEAMAP study, but that also found increased numbers of conch relative to past studies. SEAMAP program is, this year, doing pilot studies to revamp their study going from transects to circles and based on the results of that, new studies will be starting next year.

So, it's kind of like the worst time because, you know, it's been so long since we've done the past studies, but new ones are on the books to be done now that we're out of pandemic.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Richard. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Well, I will please ask if we can give the opportunity to the commercial fisherman to make their questions.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, we will. We are living the best for the end/ We are addressing the body of the Council and before we start with the fisherman, I want to make a question to Orian. Orian, what is the difference in terms of quantity or quality of scientific data from the 2006, I believe it was when it was first evaluated for the same reasons, and now? And why the difference in pursuing this? What is the motive, what is the reason you guys are doing this again after not granting any— already addressing that in 2006?

**ORIAN TZADIK:** It's a good question, Marcos. Give me a second here. Christina, can you pull up, the last one, slide 30.

So, as Marcos mentioned, I didn't really want to go through, I mean, I didn't want to bring all this up. I think there's a lot of processes that were involved here, but this is a much longer

process. Yeah. We originally were petitioned in 2012 and then in 2014 it was determined that it was not warranted. The petition was not warranted. I think that's what Marcos is referring to. Yeah. Okay. So then, in 2016, the original groups that wrote the petition filed a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court challenging the decision. And then in 2019, the court vacated the determination and then remanded the determination back to NOAA Fisheries. And so, we then initiated a status review, a complete status review at the time. And amongst other things there was the connectivity modeling that had gotten done. And then obviously more surveys, more population level surveys that we were aware of. And then, at that time, yeah, the big thing was, I'm getting told, hold on. Yeah. Species connectivity. There was new data on reproduction and genetic connectivity. So, those were the main factors that kind of changed between the original determination and then the next determination.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. One other question just for me and for the group to understand. Like Richard said, there was a study, recent study, that when it was compared to the SEAMAP, just evaluate the density that come out of those methods. The same approach to other assumptions that you guys do across the range. Are you guys going to do the same assumption and using this level of that much of density across the range too? Or are you going to stay on the lower side of the coin on this type? How this work, how on the process of ESA and the scientific discussion, how is this weighted?

**ORIAN TZADIK:** You are talking about the density threshold of adult conch.

 MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Because there is, in some instances, that everything is spread down and make an assumption based on science on this case, very specific question. It's unfair to think to, to assume that that's true across the range and having higher density based on this study or something like that.

 ORIAN TZADIK: Yeah. So, a couple things. There's a lot kind of in there, but you know, like I said right now, the comment period, we're looking for information like what you're talking about. If somebody else has better information, we want it, so that we can evaluate it and put it towards, you know, making the best scientific determination that we can.

In addition, we are looking, actively looking for more information. So, for example, the fishermen and Cabo Rojo have put in for funding to try and develop better survey methods to get a better idea of the conch population down there. And importantly to make it consistent, right? We have, in a lot of places, we have very

sparse density estimates from, you know, temporarily. We have one year and then we don't have another survey for 15 years. And so, one of the things that's very important is to try and get better surveys, more frequently, more often.

And I'm going to wrap up a different question in here that I heard, which is to do with the listing of threatened and whether that then becomes a ticking clock to then list as endangered. And the answer is no. Once it's listed as threatened, we want to get it out of being threatened. Our primary goal is de-listing the species. Our primary focus is kicking it back over to those guys in sustainable fisheries. We want to create a situation where there's a sustainable fishery and something that works for everybody. So, I think, did that answer your question?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Then come another question. Which example do you have of a threatened species that came back to the protected resources? Which example you have on that path versus the other way, which is going to full protection and to the ESAs more complicated stages?

**ORIAN TZADIK:** Yeah. The most, I mean, I'm not necessarily, I can't speak for everything. I just know that in -- So, the way that NOAA is divided is that there's kind of a coral section, a marine mammal section, a turtle section. I work with the species conservation branch, which focuses on kind of the other species. So, fish and elasmobranchs and that sort of thing.

 We recently had a seagrass that was delisted. So, that would be an example of one that I'm aware of. However, the majority of species that were listed fall into those other branches, and I can't really speak to that.

MARCOS HANKE: I just wanted to put a historical happening behind this. Thank you very much.

I think this is a good moment to sit down with the real experts on conch. They live out of it, the fishermen. I want to highlight, as a chairman, as a fisherman, and have a discussion about anecdotal information being transforming to science. We need to make sure that we find a way to hear those voices in a valuable way that doesn't drop in a lost basket and for everybody to be able to support the conch population and other resources.

Please, the fishermen, whoever going to represent. Miguel first.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, I spoke to Raymundo, Carlos and the other fishers, and their comments are going to be addressed to the

Council. I have a letter from Pauco, I'm going to read it when they finish. So, we would like to give five minutes each. And I believe that Carlos told me you have a video that will be used. So, the order of people will be Carlos, Raymundo, Alex. Okay. So, please sit in the order that you wish. And then I have Nelson that will be included in the list of people deposing today. Okay.

4 5

## Fishermen Anecdotes

**ALEXIS BURGOS PÉREZ:** Muy buenas tardes a todos. Yo soy pescador de la isla de Culebra.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Perdóname. There are radios for those people who like to hear the translation, and if you don't have it, please go to the back and you can get it. Just to reiterate, all the depositions could be done in Spanish or English.

Carlos y que se pegue al micrófono di tu nombre y a quien representas.

MARCOS HANKE: Give me one second because there is a lot of people that want to hear you. I just want to make sure that everybody that needs the radio have it.

ALEXIS BURGOS PÉREZ: Muy buenas tardes a todos. Yo soy pescador comercial. Me llamo Alexis Burgos Pérez. Soy pescador de la isla de Culebra. Yo, en mi critica por lo menos, he evaluado parte de la situación que está pasando aquí. Yo soy pescador de carrucho diariamente. En las aguas de Culebra abunda mucho el carrucho, es a lo que yo me dedico diariamente. Hasta el sol de hoy, llevo treinta y pico años pescándolos, inclusive en Culebra hay una reserva natural que tiene esa área protegida para el carrucho exactamente y otras especies más.

Hay unas cosas aquí que yo no estoy de acuerdo con ellas porque el sustento de los pescadores mayormente proviene del carrucho. Y esto, yo espero que lo tomen en consideración y hagan otros estudios más, a más profundidad, para que sepan la especie verdaderamente como va abundante en carrucho. Si, yo sé que han buscado profundidades más profundas, eso se sabe. Pues, por la situación de que se ha [inaudible] el carrucho, pero no está extinto todavía. El carrucho abunda bastantemente en la isla de Culebra y en otras islas más.

Yo considero que deben de hacer otros estudios más profundamente para que vean la condición del carrucho como abunda, y las vedas que se respetan como tiene que ser y eso ha ayudado mucho a la conservación del carrucho. Yo espero que tomen en consideración eso para que pasen otras evaluaciones más para que no afecte a nosotros los pescadores que vivimos de esto. Eso sería mi comentario. Muchas gracias y buenas tardes.

MARCOS HANKE: Gracias por estar aquí. Próximo. Por favor decir su nombre y donde pesca y un par de detalles. Y a quien representa.

MARTIN SOTO: Si, saludos. Buenas tardes, mi nombre es, Martin Soto. Soy presidente de la Villa Pesquera de Punta Santiago. Una de las situaciones que estamos viendo aquí relacionado a lo del carrucho es que nosotros que estamos diariamente en el mar pescando sabemos y conocemos las áreas en donde está el carrucho, donde anda el carrucho y la cantidad de carrucho que hay.

A veces se hacen estudios simplemente sentado en una mesa, en una computadora, porque fulano me dijo, o porque aquí dice, porque en el internet dice, y cuando realmente vienen a buscar la información prácticamente la información es bien nula. Se lo digo, yo he pasado muchas experiencias. Yo también llevo años pescando tiburón también y he pasado muchos tragos amargos relacionado con las mismas personas y con los mismos reglamentos. Cuando usted va a hablar de un tema o va a tomar decisiones sobre un tema, usted tiene que estar bien claro que usted tiene que primeramente buscar de las personas que tienen la experiencia y el conocimiento para poder buscar la información verdaderamente porque sentado en una mesa desde una computadora prácticamente eso no implica que la información va a ser correcta.

Ahora mismo nosotros prácticamente pescamos en el área de Culebra, donde también pesca Alexis, y a veces nosotros vamos y prácticamente la cuota la completamos. En dos tanques completamos la cuota prácticamente de carrucho y después nos vamos a coger unas pocas langostas y eso.

Pero a veces hay fondos que uno va y prácticamente el carrucho parecen alfombras juveniles o grandes, de diferentes tamaños. A veces nos tiramos por ahí a inspeccionar algunas áreas llanas, ya sea a penas a dos brazas, uno ve una alfombra de carruchos juveniles ahí, una cosa bien preciosa donde se están ahí criando.

Pero aparte de eso también quería abundar sobre el peje puerco. El peje puerco, le pueden preguntar a casi todos los buzos por ahí, el peje puerco es un pescado que prácticamente no tiene valor comercial. El precio que se paga por peje puerco no vale la pena ni cogerlo. Nosotros apenas cogemos así, cuando una persona nos ordena o nos pide o que se yo, pero salir a bucear para perder el tiempo cogiendo peje puerco, más el riesgo de que siempre están mordiendo a uno y esto o lo otro, realmente peje puerco eso está

por ahí bien, bien abundante. Y la pesca de peje puerco también es bien mínima, casi no se coge peje puerco por el valor comercial, como le estoy diciendo.

Nada, por lo menos en mi sentir, espero por lo menos que nos tomen en consideración. Yo creo que nosotros somos el ancla principal en este asunto, en cuestión del conocimiento y de la experiencia, y que valoren a los pescadores. Aparte de eso si logran poner una veda permanente de carrucho, después entonces van a venir con lo mismo con la langosta. Va a venir con lo mismo con la langosta porque entonces, si no se puede pescar carrucho, pues entonces vamos a pescar langosta y van a venir entonces a sobre pescar la langosta y entonces, ¿las consecuencias que van a ser? ¿Van a sacar a los pescadores del aqua? Gracias. Buenas tardes.

MARCOS HANKE: Muchas gracias. Próximo.

ANDRÉS MALDONADO: Buenas, mi nombre es Andrés Maldonado. Todo el mundo me conoce como Andy. Estoy en el Consejo desde hace mucho tiempo. Estoy representando a la Federación de Pescadores, FEPDEMAR. Soy pescador de carrucho por 50 años. Estoy pescando desde los 13 años; he visto cambios que ustedes ni se imaginan, tanto en el medio ambiente como en las especies. En el 2017 con el huracán Irma, María y una marejada ciclónica que hubo después, las poblaciones de carrucho en las aguas llanas se fueron bien afectadas. Los fondos cambiaron, se movió mucho fango. Los animales que no murieron por ahogamiento de fango, me refiero a los moluscos, se movieron a aguas hondas. Y de momento, en cuestión de dos años, hay están. Son miles las manchas de los juveniles y de adultos ni se diga.

Anteriormente cuando el carrucho se escaseó, que los pescadores, obviamente por la necesidad se fueron a las aguas hondas porque en agua honda hay muchas poblaciones, pero el límite es la profundidad. Y le puedo nombrar por nombre y apellido los buzos que han muerto allí sin contar los que han quedado inválidos. Ahora no, ahora están en el llano. Esto fue a 40 pies de agua y hay cientos sino miles. Te puedes cansar de nadar por encima de ellos.

 Tomar decisiones tan drásticas como mover una especie a otro lado, no nos garantiza nada. Porque dicen que no van a hacer nada, pero así nos dijeron con Mona, "No, tranquilo vamos a hacer una reserva, ustedes pueden seguir pescando" ¿y donde terminamos? No nos dejaron entrar a Mona. Y yo fui de los primeros que les enseñé donde era que desovaban los meros en Mona, porque nos iba a beneficiar a todos. A los pescadores no, porque nos sacaron. En este caso, ¿nos va a pasar lo mismo? Se mueve de categoría y ya estamos a un empujoncito y lo sacan de carrera.

Hay maneras de cómo resolver el problema por islas, por terreno, por país. El que tenga problemas, que lo resuelva. Pero el que no lo tenga, bendito, no lo castiguen. Tenemos vedas, tenemos cuota, tenemos tamaño y vamos a pasar por estas también. No, si quieren usen el modelo de Puerto Rico y llévenlo a esta gente para que aprendan como se maneja un recurso. Ahí está la prueba. Yo entiendo

MARCOS HANKE: Gracias. Carlos.

CARLOS VELÁZQUEZ: Saludos y buenas tardes. Carlos Velázquez para el récord. Soy miembro del Consejo de Pesca, pertenezco al Panel Asesor de Distrito y también pertenezco a la Junta Asesora de Pesca del Departamento de Recursos Naturales y Ambientales, y al subcomité que también se estableció para la implementación de enlistar a esta en peligro de extinción, el carrucho.

que un video habla mejor. Muchas gracias. [Applause]

Tengo un videíto por ahí sí pueden ser tan amables de pasarlo por favor. Gracias Graciela. Aprovecho y saludo a todos los miembros. Gracias por la oportunidad que me dan.

Esto es un video tomado tan recientemente como hace dos semanas atrás. Es de un pescador, que nos impresiono tanto el video, porque como ustedes ven, en ese hábitat, eso es un hábitat de arrecife, no es un hábitat hierba, no es un hábitat de thalassia. Es totalmente un arrecife en cual están tanto los machos y hembras adultas, como también vemos muchos, muchos juveniles mesclados entre ellos.

Ahí vemos los buzos cuando están escogiendo, obviamente dejan el carrucho juvenil y escogen el grande. Lo que pasa es que, pues, en este foro hay que ser más que pescador para tu identificar donde están los juveniles en ese arrecife porque se camuflan muy bien. Pero, hemos aprendido, en estas secuencias, como el carrucho se comporta en estos tipos de hábitat.

Tenemos la gran bendición de tener a la Doctora Megan Davis. Tenemos también en la Universidad de Naguabo, juntamente con la Organización Conservación ConCiencia y su presidente que esta justo a mis espaldas, que hemos organizado el primer video de carrucho aquí en el caribe. Y en ese sentido Megan ha sido una biblioteca para nosotros y el conocimiento de ella nos ha atraído porque es bien curioso lo que estamos viviendo en estos tiempos de la abundancia tanto del carrucho que hay hábitats de arrecifes de carrucho. Se pasan en estos tipos de hábitats.

Pero ¿por qué se pasan ahí? Sería una buena pregunta que me harían, pues porque ahí le gusta la comida. Ahí hay sitios de comida de carrucho que comen. Es como a usted, no le gusta ir a Burger King pues posiblemente va a Texas de Brazil. Pues ahí ellos están en Texas de Brazil, se mudan de Burger King y van a Texas de Brazil y ahí entonces están saboreando esa yerba marina, según ella nos cuenta.

4 5

Yo sé que Marcos se ríe porque a él le encanta. Después de esto tenemos un dialogo, Marcos, para que nos vayamos a comer.

Entonces pues ahí, obviamente, ustedes pueden ver la abundancia de carrucho que hay en ese hábitat porque obviamente le gusta esa yerba marina. No yerba marina, si no lo que se adhiere al arrecife.

Hay un segundo video, no sé si pudieron pasarlo, que dura un minuto. ¿Lo pudieron pasar? Ese video se ven-- no se si lo tienen disponible. Solamente dura un minuto. ¿Lo tienen o no lo tienen? Ay, qué pena.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Carlos, el otro se le manda a Orian.

CARLOS VELÁZQUEZ: Pues okay, le enviamos a Orian.

En el otro video que tenemos también disponible, se ven más los juveniles en concentración en lo que es la agregación de juveniles con los adultos, pero se ve solamente mucho más que ahí.

Nosotros estamos dispuestos pescadores como comerciales, Presidente de la Corporación de Pescadores Unidos en Playa de Naquabo, y en la Universidad del Carrucho colaborar con la ciencia, colaborar con los diferentes foros pertinentes para tener un mejor equilibrio, balance, y ayudar a este recurso pesquero el cual no es de un año para acá. Este recurso pesquero lleva más de un siglo establecido. Tengo la experiencia de gente que ya no está con nosotros cuando el carrucho valía diez chavos en paletas, los [inaudible] donde se lavaba la ropa. Entonces esto es una pesquería saludable que si desde esos años lo pescan, imagínese ustedes hasta el día de hoy cuando vemos la sobre abundancia.

Yo podría hablar muchos temas relacionado al carrucho después del huracán María. El huracán María fue un desastre tanto para la naturaleza, para los ecosistemas, para los recursos marinos. Alexis está aquí. Si ustedes ven a Alexis caminando cojo, es que, Alexis no tiene un padecimiento, eso fue una burbuja que el cogió, lamentablemente, después del huracán María por buscar el carrucho más hondo, porque el carrucho fue allá.

Ahora ahí tenemos a [inaudible] Mofle, que esta allá atrás, como cariñosamente le llamamos, con un bastoncito. Ahorita yo le pegué un vacilón porque lo vi, creía que el bastón era para otra persona, pero es de él. También Pinto. Que son pescadores de profundidad de carrucho— Yo sé que esto nos limita, pero son comentarios que se quedan en el Consejo —que son tremendos pescadores de carrucho. Que solamente se dedican a eso. Que cuando viene la veda estatal, sacan sus botes, no pescan, por la razón de que respetan una veda. Y esto son resultados, lo que ustedes ven ahí, de las vedas establecidas localmente, federalmente, y las vedas de naturales.

Pero no venimos a hablar de eso aquí, sabemos— y yo quisiera que NOAA, tanto como el Consejo, cogiera de la participación de estos pescadores y el insumo que están cogiendo, ya que poner una especie, enlistarlo en peligro, da la facilidad de la importación. Como hablo aquí Richard Appeldoorn, como mi colega también y mi compañero que eso pone en peligro a tu traer una especie, cerrar la pesquería, venir entonces esta importación. Entonces que queda de los otros países, porque es una presión de pesca sobrenatural que va a haber. Sobre eso, también se cierra la pesquería de carrucho, como dijo el compañero Martin, vamos a poner una sobrepresión a la langosta, al pescado porque de eso vamos a vivir.

Entonces esas mediaciones no se están tomando en consideración. Hay que tomarlas en consideración antes de tu evaluar, hacer y someter cualquier tipo de proyecto o cualquier cosa que venga porque tienes que pensar no solamente en el carrucho que lo quieres enlistar, es en las futuras pesquerías de las otras especies que hay, porque se van a sobrecargar. Van a ponerle mucha presión a esas pescas.

Entonces mi consideración a esto es que estamos dispuestos a colaborar un 110% para que haya una mejor ciencia. Para que haya un mejor efecto, una mejor responsabilidad en el manejo y el recurso. Así que mucha gracias y linda tarde a todos. Estas son mis palabras.

MARCOS HANKE: Gracias, Carlos. Yo quiero, como conozco la trayectoria de Carlos, decir que no son solo palabras, él ha hecho muchas cosas asociadas a lo que acaba de decir y es un ejemplo para la comunidad pesquera en cuanto a crear los puentes y crear mejor información. Así que dejo ahora la palabra con Raimundo Espinoza.

 RAIMUNDO ESPINOZA: Pues muchas gracias a todos. Ahora voy a cambiar a inglés para beneficio de la gente que tenga que escuchar esto a propósito.

So, hi everybody. My name's Raimundo Espinoza. I'm the director for Conservación ConCiencia. We've been working in collaboration with fishers throughout Puerto Rico and many places throughout the Caribbean. Specifically on fisheries issues on how to collaborate with the fishing sector and involving them directly in conservation actions.

4 5

Since this process began with the conch listing, we've been working to see what kind of information we could help generate including efforts that incorporate the work that we're already doing with the Naguabo Queen Conch Aquaculture Center. And so, part of those efforts was to already begin to identify historically known or new juvenile conch habitat, as well as known conch fishing grounds. So, a lot of the videos that you've seen had been part of that documentation through Fishers. So, I mean, they're available online and on social media if you want to check them out. But one of the things that those videos brought up was just the amount of conch densities that we were able to find. And this is just random times that fishers were going out to fish. So, both for conch, for juvenile conch habitat and also for adults.

Additionally, it's it was really interesting to see Andy's video and then the next video just to differentiate the habitat that you'll find them. So, it's not the classic conch habitat that you usually see. So, when we see that Puerto Rico has, I think it was 3.7 of the habitats, or was that population? Yeah, of the U.S. Caribbean. It was really interesting because we want to see from the literature up to where are we including conch habitat. For the entire Caribbean as well like, Rich, mentioned, it's mostly five countries that are doing a lot of the exports. But those five countries also don't match with the countries that have the majority of the conch habitat. So, it's also interesting to see about that range.

Another thing that was mentioned earlier was the paper, the 2000 paper, the Marrero paper, which also brings up the bias or the difference in the amount of conch were seen with the sled versus the diver. So that's also something that's interesting just because it creates the doubt in how many conches are really there or how much bias is there in the diver surveys. Just implicit bias by the diver being there. Which is something that the fishing sector has been continuously bringing up of the capacity of divers, doing the surveys. Not their scientific capacity, but their observational capacity. Divers, commercial divers are able to see a lot of conches in the same areas that other folks aren't able to see.

So, this is one of those things that the collaboration including the sector, can either help provide better data with better

analysis, which it's right there for the serving. And so, what's prevented this in the past is just further collaborations and lack of trust between the sectors. But I think we're at a point that we could continue to do that, to build on further improving the data availability without having to be a fishery dependent.

And so, this is what you mentioned earlier in the past about us doing something with the fishers in Cabo Rojo. That would be open pretty much to fishers throughout Puerto Rico. Which again, it's a very small island, very small jurisdictions, when you compare to the rest of the conch range throughout the Caribbean, which is also kind of something very interesting to see some of the data provided on there, being that we are such a small portion of the conch habitat, as well as the Conch population, but a lot of the data is very different than what it seems to be the sector's perception of conch in the water.

So, there's a lot of uncertainty and differences in what the reality seems to be on the ground. Because again, nobody's questioning the capacity of the researchers, but it's more so, of who's driving the car. You know, I can drive a Ferrari and I'll crash it into the wall, but someone that knows how to do it is able to do it really well. So, it's not the car that's the issue, it's who's driving it. So, this is one of the things that having fishers being involved in where to find it, how to find it.

And so, this is again, part of the efforts that we've kind of began to see. And it's really through processes that include transforming traditional and historic knowledge into data that can be useful for managers and stakeholders at the federal and local government efforts.

 And so, one of the things that we did want to bring up, specifically, with some of the issues with the process was an issue that we found on the process of the listing that it was seen as a negative. Some of the regulatory aspects of it mentioning that there's 21 locations or countries that have regulations that don't prohibit scuba. And so, this is implicitly something that is, it could be even counterintuitive because, for example, if you take Puerto Rico a place where scuba is the main gear used to fish conch. It's also the main limiting factor because, one, the depth and, two, the gear itself. So, like Martin mentioned, we're going to go and we're going to catch in Culebra, we'll use two tanks. That means that's two hours of fishing, that's two hours of fishing. And of course, if they're going even deeper, it's even less time.

So that is already implicitly letting you know that the gear itself and the depth is limiting the amount. However, that's something that is a marker against a location. So, one of the reasons that conch should be threatened is because they don't have-- or that it's a mark against it, is because they don't have regulations against scuba. And using scuba could actually be something positive.

4 5

So that's one of the things that we want to bring up because that's actually something that, you know, we did find that might be a little bit counterintuitive. Because it's not hookah, which is a very big difference. You know, hookah and scuba are very different. And again, they're very different in the depth you can go, in the amount of time you can spend on water. Especially, when you consider that most of the Caribbean, except some of the large, big boats, not just Puerto Rico, but they're fishing out of small vessels.

The majority of queen conch fisheries are small scale. So, again, if they are using scuba, that means they're only going to be fishing two or three hours in a day. Because of the capacity, the boats are able to take how many tanks under, unless they have a big motorboat, which it changes everything. So, that's one of the things.

The other thing as well, is saying how the perception that using scuba, it gives you a lot more time to, or more access to the deep water refugia. So, even as of last week, some rebreather divers have been letting us know that they've been seeing conch at 260 feet. This is not scuba depth diving. So, where are we putting the limit to the deep water refugia? So, again, this is some of the parts where the science hasn't caught up to what we're actually seeing in the field.

And so, a lot of these things are the best science available. Where? Because the best science available might not be published. And so, that's some of the parts that I think we need to continue to improve because a lot of the best science available sometimes isn't accessible to folks that are creating the proposed rule, the listing and continuing on with these determinations.

At the same time a lot of the folks that have this data countries, folks in the fisheries office in Belize, in Honduras, in Guatemala, have expressed their discontent and having been able to provide their latest data. And so, that's also something that's, of course, very concerning just because if there is more recent data on landings, that also needs to be included. Especially for places, for example, when we see U.S.V.I. or Puerto Rico where we see

every-- or smaller islands Culebra, Vieques, where we see-- we actually have the numbers of how much is being landed. And so, if you take Saint Croix and there's only three nautical miles and they're not fishing all of those three nautical miles, you can see how many hectares-- you can just run the numbers, how much is the landing by the amount of space available to fish. And that number is going to give you numbers really close to what on the chart it says that that's the critical threshold for conch.

4 5

So, it's really interesting to see how a lot of the commercial data on the landing side can also help include it. And so, maybe, hopefully I missed it, but I didn't see that, for example, the commercial landings for Puerto Rico. So, a lot of this data I feel needs to continue to be incorporated. And I feel for Orian, and I think, you know, with sharks we're already starting to do it. But the door is very open right now and, you know, whether this listing goes through, or it doesn't, the door is open right now to continue those collaborations on the ground, to really take into consideration, to really include the historic and traditional knowledge of the fishing communities throughout Puerto Rico.

Because, again, like Carlos mentioned, we work with one of the many conch experts in the world with Dr. Megan Davis. And a lot of the information we've found and shared has surprised her as well. So, for example, conch nurseries at 80 feet. A lot of conch nurseries beginning at 80 feet and going deeper waters.

So, there's a lot of things that could be shifting, could be changing. Again, Puerto Rico does not have that much of the typical and classic conch habitat that you see in Turks and Caicos or Bahamas, but we are finding, like you saw, a lot of this coral rubble. Coral rubble is one of the preferred conch fishing grounds because of the high densities, which is really interesting to see. open to, you again, we have the door collaborations to folks and really facilitate to those conversations with the fishing sector.

 You said everybody was a fisher, but I'm not a fisher. And also, the same thing, the best for last. They went before me. So, thank you, Marcos. And thank you everybody for giving me the time. Thank you, JP, for commenting on the Section 7 about Puerto Rico. So, we didn't miss that much of the DNR, even though they were absent for being present. And thank you Orian for giving us the time and being so, open to hearing us, hearing our comments. And so, thank you everybody.

MARCOS HANKE: And thank you to the whole group for being here and for helping the Council understand better what is going on and

probably producing a letter including those comments and submitting to the right channels. And I please encourage all the fishermen to submit in Spanish or English, on the links and information that Orian put up on the screen.

Orian, please be available to them to facilitate a little note or whatever, just to make sure that they have the opportunity to submit the comment on the right channel. Thank you. And we have Nelson Crespo.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No tienes a Pauco primero.

13 MARCOS HANKE: We have Pauco first, online?

**MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:** Okay, Pauco no está ¿verdad? No, puedes ir después de Nelson.

18 MARCOS HANKE: En el orden. Te sientas allá y te voy a dar la palabra ahora. Vas después de ellos, por favor. Gracias.

21 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Vas después de Nelson.

MARCOS HANKE: Nelson.

25 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, va Pauco primero.

Okay. Pauco is not here, but he told us to read the letter for the record and he has been waiting the whole afternoon for this. So, Mr. Chairman, I will read for the record the letters sent by Mr. Edwin Font. It's in Spanish. By the way, we have 50 more minutes of the translation services after that, that's it.

 Estimados miembros del CFMC, luego de dedicarle pensamiento a la situación del carrucho me permito hacerle varias observaciones. Considero que la intención de enlistarlo como especie amenazada bajo la ley de especies en peligro está haciendo mal interpretada. Se piensa por algunos, que equivale ponerle más restricción a lo que ya tiene y eventualmente prohibir su captura y extracción permanentemente, como en el caso del carey. Es mi parecer que esta acción pretende ponerle más atención y vigilar más de cerca el comportamiento de su extracción en términos de calidad, tamaño, madurez, población, etcétera. Para que en un futuro se puedan ejecutar las acciones pertinentes de acuerdo a los datos locales.

De no la instalo como amenazado, no impedirá que se adopten medidas que resulten antipáticas para los pescadores de carruchos por las agencias. Entiendo, pienso, y sugiero que el esfuerzo de los compañeros pescadores comerciales de carrucho debe ir dirigido a levantar evidencia sólida y contundente, que apoye su teoría de que el recurso está saludable, dado que en un futuro predecible esta información será fundamental para inclinar la decisión hacia un lado o el otro. Las opiniones que no puedan ser medidas carecen de efectividad. Los esfuerzos de nosotros, los pescadores, deben estar dirigidos, enfatizó, a proveer evidencia poco refutable acompañada de hechos y datos.

No se puede continuar pensando que solo está bien y tan solo está en el [inaudible], y ahora el futuro se hace presente y es necesario anticiparnos al debacle que el futuro nos traerá si no se adoptan medidas preventivas y precautorias. Tenemos que acabar de entender que los recursos del mar no son infinitos. Por el contrario, se acaban si no son bien utilizados, lo que eventualmente nos llevaría a su extinción y es lo que queremos evitar ante la amenaza del cambio climático y la degradación de los hábitats. Muchos pescadores como yo, que llevan sobre cuatro décadas en la pesca, lo sabemos. Y no quiero mencionar nombre por no estar autorizado y no herir susceptibilidades.

No acabo de entender por que esta negación cuando la hemos vivido y evidenciado, de hecho, la tenemos. Es necesario enfrentar la concecuencias de nuestras acciones. Escuché el comentario de que durante la veda al carrucho se capturaban más que fuera de ésta. Si no tenemos el control interno para respetar las vedas, ¿por qué nos quejamos de las restricciones externas? ¿Qué nos sucede? Vivimos de recurso natural y nos oponemos a su protección. Pues necesitamos levantar la evidencia de que no necesita protección.

Para terminar, también he escuchado que a profundidades que el buzo no puede bajar, hay mucho carrucho. Pues dejémoslos donde están, porque posiblemente están poblando a los que sí podemos capturar. Practico el don de dar, servir y ser útil. Atentamente, Edwin Font "Pauco".

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MARCOS HANKE: Gracias. Gracias, Pauco. Gracias, Miguel, por leerlo. Yo tome la Libertad de pasar la palabra al pescador de Naguabo. Por favor, el nombre, a quien representa y para aprovechar la traducción. Luego Nelson trae su punto. Adelante por favor y muchas gracias.

 JONATHAN ORTIZ PABÓN: Buenas tardes. Mi nombre es Jonathan Ortiz Pabón. Soy pescador del area de Naguabo. Vengo de una familia de pescadores, el papá de mi papá, de mi papá, mi tatarabuelo, mi hermano es pescadore. Mi papá, que ese es mi compañero de pesca. Soy pescador hace 15 años. Soy padre de 3 hijas que las mantengo

de la pesca. Mi profesión de estudio, es turner and maker. Yo soy tornero, yo hago tornillos de operaciones. De muñeca, espina dorsal, rodilla. Trabajé en Medtronic muchos años. Pero lo dejé porque mi vida es la pesca. Hay pecadores, como nosotros, que cuidamos y valoramos lo que nos da el océano. Hay otro pues que no lo hacen, pero no por otro tienen que pagar todos.

Ahora mismo, el carrucho es inteligente, el carrucho es un animal que muchas personas dicen "Ay, el no siente, no-" El carrucho es inteligente. Muchos años atrás, tú cogias un carrucho y te ibas y virabas y estaban ahí. Ya no. Ahora tu, pescando, tu los ves a ellos corriendo y escondiéndose. El carrucho, el se camuflaje él mismo.

Con estos mal tiempo que vienen de cada rato, los mal tiempos que vienen cada vez que azotan. Ellos tienen que ir a esconderse. ¿Se van a donde? a las profundidades, donde -- ¿por qué la resaca de la orilla es más fuerte que en el mar adentro? Porque es mas llanito. Ellos se van a esconderse. Son cosas que nosotros, los pescadores, sabemos. Que vuelvo y digo, eso es lo que queremos, que colaboren y nos tengan en consideración a nosotros los pescadores. Porque nosotros tenemos mucho conocimiento. Ellos no corren por todos lados, ellos saben. Si tú estás cogiendo un carrucho aquí y ellos los escuchan en Ponce, ellos se van a ir, se van a esconder porque es algo inteligente. Si tú vas pasando por una calle, escuchas un tiroteo, ¿que tú vas a hacer? Por ahí no voy, me voy por acá. ¿Sabes? Son muchas cosas que nosotros sabemos. Nosotros tenemos una profesión, un doctorado, como dice Joel, Carlos Joel, en el mar.

Por qué el pecador -- hay mucho pescador nuevo ilegal. Que es verdad como estaban diciendo, que en la veda lo sobrepescan también. Hay personas irresponsables que lo hacen. Pero de esos tres meses de veda ¿Dónde estaba Recurso? ¿Dónde estaban las otras personas que se supone que estén pendientes a los pescadores ilegales? Porque los buenos no pueden pagar por los ilegales. ¿Por qué el pescador coge más carrucho, se va a coger carrucho y deja la langosta? A qué no saben. No es porque paga más, porque es verdad, paga más, pero no es por eso, es porque el carrucho anda con una manada. El pescador lo que quiere es llegar al sitio, pescar rápido y vámonos para casa. Porque nosotros estamos en riesgo. Nosotros salimos todos los días a esos riesgos, a abuchear a lo hondo, a hacer lo que sea todos los días. Pero nosotros, podemos coger langostas, podemos comer pescado, pero el carrucho es lo más rápido que se nos hace al coger, tirarnos en un sitio y viste una manada, cogiste la cuota, cogiste 50. Como está el carrucho ahora mismo, con una pailita. Con un cubo de una paila de pintura ya son 500 pesos.

Vámonos, ya eso no da para ganarnos ciento y pico cada uno y ya nos fuimos.

Lo que quiero hacer es ese acercamiento y decirles que nosotros sabemos mucho. Hay personas como nosotros que somos dedicados, que como yo, como yo, que soy dedicado, teniendo mi profesión, la dejé. Mi esposa me quería matar. Trabajando en una fábrica, pagándome el plan médico, pagándome todo, me fui porque me gusta la pesca. Me encanta. Por favor ayúdennos a que no nos saquen de la mar. Eso es lo único que pido. Muchas gracias.

MARCOS HANKE: Muchas gracias. Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to make some comments to the Council, so they can include them, if pertinent, when they prepare the reading comments to submit for the queen conch proposal rule. The comments I'm going to make are based conversation I have with fishers and some legal accessory that I received in during the past weeks.

During the past weeks, I have been talking with conch fishermen from various sectors of the island and the frustration and impotence they feel regarding listing conch as threatened under the ESA is heavy. This is a very serious matter, and they feel that NOAA and Puerto Rico DNR have not done the job correctly. And even though it is made crystal clear that the socioeconomic factor will not be considered, this could affect many fishermen in the Caribbean in the future. Many questions came to light among them, what resident studies has not done to the mind the health of that resource? What scientific studies are being considered to make such an important? Has stock assessment been made in all the regions that will be impacted by this decision? Has knowledge of the scientific community that has worked in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Island been taken into considerations as Dr. Schärer, Dr. Reni García, Dr. Richard Appeldoorn, and Dr. Megan Davis? The last two with extensive knowledge about conch. Has the knowledge of the fishermen who have contributed so much to the management of this resource been taken into consideration?

It's public knowledge that natural events such as hurricanes, Irma, María, the Greenland tidal wave, past earthquakes, covid, and recently Hurricane Fiona, in addition to causing a reduction in the population because many people immigrate to the U.S. because a reduction in the market and having no sales and there was no fishing effort. It is true that at the moment the conch stop being seen where it used to be, but there are report from fishermen that they are deeper. I wonder if someone investigated if this was true. However, this last season the conch has been seen again in large

group and the catches have been impressive. As proof of this you can look for the page of Conservación ConCiencia, Queen Conch lab among other webpages where they show several videos of young and adult conch populations.

And if we get carried away from the webpage of Queen Conch Lab, that is managed by Dr. Megan Davis, who has an extensive knowledge on this subject, pearls in conch are not common and it's estimate that one in 10,000 could have them. I know of one fisherman only who has taken six pearls this season.

In addition to all these, conch fishing is not allowing federal waters around Puerto Rico for a long time. In local water, we have season closures and management plan. We know that given the limited number of port samplers reliable data cannot be obtained but this is a topic to be discussed at another time.

This is not personal. Here, the primary responsibility lies in the federal government which must supervise federal water and does not pay proper attention to the Caribbean. And even worse, they only have a limited number of boat and NOAA agents for the Caribbean. Even more, NOAA has been negligent in the management of the Caribbean fishery with a lack of sound management and policies.

Contrary to other regions of the U.S. and the Gulf of Mexico, Florida, among others, you have not made a single stock assessment in Puerto Rico ever. It's necessary to start a stock assessment for these species. And the problem here is that one size does not fit all. This has a severe connotation because our population does not have a valid representation in the U.S. Government, and we are defenseless and at your mercy. However, the real victim here are the fishermen that have been cooperating with all of you.

You cannot pretend to designate an endangered species without doing the necessary studies. When you [inaudible] of mismanaged the resource of the U.S. and with those actions destroy a whole region you [inaudible] in a case of institutional racism and discrimination. And I'm talking about equity and environmental justice. Like I said once, soft science requires soft measures. Thank you for your attention.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Nelson.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Nelson? This ends the comments, but are you going to send that letter to Orian?

**NELSON CRESPO:** Yes.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: We are ready to adjourn--

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, no, no.

MARCOS HANKE: To end this topic. I'm sorry. Gimme just one sec, Yeah, go ahead, Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: I'd just like to make some quick comments. Mostly regarding Raimundo's presentation, but also some of the other things here. Raimundo made really good points about having the fishermen involved in surveys in some way. And I could see where that would really be important in potentially training some of the divers or maybe participating as divers if they get trained in the methods for collecting the data. Having been involved in quite a number of surveys myself, I can say that for the studies that I have been in, there's been no problem trying to recognize conch even in those very rugose coral rubble habitats. But when I've done it with fishermen, they're picking out the conch from the surface just as we get in the water, I have to go down to the bottom to see them. So, they really could be helpful in training the divers who are participating as divers.

But the place they could really help is designating where those surveys would have their greatest impact. So, almost all of the surveys done in Puerto Rico have been done on the West Coast. That's mostly due to a lack of funds. There are more funds available now. There will be studies done, particularly, on the East coast, but also on the South coast in the upcoming surveys. And that was looking for even more funds to conduct surveys to really get our sample size way up, and that would also be for the Virgin Islands.

So, those are stratified by areas we think the conch will occur or used to occur, and areas that don't. So, the better maps we have about where conch occur, the better we can allocate our sampling effort to get a better estimate of where those areas are. And those estimates are done with interviews for fishermen. Those will be coming up probably next year. And hopefully we will be looking at the East Coast a lot more than we have in the past. So, hopefully people will be coming to Naguabo and other areas and saying, can you help us in designing our surveys to get better information?

There was a comment about how scuba can be a limiting factor as well as an exploitative factor. Our experience in trying to assess conch, and I'll make a comment on that, is that basically every trip that goes out reaches the bag limit. So, maybe that bag limit

is actually more of a limiting factor. He is right about hookah being abused a lot in other areas, but scuba is abused a lot either and that's why people end up in the hospital. Not so, much in our jurisdictions, but certainly in others as well.

The thing to know about stock assessment, Nelson was criticizing that, you know, the foremost thing you have to understand when looking at conch, is conch not fish. So, almost all the models that we've generated for fish don't apply to conch. Their biology is just very different. They stop growing at some point and, you know, reproducing, their shell dimensions change from length to lip thickness and, well, it makes it very hard. But there are things that we can do and these kinds of surveys that look at not just density, but proportion of adults, how old those adults are and how they're distributed are really important.

So, the last part is, for those fishermen who want to put comments that we've been hearing here and want to put them into the NOAA site, be kind of open to what Orian presented. Like, this is the kind of information they're particularly looking for. And I would say from what I heard, you want to be as quantitative as possible, and even if that's just an approximation number or something, but you know, the team needs something they could recognize as, this is something that looks healthy or does not.

So, when you're talking about abundance, you're really talking about density. How many do you see in a given area? And so, to the degree that the conch fisherman can say, "On average, when we go diving in a certain area, I see X amount of conch." Or even, "When I go diving, if I'm in a good area," how far is one adult from the next adult? So that's a minimum nearest neighbor distance measure that can be used. Or "when I'm in a really good area" how close is the next conch? "When I'm in an average area," how close is the next conch? Those are kinds of information, even if it's an estimation, it's quantitative enough to say, "you have a really good conch population" or not if your data's not that good. But that's not what we were hearing.

The other question is, how old are—you know, what percentage are adults? and how old are they? And you don't have to say, "oh, they're 23 years old" or whatever. But you can give an idea of how old they are by the thickness of the lip and the amount of erosion. So, if you're saying, you know, "20% of the conch I see have really thick lips and they're very eroded" or "50% of the conch" that's telling the review team here that you have a very healthy population. These things are living, despite the fishing pressure, these things are living a long time. And so, that's the kind of information they're looking for. From what I was hearing those

fishermen actually have that kind of information, but they need to make sure they, to the best of their ability, get it into a form that is useful for the review team. And I think Raimundo can help them with that.

The last point I have is actually a question for Marcos and Miguel. I sent you both a draft of my response, which is going to be, I'm going to submit that separately to NOAA on that. It's being revised right now, pending from reviews I got back from people like Allan Stoner and Alex Tewfik who are really experts in areas. I don't know if you want me to comment on that or just let me submit this separately and you guys make your own comments or—

MARCOS HANKE: Because of time, maybe to submit is the appropriate thing. Share it with Graciela and we can find a way to share it with the Council members, your comments, and the SSC too. Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. What Deanna and I were talking about, we are going to have this part of the audio and we are going to do the transcription. So, the Chair can prepare letter taking all this in consideration as a letter from the Council. And certainly, everything that Richards and everything else that has been said here will be taken in consideration. We have to comprise it.

But yeah, the question, to Richard. Richard, send those comments directly to Orian, because I believe they are top, as well as Nelson. I spoke to Raimundo, and he's going to help the fishers here, and Andy, to put together the appropriate correspondence that is going to be sent to Dr. Tzadik. So, they will be taken into consideration.

I want to say this for the record again. All the comments that you have here are not the official comments for the actions that are going to be taken by the office of Dr. Tzadik, but they will be taken in consideration, and we will make sure that we be as close as possible to all the comments that we have received here today. And that will have to do with the science, with the socioeconomic.

And remember, socio-economy is not considered under the ESA. The animal is first, but it doesn't hurt to include a little bit of here and a little bit of there about it. Okay.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. And Richard I want to comment that for sure your support on the draft of the letter that we are going to submit. I'm counting on your help on that too. Go ahead, Richard.

RICHARD APPELDOORN: Yes. So, I was just reiterating that my intention is to submit my comments directly to the NOAA team, but I will make sure that you have a copy of the final version of that.

And one last comment, I forgot the name for the fisherman. One of the major criticisms that is that the peer reviewers or the knowledgeable peer reviewers on this issue had made was nobody liked the habitat maps that were used to generate population estimates. So, the more precise the information one has about where conch are found and how deep they're found in various areas the better that information will be. I don't think they will revise the model, but they should understand the degree to which the model can make errors.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Richard. We really need to speed up. Nick, your comments and then we go for the last presentation, which will be Jannette.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Gerson Martínez, for the record. Miguel, eso no era para ti. Okay. I'm going to compress my presentation and I'm going to send you a copy directly, Mr. Tzadik. Everybody touched a little bit on my comments and I'm glad I was told this because it would take at least a lot of 15, 20 minutes and I know people want to go home.

A hundred percent of the conch I fish are caught in a dive that are more than half an inch thick in lip. And each dive I can catch anywhere from 50 to 130 conchs per dive, dependent on the depth. So, our fishery in our Virgin Islands has been so healthy because of the strict regulations that we have into place, which I'm going to elaborate more when I send you that email. And I just wanted to make it the point that we have been doing our homework in a Virgin Islands, and I believe, as a fisherman, that blanket laws cannot penalize people who are protecting the resource and we have given a lot to protect our resources in the Virgin Islands. And our government has been there for us listening to our FAC who recommends regulations to the commissioner, and he has been very strict into listening to us and working those regulations. And even more, we have put stricter regulations in our resource from 1994 to date, to prevent overfishing.

And I know my fisherman has been very responsible in where it comes to protecting our resource and following regulations. I will send you a more elaborated letter through email and even I'm going to send you even GPS coordinates of different habitats with different species in size because the bundle of juveniles over there is ridiculous every four to six inches as far as you can swim as far as you can see in all directions we have those juveniles, which is

showing that our recruits are there to show that our fisheries is in good condition. That's all I have to say for now, and we will send you that letter.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank, thank you very much, Gerson. I just want to mention that in Cabo Rojo where the Conch fishery is very famous. To be a good fisherman is a fisherman that for the last 30 years and more they race to the dock at 10:30, 11 o'clock. Everybody comes to the dock consistently over the years and that habit happens over time for so many years. You just are able to do that if you have a lot of conchs out there. They are not changing the way they fish. They are just using the resort that have been there forever. This is something very that we have to take in a consideration, like a fisher related effort signal, right? And those kinds of things should be considered some way somehow. And now Jannette, next presentation. Vanessa, very quick.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. I just want to say, as you said, practically, we have more than 400 divers in there and for the first time we have a new generation of divers also. So, we are looking for ways to bring them the tools and also give them, by federal funds, in Cabo Rojo, we are giving them the scuba diving license also. So, those are going to be a generation that could participate in the next studies. So please and I'm going to ask Alida to send more information to teach all this new generation about these recommendations that they don't even know. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. Jannette let's change the subject. Thank you for all the participation.

#### Puerto Rico's Fishing Villages after Disaster

 WILSON SANTIAGO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm Wilson Santiago, Puerto Rico Fisheries Liaison, for the record. My partner is Jannette Ramos, partnering crime. She's going to present later. Also, very, very quick, we're going to make this presentation. This is a presentation, an effort that Jannette and I made, like an assessment, after the hurricane Fiona and what has happened to the fishing villages in Puerto Rico after María and other natural disasters that have been happening in Puerto Rico. So, Jannette is going to present. So, I'll leave you with Jan.

JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: Gracias, Wilson. Thank you, Wilson. Well, as you know, Fiona made landfall—

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Jannette, who are you for the record and who do you represent?

4 5

JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: I'm sorry. I am Jannette Ramos-García an OEAP member and I also work for the Sea Grant program. So, as you know, Fiona made landfall on September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2023, and since it made landfall between Cabo Rojo and Lajas in the Southwest coast of the island, the first fishing villages visited were those of Cabo Rojo and Lajas. Our first trip was three weeks after the hurricane.

The trips were divided taking into consideration the areas that were the most affected by the hurricane. We visited 17 municipalities where we interviewed fishmonger employees and some independent fishermen and also, fisherwoman. The coastal municipalities visited were in the Southwest coast, Cabo Rojo, Lajas. In the West coast Mayagüez and Aguadilla. In the South coast Guánica, Peñuelas, Ponce, Juana Díaz, Santa Isabel, Salinas, Guayama.

WILSON SANTIAGO: As you see this photo, this is Villa Pesquera La Mela in Cabo Rojo. This fishing village was very impacted by hurricane Fiona. As Jannette said, hurricane Fiona enter between Lajas and Cabo Rojo, so the municipality of Cabo Rojo was one of the most, well, I can say it was the municipality that was most impacted in Puerto Rico by hurricane Fiona.

So, you see this hole in the fishing village that was "velero" sail. That was a sailboat that was in Puerto Real and hurricane Fiona took it to the fishing village and it broke the wall. So, as you see, this is another area too, Cabo Rojo was impacted. Jannette

JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: Thank you. And then, we went to the North coast to Dorado, Vega Baja, Camuy, Loíza, Rio Grande, San Juan and Cataño. In the East coast due to the road conditions and the continuous rains, the East coast was not visited, but we are planning to visit it during the next weeks and also, we are going to Vieques and Culebra.

Next.

So, in the Southwest-- and then the other one, Christina, por favor --what we found in the Southwestern area, in Cabo Rojo, as you see in the first picture, sometimes there is a saying that goes "one picture, say more than a hundred words." Well, what you are looking in the first picture is, when you go to La Mela, you have to cross a bridge. That bridge doesn't have railings. So, after Fiona passed the bridge goes way on one side, putting all the people that passes through it in a precarious situation. And for the fisherman who needs to take out his boat, it can be very dangerous. So, in the

next picture, you see the fishing village, the roof is raised and the "escamadero" in the next picture is about to collapse. It was broken with the waves.

WILSON SANTIAGO: Just to add something. This fishing village, like another fishing village in the South coast of the island that we visited, they have been impacted in several natural disasters. Starting with Hurricane María, the earthquakes in 2020, and now Hurricane Fiona completed all the destruction.

JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: But La Mela during Hurricane María didn't suffer like this, even when it was a category five hurricane. Well, this time it suffered a lot.

As you see, the wet floor in La Mela fishmonger is a testimony of the roof conditions after a rainy day. I went back to La Mela and that's what I found. That day it was raining a lot and when I entered the fishmonger, it was like, what happened in here? The roof was leaking all the rain through it.

Next.

And then we went to the South coast to Guánica, Peñuelas, Ponce, Juana Díaz, Santa Isabel, Salinas and Guayama. What we found in Guánica at Playa Santa, the platform around the fishing village was severely cracked as a result of swell caused by Fiona. So, you are looking at that. And also, this is part of what began with the earthquakes and then Fiona completed what the earthquakes began.

WILSON SANTIAGO: Yes. I just want to add, in Cabo Rojo too, the Fishing Commercial Landing Center, is called El Corso-- my partner Andy Maldonado lives over there --they use that ramp and that "muelle" that duck. So, El Coroso is the area that is next to the Salina in Cabo Rojo, everybody knows that area, you know that area doesn't have a road, it's a dirt road, so the Caribbean Sea entered completely to that area. So, the fishers, like one or two months after the hurricane, were having difficulty throwing their boats to use the ducks. So, right now, Jannette said to me that she visited again, and right now it's clean, completely, but the damage is done. Okay.

 JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: Christina, next slide please. And then we went to the South coast to Peñuelas to Santo Cristo de la Salud. The Peñuelas Fishermen's Association in the EL Boquete Sector did not suffer structural damage. However, since the impact of Hurricane María, fishermen have been deprived of a safe dock, as you will see in the following video. They have managed to have a

floating dock built for them on drones, but it was damaged and useless after Fiona's impact. Christina, please run the video.

WILSON SANTIAGO: This was a video that we took. We had luck that a commercial fisher landed that day. So, you can see the difficulty they passed day by day in that fishing village. That day the wind wasn't blowing a lot.

JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: But as you can see, it's very dangerous for the fishermen to that every day. They have to take out their equipment, their fishing [inaudible] and put it in the rail of what is left of the dock. And then he has to take the boat out with a ramp that is also broken.

Next slide.

Here we went to Aguirre in Salinas, this is a Google Map that I took out. As you can see, the pier that you see in the photo no longer exists since Hurricane María. So, next slide Christina.

In Aguirre we went to the fishing association to the fishing village and Fiona raised the roof of the buildings, which had already been affected since María. In the same way, the "escamadero" was left in the open without a roof. There is a ramp that is uneven in relation to the beach, making the process of putting the boats at sea a hard and difficult one.

Next slide.

And then, we went to the North coast to Cibuco. What we found-Next slide. What we found in Cibuco is that the Fisher Village shares its ramp with recreational fishermen and with FURA. It was covered with sand and the pier was in terrible condition, as you can see in the second picture. And we also saw fishermen trying to tie his boat to the dock and it was a horrible process. He went away, went back, tried to tie the boat without-- it was practically impossible to do that.

Okay? And then we went to Loiza. What happened in Loiza? Well, Loiza was affected by hurricane Fiona but not the fishing village.

 Next slide, Christina. We found Rafael, the president of the Fishermen's Association, and he told us "They came to remodel the village, they started and left everything lying around and they haven't been back for months." He was talking about the Agricultural Department.

Next slide.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Jannette tienes dos minutos más to finish it.

JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: Yeah, I'm finishing. Thank you. This is what we found in Loiza.

Next slide.

 Okay. This is in Juana Díaz, also in the Southwest coast. Here we found coastal erosion and even though we were looking for that, those were the things that we were out to see. In both places, the sea enters the facilities during the passage of Hurricane Fiona. You can see the loss of beach at the space occupied by buildings near the coast.

WILSON SANTIAGO: Yeah. One of the things that we found when we spoke to the fishers— because we make this effort, but additionally to that, we talk and listen to the fishers. Okay? So, over there in the Pastillo in Juana Díaz, as you can see, those fishers, they are fishers from pot and traps, lobster traps and lobster pots. So, they told us that they have found that the tidal from the Hurricane Fiona take the pots like a mile, two miles away in the sea. So, you can see the impact that it made.

JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: Even though it was not Fiona-- next slide, please, Christina --we found abandon fishmongers, this one is in Las Mareas, closed since 2014.

Next slide.

And in Papayo in Lajas, even though it is an area of fishermen who report their catches and who have the facilities of a dock built by them, the building that would house the fishermen's association has remained closed and in disuse for years. It does not have water or electricity facilities, nor permission for them to use it.

 And then more important than reviewing and collecting the physical damage suffered by the structures that house fishmonger, is what the fishermen had to tell us. "I lost six 60 fishing boxes and 30 traps," fisherman in Santa Isabel. "The engines of my 'yola' drowned," fisherman in Aguadilla. "We lost all the fishing," all the fishermen interviewed. "We couldn't go fishing for several weeks," all the fishermen interviewed. "The government has forgotten us," all the fishermen interviewed. "We have been like this since María," fishermen in Peñuelas. "You are the first people who come to visit us and ask us how we are doing and what we need."

48 Next one.

4 5

These are the faces of some of the fishermen that we interview. In the first one, you are looking at the fisherman who was in El Coroso in Cabo Rojo; he was fixing his net. In the middle, this fisherman was in his boat, and he asked for help to go out at the boat and I said, "why?" well, he is a diver, and he got a bubble in his spine, so he can't walk. He can't bend, thank you. He showed me his walker and it was full of mold, and we went out and brought another one, it's a Bentley of a walker. And in the third picture, you see a fisherman in Lajas in La Parguera.

And the next one, in the first picture you see Cynthia Lugo from El Coroso. And in the second picture down, two fishermen from El Pastillo, Aguirre in the middle, and La Mela fisherman. And this is us.

I have to say something to finalize our presentation. Even though we have not finished the work, I want first to thank the Council for the confidence it had in our work, but also, I want to thank Christina Olán for being the voice of order and structure for Wilson and me. And last, but not least, I want to mention that inviting Wilson to make this visit, was for me the best decision. Our ways complement each other perfectly and we can bring the correct information that fishermen and fisherwomen need regarding licenses, loss and other topics. We hear them and we think that they appreciate it. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Jannette. Because this is an expression of what we have been hearing since María in words, now we have images. Thank you very much. Alida.

**ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR:** Yes. I want to thank them. And also, I am really sorry that we don't have anyone here from the Department of Natural Resources because that's not just [crosstalk].

 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you Alida. And we are going to pass now before we adjourn to the moment for the public comments. Anybody on the public that want to make public comment? Seeing none, we are ready to adjourn. And thank you for your patience it was an interesting meeting today even though we accomplished a lot. Tomorrow is another day and we going to start at nine o'clock. I'll see you all tomorrow. Thank you very much.

The people for the closed session, please stay in the room.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed on December 6, 2022.)

48 - -

# DECEMBER 7, 2022

#### WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

5 6

1 2

3

7

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

MARCOS HANKE: Good morning, everyone. We are going to start the meeting. It's 9:00 AM Today is December 7th. This is the 180<sup>th</sup> CFMC meeting. I just want to remind everyone to ask for a turn to speak by rising their hand. If you're in a virtual, also proceed with the same and I will do my best judgment to include all the comments.

the same, and I will do my best judgment to include all the comments if it fit on the agenda from the virtual attendees. Close your mic after we stop speaking and also make sure we speak close to the mic to make sure the record is clear, and everybody can hear you. I encourage everybody to speak to the agenda items and to be more effective on our discussion. Also, I want to say thank you to all

I encourage everybody to speak to the agenda items and to be more effective on our discussion. Also, I want to say thank you to all the participants from yesterday meeting. We did a lot of things yesterday under a very professional and productive way like we

always do, and I want to keep this positive momentum forward.

202122

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36 37

38 39

40

41

42

43

I want to read something that I forgot yesterday on our family. Sometimes it's just a procedural thing, but I want to put the rules out there as a reminder. Rules of conduct and all instructions for all meetings. I want to remind everyone about those rules for the hybrid or virtual meetings. All participants should mute their sound until they are recognized by the Chair as a turn to speak. Please don't interrupt anybody. Let's be very respectful to everyone. Participants can indicate that they wish to speak by using the chat or rising their hand using the reaction feature. The chat will be monitored to identify people who wish to speak or who need assistance or technical difficulties. The intention of this Council is to hear everybody, but we have to do in an orderly manner. The chat should not be used to address Council committee panel or to make public comments. Please your comments, if they are relevant to the agenda, we want to hear them in an orderly manner. Unless the Chair permit, please raise your hand and I will use my judgment to make sure that everything lines up with the agenda items. Sidebar conversation or comments made in the chat will not be read and will not become part of the record unless permitted by myself, by the Chair. The idea on this is for everybody to stay on the same page and all the rules of the game. We are a family, and this family is going to start the meeting now. Let's go forward.

44 45 46

47

48

Today we are going to readjust the agenda based on the presentations that were left from yesterday. The first presentation is going to be Caribbean Fishery Management Council,

- 1 Scientific and Statistical Committee Practices and Procedures
- 2 Concerning Objectivity and Conflict of Interest. After that, we're
- 3 going to have the Pelagic Fish Amendment to the Island-Based FMPs.
- 4 After that, we going to have Managing Trap Fisheries in the
- 5 U.S.V.I. Then we are going to pass to the Southeast Fisheries
- 6 Science Center presentation. After that, we're going to address
- 7 Recreational Fisheries by Russel Dunn. And then we follow the
- 8 regular roster on the agenda.

10 Uh, with no more to say we going to start with the with the roll 11 call. Christina.

12

13 CRISTINA OLÁN: Cristina Olán, Council Staff.

14

15 LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Liajay Rivera, Council Staff. Buenos días.

16

17 **GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER:** Buenos días. Graciela García-Moliner, 18 Council staff.

19

20 MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: María López, NOAA Fisheries.

21

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Good morning. Vanessa Ramírez, Council Member, Puerto Rico.

24

25 **JAMES R. KREGLO:** Good morning. James Kreglo, Saint Thomas, Virgin 26 Island.

27

28 **JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL:** Good morning, buen día. Jean-Pierre Oriol 29 DPNR.

30

31 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Good morning. Carl Farchette, Council members, 32 Saint Croix District.

33

34 **SAMUEL D. RAUCH III:** Good morning. Sam Rauch, Deputy Director 35 National Marine Fisheries Service.

36

37 MARCOS HANKE: Good morning. Marcos Hanke. Puerto Rico, Chair.

38

39 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Good morning. Miguel Rolón, Council Staff.

40

41 **DIANA T. MARTINO:** Good morning. Diana Martino, Council staff.

42

43 **JOHN MCGOVERN:** Morning. Jack McGovern, NOAA Fisheries.

44

45 **KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI:** Kate Zamboni, NOAA Office of General 46 Counsel.

47

CLAY PORCH: Good morning. Clay Porch, NOAA fisheries, Southeast Fishery Science Center.

ANDREW MCGRAW-HERDEG: Good morning. Andrew Mcgraw-Herdeg, U.S. Coast Guard, Sector San Juan.

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

MIGUEL BORGES: Good morning. Miguel Borges, NOAA Office of Law Enforcement.

HOWARD FORBES: Good morning. Howard Forbes, DPNR Enforcement. 

MARÍA DE LOS A. IRIZARRY: Good morning. María Irizarry, Council Staff.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Good morning. Gerson Martínez, DAP Chair.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Good morning. Alida Ortiz, Outreach and Education Advisory Panel.

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

NELSON CRESPO: Buenos días. Nelson Crespo, DAP Chair of Puerto Rico.

ALEX TERRERO: Alex Terrero, NOAA Law Enforcement, Saint Thomas.

ADYAN RIOS: Adyan Rios, Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

RUSSEL DUNN: Russ Dunn, NOAA Headquarters.

TIM SARTWELL: Tim Sartwell, NOAA Fisheries. 

SEAN A. MORTON: Sean Morton, NOAA Fisheries. 

SEAN R. MEEHAN: Good morning. Sean Meehan, NOAA Fisheries.

BRAD MCHALE: Brad McHale, NOAA Fisheries. 

HELENA ANTOUN: Morning. Helena Antoun, NOAA Fisheries.

ANDRÉS MALDONADO: Andy Maldonado, Puerto Rico Conch Fisher.

NICOLE GREAUX: Nicole Greaux, Caribbean Fishery Management Council Liaison to Saint Thomas/Saint John

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Nicole Angeli, Director of the U.S.V.I, Division of Fish and Wildlife.

WILSON SANTIAGO: Good morning. Wilson Santiago, Puerto Rico Fisheries Liaison.

MICHELLE SCHÄRER-UMPIERRE: Michelle Schärer, SSC.

ORIAN TZADIK: Orian Tzadik, NOAA Fisheries.

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: I am going to read the names of the people that are in Zoom. We have a person that his or her name is Dwame, I do not know how to pronounce it. Kevin McCarthy, Laura Cimo, Refik Orhun, Sarah Stephenson, Tania Capote, Virginia Shervette, Yamitza Rodriguez, Rachel O'Malley.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much for the attending virtually. I want to remind everyone that every time we speak state your name. First presentation. Kate, can you proceed please? Thank you.

## Caribbean Fishery Management Council, Scientific and Statistical Committee Practices and Procedures Concerning Objectivity and Conflicts of Interest

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Yes, sir. Good morning. My name is Kate Zamboni. I'm an attorney in NOAA's office of General Counsel in the Southeast section. And as a little bit of background before we get into this, my colleague, Jocelyn D'Ambrosio, discussed several principles regarding conflicts of interest as they relate to members of the SSC during the Council's August meeting.

Her discussion actually starts on page 214 of the transcript if anyone wants to go back and review what she talked about. During that discussion, she refers to a document that she was working on that reflects the principles of conflict of interest as they relate to members of the SSC. Last week, a working draft of that document titled Caribbean Fishery Management Council Scientific Statistical Committee Practices Procedures and Concerning Objectivity and Conflicts of Interest was circulated to Council members, and it is available in the briefing book materials for this meeting on the Council's website.

 The document suggests best practices that may be applied to SSC members to preserve the objectivity and independence of the committees work. There is no action associated with that document today; nonetheless, I'd like to summarize that document for you and answer any questions you may have about it, and if the Council

believes this document would be useful, it may consider it for adoption at a future Council meeting.

2 3 4

1

Next slide please.

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

So, just as a little bit of a background on SSCs. The Magnuson-Stevens Act requires each fishery management Council to establish, maintain, and appoint members of a scientific and statistical committee, what we refer to as the SSC. And the purpose of the SSC is to assist the Council in the development, collection, evaluation and peer review of such statistical, biological, economic, social, and other scientific information as it relates to a Council's development and amendment of any fishery management plan.

131415

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

2425

26

The SSC plays a very important role in the Council's efforts to develop conservation and management measures that are consistent with the national standards for fishery management, including in particular National Standard 2. And that is the standard that use best that the Council scientific information requires available. The SSC assists the Council in doing that, identifying what we refer to as BSIA and often provides advice and recommendations based on BSIA. This management advice can include recommending such as acceptable biological preventing overfishing, identifying maximum sustainable yield, achieving rebuilding and reports on stock status and health bycatch, habitat status, social and economic impacts of management measures, as well as the sustainability of fishing practices.

272829

30

31

32

33

34

I will note here though that although the SSC helps to identify and ensure that conservation and management measures are based on best scientific information available, it is ultimately NMFS's responsibility to approve conservation and management measures and certify that decisions are consistent with BSIA. As part of that process, NMFS does evaluate and use the SSCs determinations and other information as appropriate.

35 36 37

Next slide please.

38 39

40 41

42

43

44 45 So, some of the SSCs responsibilities that are relevant for our discussion today and the functions that they serve include recommendations on identifying that best scientific information available, providing management recommendations and advice and like I said, those can include ABC recommendations and it can also include identifying research priority recommendations and areas where additional information is needed. The SSC can also be asked to conduct peer reviews as a body or evaluate those peer reviews.

46 47 48

Next slide, please.

So, as it relates to the SSC, why is it important to discuss conflicts of interest? In fulfilling its role as the Council's Scientific Advisory Committee, the SSC must ensure that its deliberations advice and recommendations are clear and well-reasoned, and that they are objective. While the MSA does not explicitly address SSC members conflicts of interest, there are the National Standard 2 guidelines that provide guidance on how to navigate conflicts of interest in the peer review context. And therefore, when the SSC is performing that function as a peer review body, those conflict-of-interest rules do apply. The purpose of the document that was circulated and what we're going to go over today is how some of those guidelines that we know would apply in the peer review context could apply to other SSC functions, such as identifying the best available scientific information and providing management recommendations and advice.

Next slide please.

1

2

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

1314

1516

1718

19 20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44 45

46

47

48

So, again, really the goal here is to ensure objectivity and independence and in the peer review context we can do that by making sure that the people involved in that peer review are independent from the material under review and otherwise free of conflict of interest. You know, you may think you know what it means to have a conflict of interest, it does have a real meaning in the law, and it tends to be related to financial interests. In the peer review context, however, it is financial interest, but it could be other interests that conflicts with the service of the individual on the review panel and what that means is if a member of a review panel has had a substantial involvement with the work that is being reviewed, they may not be as subjective in providing that peer review. But I did look up, for your benefit, a definition in Black's Law Dictionary, which defines conflict of interest as a real or seeming incompatibility between one's private interest and one's public or fiduciary duties. Conflicts of interest can include but are not limited to one's personal financial interest and investments, employer affiliations, consulting arrangements, grants or contracts of the individual and of others with whom the individual has substantial common financial interests. And so, what that's focused on is obviously where someone can benefit financially, not just themselves, but if it's a close family member such as a spouse who has those types of financial interests that person may benefit in some way and that could be considered a conflict. But as I said, really in the peer review context, I think what's more common is that peer reviewers have not contributed or participated in the development of a work product or scientific information under review. In some cases, a greater degree of independence is necessary to ensure the credibility of that peer

review process when the product under review involves novelty or controversy.

Next slide please.

So, what do the NS2 guidelines say about avoiding conflict of interest in their peer review context? For reviewers who are not federal employees, they must be screened for conflicts in accordance with the NOAA Policy on Conflict of Interest for Peer Review Subject to the Office of Management and Budget's Peer Review Bulletin, or other applicable rules or guidelines. And as I mentioned, peer reviewers must not have any conflicts of interest with the scientific information, subject matter or work product or any aspect of the statement of work for the peer review.

Next slide.

There is a very important exception, however, and that is for reviews that require highly specialized expertise where there is a limited availability of qualified reviewers. In that case an exception may be applied when a conflict of interest is unavoidable. The way that gets handled is that the conflict is disclosed promptly and publicly.

Disclosure of a conflict is an important concept. That is often the way one cures, if you will, a conflict. It's disclosed and then once that knowledge is out there an informed decision can be made, whether or not to waive the conflict. I think this exception is very important in the SSC context because of the role that that committee serves. Its members are selected because they have specialized expertise and that indeed is why we want them on the SSC. And so, when they have to perform functions, there may be some overlap in work that they performed and that is why they have that specialized knowledge, and so this exception could come into play in other contexts.

Next slide please.

So, like I said, we know basically what rules would apply when the SSC is conducting a peer review, but we can talk about what best practices could be applied when the SSC is determining and making a recommendation as to what constitutes best scientific information available. There are no rules or criteria imposed by the MSA or the National Standard 2 guidelines for avoiding conflicts of interest in the BSIA determination process but we can borrow the same principles from the peer review context and if we did that, if an SSC member has participated in the development or review of a work product, we know that they have to publicly

disclose his or her underlying work and their role in that underlying work.

Let's go to the next slide. It's continuation.

And so, if that underlying work is now being recommended as best scientific information available, the SSC member, in addition to disclosing their work, could consider recusing himself or herself from actually voting on whether that work meets the standards of BSIA, if that member's objectivity would be compromised but they should be able to participate.

Are we ahead of slide? Go back one, sorry. Yeah. So, they should consider recusing themselves, but again, that exception may be appropriate because if there is a need for that specialized expertise and that person has that expertise, and it's not otherwise available, then the exception may be appropriate. But again, that would be with the disclosure.

Next slide.

And if an SSC member has recused himself or herself from voting on the BSIA recommendation, a best practice might be to allow that SSC member to participate in the technical discussion and to answer any questions. Again, we don't want to no avail the SSC to that expertise and so it might be appropriate to have that member participate in the discussion, but perhaps avoid expressing his or her opinion as to whether or not the work that they've had involvement in actually constitutes BSIA in order to preserve the objectivity of the SSCs recommendation.

Next slide.

And similarly, if the SSC is discussing research priority recommendations, how can we apply conflict of interest principles here? Again, an SSC member should consider publicly disclosing any interest or involvement in projects that may be recommended by the SSC. And that involvement or interest again, could include somebody with whom they share a household with, so, a spouse or a child perhaps or parent that, you know, if they could stand to benefit financially due to the SSCs recommendation on a priority project, it may be appropriate for the SSC member to disclose that. That last bullet, talking about relationships or other related entities. So, it can, again, be the personal relationships with somebody in one's household, but it could also be contractual relationships with an entity that may be hired to perform the work.

Next slide, please.

 And if an SSC member stands to benefit financially, again, directly or perhaps indirectly through related entities or personal relationships, a best practice might be that the SSC member considers recusing himself or herself from actually voting on that recommendation.

Next slide.

However, once the SSC has made a recommendation as to whether information is BSIA and if an SSC member has recused himself from that vote, they should be able to participate in discussions and subsequent votes about how to use that information to support management advice and recommendations.

Next slide.

So, when talking about other management advice that the SSC may provide, here, I hope you're seeing that the rules become—they're not even rules, the suggestions become less onerous. So, if an SSC member has recused himself or herself from voting on a recommendation, the SSC member should be able to participate in technical discussions and answer questions. And in this case, in terms of best practices for other management advice, it may be appropriate for the SSC member to express their opinion on the merits of a project.

I think that's the last slide. So, I'm happy to entertain any questions and provide any additional clarity.

## Discussion

MARCOS HANKE: Miquel.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you Kate. Two questions. The first one is sort of technical. The other one is, my intention to adopt this as an appendix in our handbook, and also it could be included in our SOPs. In the SOPs you have a section on, it's a charter of the SSC and we can attach this. So, I have two questions, who determines, at a Council meeting or at an SSC meeting, that there is a possible conflict of interest? Is it raised by any member? Is it raised by the Chair? Who may have the responsibility of raising that. And second, in the Councils when we met all the executive director, we were talking about who is the final decision maker in terms of the best available information, the Center or the SSC? So those are the two questions.

 KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Okay. So, first, in terms of who is responsible for identifying a conflict, I think one of the purposes of this best practices document is to encourage individuals to self-disclose. They would have the best information as to whether or not a relationship exists or have knowledge of their role in any underlying work. I didn't want to rehash it too much, but we know that allegations of conflict of interest have been made because there is this belief that it is something very negative, and I hope to change that opinion. It is not necessarily negative to have a conflict of interest. It just means you may have a lot of information or have participated in things that are relevant.

4 5

The public disclosure of that conflict is really important though, so that everyone understands what role somebody may have had in information and how they may stand to benefit. Usually though, I'm going to say, like in the SSC context, any financial benefit is pretty attenuated, so I think it's highly unlikely those types of financial conflicts would come into play. Outside of that, and outside of what we know for the peer review context, there's nothing illegal about participating in a vote on what constitutes BSIA, even if an SSC member has substantial involvement in the work under review. Again, this is just about perhaps some best practices if you want to avoid any appearance of a conflict and really preserve the credibility and objectivity of those recommendations. These are things that could come into play.

So, I would encourage to go back to that question that individuals self-disclose and that that's really where the responsibilities should lie. If somebody believes, somebody has had an under, you know, performed a function or had a substantial involvement in some work and that person hasn't disclosed it maybe just a side conversation of like, "Hey, do you think you should disclose this?" or ask the question, and then maybe that'll prompt the member to say, "oh yes, I" maybe they forgot and then they can disclose it at that point.

Your second question was, who ultimately has the responsibility for identifying what is best scientific information available? It is NMFS and it comes at the part of the process after an amendment has been transmitted to the agency and they take on that responsibility of drafting a rule, they have to certify that it is based on best scientific information available. But they do take the SSCs recommendations into account as well as the Councils.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you. Because that's precisely the issue whenever we are discussing this. Richard and I have discussed this for many, many years and we understand that the SSC filters the best available information. But when there is a conflict, one

Council, for example, has a conflict, they have a number, the Center has another number, and they were really a little bit upset because finally NMFS approved the number of the Center, not the number of the SSC. So, it's almost a non-issue here, but we wanted to have it clear for the record.

So, the best practices that we have so far is that the SSC takes into consideration the numbers received from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and those are the ones that they use for any analysis they present to the Council. Thank you.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: You're welcome. And I think maybe part of your question that I didn't answer was, so what would happen if someone said, "Hey, I'm not sure, maybe I have a conflict." Counsel can help do that. I don't necessarily have the authority to declare somebody free of a conflict of interest, but I can certainly help somebody navigate when it might be appropriate to disclose something. And, again, whether or not, is this a situation where you want to recuse yourself from voting but still participate in the discussion? Is this a situation where you should refrain from expressing an opinion? I can certainly help that, or whoever is serving as Counsel can assist.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Kate. Go ahead, Clay.

CLAY PORCH: Yeah, thank you. Just to follow up on that. So, yes, technically the, the Secretary of Commerce is the final arbiter of what's the best scientific information available, but the Southeast Center typically serves as the proxy for that, for most of those decisions. So, we would be the ones that would say, "Yes, this is based on best scientific information available." And yes, we take the SSCs advice under strong consideration when we make that determination.

The other thing I wanted to mention is that a very similar issue came up regarding conflict of interest versus bias at the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council's SSC in that we had a competing survey. You may have heard the so-called Great Red Snapper account, and many of the SSC members were part of that. And so, there was a debate whether that was the best scientific information at the time that the ACL should ultimately be based on. The Gulf Council came to a very similar solution to what's been described here. So, there is obviously a bias when you're part of that study. And so, the SSC members actually voluntarily recused themselves from voting on the final motions.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: You know, the first course I took on conflict of interest was in 1976 and I remember that the lawyer told us "All

Council members, all staff members sit down on the table will have a conflict of interest, otherwise they should not be sitting here because you represent your sector." So, if I'm a recreational fisherman, I will be taking all my decisions based on my recreational sector. But whenever there's a dollar in between, that's another \$20 as we say in Spanish.

So, it's kind of a difficult concept to absorb once and for all. What I encourage all kinds of members, this document will be distributed so you can have an idea of where you are. In the case of the Councils, I need to provide a report to, after María and I exchange some notes, we need to provide a report to Congress as to, in the current year, how many instances of abstention, recusal have occurred, because they take this very seriously.

I believe that I personally would like to thank Kate, because she didn't have to do this, but she decided to do it. This document clarifies a lot about what conflict of interest is and what is not. So, my proposal, Mr. Chairman, is that we adopt this as part of the charter of the SSC, we will include it in our handbook, one of the appendixes.

For those of you who are new, the administrative handbook is a document that has all matters related to the administration of the Council on a routine basis staff, the way we operate. The standard operational procedure is the documented above that. In general terms is the guide that we use to operate the Council and both documents compliment with each other. So, if you want to make something stronger, you put it in the SOP, and then in that SOP I review by the appropriate authorities in Washington.

So, Mr. Chairman it's just to hear from the other Council member. Do you think it's a good idea to incorporate this in the handbook and all the charter of the SOPs?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. I'll transfer to the floor, but I just want to state that we already discussed this in the previous meeting, extensively. My perception is that the whole Council want a very clear guidance on where we can keep educating ourselves, how to best proceed as Council members and the DAPs and all the other members. I would like to hear the Council members. Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. On the subject of recusal, does the individual decide that he's going to recuse himself or can the Chair say, or a member say, "Well, I believe that this person, because of blah, blah, blah, should recuse himself."

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: So, again, these are just recommendations. Even if it is adopted, they're recommendations and therefore no one should feel required to recuse themselves from voting on a BSIA recommendation or management advice or research priorities. So, my advice would be if someone thinks that they have a potential conflict when they just want to preserve that credibility and avoid having it appear as though the vote is biased in any way, that is their choice. They may recuse themselves. I do not think it is appropriate for other people to tell somebody else "You need to recuse yourself" because the rules are not, they just don't have that weight.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you for that.

MARCOS HANKE: Any other Council member? Okay. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. I have been, virtually, in the discussions before and I have checked out the information given by the staff also and the provided. So, it's very clear what we want is to have this in our handbook also and available to all of us, but we have clear what we have to do. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And thank you very much Kate, for your work. I think we are ready to move on. Let's go for the next presentation, which should be pelagic fish amendment. Sarah.

### Pelagic Fish Amendment to the Island-Based FMPs

SARAH STEPHENSON: Good morning. This is Sarah Stephenson with the Southeast Regional Fisheries Office. Christina, are you going to drive? Okay. I'm going to give an update on the amendment that we started working on, the generic amendment number three, to the Puerto Rico, Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix Fishery Management Plans to develop management measures for pelagic species that are managed under those plans. And just so, you know, the term generic just means, at this time it applies to all three FMPs.

Next slide, please.

Before I go to the amendment, since the FMPs are now effective, I'd like to just kind of review the management measures that are included for these new pelagic species in those FMPs. It's not a lot, but I just wanted everyone to be aware.

So, all finfish, including the pelagic fish, must be maintained with the head and the fins intact. There are exceptions for bait

and consumption at sea. There are currently no gear restrictions for the pelagics species, although the amendment that María presented yesterday, if that gets developed, that could include prohibitions, for instance, for the trawl gear for the pelagic species. That just hasn't happened yet. There are currently no size limits, commercial trip limits, recreational bag limits, or seasonal closures for pelagics. Although, I will point out that some of our marine management areas do have restrictions for all fishing, either year-round or for certain times of the years, and that would apply to these pelagic species. Those are listed down, I'm not going to read them all, but those are down in footnote number three.

12 13 14

1516

1718

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

28

1

2

4 5

6

7

8

9

10 11

> The FMPs established management reference points for the new species either by stock or stock complex, which include the sustainable yield level, which was an overfishing limit proxy, the acceptable biological catch, annual catch limits, which were determined to be equal to optimum yield and annual catch targets and we'll see what those numbers look like on the next slide. The FMPs also established accountability measures for the pelagic species and to do that, they set an annual catch target at 90% of the annual catch limit that would serve as the accountability measure trigger. So, for instance, if landing -- and we'll talk about landings in a minute --exceed that catch target, the Council, in consultation with the Science Center, would assess whether corrective action is needed. It's a little bit different than the accountability measure for the other species because these are new to management and so the Council wanted to be a little bit more conservative in what accountability measure might be applied.

293031

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44 45 I'll point out, for Puerto Rico, that ACLs and the ACTs were set for both the commercial and the recreational sector. Although, I did want to point out that the amendment includes language that if data or landings for one sector are not available, for instance the recreational landings, then the sector that has available data, which would be the commercial sector, the ACL that was specified for that sector would become the ACL for the stock. So, I just wanted to point that out because that's pretty important right now since we don't have recreational landings for any of the complexes that were established in the Puerto Rico FMP. And then to go back really quickly to the landings, the FMP established kind of a spin up process. In the first year of implementation, we would compare just the single year of landings to those either ACTs or ACLs and eventually we would get to where we're using a three-year average of the landings and comparing that to the target. So, I just kind of wanted people to be aware that that's what the process.

46 47 48

Next slide, please.

4 5

So, here are the numbers that were put into the FMPs and then are on our regulations now. So, you can see = the stocks or stock complexes, how they're managed. For instance, dolphin and Pompano dolphin are managed in the dolphin fish stock complex and the asterisks there, dolphin was selected as the indicator stock for that complex. So, the numbers are based off of landings of just that one species, but any kind of accountability measure would apply to both species in that stock complex.

So, you can see the SYL and the ABC, those are set at the stock level, but then you can see the sector ACLs and ACTs. I would like to point out, for instance, for dolphinfish the recreational ACL is much greater than the commercial ACL. If you remember what that accountability measure says is, if you don't have data for one sector, then the sector ACL that you do have data for becomes the ACL for this stock. So that's going to be very important for us going forward until we can get some recreational landings information.

So, you can see all the numbers here and then the bottom left table are the values for dolphin and wahoo for Saint Thomas and Saint John. Those are the only two species managed under that FMP. And then similarly, on the right table, on the bottom, those are the numbers for dolphin and wahoo for Saint Croix. And again, those are the only two species managed under that FMP.

Next slide, please.

So, at the August Council meeting the Council did make a motion to request us to move forward with preparing an amendment to each FMP to develop recreational bag limits, commercial trip limits and size limits for the pelagic species as they were selected at that meeting. And then for Puerto Rico, they selected dolphin and pompano dolphin, wahoo, little tunny, blackfin tuna, mackerel, and cero mackerel. You did not, at that time, choose to include great barracuda or tripletail, which are the other two pelagic species managed under that FMP. And then, for Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix, that you picked both species managed under each FMP, which are dolphin and wahoo. And the rationale at that meeting during the discussion was to prevent over harvest of these species through both bag and trip limits, and then to protect undersized individuals through size limits.

Next slide, please.

Following that meeting, we formed an interdisciplinary planning team, and María talked about this a little bit yesterday and was

like, what is that team? So, it's a group of people comprised of members from the Council, the Southeast Regional Office and the Southeast Fishery Science Center. It includes a variety of expertise such as biologists, economists, anthropologists or social scientists', data analysts, policy writers who help write, if there's any new regulations involved in the amendment, they help make sure that those regulations are consistent with both the FMP and the current regulations, general counsel, protected resources, such as Orian like we heard from yesterday, habitat and conservation, General counsel, and then law enforcement. So, all of those people meet every time we have a meeting, and we discuss the issues that could be developed in the amendment.

4 5

So, the IPT, for this amendment, met in October of 2022 and review the information that was included in the white paper that was presented to the Council in April of this year and the scoping document that was presented in August this year. They did recommend that we think about organizing the actions in the amendment by management area. So, as we saw yesterday when María was presenting, it makes sense to consider all recreational bag limits, trip limits, size limits for Puerto Rico first and that way we can analyze all of the management measures and how that would affect Puerto Rico. And so, then the next few actions would be, for instance, for Saint Thomas/Saint John and they would do the same thing. So, the IPT did recommend— so, once we do come back with an actual amendment for you to look at, like what María presented yesterday for her amendment, it will be developed by FMP, by management area.

The IPT spent a long time discussing a list of information and data needs that they would like to know in order to help draft alternatives for these, the recreational bag limits, for the commercial trip limits and the size limits. And a lot of those questions, which we'll see on the next slide, kind of get at what our normal chapter three in the amendment is, which is the description of the fishery. So, how many fishers are there? Where are they fishing? What types of gear are they using?

So, next slide, please.

And I'm not going to read all of these questions. They're here, and this presentation will be available to you afterwards if you wanted to look at it. But I will point out that a lot of the questions are getting at that description of these fisheries, and would be helpful in determine, for instance, recreational bag limits. What species are landed together? If dolphin and wahoo were never caught together, then it wouldn't make sense to have a recreational bag limit for both of those. So, we started exploring

some of the information and we sent this list of questions to stakeholders from each island to try to get initial input. We will obviously keep digging it and keep flushing out and try to answer all these questions as we prepare the amendment. And so, we did an initial kind of exploratory look really quick at some of the data and I'll start showing you those next.

4 5

So, next slide, please.

The IPT did identify some sources of either information or data that they thought would be useful by answer some of these questions obviously the commercial data. And, for instance, they did have other recommendations such as use the longest time series available, like, don't truncate it to only, you know, since ACLs were invented, use all the data that's available and let's look at that. And then again, for Puerto Rico don't use the reported landings, use the adjusted landings, which I know we've heard that there's issues with that, but since that's generally determined to be best scientific information, that's what we should use for this amendment.

Recreational landings, I'll note that the data set there, the last full year that was collected was in 2016, so that's what we would look at. And again, that's only available for Puerto Rico. And then if there's additional charter information out there or trip intercept, which is going to tell us size limits, that's caught for the fish, there was a report that reviewed U.S.V.I. recreational fishing regulations, any tournament data that's out there, the Dolphinfish research program, which we've heard presentations from Dr. Merten at this Council meeting on that, the Council itself, its advisories panels, and then stakeholders. So, we're going to start reaching out as we develop this amendment and just get all the information we can on these pelagic fisheries, so that, hopefully, our amendment makes sense, it does what you want it to do, and we've considered everything. So, obviously, if I've missed or if we've missed something that you know of that's out there, please let us know during the discussion.

Next slide. So, first, preliminarily, we looked at seasonality of the species just to see if there was any.

Next slide.

So, I'll explain these graphs a little bit and then they will be repeated for the other species in the other islands. So, on the left-hand graph, you have the average commercial landings per each month over this 32-year period. So, what that means is, the first point in January, if you look at all of the landings for every

January during that time series, the average pound of dolphinfish that was reported, and again, these are adjusted landings, is 15,000 pounds. So, that's how you kind of get a feel for this graph. So, you can see that for dolphin, in Puerto Rico, in the commercial landings, the highest landings are from December and January. And then for wahoo the highest landings, average landings, are at the end of the year November and December. And you can also see that the landings of dolphin are much greater than the landings of wahoo. So, that's how these graphs are going to look, the ones with the arrow bars.

101112

1

2

4 5

6

7

8

9

Next slide.

1314

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

2425

We did a similar thing for the recreational landings, although I'll point out that the recreational landings are reported by twoinstead of month wave. So January, February, January/February lumped together. So, you get these six waves, as they call them, throughout the year, but these are similar graphs. So, over the time series from 2000 to 2016, the average number of dolphinfishes reported by the recreational, or estimated I should say, by the recreational fisheries, was just under 300,000 pounds. So, you can also see from the last slide to this one that there are a lot more dolphinfish removed by the recreational sector, than by the commercial sector. So, for dolphinfish you can see that the majority of those landings occur at the end of the year in that November-December wave. And then also similarly for Wahoo.

262728

Next slide.

29 30

31

32

33

3435

So, now we're moving to the next two species managed under the Puerto Rico FMP, the king mackerel and the cero mackerel. Same type of graph, you can see that the peak here is generally in the warmer months in the summer, they look almost identical in the line shape, but again, the pounds of king mackerel are almost twice what they are for cero mackerel. So, a lot more king mackerel removed over the historical time period.

363738

Next slide.

39 40

41

42 43

44 45 The recreational landings here. These look different compared to the last slide where we just saw the shape of the graph was very similar. You can see cero mackerel, the highest point at the end of the year. King mackerel, that March/April wave was where the peak landings. And you can also see on this graph that there are a lot more king mackerel caught by the recreational sector during that time period than cero mackerel.

46 47

48 Next slide.

For blackfin tuna and little tunny, they're similar in that the majority are kind of in the warmer months, so May and June for blackfin and then May for little tunny and, but the amount of pounds are pretty similar for the two species.

Next slide.

 Recreational look almost identical to each other, although with the peak landings in May/June, which is similar to what we saw for the commercial although you can see that the amount of Blackfin tuna is a lot greater than little tunny.

Next slide.

Dolphin and wahoo for Saint Thomas and Saint John. The historical year period is a little bit different, it's 2000 to 2021. You can see that the peak, the highest in the historical data set for Saint Thomas for dolphin, is April. And then for wahoo, it's kind of the end of the year and the beginning of the year. So, December and January.

Next slide.

And then for Saint Croix, it's the same year period as Saint Thomas/Saint John. Dolphin, the peak landings are at the beginning of the year with the highest that was reported in the landings data in April. And then for wahoo was towards the end of the year in November. Again, there's no recreational landings information for the U.S.V.I., so, we don't have similar plots to show you for those species.

Next slide.

We also wanted to look at the spatial distribution, where these fish are caught. For Puerto Rico, the commercial landings information included landings by coasts and so, we'll see that the recreational data set does not include that. So, there will be no recreational information by coasts. And then we'll look at the preliminary division of state and federal waters. And we heard a little bit yesterday about what does that federal waters mean? It's not perfect exact to federal waters, but it-- so, it's just preliminary. I just wanted to point that out.

So, next slide.

I apologize for the colors and the smallness of it, but I'll try to walk you through it.

4 5

6

7

8 9

10 11

So, this is a proportion of the commercial landings per coast. So, basically, how much of the landings came from one coast versus another during that same historical data time period '88 to 2019 for Puerto Rico. So, let's just pick a year. The last year that we have data available for 2019 for dolphinfish, you can see that there was a bigger pulse from the East coast, which is the red color. Normally there's a lot caught from the North coast, which is the blue. The South coast, which is green, is the smattering throughout the years. And then the West coast is purple. So, in this last year you had almost the majority from the West coast for dolphinfish on the left.

12 13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

So that's how you can kind of look at this. So, this would theoretically tell you if the majority were coming from one coast, it should be very easy to see or if there was a shift in time. You can kind of see a shift in time for the wahoo on the right. All of a sudden after, like starting in 2004, the West coast has a majority of the landing. So, these are somethings that the IPT will look into, and it will help us describe the fisheries. It might not be as applicable to setting some of these management reference points, but it will be helpful, and it would be included in the amendment.

23 24 25

Next slide.

26 27

So, for the mackerels you can see a pretty, not exactly even distribution by coast, but it's caught on every coast, every year. That fluctuates slightly, but not a giant trend anywhere.

29 30

28

Next slide.

31 32 33

34

35

36

37

And then for the tunas, it's a different story. You can see that almost all are caught from the West coast, which again, is that purple color. For little tunny, there's a little bit more, maybe about a third, it's caught from the North coast. So, again just interesting information that we will take back to the IPT and help describe the fisheries.

38 39

Next slide.

40 41 42

43

44

48

What might be more helpful for today's discussion is what proportion of the landings occur in state versus federal waters. So, here are the dolphin and wahoo for Puerto Rico. We did have to truncate the data slightly just because the data field that 45 included the location of state versus federal was less reliable 46 47 before 2012. So, this is just the last few years, but you can kind of get a feel that about half in state waters, half in federal

waters for dolphin and wahoo in Puerto Rico. And what is kind of encouraging to see is that the purple, which is that unknown area, does generally get reduced as we go forward in time. So, reporting is getting more informational for these species.

4 5 6

Next slide.

7

8 We were able to do something similar for the recreational landings' 9 information. So, same species for Puerto Rico in the recreational 10 landings. You can see almost 50/50 there, maybe a little bit more 11 in the federal waters for dolphin and Wahoo.

12

13 Next slide.

14

15 For the mackerel and the commercial landing, you can see the 16 majority, for most of the years, came from state waters. And then 17 in the last year, the majority were reported in the federal.

18

19 Next slide.

20

21 And that's kind of reflective here too. In the recreational 22 landings where the majority of the macros are reported in state 23 waters.

24

25 Next slide.

26

27 For the tunas it's not as easy of a trend to pick out, but it does look like the majority kind of occur from state waters.

29

30 Next line.

31

And of course, that is also reflected in the recreational landings where you could see more green than blue. Green being the state waters. Blackfin tuna is not as clear cut, but it might be, you know, at least half the landings reported from state waters.

36 37

Next slide.

38

For Saint Thomas and Saint John, it's easy to see that the majority of dolphin and wahoo come from federal waters.

41

42 Next slide.

43

- And then same for Saint Croix. Most are coming from federal waters, although you do have an interesting peak there for wahoo in the state, which I'm sure the IPT's going to want to know more about that. So, if anybody has any information on what might have been
- 48 going on there, I'd love to hear it.

Next slide. We also wanted, really quickly, to try to see if we could answer the question of what gear are being used to harvest these species.

Next slide.

So, instead of a graph, you get a table. and it did put in bold, the majority. So, these are percentages now. So, for instance—and you can see across the table the species. So, for instance, for dolphinfish in Puerto Rico, in the commercial landings, the majority are caught or reported with trawl line gear. The same for wahoo and blackfin tuna and little tunny. The cero and king mackerel, the majority of those landings during the historical time period were reported by bottom line. And I will point out that this is a, like I said, a 32-year data set. So, these are just all the gear types reported during that time. It might not be reflective of what's actually going on in the fishery now, but it's our starting point. And so, we want to just refine, refine, refine as we develop this amendment.

Um, next slide.

I will point out too that the recreational landings data that was available doesn't have information by gear, as far as I know, so those aren't included.

For Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix on this slide, Saint Thomas, Saint John's on the left and Saint Croix is on the right. You can see that dolphin and wahoo in Saint Thomas are mostly caught by line fishing. And then in Saint Croix, dolphin by line fishing and wahoo by handline. And this matches, you know, preliminary— all of these tables match preliminary information that was reported by the stakeholders that we asked.

Next slide.

So, now we're to today's discussion, and I won't be asking for any motions, but we're going to see tables that include the options that were included in the August paper and presentation that you saw. So, there's no new numbers, but it is just a summary of those options. And so, where there may be a hole or a gap or anything that you might want to add to, to help refine the scope of the management measures that could be included, that's where we're going to ask for help.

So, next slide should be the Puerto Rico.

Yeah. So, again, this first column of potential action—this is just a suggestion—they're kind of split out by species initially, but then the tunas are lumped together since they're managed in a stock complex and the mackerels are grouped as a potential action. So, all of these would be under the Puerto Rico section of the amendment. And so, you can see all of the numbers that were put into the options paper shown in August. For instance, the rec bag limit was 10 dolphin per person per day, or 30 dolphins per vessel per day and that would match what's in the regulations for DNER currently. And then there was also a potential suggestion of five dolphin per person per day, or 15 per vessel per day. And that was recommended by the Puerto Rico DAP and presented to the Council.

4 5

So, both of those were included in that August options paper. And here today, if those both look good to you, the IPT will continue to develop and analyze those. But if there was something additional that you wanted to see, that's where we could help fill in this table.

So, the commercial trip limit, the options paper just had, under that management measure, had the average pounds reported by trip. And so, for instance, for dolphin it was 67.3 pounds. So, for this, for today, we just rounded up just to make it an even number. But again, that's something that you could refine as you wanted. Otherwise, the IPT is just going to ingest all of this information and data and then come to you with what the recommended alternatives based on what we found are. So, again, if you want to refine anything, today would be great.

And then you can see that for minimum size limit, there's holes. So, there was nothing currently in place in state waters. So, there's nothing to be compatible with. The options paper recommended that you could do it based on life history information or by any other information like the trip intercept size limit data. We, we haven't analyzed that yet. So there, there might be com something that comes out of that.

I will point out that the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council has a 20-inch size limit, minimum size limit for dolphin. And so, that's what the SA means here. And then, there there's information and considerations if anybody knows what the rationale for that 10/30 bag limit that DNER has, we could discuss that and see if that's applicable to what we would like to do.

And then another consideration would be the Puerto Rico dolphinfish complex includes pompano dolphin, but if you're setting size limits, do you want the same size limit for that species, which generally is smaller. So, that's a consideration for that one.

Wahoo. You can see there, there's not a lot of information that was included in that options paper. The South Atlantic has a two wahoo per person per day limit. Would you want to do something similar to that? Would you want something new? There are no size limits anywhere to be compatible with or to help us consider. So, is there anything that you know of for Puerto Rico? There is a combined bag limit for wahoo and the mackerel for the state waters in Puerto Rico, they lumped those together. Is that something that you would want to consider? Would you want to keep them separate? And then similarly, the South Atlantic has a combined dolphin and wahoo bag limit. Is that something you would want to consider?

4 5

Again, if not the, IPTs going to look at all of the landing's information like what I showed on the previous slides, and kind of make those decisions based on what they think is best either by gear use or by landings information. We haven't looked at what species are caught together, but pretty much from what I've heard everybody says everything is caught with everything, so we'll see if we can refine a little bit more in the data. But you can already see from the seasonality, sometimes it might not make sense to have two managed together.

And then for both the tunas and the mackerel, I'd like to just remind you that most of those landings were from state waters, from what we saw. So, our recreational or commercial trip limits, is that something you would like to develop since most are reported from those areas? You could obviously continue developing size limits to protect the species that are being caught in your waters. But, you know, again, if you want to refine the scope, meaning the list of species that you requested staff include in the amendment, you could do that here.

Next slide.

This is a similar table for Saint Thomas and Saint John. There are only two species, so it's a little bit easier. there were bag limits, trip limits and size limits included in the options paper, which are here on the slide. A lot of that information was recommended to the Council in 2019 by the Saint Thomas/Saint John Fishery Advisory Committee. And so, those were put in the table and are shown again here. From what I got from the Saint Thomas/Saint John Chair, DAP Chair, these size limits are still recommended by the FAC. But again, if there's any new information or you would like to see a different range of size limits or bag limits considered, we could add those to the table.

And then I would like to point out that the U.S.V.I. is going to put into place, or has already, a combined bag limit of dolphin

and wahoo, and you can see that over in the side. And that's going to be applicable for both Saint Thomas, Saint John and for Saint Croix. So, that would be setting a bag limit for both species together, which the Council could do if you'd like to.

Um, next slide.

Saint Croix, you can see there wasn't as much information included in the option paper, so this table looks very empty. And so, again, if we could get any kind of additional just guidance on things that you would like to see for these management measures. I will point out that the item there in red for the size limit was a size limit that came in before or after this presentation was completed by a Saint Croix stakeholder. And it was a recommendation for a minimum size limit for dolphin of 32 inches.

Next slide and this is my last slide.

So, the next steps for today, again, provide any additional guidance to help us refine these management options that are going to be developed into the draft amendment. The staff and the IPT will continue data mining exercises to try to answer those questions posed by the IPT and that, again, will help us describe the fisheries and could potentially help develop the action alternatives. The hope is that the IPT would have enough information to populate the background information and the actions and alternatives, parts of the amendment, and bring those back to the Council for consideration at the April meeting.

And with that, I'll take any questions.

#### Discussion

MARCOS HANKE: Sarah, I have a whole list of things that— this is a long conversation. With this in mind, can you go to page six, the question list that you have there?

SARAH STEPHENSON: This is Sarah. So, that's slide six.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And my recommendation and I want to hear about it on the Council, this is all the feedback, the whole list of feedback that you are asking, and also you address some of them that are more urgent and that we need to address quicker and so on, to make the work go on, right?

My recommendation and request to the Council, do you think is a good idea, I would love to do this, to send those questions to each of the Council and the DAPs for you guys to answer? If you

don't have an answer, just say, I don't have an opinion about it. And then, we'll try to help Sarah and María and all have this feedback as soon as possible because we don't have time on the meeting to address all those questions. Does that sound like a plan for you on the first step?

4 5

SARAH STEPHENSON: This is Sarah. I don't know if we can do that officially because of the paperwork reduction acts. We can't send a list of questions to be outside of a public meeting. So, what I would maybe ask is that if there's anything that you want to think on, on these questions and then come back at the next Council meeting and say, "We discussed with our fishermen and we would like to recommend this." That way it's done during a public meeting as opposed to going back to your constituents and then emailing me the answers.

## MARCOS HANKE: Miquel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, I was thinking about the same thing because we have the lawyer here keeping an eye on us whenever we have a question mark at the end of any sentence. But we can use this as guidance. Actually, if you drop the question then the Council members, the staff can use that as a quideline for preparation to discuss this at the April meeting. But be between here and April, if you have any thoughts about any of these topics, you can send it to Sarah and María, so that they can start incorporating these topics, this experience that you have with the dolphin. And Marco said something, maybe you don't have anything to say on this one, that's fine too, but maybe you have information that you can

that you know, to provide to Sarah.

In addition, the working group— I like the name ——Flying Fish Dolphin Wahoo Working Group is going to meet in February or March, and each country is supposed to prepare the status of the fishery, dolphin and wahoo especially, whenever the topic on the agenda comes up. That's why Laura Cimo is here somewhere virtually. Laura is with the Office of International Affairs, Trade and Commerce and María del Mar represents the Regional Office here at those meetings. So, I spoke also to Wes, so we have two invitations to make, just for the record. But anyway, Sarah and María, they can coordinate the presentation to the status of the dolphin and wahoo in the U.S. Caribbean.

provide at this time from your fishers, from the group of people

We will knock on the door also of the South Atlantic and the Gulf, where they also have these little species and that could be part

of the presentation of the U.S. delegation. In addition, I have Wes Merten, you know, he's the scientist chasing dolphinfish all around the world, and he has collected a lot of good practices that we can also present at the working group.

The meeting probably will be held in Puerto Rico because the Council is, with the logistics and everything, so it will be easier for us. I will have Graciela at that meeting, maybe Liajay as a fly on the wall, just to hear what they have to say. But also, yeah, because when you go to those meetings in the delegation, you have to be mindful of who can talk and who cannot. Usually, I see that at the outside. And anyway, the Chairman also will be present at that meeting.

So, in summary, I encourage the Chairs of the DAPs consult with the Council members around about these topics and come prepare to discuss at the next meeting. When you see on the agenda "Dolphin issues" this is what we're talking. You know, it doesn't mean that we are going to talk about only problems of the dolphin, what have you. Dolphin issues, what are the things that can be considered? For example, in some other countries they already have management plans for dolphin because dolphin is mostly caught by commercial fishers, not recreational. In this side of the world, recreational fishers are the ones who really have been historically after the dolphin, the dolphinfish. The wahoo, in many countries, is just a recreational fishery species, in others is also part of the commercial fisheries. Some of the things that they're discussing is to adopt what other countries have been doing, which is the hook that you use to cash the dolphin will allow you to throw the dolphin back into the water when is not the size limit that has been approved in the particular country with minimum probabilities of damage to the fish. That's a common practice. Seasonality, they close the season or part of the season sometimes.

The two species, if you have a size limit here and you cannot tell one from the other when they are the same size, then we have a problem with size limits. And the information comes from the fishers who really know the fishery. When I want to know whether that fish is good or not, or whether the species, I asked Marcos. And now I have James to consult with about any doubts that we have. So, it is important for you to, please, if you have information about the two dolphin species send it to Sarah. If you have anything to say regarding any of these topics, please let us know.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay, thank you, Miguel. I just want to follow up because— I'll go with you, Vanessa, in one second. —when I mentioned that, I didn't mean to have a communication internally, not publicly. What I want them is to analyze, have this and on the

next meeting to come up with the public discussion about it. Because I don't want anything to be lost that is needed to do this right. Right? That's my intention behind this. And thank you for the clarification. And I have a whole list here that I'm going to let the Councils address. I'm going to go-- Do you want to go now, Clay, to the point? And then Vanessa.

CLAY PORCH: Sure. So, obviously this is, you know, especially dolphinfish, wahoo, little tunny, it's a kind of a case with the Council of a square peg trying to get in a round hole, right? In terms of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and how the Council can act. Because you're not dealing with the unit stock. Really this should be managed to an international body. Let's face it, you know, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are catching a very tiny fraction of a much larger stock, and it's just moving through the area, and you peel off a little piece.

So, the question here is, how do you best utilize that fraction of the population that's coming through your waters here? And in that case, things like sustainable yield and all are kind of irrelevant, right? Because there's not a particular sustainable yield, it's just what fraction of the population happens to come in your waters. So, we can't really advise you very well on things like that. What we can do is shift a conversation to, what's the best way to utilize the fish that are coming into your waters? And to that end, as someone mentioned, the South Atlantic Council has been struggling with their own dolphin wahoo FMP for quite some time. And where the discussion is kind of shifted, is towards a management strategy, evaluation approach that involves stakeholder workshops to better define what the goals really are. So, it's along the lines of some of the questions that are being asked here.

For instance, the big issue with dolphin wahoo on the U.S. East Coast is that you have a, you said an ACL, but the fish are coming in one area before another area, and sometimes that ACL gets all caught up when the fisher say in the keys or when they're in North Carolina or something and so, there's a big allocation issue. And I think those sorts of things could be worked out through a management procedure that looks at, for instance, catch rates of particular fisheries when the fish are coming into an area. If the catch rates are really high, it implies that there's a large number of fish moving in and you could set your harvest rates, your ACLs, based on what your anticipated influx of fishes and make sure that all the fisheries in different places will still get they're fair piece of the pie, if that makes sense. So, I think that would be a way to go in the future and it would start with the whole series of stakeholder workshops like are going on in the South Atlantic jurisdiction now.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Clay. I have a question, Will this be a flexible approach in terms of the projection, what amount of fish are arriving each year?

CLAY PORCH: Yeah, exactly. So, the problem here would be getting consistent catch per unit effort data. In the South Atlantic they're looking at things like the long line fishery because it has a pretty broad coverage. So, if you're seeing high catch per unit effort in a particular area, it would help you decide how many fish you might want to take in that area to make sure there's still going to be fish in other areas as they move up the coast. And you could probably do something like that here.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. The dynamic in the island is a little different than that because we have seasonality on the-traditionally, because everything is messed up with sargasso arrival now. But traditionally we have one defined season on the North and one defined season on the South from different size fish and different, traditionally. different methods of fishing for Puerto Rico.

But we can talk about that later. Vanessa. And I have a whole list here, Sarah. All I want is for you to get the best information from this meeting. And later on, please guide us with questions of things on the order you need. Go to a specific question, they're going to help you to keep building and forming the document. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. Of course, we're going to be working with all these questions that you have, and I know that Nelson also and the DAP can have all those answers for the next meeting. But I want to make a point clear for the record--

PA SYSTEM: May I have your attention, please. May I have your attention, please. An ALARM has been reported in the building. Please--

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Can I continue, or do we have to go out? Okay. So, all the data that was presented here was practically up to 2018-19, and we have a big issue with a commercial license that between 2019 up to now, there's a big difference of 2000 more commercial fishermen.

PA SYSTEM: May I have your attention please? May I have your attention please? The cause of the alarm has been determined to be

a false alarm. No evacuation is required. Please resume normal activities. Thank you for your cooperation.

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah, you have my attention. [laughter] Vanessa, please. I have my attention to you now.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez again, for the record. So, I know that most of those commercial fishermen that are new are practically recreational fishermen that are now in the commercial sector. Some of them just lost their jobs and then decide to go fishing but most of them, the target is these kinds of pelagics that we're talking about. So, I will make my research, of course, to try to bring the reality of the numbers.

 The other point that I want to put is that in the table that you have that more of the, was the state, the one that refers, is because most of the commercial fishermen, when they have to put the record in the report, most of them don't have the permit to be in federal waters. So, they always put that they are inside the nine miles. It's just practically they do it for that. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Sarah.

SARAH STEPHENSON: This is Sarah. So, that gets to one of the questions that I would like to know today. For Puerto Rico, the species and the stocks that you that you identified at the August meeting, are those ones that you would still like to see in the amendment? So, for Puerto Rico dolphin, pompano dolphin, wahoo, blackfin tuna, little tunny, cero mackerel and king mackerel, all of those continue—

MARCOS HANKE: Barracuda?

SARAH STEPHENSON: No. Well, you did not select barracuda.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. The question, my opinion-- this is Marcos -- is yes. The rest of the Council, do you have any different opinion than that? We are talking about Puerto Rico, correct? Yes.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Just for the record, Vanessa Ramírez. Yes, those are the species that we are looking for. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay, anybody else who would like to comment? We are talking about Puerto Rico right now. Nelson.

**NELSON CRESPO:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelson Crespo, for the record. Can you please go to slide 33? Can you explain for me from where does that number come from, for the commercial sector?

SARAH STEPHENSON: Yes, this is Sarah. So, what we did, for the document that was shown in August, is we looked at all of the trips that were reported for Puerto Rico during that time period. What was the average amount of dolphin or wahoo reported on each trip? And so, for dolphin, it was 67.3 pounds of dolphin are reported--and this is adjusted pounds -- are reported for every commercial trip. So, this was just a starting point that if you round up from there and say a hundred pounds-- I do remember that you put on the record at that meeting that sometimes you catch a hundred pounds in a trip. Sometimes you catch a thousand pounds. So, this would be a good point for you to come and say, "Those are way too low for a commercial trip limit. You should do a thousand pounds, 5,000 pounds." That's where we would want stakeholder input onto what is an actual valuable number that should be considered. Otherwise, the IPT is just going to look at the data and the information and potentially look at what might be harvested in other regions and base it on that. But it would be much more beneficial to base it

And I would like to just point out that Graciela is the co-lead on this amendment, so if you want to send questions or information, send it to both of us. And then also, this presentation will be up on the Council's website, but if you'd like me to email it to you, I'll do that as well. So, you don't have to take screenshots.

NELSON CRESPO: Can I do a follow up?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

on your recommendations.

NELSON CRESPO: Yeah. Okay. No, because those numbers— Nelson Crespo, for the record — are, you know, really low. And also, for the dolphin and the wahoo, I think that it's better to maintain apart. Because it is true that sometimes, when we got the sargassum season, we catch the wahoo and the dolphin together, in the West coast we have a huge wahoo season that we catch apart, alone, and it's a big resource and a big marker for the commercial fishers.

MARCOS HANKE: I want to add to that. We are talking about, I'm going to try to make that apply to the rest of the island too. You have basically three ways to fish for mahi. I'm trying to just—in order to illustrate. You have the [inaudible] line fishery that catches about every size but medium to smaller fish. And we have, on the South coast, frigatebirds fishery that address bigger mahi's in general. Fishing with birds. Then you have drop off fishing for wahoo that addresses larger animals. This is what they are targeting and looking, wahoo's over, normally, over 20 pounds. This is where you catch the very large wahoos, but the smaller

wahoos are mixed on the two other fishing that I expressed there. One thing that I think will be super unfair—following up on Nelson—is that, right now, the commercial fishermen that do during the season wahoo fishing and go and catch 5, 6, 7 wahoos of 40 pounds, that's not totally uncommon, especially with the techniques now, those numbers will not allow them to do it. We need to be very mindful of that, otherwise, we cut ill from any possibility of access to a sustainable fisher that are catching adult fish on a season. Do you agree, Nelson? Okay.

4 5

And I want to-- maybe if I go through all the points that I have here it's going to be a good guidance for the rest of the group to help you out. About the seasonality, is super important -- I'm going to repeat --everything changed in terms of mahi because of sargassum. We have, pretty much, sargassum all year round now and it's unpredictable when we are going to have a wave of sargassum arriving with mahi, most of them smaller size. Right? And this is also part of the explanation. In Florida, they are asking, "Oh, what is happening with the bigger mahi?" What happened is when you're fishing for birds and fishing for the larger mahi, you cannot fish for them and chase because the bait is always getting tangled and dirty with the sargassum and people don't spend the effort, reduce the effort, on looking for that kind of fishery like they did on the past. Right? And there are many effects about the arrival. You have more mahi coming, but it changed the way you fish and changed the size of the catch too as a consequence of that.

Dolphin issue. Misinformation across all regions and there is a discussion about the influence of the Caribbean on the size of the dolphin caught in Florida, because the bigger dolphin disappeared. There are articles on every magazine. The reality is that we have, mainly, a big chunk of the fishery is recreational here in the Caribbean. Some commercial fishermen fish for them, mostly seasonal and in an artisanal way. There is very limited, actually one boat or so, that don't fish all the time but that target tunas and swordfish locally, that don't target mahi. They just catch with larger hooks and most of the mahis that they catch, incidentally, are larger animals. They are not the smaller dolphins.

The different seasonality on the North and the South coast is super important to take in consideration. I spoke to a fisherman on the South of Puerto Rico and asked-- because of the discussion on the East coast of the U.S. --are you seeing less bigger dolphin and whatever? And he shared what I'm sharing with you, the fact of sargassum. Over time he's seen the bigger man available, but short, more compressed into the peak of the season but they are still

there. Between us, we talked about other factors that are affecting that resource. I'm sorry to elaborate, but I think it's important. We have shallow water. Granada and other islands up current of us, that fish with shallow sets on small longliners happening and developing, also in Venezuela. Those guys do catch a lot of wahoos and mahi on larger sizes that are part of the fish that arrive to us, especially in the South coast. And we have a FAD fishery being developed on D.R. that also is in place. If you look to when people started complaining about the disappearing of the mahi it has some relation with the timing of when the FAD fishery explode in D.R. It's important to take that into account.

4 5

In Puerto Rico, we have FAD fishery now. It is installed by the government. It's not a private entity that is doing that and we need take that into consideration about pelagics because the availability of— all the species that we are talking about are going to be different because of the FAD fishery that we have now. That includes also HMS species.

Fish Aggregator Device. FAD fishery is fish aggregator devices related activity. And one thing is, just to understand, don't think that I go to the FAD, and I catch all these specie; is that, as a fisherman, I am going to have an incentive to go to the FAD to fish for mahi, wahoo and tuna, but on the way, I'm going to catch all the species that we are talking about. There is an indirect effect that is going to result into a different catch composition and effort.

Okay? State versus federal water. Very important is the scale, how do you present that question for them to answer correctly to you? Because it's different on the South coast than on the North coast. There are platforms that are closer, like in Yabucoa, half mile from the shore versus a little farther on the South coast that is 12 miles out. That judgment of where the fishery happening, if it's happening in federal or state water, then will change by that topographic feature around the island.

I'm going to lose air, but I'm going to keep going.

Okay. The gears used are hook and line that are divided and hand line, rod and reel, electric reels, bandit reels, yo-yo gears. Yo-yo gear is like a little buoy that is used in the V.I. for tunas, but they have the capability of catching on the deployment and hauling mahi with that. That's why I included that. And we have, which is not prohibit, the presence of a longliner in Puerto Rico and you have to include it on the gear because it's an authorized method of fishing that has the potential of catching those guys, and they do it incidentally. We also have spearfishing. If I'm

missing anything, Nelson and the rest, please help me out if I'm missing any gear for the pelagics.

Already Nelson, address, especially for the commercial, the number of pounds allowable per trip. We need to be very careful on that in terms of the recs. If we are going to follow the route of bag limits, for recs is more appropriate, the bag limit, the unit of fish being counted versus poundage too. Now, about size limit, we already discussed very extensively the size limit. I was talking to Miguel, we have two species, the main species here is hippurus, the dolphin that grows bigger. Okay? The 24 inches applies to both species, which means, we are not preventing from catching all the two species of dolphin. Maybe we're leaving a little ill on the species that grow less, that don't grow as much, but still have access to do it but they are not as predominant in our fishery. It happens, but it's not as important based on my experience.

And the other thing that I talked to Nelson, and the record is clear, is that we want the dolphin to be a fillet fish. We don't want the dolphin—if your recommendation that we did on a past, which was 24 inches,—the dolphin to be used as a deep-fried fish on a skillet and start to catch little fish. And even worse to avoid the development of that market and the people to target really small mahis and impact the population in a way. And if you develop that fishery for little mahis, you are going to affect other fisheries that fish for whole plate or the whole fish on the plate. There is a rationale behind it, the size limit that we need to keep discussing. The number is 24 inches, it is actually compatible with the recommendations that Julian just showed me for the Saint Thomas. This is a fork length measurement; it's not a total length measurement.

Okay. I'm just finishing, and I will answer the virtual. And I have a question that I received virtually too. I see there that you have on your presentation, recommendations from the group of fishermen from the U.S.V.I., similar to our Junta de Secretaria (Asesora de Pesca), FAC or whatever, in some part of your recommendations. I'm interested to know why the-- Fisheries Advisory Committee from the V.I. --why the Junta Asesora de Pesca discussions and recommendations are not included. Maybe we can facilitate those rationales and those discussions that we had on the past coordinated with the DNR for you to have the benefit of that.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos, la junta se llama Junta de Pesca.

MARCOS HANKE: La Junta de Pesca de Puerto Rico. Those are my points and I want to-- before I go with you --I want to answer the question on the virtual meeting.

CRISTINA OLÁN: We have Yamitza Rodríguez waiting for a turn to speak. Please, please.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Yamitza, for being available.

CRISTINA OLÁN: Yamitza, you are muted.

MARCOS HANKE: Junta Asesora de Pesca is the right name for the body for Puerto Rico and we can keep the communication and trying to include those feedback from the Junta to you.

CRISTINA OLÁN: Also, we have comments in the chat.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Julian, I go with you. I want to make sure the virtual people can address the Council and then I'll go back to you. Okay. Go ahead. Yes.

CRISTINA OLÁN: Okay. We have a comment from Ricardo Lugo. "Just a comment, the size of the bait will have an impact on the size of the dolphin because, in many cases, it swallows the whole bait. This mean that undersized fish will be returned with no probability of survival.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And we can discuss the details with Ricardo, which is an excellent fisherman. And the reality is, Ricardo, that we are looking still— there is a cultural aspect of looking for larger mahi, rigging bigger ballyhoo and so on. We are not— and I don't want to do it publicly because I don't want to incentivize the fishery of a small mahi, but there are other ways to approach the fishery that I don't think is appropriate for our area and for the Council to promote. And at least not to consider once we advise anything about mahi.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos, just for the record, be careful what you say on the record because what we're talking about is an option paper that you put together or ask the staff to put together. We are not really taking decisions or making a decision as to one way or the other. It's just that we have provided information so the staff can come back at the April meeting, maybe at the August meeting with more information, better information. But at this time, we don't have any preconceived preferred alternatives or any preconceived idea of what we are going to do. The other thing is that with Covid, we forgot about public hearings. Remember when we have this, this will be discussed at the level of the DAPs, Puerto

Rico, Saint Croix, Virgin Islands. We'll have workshops. We also will have public hearings once the documents, the appropriate documents, are prepared.

So, in 2023, this is one topic, hot topic, that we are going to be pursuing. But what Marcos is trying, not trying, he's doing here, is to provide a framework of ideas. A framework of topics that people, especially Council members can address and bring back to the meeting in April. Also, the three Chairs here, you have an abundance of knowledge, and you also have the presence of your DAP members, virtual or not, and we are going to have those topics included in the first meetings of 2023.

MARCOS HANKE: Julian, go ahead.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Julian Magras, for the record. I think Miguel just summed it all up. Because what I was going to say-- I'm not going to speak about anything here that's up here right now. The only comment I would make is that the FAC information that is there was from back in 2019. So, I haven't had any recent discussions with the new FAC, but I would like to have a discussion with them and these slides to see if there are any changes or any regulations that they're looking to promote or move forward. And most importantly to get this to the DAPs. But when this is brought to the DAPs, we need to ensure that when this is on the agenda that we invite the fishers that fish this type of fishery. Because under the DAP, we only have one real fisher that fishes for the pelagics, even though he's one of the biggest guys, but we need to include like the Game Fishing Club and people, members from those different areas to ensure that when we present back to the Council that we have closed the loop. That's the most important thing. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Julian. Sarah, I have a question too. It's not a comment it's, you talk about dolphin being the indicator. I'm concerned because we don't have recreational, very good recreational data and dolphin is one of the most desired and targeted species by the recs. How are we going to address that using dolphin indicator while not having that data available?

SARAH STEPHENSON: This is Sarah. So, if you remember, there were ACLs for both the commercial and the recreational. And so, the dolphinfish stock complex ACL, for both sectors, was just developed based on landings solely of dolphin, as opposed to dolphin and pompano. Like your mackerel, the landings of those two species were added together and that's how the ACLs were developed. So, what's going to happen in lack of recreational landings information is the ACL for the Dolphinfish Stock Complex, which was based on

just landings of dolphin, is going to be the ACL that we will compare landings to every year.

 So, it shouldn't really affect the management of the stock, with the exception that you won't have the benefit of the total landings like you would if you had both sectors. If we had information from both sectors, then we would get the commercial landings for dolphin and the recreational landings for dolphin, we would see if either of those sectors exceeded their sector ACL and then also if the combined landings exceeded the combined ACL. And so, that's how the AM was developed. But in lack of the recreational, we will only be comparing the commercial to the commercial.

Now, if you thought you had a lot of landings of pompano dolphin and you wanted to reconstruct how that ACL is set up for the stock complex, you could send it back to the SSC and as a Council you could determine if you wanted to revisit having dolphin as the indicator for that stock complex.

MARCOS HANKE: My comment is much more simple than that. You're going to have a number for combined dolphins. Right? The majority of people don't identify them well, and for them it's the same as just a chicken dolphin. Chicken dolphins are all the same. Okay? My point is that we are going to be missing the total—this is a historical happening, it's not now —we are going to be missing information on what is really going on if we just go with the commercial landings, because that's not the bigger chunk of the dolphin removal. This is the part that I don't know how we're going to address. I don't think it's easy, but we need to be mindful about it. Graciela.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos, before Graciela. Let's not confuse the management measure with the art of data collection. Okay? If you have a management measure— and by the way, Clay mentioned this before. I've been saying this for the last 40 years. —you are not managing the stock, what you're really managing is allocation because in order to manage the stock, you have to go all around the area where those animals occur.

And also, we have the same problem at an international level because we have what we call the gauntlet fishery. The gauntlet fishery is every country grab whatever they can. They don't care about the country before or after them. They just grab whatever they can. If we don't have a concerted effort to manage those species, like the dolphin for example and some other pelagics, in a concerted manner, where every country understands the dynamics of the dolphinfish and then apply appropriate measures for

collecting data and distributing data and management there is very little you can do with the animal.

In the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, what we have done is that we are using really the commercial landings like a litmus paper. We don't know what is happening with the recreational. We know it's a lot, but we don't know. Even the fishery that we call commercial is also kind of fussy because of the reporting factor that we have here. And then, on top of that, what Marcos is saying, the chicken dolphin is any dolphin that is about this size, could be one species or the other. And those are the kind of things that you have to discuss probably at the premeeting. And if we don't have that information think about ways of collecting information.

Clay mention, for example, we can have workshop with the fishers and collect that information. And the fishers that count in terms of the information that you want. So, what Julian is saying, out of the 20 or so DAP members there are one or two who actually fish for dolphin. Around the table here, our Chairman fish for dolphin. So, when he talks about dolphin, he knows what he's talking about. And those are the kind of information that we need.

We also mentioned about anecdotal information, translat that into science. Anecdotal information translated into science is nothing but hearing what the fisherman has to say, the ones that have the experience, and see if that make any sense in terms of the formulas and applications that you have from the scientific point of view.

The other question I have for María and Sarah is, where are we in terms of the schedule of preparing this? And by the way, remember that we have the three island-based FMPs approved, so what is necessary, something that we need to adopt for Puerto Rico may change for Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix.

So, Sarah and María, where are we in terms of the schedule for the Council actions based on the work that is needed to be done and what you have done already?

 SARAH STEPHENSON: This is Sarah. I'll take a first stab and then pass it to María. So, we've only had one IPT meeting. They obviously had a long list of questions that they would like to know the answers to. So, I would say we're kind of at the beginning of this.

It's very important. We want to make sure we get it right. We obviously would like to have opportunities to speak to not only the DAPs but the fishers, so I would say very preliminary.

Obviously, we do want to make sure we get it in place, so that we are protecting, especially in light of the lack of recreational information. But we're very preliminary at the beginning. María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yeah. Thank you, Sarah. This is María. So, with all this discussion, I was kind of thinking that, you know, the complexity of the process in Puerto Rico, because of all the pelagic species that they have, seems to be a little more than for the other islands. So, I was kind of wondering, if it could be explored, maybe dividing this. Like if there's an urgency to have-you know, like, if the Puerto Rico one is going to take a little bit more time than doing something for Saint Thomas and Saint John or Saint Croix, like, if there was a possibility perhaps of doing it separate, because we have different FMP.

So, I mean, unless, because you know, like maybe Puer-- So, Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix, they're only managing two species and assuming that they could just-- those two species will be a kind of easier, perhaps, to get everybody on the same page as to where they would move forward. So, that could be a possibility. That could be explored because we're very, very early in the process.

And then separate a little bit the processes for, like, if you're going to do scoping hearings or public hearings or DAP meetings, etcetera, maybe that will benefit from that. This is just a suggestion for the Council to consider.

MARCOS HANKE: Miquel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Well, that was the suggestion I had in my head. So, I'm glad that you said it, not me. I believe that we might be ready to move forward, faster, with Saint Thomas and Saint John, for example. As what Julian was saying, you know. We can have a virtual meeting of the DAP, at a particular point in time, where we will be able to discuss this. Anyway, so, we can have Sarah Graciela, María, James, and anybody that you recommend, Julian, from your group, the DAP, in addition to fishers that you may recognize as knowledgeable about the dolphin, wahoo situation, experienced, not necessarily members of the DAP so we can invite them. And then when we have the physical meeting, we can revisit that meeting. But I believe between here and April, although April looks far away for IRS purposes is too close. April 15 is close, for me at least. So, we need to plan ahead. Then we can have a virtual meeting, I can coordinate with Julian, Sarah, and María, and see what is the best appropriate. And so, we have one topic regarding this, so we can advance that.

 The same with Saint Croix. In the case of Saint Croix, what is the situation with Saint Croix? And there, I will recruit Carlos Farchette as a Council member. The same thing, you can work with the Saint Thomas/Saint John. In the case of Puerto Rico, of course, Vanessa and Marco have to be included there. And then, we have to look at the things that we need. The gaps that we have in the case of Puerto Rico. The complexity that we have there. We can use the Virgin Islands as an example to follow in terms of the dolphin and the wahoo so that we don't have to reinvent the wheel.

4 5

In the case of the international, we need that for yesterday. But the thing that we can say is that the U.S. Delegation can just give an update of where we are with the dolphin wahoo. The South Atlantic has a lot of experience working with that. They have a plan. The Gulf is on and off. But I will leave that to the discretion of the Regional Office as to how they can interact. Larua Cimo has been contacting them and the two other Councils are interested in participating as much as possible.

The last part I was going to say, long ago, the three Councils Gulf, South Atlantic and the Caribbean we tried to have a common management plan for the three areas. It resulted, at that time, we were ahead of our time because of the complexities of it. The priorities, for example, dolphin wahoo might be a priority here, not necessarily for the Gulf. They have other species there. Bigger, you know, other states, etcetera.

So, in summary, Mr. Vice Chairman, the staff will coordinate with the Julian, Nelson and Eddie to see the best time for a meeting that we can address this particular issue. Now that we have virtual meeting is easier to address one topic one day. So, we can get that out of the way in terms of collecting the information that we need.

Yeah. Jack. And I need to keep moving along, but we have good news for you in a moment.

JOHN MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Jack McGovern. I think the suggestion María has made is a good one where we could just move forward with a separate amendment. I don't know if you're thinking for both Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix, just doing one amendment for that, for the two pelagic species there. I think that would be pretty easy to do is just two species and then just have Puerto Rico as another amendment that would be further developed. If you want to do that.

And I guess the next step here is to go to the DAPs and gather information. The presentation that Sarah has made is on the

Council's website or will be on the Council's website. So, everybody can see all those questions and the DAPs can see those questions and they can answer them.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Jack, do we need a motion for that?

JOHN MCGOVERN: I don't know if you need a motion. I think just guidance to staff is good.

MARCOS HANKE: Clay. And just before the break, I have somebody that wants to engage into the conversation in a moment. Go ahead.

CLAY PORCH: All right. Thank you. I just had a question regarding process because I see SYLs, ABCs, ACL, and ACT in there and I guess the SYL and ABC might have come from an application of the SSC's ABC control rule, but I don't think the SSC has looked at any of this.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: They provided this. Sorry, Graciela, for the record. They provided the ABCs to the Council before the island-based FMPs were put in place. They were just approved October this year. So, they've been involved in the process of the ABC control rule and providing the ABC—

CLAY PORCH: Just not having a formal discussion about it?

**GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER:** Through all of the SSC meetings that they hosted before that came into the island-based FMP? Yes.

CLAY PORCH: Oh, so, going back pretty far.

**GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER:** So, this is, yeah, the data for this was to 2016, and that's what they've seen. We haven't brought this back to the SSC recently.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Graciela. Sarah, I just alluded to the need for recreational data, and you have the benefit. I really thank you Griselle. She's present. She's the DNR personnel that deals with recreational fishery for a long time, and I want her to say something to the group and to put you guys in contact because this coordination is super, important.

GRISEL RODRÍGUEZ-FERRER: Good morning, everybody. My name is Grisel Rodríguez-Ferrer, and we've been working with Recreational Fisheries for the past 22 years. So, mainly we do the interviews and also, we go to the tournaments. I saw in the list that you have first the pompano dolphin added up with mahi. In 22 years, we have only two individuals of pompano dolphins that we have seen,

Id and we even did the barcoding on them for Puerto Rico on the North Coast. So, regarding recreational, is not common to see pompano dolphin. We do have the data. We have, as I said, 22 years' worth of data and we have the raw data from MRIP up to 2013 and then we did continue our own project. Right now, we are developing another project and we do have data on mahi and on whaoo. We also have several students from UPR that are working on the species that once their thesis is done, they are going to be useful for the management.

4 5

So, our project, which is the Recreational Statistic Program from DNER is more than willing and more than happy to be a part of this conversation, especially with pelagics. That's pretty much the main focus of the recreational anglers here. We will be more than happy to share our data and collaborate with these management issues.

MARCOS HANKE: Perfect timing, Grisel, thank you very much for being available and we need you. Right? Please get in contact with Sarah to send whatever data you have available for her, and we really need that. I really appreciate your engagement, your availability to this. Thank you, Grisel.

I need a five-minute break. Many people are texting me that they need the five-minute break. Five-minute break now. When we come back, we are going to keep the meeting-- I'll let you guys know. Five minutes, back in five minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MARCOS HANKE: Please take your seats. Let's restart the meeting. Thank you. Avoid conversation on the back of the room. Thank you.

The next presentation is Managing Trap Fishery in U.S.V.I. María.

# Managing Trap Fisheries in the USVI: Review of Pertinent State and Federal Regulations

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you, Marcos. This is María López with NOAA Fishery Southeast Regional Office. This presentation is titled Managing Trap Fisheries in the U.S. Virgin Islands: Review of Pertinent State and Federal Regulations. So, I wanted to point out, while our staff gets ready to put the presentation on the screen, that this is not something new. This is a presentation that was given to the Council back in December 2019. That was right before the pandemic hit. We are bringing it back because the Council requested that we bring back this topic again so that the Council can decide how to move forward with it.

So, what you are going to listen to today there are some things that may have changed and that need some updating. At the end of the presentation, I will ask the Council how they would like to move forward. Okay.

Next slide please.

Okay. So, this was this is the summary of the discussion at the 168 Council meeting. That was in December 2019. If you remember Dr. Bill Arnold was still with us during that time, and it's a presentation that he gave. The Council and constituents requested review of three topics at that time. Recreational trap use in federal waters, extending fish trap reduction plan to federal waters and revising the spiny lobster management. There is a motion that I added in there because this all comes from the 165 Council meeting that was in April 2019, where there was a Council discussion that fish traps are an authorized gear for recreational fishers in the Caribbean EEZ. So based on that discussion, the Council directed staff to develop amendments to the island-based FMP, which were not in place yet by that time, to the address the use of fish traps and pots in the EEZ. So, this is basically what started this conversation, at least for the part recreational trap use.

For the fish traps reduction plan, it was because Council, NOAA Fisheries work with the U.S. Virgin Islands and with the fishers and the government to establish and to develop a fish trap reduction plan for their state waters that has been in place since 2017. And we'll talk about that a little bit later.

Can we go to the next slide, please?

Now, during that 168 Council meeting in 2019, in December, the discussion centered in the clarifications that were needed to existing regulations before addressing certain issues that had to do with compatibility of regulations between federal waters and U.S. Virgin Islands state regulations. I want to emphasize that this presentation is just focusing on the U.S. Virgin Islands because they were the ones that requested this discussion.

So, some of the clarifications that were needed at the time that were pointed for the staff to work and the U.S. Virgin Islands state government to work is the distinction between a fish trap and a lobster trap that it's not evident in the regulations in the U.S. Virgin Islands regulations. Also, some inconsistencies between the design and construction requirements for the traps and buoy marking. And these are inconsistencies, again, between

federal and U.S.V.I. fishing regulations. Also, other issues with compatibility for the spiny lobster, such as licenses and permits, minimum harvest size requirement for imports, retention of undersized and egg-bearing lobsters, use of chemicals and annual catch limits and accountability measures.

So, during this discussion they were, Council members and participants of the U.S. Virgin Island Fisheries, were talking about the differences between their fish and lobster traps. The use of bigger traps, a lot of people depend on lobster fishing using wire traps, etcetera. We showed the pictures of different kinds of traps that were used, etcetera, with the idea of trying to make a distinction. Because in the U.S. Virgin Island regulations, which is something that was pointed out by participants, there wasn't really a description of what a spiny lobster trap constituted, which was a problem because if we were wanting to move into compatible regulations, there needed to be some sort of distinction so as to be able to implement something that makes sense between both of them.

So, bottom line is, that everybody agreed that in both sides, federal and in the U.S. Virgin Island side, in terms of regulations, there was things that needed to be corrected before the federal government could adopt things, including the fish trap reduction plan that was in place since 2017. And then, because at that time we were moving into island-based FMPs, there was some sort of agreement that each island needed to work to get their rules in place. And in here they were talking about everybody, including Puerto Rico, for working with the federal government so as to look into compatibility. And we'll get into some more details about that.

Let's go to the next slide, please.

Okay. And remember, this is just what was in the other presentation, a little bit updated as a refresher for you to decide what you want to do. And this is from the U.S. Virgin Islands coast. U.S.V.I. prohibits the use of pots, trap, haul seines and set nets by recreational fishers, which is what we were talking about. U.S. Virgin Islands has specific regulations, the same as Puerto Rico, that do not allow the use of pots and traps by the recreational fishers. However, in the federal waters, there's not a compatible regulation for that. So, that was something that was discussed. And with regards to this, then the Council will need to decide how to move forward if they want to do some sort of amendment to prohibit or evaluate the use of recreational traps in federal waters. The way that this could be done, it's something that, you know, obviously we will have to sit down and figure this out. But

there was a lot of interest, obviously, from the Council into not just authorizing the use of traps for the commercial sector because that's how it's traditionally used and there's really nobody using recreational traps in federal waters. However, you want to be proactive for the future. Those are the things that were discussed, and we'll talk about that later.

4 5

Next slide, please.

Okay. So, then the second issue that was presented was extending fish trap reduction to federal waters. This is just a summary of what was presented back then. The Caribbean Fishery Management Council established two Trap Reduction Steering Committees in the U.S. Virgin Islands. There was a Saint Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands Fish Trap Management Plan, and then one management plan for Saint Thomas/Saint John. I'm not going to go into details, but these are the trap management plans that occur in in their waters.

Next slide.

Oh, you cannot see this, but anyways, you can find this in the U.S. Virgin Island Commercial Fishing Handbook. This is just to show you where you can find information about the U.S. Virgin Islands Fish Trap Reduction Program. You can read everything that you need to know. This is not something that is federal, just state. So, basically it says that it was signed into law by the governor of the U.S. Virgin Islands in August 2017. And the purpose is to establish a sustainable management program for the fish trap fishery within territorial waters in order to achieve the following general intentions and purpose of the government of United States Virgin Islands.

It says, limit participation in the Virgin Islands trap fishery; Cap, maximum number of allowable fish traps per fisher; reduced the total number of fish trap by about 20% relative to the status quo in Saint Thomas/Saint John; reduce the total number of fish traps by about 10% related to the status quo in Saint Croix; and improve the economic efficiency of the fish trap fishery by increasing catch per trap.

 And then it talks about eligibility. And then, goes into specifics of each one of the trap reduction plans for each one of the districts, Saint Thomas/Saint John, and in the District of Saint Croix.

Next slide.

The plan also has, and you can find this in the Commercial Fishing Handbook that is available in the U.S. Virgin Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife website, information about the administration, the fees, enforcement, etcetera.

Go to the next slide, please.

And again, I'm just highlighting this so that you all know that there's a Fish Trap reduction program and it has various specific things that are required and goals and things that are accomplished. And if it's the intention of the Council, which was in the past, to adopt a similar plan for federal waters, and then that will be something that will need to be evaluated for the Council to see how it could be done. But then, you know, we will be interested in seeing, you know, what the U.S. Virgin Islands Council members and other Council members would like to say about this.

Now, regarding trap construction, and this is just to highlight some of the differences that were mentioned in the past about trap construction. For example, in Saint Thomas/Saint John the fish traps must have a minimum two-inch square mesh. It used to say in the presentation "or 1.5 hexagonal mesh as the smaller mesh on two sides." I crossed that off because in the information handbook that wasn't there anymore, so I wanted to ask if that was something that was different or not. But the point is that if there are differences between different regulations that the islands have and the federal and the federal regulations, and if there is an interest in compatibility, then that's something that we need to talk about to see how we can fix it. That's it.

So, it also talks about Saint Croix that all traps must a minimum of 1.5. And then, in the Virgin Islands code it says no fish trap, fish pot, or lobster pot, constructed of wire and or mesh can have a mesh size smaller than 1.25. So, there's some sort of differences that—remembered, we discussed this in December 2019, so there may have been progress made in terms of discussions within the involved parts during this time, but we are not aware of those. So, this will be a good opportunity to know where we're moving with this and if there are things that need to be updated.

Okay, next slide.

Okay. So, this is where that information about the gear restriction is included from, again, the U.S. Virgin Islands, from the regulations. It's talking about inspections for Saint Thomas/Saint John. All fish traps must have a minimum two-inch square mesh.

That's the same thing that we had before. And then, information about the construction, etcetera. Everything is in here.

So, we go to the next slide, please.

And then again, this is from the V.I.R. code. Also, information about the fish traps, for example, it has the different days from 1995 and then after 1998. I'm assuming that the most recent is the one that is commencing on January 1st, 2000, all fish traps placed in the Territorial water of the V.I. shall have a mesh size of at least two inches square, or, if hexagonal, two inches square. So, I guess the question is, has anything changed? Are the Virgin Islands operating under this 2000? From the regulations, the one that said after the year 2000, etcetera. So, just to clarify again, where we should go with this and what things need to be done also on our side to be able to be compatible with you.

Next slide.

Now let's go to the federal regulations. So, in our federal regulations that are current right now because of the island-based FMP we made some efforts to try to better define what a fish trap means, and as spiny lobster trap means, because of course we also had some text that wasn't very clear, right? And there are still things that we can do. But for now, this is what we have done.

So, in our current regulations, a fish trap means, in the Caribbean EEZ, a trap and its component parts including the lines and the buoy, regardless of the construction material, used for or capable of taking finfish. This does not include a spiny lobster trap as defined in subparts S, T, and U of this part.

Subparts S, T, and U are each one of the islands. I believe S is Puerto Rico, T is Saint Croix, and U is Saint Thomas and Saint John. So, that's how our regulations are divided now. They're divided by island. So, there are just the references in there in case you want to look at that.

Now, there's also a distinction for a spiny lobster trap. It says, "it means a trap and its component parts, including the lines and buoy used for or capable of taking spiny lobster and meeting the spiny lobster trap construction and specification of this subpart." This doesn't change anything about how you work your traps or what you can catch or not catch. It just makes it easier for regulations to be specified either for a fish trap or a spiny lobster trap. Regardless of if you catch a spiny lobster in a fish trap, which is what many people do.

 Next slide.

4 5

Okay, so, the federal regulations for fish traps address mesh size depending on the material, either wire or not, and the shape of the mesh, either hexagonal or not. These are the references where you can find, in our regulations, where you can find information about that. Federal regulations for spiny lobster traps do not address mesh sizes or construction materials other than for escape panels.

What is the need. Within each of the Saint Thomas/Saint John and Saint Croix management areas, U.S.V.I. regulation should include a description of allowable construction, including mesh material and size for each of the fish and lobster traps. Remember, most of the descriptions that are in the, or almost all of the descriptions that are included in the regulations that manage the use of fish traps and spiny lobster in the territory are referring to fish traps, right? So, this need was pointed out as to "let's have some distinctions between the fish and lobster traps, so we can move forward with regulations that are as specific to each one of them."

Federal regulations cannot be brought compatible with state regulations unless and until the state regulations regarding the respective definitions of fish and lobster traps are clear and unequivocal.

Ideally, the compatible federal legal descriptions should be consistent throughout the U.S. Caribbean. They don't have to be absolute, but there should be features of each trap type that clearly define them as either a fish trap or a lobster trap. I think we're kind of clear on the purpose of this one by this point.

So, what's the next. Please, go to the next one.

Okay, this one is related to trap escape panels and vent. Regarding escape panels. In the USVI territorial waters, fish pots may be constructed of any material, but a panel of some sort must be constructed of some material less durable than the construction of the pot itself, such as twine, bamboo, or soft wood. We have similar but more specific regulations in federal waters. Just to point out, you know, compatibility or not compatibility.

U.S. Virgin Island spiny lobster regs require escape mechanism on any vertical side or the top a panel no smaller than the diameter of the throat or entrance of the trap. It must be made of or attached by a) untreated fiber of biological origin not exceeding 1/8" in diameter, such as tyre palm, hemp, jute, cotton, wool or

silk. Also, ungalvanized or uncoated iron wire. We have a similar law in federal waters for spiny lobsters. So, we're good there.

What is the need? There's a need to have clear and compatible regulations regarding trap escape panel design and attachment.

And this is a note from 2019. At that time, there was no reference to escape vents that we could find, the ones that don't have a cover and they don't therefore allow continuous release of undersized specimens. The escape vents are in use by Saint Thomas/Saint John fishers, but we were not sure if only for fish traps or if Saint Croix and Puerto Rico have similarly installed escape vents.

Next slide.

Regarding marking traps and trap lines, just to highlight some of the differences or similarities. The U.S. Virgin Island law requires buoys to be marked with the commercial fisher's license number and for the buoy to bear the fishers assigned color scheme. All traps and pots must be marked with the commercial license number.

All fish traps set in U.S. Virgin Island territorial waters must be identifiable with a uniquely letter number U.S.V.I. fish trap tag composed of a durable material not easily destroyed.

Now In the EEZ, federal law requires fish traps and spiny lobster traps, and associated buoys, to be marked with the vessel number. So, there's a difference in there, right? And we should figure this one out. Buoys must have the color code assigned to the vessel.

So, what is the need? Again, clarity and consistency between state and federal regulations.

Okay, on next slide.

 So, a little bit more about marking traps and trap lines. Number and locations of buoys are not described for territorial deployments. However, in the EEZ, our regulations says that individual traps must have at least one buoy that floats on the surface. And if a trap line, then a buoy attached at each end of the line. That should be there.

The need. Territorial description of buoy location for individual traps and trap lines. For trap lines, clarify that a minimum of two buoys is required, one at each end of the trap line, if that's the case and just to be compatible with the federal if that's what they want to do.

Next slide.

Now regarding spiny lobster management. With regard to licenses or permits, the Virgin Islands code requires commercial fishers to have commercial fishing license and for helpers to have helpers' license. There are reporting requirements, catch sampling consent. To sell fish landed in USVI, they must have a commercial fishing license and a business license, even if harvested from the EEZ and even with an HMS permit. No person, not a resident of the territory, may sell in the territory without proper license issued by the Commissioner.

What is the need? Is there a need for a permit in the EEZ to manage spiny lobster harvest? So, these regulations that we just mentioned govern fishing and harvesting in U.S.V.I. territorial waters and landing and selling fish in the U.S. Virgin Islands. So, then the question is, how do we manage spiny lobster harvest in the EEZ? Is there a need to have a permit? So, those are kind of things that we have discussed in the past and once we start working with permits, which we already have an IPT and we're going to be working with that, that will be one of the considerations. It's like, what does the U.S. Virgin Island needs in terms of permits?

Okay. Next slide.

Continuing with spiny lobster management, just to highlight some differences. Minimum size 3.5 carapace in all jurisdictions. So, we're good. And then regarding spiny lobster imports, the territory requires the tail weight to be at least six ounces. The federal regulations are a little more extensive, and they do have a range from 5.9 to 6.4 ounces.

So, the need is that the U.S. Virgin Island six ounce minimum is inconsistent with the federal 5.9 ounces minimum for lobster imports. And again, this is not something new, I mean, I think we're all aware of all of these things, and obviously some of the things take a lot of time to change and address, but it's good to keep it fresh in our mind so we know what we have to do.

Next slide

For spiny lobster. allows egg-bearing lobster to remain in traps in the water with no limit on number. Egg-bearing lobster can remain in traps until eggs have been naturally released, then lobster can be harvested assuming it's of minimum legal size. Now, federal law requires egg-bearing lobster to be returned to the water unharmed, and allows them to remain in the trap, provided the trap is returned immediately to the water. For undersized species.

For undersized spiny lobster, in the U.S. Virgin Islands, undersized lobster can be used as attractants in traps or pots. Um, but we didn't see that in the fisher booklet. Federal regulations state that an undersized lobster may not be possessed, sold or purchased and must be released with minimum harm, but no specific reference to using lobster as attractants. But there's no specific reference to using lobster as attractants. So, this one is a big difference.

And there's a need then to clarify consistency regarding the use of at attractants, particularly undersized lobster.

Next slide.

The other thing, and it's about using chemicals to target spiny lobster. That's something that is specifically prohibited in U.S. Virgin Island waters, but it's not as specifically prohibited in the EEZ waters. Now in our federal regulations, because we made some changes to the species that we were managing, we made a change to the description of the use of chemicals and plants. And in our regulations, it says "A toxic chemical may not be used or possessed in a coral area." I believe before it was, a toxic chemical, may not be used or possessed may not be used for corals, or something like that. But now that all corals are completely prohibited, we made some changes -- harvest, sorry. --we made some changes to this that were within the intention of the Council at the time. So, we're just saying "A toxic chemical may not be used or possessed in a coral area." Now we do have in our regulations that poison, drug or other chemical may not be used to fish for reef fish in the EEZ around Saint Thomas and Saint John. The same regulation applies to the EEZ around Saint Croix, and the same one for Puerto Rico.

We didn't see a similar regulation in the U.S. Virgin Island. I don't know necessarily if it's needed, but at least for the federal part, there's a need to prohibit the use of chemicals to harvest spiny lobster in EEZ waters because it's not just, you know, using it in coral areas. Spiny lobster, you know, can be anywhere, but you just don't want to allow the use of chemicals to harvest the spiny lobster.

And I'm almost done. And the last slide is another difference. And you all know this one. Application of annual catch limits and

accountability measures. The annual catch limits annual catch limit reflects sustainable harvest based on best available science. And they would be our best estimate of how much can be harvested annually from each stock in a sustainable manner. Exceeding the ACL for a stock, you know, has that possibility that this stock will be put under risk for overfishing.

The accountability measures are the tools used by managers to ensure harvest stays within the ACL for each stock. And in reality, there's no value to the ACL unless the AM is available.

So, we do know that all ACLs are developed using combined landings from state and federal water, so it's important that those ACLs apply to both the state and federal waters, so they achieve their purpose. The same with AMs, and that is obviously not the case.

With that said, I want to go to the last slide, which is the next step. Basically, just highlighted all the differences with regards to some of those— there's other things that are obviously not compatible between state and federal waters, but for the interests of this topic, these are the things that were that were highlighted as incompatibilities.

Now what we need from the Council, I don't think we need a motion or anything, but I think it will be interesting to know if the Council is, what do we need to know? What do we need to do? What does the Council want to do at this time? And if they want to do something, you know, it's important to coordinate with the U.S. Virgin Islands government because obviously these are differences between the U.S. Virgin Islands and federal waters. And also, the scope of the action, like if you want to do something with this, what is your interest? Because there were many topics included in here, not just the fish trap reduction. So, with that, I give it back to you, Marcos.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, María. Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, this is an important matter. We need to break for lunch, so I suggest, Mr. Chairman, come back at 1:15. It's important but not as important as lunch. So, we come back at 1:15.

 The original idea of the whole discussion was, when Dr. Roy Crabtree asked for the local governments to come up with a proposal regarding management of traps. This is a document— and by the way, thank you to María and the staff because it's a very thorough document that was prepared with conversation with Carlos Farchette and others.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

22 23 24

25

20

21

31 32 33

34 35 36

37 38 39

41 42

40

43 44 45

46 47 48

So, Mr. Chairman, I propose to allow Sam to say some words, departing words, and then we can break for lunch and come back at 1:15 so we can continue the discussion.

MARCOS HANKE: Sam. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sam Rauch, Deputy SAMUEL D. RAUCH III: Director, for the record, National Marine Fisheries Service. It's been my pleasure to be here. I regrettably will not be here for this afternoon. I have to go back to D.C. I wanted to reiterate, first my thanks to the Chair and all the Council staff for their hospitality here. And to reiterate what I said at the beginning, this is really important, what you all are doing. These fisheries matter, whether you're commercial, recreational, or subsistence or whatever else you're doing. This is really important for the fabric the territories. And managing these fisheries well coordination with the territorial governments in a transparent science-based fashion is hard. Some of the discussions you've had here today just exhibit just how hard it is. But it takes a lot to be a good Council member. We appreciate what you're doing and keep encouraging you to keep up the good work. Thank you very much for having me here.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Sam. And thank you for your historical support to the Caribbean Council and availability to help us anytime we need some quidance and some help from the positions you have been on. We are ready for lunch. We're going to break for lunch. We're going to come back at 1:15. We are breaking for lunch a few minutes earlier and come back from lunch a few minutes earlier. At 1:15 we are back

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on December 7, 2022.)

## DECEMBER 7TH, 2022

## WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

MARCOS HANKE: Good afternoon. It's 1:17 PM December 7th, second part, the afternoon part, of our meeting. We had a presentation from María del Mar about managing Trap Fisher in U.S.V.I. and we have a little space now for comments. Can you put up the slide with what you're requesting from us? Now, there was a question there, I believe on the end. Okay. Thank you. The screen says,

Council to decide if action is needed at this time. I'm going to defer to Carlos Farchette, which was one of the champions on this discussion. Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, yeah, we're interested in pursuing this action and we would like staff to work with us. I have to talk about Saint Croix really, because that's really where I'm working this from, but I'm sure Saint Thomas is just as interested. We've already done a spreadsheet and separated tables. I had a table set up where we had compatible rights between territorial and federal. So, the Commissioner and Director Angeli are already aware of this and we're going to be working in trying to complete the spreadsheet because there's some things that are missing. So, on the 14th of December, we have a Saint Croix FAC committee meeting, and I'm going to have this as the only agenda for that night. Well, I shouldn't say that because there are a couple other things in there, but this will be the major topic in the agenda. And we are also going to jumpstart our draft spiny which speaks management plan, on the design and construction of lobster trap versus fish traps. I think that's it for now, unless questions? Commissioner?

MARCOS HANKE: Miquel?

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, I believe that in deference to the U.S. Virgin Islands the answer to this question could be that, yes, the staff will continue coordinating with the U.S. Virgin Islands. So, whenever we are ready for any Council action, we'll do so. But I believe that we should allow the U.S.V.I., the Commissioner, Carlos and other members of the U.S.V.I. community, allow them to keep working and when they're ready, sure enough, we can pursue this a little bit further.

MARCOS HANKE: Jean-Pierre.

**JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL:** Yes, and good afternoon, everyone. Jean-Pierre Oriol, for the record. So, that's exactly right. We are interested in this, but we recognize that there is a little bit of cleanup as María was able to present in terms of some of the inconsistencies even within our legislation and our policies that need to be cleaned up.

It is our goal to have compatible regulations but as for right now, we don't think there's a Council action at this time. But we do intend on having that same sort of crosswalk that was presented here today. This is where we are with our local side. This is what we would have to tweak to make it match the federal side or inquire about what action would need to be taken if the federal side should

be changed, could be changed. I think Carlos and the Saint Croix FAC as well as the Saint Thomas FAC, they've been working and there is some cleanup that needs to be done but once we complete those crosswalks, we'd be in a better position to state that we're ready to move forward if there's any action to be taken.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. We have a right path to move forward. I don't think we need to discuss anything else at this moment. Thank you, María, for the presentation. Last comment, please.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes, thank you. This is María López. Thank you for that. I do want to point out that one of the inconsistencies that we have, at least from our part, from the federal, is that requirement in the traps to— we have vessels, like the vessel number, and you guys have a license. So that's something that I think we should all, perhaps from our side prioritize as well, because that's a kind of like a big inconsistency and I think we can work on that.

And then, one last thing is that our office is available to work with you for updating the commercial fisher's guide that you have, your booklet, because the regulations that you have in there, of course, when you did the island-based FMPs, were not in place. So, that means that all the references that are in there are for the old plans. So, we'll be happy to assist you, because we know that you reference, in your book you reference our regulations, so we have done it in the past and we'll be happy to work with you to get that updated for the next version of the booklet.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, María. We're ready for the next presentation, which will be the Southeast Fishery Science Center. Adyan.

#### Southeast Fisheries Science Center (SEFSC) Update

 ADYAN RIOS: Adyan Rios, for the record. Hi everyone. Just give Christina a moment to pull up the slides. There we go. So, I work at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center in the Caribbean Fisheries Branch with Kevin McCarthy and the rest of the team. And today I will be-- Hello? Is this better? Move this over here. Okay. Okay. So, I'll be presenting the Southeast Fishery Science Center, U.S. Caribbean Projects update.

Next slide please.

We'll be looking at a non-comprehensive summary of projects. So, just give you a little bit about a lot of projects and a few updates. And I do want to emphasize that there is a lot of work

going on and so we'll only touch on a number of them, but there are more. There is a lot of work to improve port sampling on all three islands. So that's something I wanted to highlight.

And then now, going to this list, at the top there, you see that that work is now also being complimented in Puerto Rico with funding for two students at the University of Puerto Rico who are working with MER Consultants in one of those ongoing research projects. Next, additional funding was received to expand deepwater snapper surveys in Puerto Rico that are done in collaboration with fishermen. Additional funding was also received to continue life history sampling that is also conducted in collaboration with fishermen in Puerto Rico. There's also funding to begin a fishery dependent lobster survey that is also cooperative research. There are two lobster projects. This is the first one. It's designed to collect size and CPUE information, catch per unit effort, towards developing an index of abundance that we can use in stock assessments. The second lobster study, we've received funding to continue fishery independent lobster work specific to juvenile to creating indices of juveniles and of recruitment.

Next slide, please.

In the U.S. Virgin Islands, there's ongoing work in partnership with DPNR Department of Fish and Wildlife for the designing of the sampling survey. And next, we also have recreational port sampling design ongoing. The third bullet here is that new funding was received to begin work to improve port sampling. And then, the last bullet here in bold is that a critical goal for 2023 is to establish a mechanism to move collaborative research funds to U.S.V.I. So, a lot of the collaborative work that's already been undergoing over the years and right now, there's a mechanism which is the cooperative research program or other requests for proposals that are a mechanism for funding cooperative research.

And then we also have projects, like I mentioned earlier, with students, and there's mechanisms to allocate funds that are disseminated through those mechanisms to those students. And so, now the conversation can become, how do we figure out if there's going to be sustained cooperative research? What mechanism can we use to support that? And that's important to be able to not only have these initiative projects but keep that work going in this region.

Next slide, please.

A really big activity that the whole team is on is our Caribbean Strategic Planning Workshop. So, this is a three-year project, and

it is currently in its second year to develop a strategic plan for data collection to inform stock assessments and ecosystem-based fishery management. And so, just to tell you about what happened in the first year we had virtual Southeast Fishery Science Center specific workshops to prioritize activities that would, you know, support stock assessments and ecosystem-based fisheries management, as well as our outreach and our communication efforts across the Science Center.

4 5

The second year expands the participation of that to include the stakeholders, SERO, University researchers and regional partners, and to continue identifying actionable items and collaborative efforts. A key word for this project, entirely to me, is just, synergy, because we're all doing a lot of great work. And so, this strategic planning workshop identifies, you know, people who have some overlap and can synergize their energy towards the same direction. And just, you know, make sure that everyone knows about and is familiar with what our immediate goals are and what our long-term goals are collectively. And so, that involves the Council staff and SSC; the DNER and DPNR; University of Puerto Rico and the University of the Virgin Islands; SERO, Southeast Fishery Science Center, and the National Park Service.

Next slide, please.

This is the last slide, I believe, and this is just to let you know about two proposals that were recently submitted. The first one was also funded.

So, the first one is to modernize and automate the provision of existing and electronic monitoring fishery dependent length composition data required for all U.S. Caribbean assessments and wider research needs. I made that really long title but, basically, it means taking the TIP data set and making that data set more analysis ready. So, usually those data require a lot of species-specific extraction. And so, really benefiting from all the assessments we've done so far and all the work that has been done with that data set, we can really come up with a strategic way to make that whole data set more useful and more easy to work with. And so, that's what that project by me and Molly is all about.

 And then the second project here is related to aquaculture. So, we have Refik Orhun from the Southeast Fishery Science Center on that. And so, that proposal is called Establishing husbandry and grow out aquaculture techniques for blackfin snapper in the Caribbean. A Marine Aquaculture Pilot Project.

Uh, next slide. So, any questions

### Discussion

MARCOS HANKE: Graciela.

4 5

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, Adyan, thank you for the presentation. Do you know if there are any plans, speaking of synergy, to require the collection of oceanographic data while we're doing all these other projects? And the reason for that, it's twofold. One, because, you know, fishers do pay attention to changes in weather, etcetera, and what species they're going to be targeting.

And secondly, because of the, you know, we know about climate change and what we're expecting to happen. And one of the things that we've been discussing in different opportunities is that here the migration might not be in the horizontal plane, but it might be vertical. And we have very little information except for one project that I know of, of data being collected at the same time that fishers are looking for the deep-water snapper species. So, you know, that needs to be included somehow. And, you know, nowadays most of these CTDs and stuff like that are not that expensive. You know, they're expendable things that we can use and, you know, collaboration with the fisher will always be forthcoming.

So, do you know if we have any plans to include that in our future plans?

ADYAN RIOS: Um, not currently, but two points come to mind. The first is that that's a topic that we need to revisit at this strategic workshop together. And then another topic that comes to mind and it is an example of just that. So, on the West coast of Florida where they've been subject to a pretty frequent and persisting red tides, there has also been a lot of initiative from the fishers in that region to collaborate with scientists to better understand how that's happening. And that's actually exactly what they do. They've got a whole system set up to process that information and make it available in near real time. And so, that type of ongoing effort and identifying funding to support those resources, is a very important direction that is awesome to have that as an example and for us to look forward to as well.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, I want to make a comment on the same lines of Graciela not the same specific thing. I really value the effort and coordination and focus on getting the minimum things that we need to have to move forward. But we are not doing an effort on asking, for example, making a workshop with fisherman saying, what kind of data do you think you can provide us? And to see the

willingness, number one, to provide data or things that they think they can provide data that with that interchange or conversation they'll learn that there are some things that are a little more complicated than what they think. But maybe there is a few items that we can all get in agreement and explore those new avenues. What I'm trying to say is that there is a need for bottom-up coordination to find those opportunities. Anybody else from the Council? Vanessa?

4 5

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. I just want to make a comment. It's about the collaboration that commercial fishermen are always there to collaborate, but it's important to give follow up on that. Because, for example, we were collaborating, we were making the workshop, two years ago, for a project for lobster traps, [inaudible] lobster traps. It was supposed, before two months, to be there and it has been two years and we are still waiting. So, we don't receive any follow up. That's important, once the commercial fishermen take their time to be there in a workshop and be, practically, with their boats right there to start the next day if it's necessary and then no one contacts them. They feel like no one is taking care of the time they took and the importance that they have with all the information that they can collaborate. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: I agree with you and there are many venues. We had a little talk related to this issue with Clay before. Laterhe going to talk to you guys about it. James?

**JAMES R. KREGLO:** James Kreglo, Saint Thomas/Saint John. Just a question I have about the port sampling techniques. Can you explain briefly how someone comes and does and the time they spend and how that works?

ADYAN RIOS: Kevin, is Kevin online?

MARCOS HANKE: Kevin.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: I'm online if I have a chance to speak.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, Kevin, we hear you loud and clear.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Sorry about that. Yeah, this is Kevin McCarthy Southeast Fishery Science Center. Yeah, we're working out a lot of those procedures, but the goal is very much to keep the time that we're working with the fishers to an absolute minimum. We recognize that, you know, that is not why people go fishing, to come back to the dock and be interviewed by a port sampler. They've got other things to do oftentimes to go and sell the fish. So, we're very

much aware of that and that we want to keep that interview to the absolute minimum time. And that's why one of the bullet points that Adyan had there was some funding to improve the efficiency of the port sampling. So, we've got a lot of moving parts with the port sampling. One of them is to properly design a statistically robust sampling scheme, right? So, when and where do we send samplers so that we get a good estimate of not just the landings but the size composition of those landings, because we want to achieve both with this survey.

4 5

Um, but we also have the other side of the equation, which is when you are interviewing someone, you as the port sampler, how do we get that done as fast as we can while still getting good quality data? So, you'll be seeing things like new technologies. Like cameras that are taking pictures of the animals that are landed, right? To get a species identification and a size composition as quickly as possible. So, there's a lot of things going on with trying to improve that efficiency while still maintaining a good statistical design for the survey. I hope that answered the question.

**JAMES R. KREGLO:** That answers part of my question. And actually, I'm going to ask you one more and then a follow up. Now, are we talking commercial and recreational?

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Yes. Commercial and recreational in the Virgin Islands where the Science Center is partnered with the territorial scientists to get that survey in there. Because we recognize that in the Caribbean there's some gray area as to what a vessel may be doing on any given day. It could be a commercial trip one day and it could be a rec trip another day and it could be a for hire trip another day. So, we don't want to not catch the fishing effort and the landings for any vessel just because they happen to be in a different category on a particular day. And as we all know, we need to have the landings and the size composition of those landings from every sector of the fishery if we're really going to manage the resources properly. And in Puerto Rico--

JAMES R. KREGLO: Okay. All right. And then my follow up question. Again, James Kreglo. Oh, go ahead.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: I was just going to say, in Puerto Rico the Science Center has funded work and continues to fund work to properly design or get the information properly design commercial fishery survey. And we're working in support with DNER and Grisel team and they're very much the leads on the recreational side of that work in Puerto Rico. We're providing some support to that, but they're the leads.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Alright. James Kreglo, Saint Thomas/Saint John. And then my primary concern is I have seen the port samplers, the last few years, actually they set up right where my business is quite often at my marina, and they have to wait for vessels to come in. A lot of times they just are not coming in or they'll be sitting there, and I'll look around, I'll say, "okay, I know this fishing, that person's fishing. recreational, this one's recreational, this one's commercial. They're not going to be back for hours." But I just, there has to be some more way. Or in Saint John I'll say, "Well, I know these guys are going fishing this day." But for the port samplers, I know I've had to go and find an umbrella for somebody because they're sitting in the hot sun. Or, you know, they try to bring some things, but I try to do what I can to help out, but it just seems sometimes they're just there waiting for people to come in for a long time. There has to be an easier way to get the data.

25

2627

28

29

30

31

32

33 34

35

36

1 2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

1516

17

18 19

I agree. And I applaud your efforts in helping KEVIN MCCARTHY: those poor folks out who are sitting in the hot sun. So, what we've completed, and by we, I mean the port samplers that are down there right now. I was sitting in an air-conditioned office while they were out in the sun. Over the last several months, let's say six months or so, what we've completed on and it's still ongoing in Saint John, if I'm remembering correctly, but in Saint Croix as well as Saint Thomas is an effort survey. And what that is, is to go around, we divide the day up into time blocks and we go around to the various ports where people are coming in and we figure out activity patterns so that we very much get at a more efficient sampling design. So, that we don't have people sitting there for hours when nobody's coming in. So, they're going to know, "okay, we need to go to these ports at this time and we need to go to those ports at another time." And we go to certain ports where we know we're going to catch the commercial traffic and other times we catch the recreational traffic. So, this is very much an effort to improve that design for many of the reasons that you've just mentioned.

373839

40 41

42

JAMES R. KREGLO: Okay. James Kreglo. Thank you very much. I appreciate the information. Anything we can do to help out, because a lot of times we know when certain people are going out and coming in and we just want to get the best data that we can for our surveys.

43 44 45

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. I want to just to make-

46

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Thank you. I appreciate that.

47 48 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Kevin. I just want to mention my comments before about making the workshop with the fishermen, with the industry, with the people like Kreglo, is that we can identify those opportunities that are there that we don't know now, right? We cannot, for example, if we have 10 people like him spread around the island is one thing versus having just one. But we don't know that yet. We need to include the fishermen and have that capability the industry, or that willingness that the industry has to support science. Thank you, Kevin. I would like to pass the word to Clay Porch on the same lines. Clay, one second. There is a virtual hand. Kevin.

4 5

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Thank you, Kevin McCarthy. Yeah, and it could be that as we build through designing the survey, that there are aspects of the fishery that need to be more individually based. And so, what I mean by that is, there may be sectors of the fishery that a handful of fishers are involved, and it may make more sense to capture them in something that's a little bit different than a traditional survey design. You know, where you'd have sort of an individually based survey. We're not that far in the design yet, but we may, you know, we've talked about that over the years. That's something that's been discussed with the other contractors that we've had looking at these kinds of problems in Puerto Rico and some years ago, some initial steps looking at designing surveys in the Virgin Islands. So, there are a lot of ways to get at this and we want to be flexible, and we want to be efficient. And we want to hear from, you know, ideas from all sides. So, I agree with you Marcos. It's important to keep talking to everybody involved in the process.

MARCOS HANKE: I want to express my gratitude and the gratitude of the Council member that I spoke to on your leadership or making a focused effort to move forward in a quicker and more effective way. Thank you, Kevin. Clay.

CLAY PORCH: Yeah, thank you. That was an excellent summary by Adyan and Kevin. I just want to say a couple things. I think the gist of it, what you heard from Kevin is we need to move the Caribbean into the 21st century in terms of data collection. I mean, that's the bottom line. You heard our commercial statistics are highly uncertain. There are big gaps. People are reporting fishes that's one thing, as something else. All these sorts of things that are going on. We really have to step it up. I appreciate that there are those who want to help but the key thing is we need to make sure that we have a very good sampling design. We need to make sure it represents the entire fishery and not just those who want to help. So, the people that Kevin's been working with, I know Julian's been involved, a lot of people have been involved,

are trying to find ways that are flexible, but still get us what we need for both the science and the management.

And that is a tricky line to walk sometimes, right? What will actually work and is really defensible for science and monitoring versus what people find acceptable. Because we're talking about changing the way people have been doing business for an awful long time. So, we are trying very hard to work with folks.

The other side of the equation is though, it takes resources, it takes funding to do some of the things that we want to do. And in the past, I would say, generally, it hasn't been there. There were some funds in the president's budget, part of the territorial initiative. Unfortunately, that hasn't made it into the congressional language as of yet. So hopefully there'll be some advocates that arise for getting more funding into the Caribbean for those sorts of things.

Kevin also mentioned and others have mentioned the lack of recreational statistics. Obviously, what was going on before wasn't sufficient, so MRIP pulled out of the game because there wasn't any point throwing good money after bad. So, part of the strategy is to develop a sampling plan that covers both recreational and commercial. Sometimes the same size boats using the same ramps, right? So, there's a logic to that. Hopefully, by combining funds that could have been used for commercial and funds from MRIP and other sources for recreational, together, if we're using the same program, we can get more bang for the buck.

So that's what we're trying to work on. Work with all our partners, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico and see what we can come up that's efficient. But again, we do need more resources to do everything that we're hoping to accomplish. So, that tells us what's being taken out of the water. Right? But the other thing is to see what's left in the water. And that's our resource surveys. And we all agree that probably using the great big NOAA White ships isn't the best thing for the Caribbean. Not the best investment. The advantage to us though is we get a certain allocation of white ship time.

So, how do we move from that to something that's more efficient? Um, we've already started a deep-water survey that is a cooperative research survey, works with the Fishers for deep-water snapper, and grouper. That's just really started this year coming up. The first year going at full steam. It's been a pilot study before that. We had the experimental trap survey in Saint Croix. That's one we would like to see expanded across all the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico maybe every couple of years because that gets one

group of fish. There is the diver base survey, but the problem is that only goes to something like a hundred feet and as many people have mentioned for conch and others, there's a lot of animals that are deeper than that. So, we're experimenting with using remote controlled cameras and other means to get a view of what's down in the deeper water and then kind of link that up with what we see in the shallow water, so that we have more robust estimates of the number of conch and other fish species out there.

4 5

So those are the two big things that spiny lobster survey that we sort of had started, but now is kind of, has stalled a bit. We need to resurrect that. Obviously, that's a huge fishery for here. So, those are the kind of things we're working on, but again, it's going to require more resources to do the things that we all want to do. I think by combining forces between the territorial agencies and, and the Feds, we can get a little more bang for the buck, but it's still going to take some more resources to be injected in the system, to really do all the things that we want.

There is also the issue of just doing some basic research, basic life history parameters. You've heard some of the studies that were funded. Adyan gave you a little summary of what's in the pike right now. And we'll continue chipping away trying to develop an information base through that means. There are several projects that could be funded in the future. We've started to use more cooperative research funds for research in the Caribbean. MARFIN now allows some research in the Caribbean. So, I think you'll see, and you have seen in the past couple years, more attention being given to the Caribbean. But again, same resources and you're competing with the Gulf and South Atlantic. So, there's only so much we can put into Caribbean without taking too much away from the others. Again, you know, more resources would be helpful in that regard.

 And then the last thing is in terms of some of the analytics. As we get more data and we try and figure out how we're going to use it to generate management advice we're going to need more analytical power, more people turning the cranks, right? You hear, for instance, Graciela, mentioned bringing in more environmental information. But as soon as you start doing that, you know, that says saying, "Okay, if I give you this new shiny thing, let's incorporate an index that reflects the impacts of changing water temperatures on the distribution of dolphin or something like that." But now we have to maintain that every year, and that can't just be temporary funds, right? So, we have to find a way to do it.

 So, on the one hand as a former modeler, mathematical modeler, I like the new shiny things and let's figure it out how we can incorporate it in the models and give management advice. On the other hand, now as a manager, I'm like, how am I going to sustain that from year to year? So, I think we're already kind of falling short on trying to meet the demand on analyzing all the products that are available as it stands now. So, a little analytical help there would be useful as well.

4 5

So that's just sort of my summary of where we are. I think we're making excellent progress in terms of learning to work together, changing all our cultures and how we get things accomplished. But we still got a long way to go, and we are going to have to find a way to garner more resources to do those things that we want to do. So, thank you for the time.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you, Clay. We discussed a little bit about it with Clay before, but if we can identify, you know, just the last part you mentioned, the analytical power that we need, a warm body that will do this analysis and I am with you that that person should be concentrated on the information that we have, you know. The synthetic part about the ecosystem and all that, that's another \$20. But that's something that the Council can contribute. If we can identify somebody that will be willing to work for us on a part-time basis or on a contract basis, for, you know, two or three years that will do the trick. What I will need then will be a one-page description of what that person should be doing. With whom that person should be working. Graciela and I can sit down and coordinate that effort.

So, with the budget cycle that we have, you know, it's every five years, but if we can justify the need for such a thing, I think that we can do it. Justification, personally, I don't think that we need to look too deep into it because the more we cooperate with the center, the more we cooperate with the local governments instead of the needs they have and we can fulfill those gaps, the better for the management of the area.

So, I wanted to just introduce it to the record. Probably we can talk later, at the end, Adyan and Clay. Whomever you assign, let us know what can be done in the next two or three years. That will be something that will help assist in the analysis of this data and that way we will move forward with the data that we have. Because we are data poor in many areas. We have a lot of that in other areas, but as Kevin said some time ago, it's just a matter of finding where they are and then what can we do with it. So, I

don't think that we need to explain that more. The staff, Graciela and Adyan, can look into this and then prepare something that Clay can bless and we can work it from there. Then while you're doing that, if you know somebody that will be willing and able to work on this type of praise, let me know.

Adyan quiere decir algo.

MARCOS HANKE: Adyan.

CLAY PORCH: Go ahead.

ADYAN RIOS: Adyan Rios, for the record. I feel like that's a topic that we'll delve into further as well in the strategic planning. And so, I also wanted to let folks know that the invitations for that event, which is the third week of May, will be coming out very soon. So, I did want to announce that. And I also wanted to mention that although I presented today, I'm not involved in all of the projects and there's a lot of people involved in each project. So, if you're interested in more of any of the projects, I can also serve as a liaison here today to tell you more and who to contact for specific projects. But be on the lookout regional partners for the event that's coming up in May.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Excellent.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Clay.

CLAY PORCH: Yeah, and to Miguel's point. I think we would be happy to work with you and look at the sort of skillsets that we think are needed for the analyses that need to be done and which parts of that maybe we would have a hard time doing because our plates are so full but where we think that if the Council had staff on board where they could help the most. So yeah, I think we'd be happy to work with you.

And I did want to say one other thing regarding the idea that Marcos had to develop capacity among both the commercial and recreational fishing community to do scientific research. And I think, in the Caribbean especially, cooperative research products, projects with scientists working with fishermen, have enormous potential. Like I said, it doesn't make a lot of sense to have 200-foot NOAA White ships trying to, you know, set cameras or set hooks in these island platforms. It makes a lot of sense to have people who are experts at doing that work. The key is that there would be, just as we have a survey like that, for instance, in the South Atlantic it's a long line survey for deep-water snapper grouper, the fishermen deploy the gear, but they follow the

sampling design, and they fish the exact same way every single time they go fishing. They follow a sampling design that was developed by the scientist so that we can say this is a defensible index of abundance. And I think it's a great opportunity here in the Caribbean to do those same kinds of things on many levels. I mentioned the trap fishery. Obviously, that would be fishermen deploying the traps. They just deploy them in a certain way according to a certain design, similar to that study that we had done in Saint Croix years ago, just expanded. And there's many other surveys like that I think we can do. It's much more cost effective than for us to bring big white ships down here. And it also, I think gets a lot more buy-in from the fishermen. And it, it's an opportunity. Fishermen are contributing to the data that gets used in the assessments and management. We, as scientists, get the benefit of your skills on the water.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Clay. And I'm available once you guys want to pursue that and create a system to create the task force of fishermen on science or something on that line. I have on my mind already what we need to address to make this doable and all the scientists, Science Center and everybody will benefit from having the list of collaborators that will be trained, will be passing through ethical on science and something very simple. But we will have a list of bold capacities, skills, and everything that whenever we want to do science, cooperative science, we're going to have that master list of people willing to do it with this capability and everything is going to be very quick instead of waiting one or two years to start the project.

Anyway, that's the point. Thank you, Clay. I think we don't-- do anybody else from the Council that want to mention something? I don't see any hand. We are ready to pass to the next presentation.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: [inaudible] la mano. [laughter]

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah, but I didn't see any hands. Still, I don't see any hands. Russel Dunn, recreational fishery presentation.

# Recreational Fisheries

 RUSSEL DUNN: All right, thank you. For those who I may not know, I'm Russ Dunn. I'm the National Policy Advisor for Recreational Fisheries. I have here with me some of my team, Tim Sartwell and Sean Morton, also with fisheries. Sean's actually with NOS but doing a detail with us as we work to update the recreational fisheries policy. So, I'm just going to cover this briefly. I know we only have about 15 minutes scheduled for it, but that is okay

because there'll be additional opportunity for your input beyond this discussion.

So, quick. First, a little background before we jump right in. So, in March of 2014, the agency co-hosted the second national saltwater recreational fishery summit with the Atlantic State's Marine Fisheries Commission. And during that summit, what we heard was substantial interest in the agency developing a policy or a policy document that could help spell out the agency's approach to recreational fisheries. We were able to take advantage of that recommendation and we move forward and published in 2015, in February of 2015, the first iteration of the recreational fisheries policy.

So, next slide please.

So, fast forward to today. Why are we here talking about this again? Well, in March of this year, we held the fourth of the National Recreational Fisheries summit. And the two gentlemen to each of my size here participated in that summit. And one of the things that we recognized very early on during that two-day discussion, was that some of the key topics here, such as climate change, DEIJ or diversity and inclusion, equity, balancing ocean uses, which at the summit really took on the meaning of wind energy and aquaculture, were not addressed in the existing policy in any way. We recognize that in order for the policy to remain relevant, that we had to update it.

Next slide, please.

So, what you see here is simply a set of just general discussion questions or discussion questions for guiding the conversation here as we go through the next couple of slides. And as you think about how the policy might be amended to be improved.

Next slide please.

So, the purpose of the policy, it really serves as a guidance document for the agency. It's a tool that helps both shape our approach to recreational fisheries and really spell it out by articulating our basic stance, our goals, and our guiding principles. And so, beyond serving as an internal touchstone, it also serves as a tool to help the public understand, "Hey, how does the agency approach? How do we think about recreational fisheries on a day-to-day basis?"

Next slide, please.

So, the basic policy, statement itself, really just sets forth the agency's commitment to accessible and diverse recreational fishing opportunities for the benefit of the nation. It's very straightforward. And, you know, I think for the most part it probably is still a fairly tenable statement.

Next slide, please.

So, the scope of the policy. So, obviously— oh, and I apologize. Those pictures slide up in about half the slides and half the time they don't. It's cut off the last sentence there. But the policy pertains really to recreational fishing activity that occur for sport or pleasure, pleasure as per the Magnuson Act definition. But we also sought to broaden it out as much as possible to capture sort of the shoreside portions of the recreational fishing community, bait and tackle shops, tournaments, marinas, etcetera which really are part of the larger recreational fishing community.

Next slide please.

So, the goals of the policy you can see here are, again, very straightforward. They're essentially to support and maintain the resources on which recreational fisheries depend. And that is a very intuitive statement, right? If you don't have habitats, you don't have fish, there are no fisheries. The second primary goal of the policy is to promote saltwater recreational fishing for the benefit of the nation. And that, again, is taken directly from the Magnuson Act as a concept. And so, we thought that was an appropriate one to incorporate.

And then, the final goal is to enable long-term participation in fisheries, right? And how to do that? Well, through science-based conservation and management as we are a science-based management entity.

Next slide.

 So, what we have here, and I'm not going to go through them one by one, but are the six guiding principles through which the agency seeks to essentially implement the policy itself. And you can see here it covers the range from the ecosystem conservation and management to communicating and engaging with the recreational fishing public. And these are sort of, each of these within the existing policy have a number of strategies that fall under them, which are sort of classic examples of how to support these principles. But we thought it was important for us to articulate not only the policy goals, but also, what are the general

approaches and principles by which we will we plan to achieve those goals?

Next slide.

So, comments received to date. Basically, we've done now about 24, 25 of these discussions around the country with the various Councils and commissions, state, state directors, general public. We've done a number of virtual sessions. And so, these are the primary bins of comments that we've received. Climate change has been a significant one, not surprisingly. And you know, we're trying to figure out how best to incorporate that, whether it's its own quiding principle or whether it's worked in throughout the document holistically. Education has been a regular subject of input. And that really comes in two different flavors. There's one in terms of, there are calls for more education of anglers on sort of conservation actions, best practices, things like that, but also secondarily on the science and management process itself. How those work? How can we get involved? So, from those perspectives.

Equity and environmental justice we've heard regularly. It has really been raised through the lens of shore-based non-tribal fishermen. Often it can be referred to as subsistence fisheries, but it's a very blurry set of lines as to what an activity is. Is someone doing it for fun? Are they doing it to supplement protein? And how do we best give those anglers a voice in the process?

Access has been raised from a number of perspectives, from physical access where, for example, in the Gulf of Mexico and here, we're seeing increased intensity of hurricanes, which is damaging, shoreside infrastructure like marinas and boat ramps and whatnot. So, people literally can't get out to fish. But also access in terms of changing migratory patterns of fish. They may be able to get out, but it's not there. Do we need to adjust seasons? Etcetera. Do we need to be more nimble in our understanding and our adjustment of how we respond to those potential changes?

Agency accountability, full implementation and transparency. I'm going to sort of wrap together here. And they're pretty self-explanatory. Essentially, people are saying, "the policy in general is still pretty solid, but we want you to do more to explain what you have done and what you will be doing to implement it." Transparency also goes to theirs, well, interesting-- sorry.

Agency accountability. There have been a number of requests for metrics to be incorporated into the policy or into the subsequent implementation plans. And transparency covers all that. But it

also includes another aspect which we often hear about. It's things such as reaching back out to the recreational community to communicate what has been done with the data that they've provided. There's often a feeling where we've gone, and had discussions with anglers that, "Hey, you've come to us, you've asked us for our data, we've given it to you, and we never hear anything more. Come back to us. Tell us, was it used in a study? Was it used in science? Was it used in management? If so, what was the impact? Comeback and give us a readout of what did you do with the information I gave you, and how has it affected the fisheries?"

4 5

The EEZ recreational permit is an issue that has come up in different fisheries all around the country. And more or less, there is a strong interest in trying to get a better handle on the universe of anglers in federal waters so that we can improve our estimates of effort that are out there. It can give us a better sample frame. There's a number of other benefits. So, it is something that we're seeing gain traction in various Councils around the country. We've seen it referenced or recommended in various reports from the National Academies of Sciences to the MAFAC, the Marine Fisheries Advisory Committee. So, it's something that again, has, we've been referenced in many, many places.

Data reporting and collection is always an issue wherever we go, whatever meeting we go to, whether it's the policy or a discussion or anything else. And there's really an interest in more, better, and more timely data collection, reporting and application of those data.

With depredation, that is an issue, again, we've seen really broadly across the country, but it changes flavor a little bit. It depends where you are. Sometimes it's shark depredation. Other places it's marine mammal depredation. Some places it's both. And then, enforcement. There's been interest or concern expressed about illegal charters. So, namely those folks who are going out illegally without their proper federal permits. And that appears to have been made easier by the internet. Used to the internet. People can find each other much more easily. And then some level of interest in seeing enforcement used almost as an educational tool where if a number of anglers are ticketed for undersized fish, wrong season, etcetera. The anglers who were commenting on that felt that the rest of the community will get the message very quickly and learn the regs.

Next slide please.

So, this is just a quick overview of sort of a little bit of where we've been, but where we're going as well. The comment period on

this has been open since August 1st. It closes about December 31st. As I mentioned, we have done numerous in-person and virtual sessions. You can see there in that giant list of acronyms, the recently, the various organizations we have spoken with. And this isn't all of them, but it's a number of them. We added your organization there, the Council, at the end there.

6 7 8

9

10 11

1213

14

15

16

17

18

19

2

3

4 5

We expect to be, early in the year, to sit down to summarize and review the comments and update the plan and have it out this coming fiscal year. And there are two ways to really comment, or three. Obviously, any input you provide here, we will take back. The QR code all the way to the right will take you to a specific comment form which asks those very questions that were up at the beginning. Or if the Council is interested in providing sort of a letter that it crafts of its own interest or supply other materials, the best is email us that dedicated to do to at recreational.fisheries@NOAA.gov. And of course, you can always contact me, or Tim, or Sean and we can work with you to answer any questions and ensure your input is fully accounted for. And that's it. Happy to answer any questions.

20 21

# Discussion

222324

25

2627

28

2930

31

32

33

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Russ. It just come up to my mind that part of the things that you are presenting, part of the things that the policy is looking for is enhancement of data collection, right? And I want to highlight that because we were discussing this earlier, and I think the Council and the Science Center need to be mindful, the coordination with the expertise that your office and you guys have with data collection expertise in other places that may be helpful to acquire better data here in the Caribbean. Just a comment I'm a fan of coordination of people that really want to do the difference. Thank you. Anybody else wants to say something? Maybe a question? James.

343536

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44 45

46

47 48 JAMES R. KREGLO: James Kreglo Saint Thomas/Saint John. Yeah. I just have a question. Now we're talking about data collection. Is there some way that fishers, recreational fishers can go to some kind of site or set something up or have an app where they could say, "Hey, I'm going fishing today. I'm available for a port sample." You know, and just, we could do it with, like in the Virgin Islands, we have the Saint Thomas Game Fish Club, we have the Saint Croix Game Fish Club, and then we just have a lot of recreational fishermen. But if they had one place and they're voluntarily willing to come in, and I know we had a comment about, you know, concerned about taking up people's time when they do a port sample, but most people I know they're happy to get a port sample done and it's not something where they're rushing off, they

have to go sell their catch or do some other thing. Because essentially, they're cleaning up their boat and doing some things like that while they're having the port sample done. But if there's some way that the public could have an app or go to some site and say, "Hey, I'm going fishing this weekend, I'd be happy to participate in the program." And that's my comment.

1 2

4 5

RUSSEL DUNN: Thanks. I don't have a specific response. I would look to Clay to see if that sort of concept is sort of tenable on its face or viable on its face. But it's certainly assuming that it is in some way, certainly something we can look at and think about. And, and so, folks, just to understand the next step in the process. More or less, once we are able to finalize the next policy, we will then turn to our regional offices and centers combined.

So, for here it would be the Southeast Regional Office and Clay's shop, the Southeast Center, developing a regionalized implementation plan that builds off the common national framework of the policies. But then, they'll be able to regionalize it to address the concerns and needs of any given region.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, James. Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, I don't know if you mentioned this, but in our area, one of the main concerns that we deal with is the enforcement of the no sale of many of the recreational caught species and also the lack of requirement for recreational fishing license and permits, etcetera. So, is that also a common theme? I'm just looking at-- so, can I fill that out in the forms?

RUSSEL DUNN: Sure. Yeah, yeah, please. I mean, any of your input would be great. Sale certainly comes up, but with different intensities in different places it. It's not, it hasn't come up every time. More of the charters have been. So, yes, it has come up. And then, sorry, what was the second part of your question?

**GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER:** And the requirement for licenses or permits for the recreational sector? So, not necessarily the charters, but the actual private vessels fishing.

RUSSEL DUNN: Yeah. Right. So, in most of the country, there are currently recreational permits issued at the state level. I think New York, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. I know Puerto Rico's has been in the works for a period of time. There are licenses in place for the private sector. And when I referenced that EEZ permit or offshore permit, the comment that has been provided has been really focused on the private recreational component, not the-- because

in most places we've got for higher license requirements already on the books and underway. So, this is a way to better capture that activity of the private boat angler that's occurring in federal waters.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, the reason why I'm asking about the licenses and the permit is because the Council has been interested in federal permits. The issue is, you know, having people have a state license and a federal permit or license, so it becomes cumbersome for the person who's acquiring the permits. But at the same time, there are so many differences, especially in Puerto Rico and the federal government, like the requirement of residency for the license and that kind of thing. That's mostly in the commercials and I don't know if it follows through into the recreational sector also. So, these are the issues that are coming up in our, probably, next meeting or two meetings from now, and it's a concern. So, that's where I'm heading with that questioning.

RUSSEL DUNN: Okay. Yeah. So, don't misinterpret what I'm saying. No decision has been made about trying to pursue this. There've been certainly lots of discussions about, if there was sufficient interest to pursue an EEZ permit, what would be the best way to do that? Because we're aware of concerns about being too burdensome with the state and federal. So, some people have suggested that if it were to be pursued, perhaps it would be best done at the state level with an endorsement, you know, for the federal so they could still just go to one place and get one permit, but then check one more box. Some people have suggested that perhaps the Council should sort of do a joint permitting action. So, we don't know. First of all, we don't know if we'll pursue it and second of all, we certainly don't know how best to do that. But certainly, if there is some effort to do it, it would be a long-term wholly inclusive effort to make sure that we do it the most efficient way possible.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. I cannot read from here. Let me see. At present, the U.S.V.I. recreational fishers can report their catch voluntarily anytime if they go fishing via the following website. This was sent by Sennai. I think it's a great initiative and this is something that maybe the-- Go ahead. Do you want to say something?

CLAY PORCH: Yeah. The Gulf and South Atlantic Councils have similar websites that you can report your catches too. It is useful for looking at some trends. The challenge we've always had is twofold. One, enthusiasm tends to wane for those sorts of apps. Initially, there's people that'll sign up and they want to do it, and then over time it gets a little old for them. The other thing

is trying to figure out how to use it in a way that we're fairly certain that it's representative of what's going on across the entire fishery. Because sometimes it's a select few that really report diligently and report accurately because they're environmentalist at heart. They want to make sure they're reporting good data, doing good management, all those sorts of things. And then others that are less diligent to report. But we need to know what those who are less diligent to report are catching as well. So, that's where the challenge has always been. How do we use that data to augment systems that are in place, that are intended to get representative ideas of what people are catching.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, because we are on the line of recreation, of fishing data collection and so on. This didn't get any form in Puerto Rico. But I would like to ask Jean-Pierre, before you step out, is there any possibility in order to have the universe of recreation of fishermen and other styles of fishing during registration of the boat, to have a small questionnaire added to that. Like, do you fish? yes or no. How many days in the year? Zero to 10 and so on. And do you fish pelagic, reef fish? Or do you dive fish? You know, some generic characterizations that that effort can be done every three years. The universe will not change. From your perspective, from the government, is this something doable? Because, for sure, that will help us a lot. That's the question.

 JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: I mean, absolutely. I mean, particularly when you are requiring that people renew, let's say registrations or something like that. So, we're able to tweak any sort of application or renewal process to include whatever information that we want to collect. And so, I don't think anything is impossible. I think that if it's generic and we're seeking some type of information, particularly since we collect information on an annual basis, then it's something that definitely could be added.

 MARCOS HANKE: I will ask. Unfortunately, we don't have the representative from Puerto Rico here. This is the third time that you present this idea that for me is a no-brainer. And if I can count with your leadership on trying to explore this possibility, it would be very helpful. And for the fishermen, once a hurricane comes, we're going to finally have a way to access the damage and the size of the industry, such economic impact and so on and the baseline for the scientific data, there are many implications on this little move. Right? And anyway, those are my comments.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: So, what I would just add, maybe what we can do is, now that we do have our recreational fishing regs in

place, maybe at the next meeting our staff, because I'm definitely not the best person to do a presentation, but definitely show exactly what it is that DPNR will be doing, what platform we're using, what sort of information we'll be collecting. And then maybe that's useful in showing how we are also aiming towards compatibility as well.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: I'll do my part on-- we already worked on some start up questions to do this in the past. I'll try to find those and maybe we can circulate them among people to make it short and chart just like the first step to see if we can make this fly. Thank you. No other question to Russ. Thank you very much, Russ.

RUSSEL DUNN: All right. I would just say thank you and urge the Council to provide its comments through the website when possible. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. And you have a meeting today, right?

RUSSEL DUNN: Yes. Yeah. We have it at six to eight o'clock tonight at Club Nautical. We are getting together with the Atlantic HMS Division and our Southeast Regional Office. We're going to be holding informal discussions with constituents there. Everyone is invited. I think as you come into the parking lot, there's a guard gate and they said to just tell people you're with the NOAA discussion. So, we hope to see a good number of folks there tonight and have just a casual discussion on a number of topics. This will touch very briefly on the policy. HMS is going to discuss a few issues as well as the Southeast regional office. And then we look to hear from what is of interest and concern to fishers there at the meeting.

MARCOS HANKE: Mostly recreational fishery emphasis.

RUSSEL DUNN: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Thank you very much. Thank you again. Next presentation, Outreach and Education Advisory Panel report. Alida.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Good afternoon, everyone.

**CRISTINA OLÁN:** Sorry, Alida. I have to answer before a question 44 from Ricardo Lugo. Es en el Club Nautico de San Juan. Thank you, 45 Alida. I'm sorry.

MARCOS HANKE: Christina, I'll send you the invitation and you can share it with Ricardo Lugo. Okay?

# 1 2

## Outreach and Education Advisory Panel Report

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Good afternoon, everyone. I will make a very short presentation because we have discussed many of these things. So, the first thing that I want to share, and I have done this before and I'm going to continue doing it— Next slide. —is that in all the outreach and education activities that we are developing, that we are doing in this area, we are following the five-year strategic plan of the Council. That was discussed with you, I think, about two meetings ago. The goal that we have is to engage, educate, and inform a variety of audiences to improve public understanding and participation in the Council process. And this is important to us because it goes beyond the fishers, it goes beyond the activity in the fishing industry. It has to do with education, it has to do with consumption, it has to the consumer education.

So, our activities for outreach education are based in the understanding of that ecosystem-based management that takes into account the species that are taken out of the ecosystem, and also the impact that many other activities outside of the marine environment can take on that ecosystem. Also, we are working intensely with the island-based fishery management plants, the Puerto Rico, Saint Thomas/Saint John and Saint Croix. Because even though we are very close to each other in the region, Puerto Rico has a different culture, a different sociology, different economics. Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix, they're very, very different. And what we had been for 20 years or so, working only on a single plan, management plan for the three islands.

And I think I came here for probably 12 years ago. I don't even remember. But since the first time I heard the fishers from Saint Thomas, from Saint Croix, from Puerto Rico saying, "we are different. We may have the same species, but the way we fish, the way we do our work is different. So, we need different fishing plans." So now that we have that we'll be working on that. And this is right now our most important activity. How to bring the information of each one of the Island-Based Fishery Management Plans to each one of the islands. And not just to the fisher, but to all the audiences.

And also, the sustainable fish and seafood consumption that we will talk about a little bit about it with the recipe book that you have. Because we pay a lot of emphasis and a lot of energy in the fish that everybody eats. And we request the fishers to bring that fish all the time, whether it's there, whether it's available, but they have to get it. But there are many, many species that are

just as good. That are just as healthy. And what we need is to have the consumers learn about these other species. And in the consumers, we mean the housewife. We also meet the people with the restaurants, everyone.

And then, the other area that we are paying more attention is the marine protected areas. Because marine protected areas are sometimes just a name on an area, but what is the importance of that area for the fisheries? Next one.

Actually, some of these materials you have already seen. We have the fact sheets that we have developed on forage fish and also on biodiversity of that marine ecosystem. Because it is not only the fish or the squids or the octopus that we have in our table. The stars and the sea cucumbers and all the animals that are there are just as important, but they are part of that ecosystem. And we are working right now on sea urchins and sea cucumbers, just to put them into, to knowledge of everyone.

Next.

Also, we have worked already on the first fact sheet on the island-base. And this is just very, very general on the main issues of what was changed from the one island-based management that now has one for Puerto Rico, for Saint Thomas/Saint John, and one from Saint Croix.

Next.

These products you have seen, and now I would like to talk a little bit more about the recipe book that you have there. The recipe book came as an idea from one activity. In one of the Council meetings in Ponce, we had a dinner with one of the chefs that is in the book. And we did not use the fish that are served in all of the very high-level restaurants that are very expensive. We used the everyday fish. And then, from there we said, "okay, why don't we make recipes about this?" It was Diana's idea. Then, from there, we started collecting the recipes. We contacted some chefs in Saint Thomas/Saint John in Saint Croix. Carlos gave us many, many of the recipes. And then, Corey Magras. Who else from there. Nicole Greaux gave some of the recipes also. But notice that the first part of the book is not about the seasoning that I put on the fish. It is about the importance of that ecosystem and the connection of that ecosystem between the species that we are taking out and also the way we use that. So, I hope that with this book now-- and Diana will be a great help in that, and the liaisons will also be a great help. --we will have workshops in each one of the islands to let

the people know that this is the new way of looking at seafood and the fishing industry.

So, we will distribute them to each one of the islands and the liaisons will help us. And also, the DAPs should help us also to identify other restaurants that we probably don't have here.

Next please.

Also, we worked a lot with these posters. Now with those posters—one of them is, the one back with the conch, Vanessa brought it—with these posters we are going to make fact sheets with the illustrations adapted to a size of a fact sheet, and also the text. So, the text doesn't have to be that large, but the text has to have the basic information that the fisher and the consumer need. Especially the lifecycle, because sometimes we know the species only on the size that we get it on the table. But no, no, no. We have to know where they grow, where do they reproduce, when do they reproduce, what do they do during their lifetime. So, that we can make a better assessment of how that population serves economically, but also how important that species is in terms of ecology. So, those are the posters that we were working, those are done already.

 Now, the other activities and the other connection with outreach and education, I would like to make emphasis on, is the importance that MREP is having Puerto Rico in terms of education, in terms of getting the fishers together. The workshops are very, very successful. We even hear different language in the people that take the workshops. So, to me, as an educator, it's very important. Tomorrow we are going to have an MREP steering committee to work on, you know, if there are any changes that have to be done with the workshops. We would like to request the support from the Council and from the DAPs and from everyone that is here, how can we have MREP in the Virgin Islands.

Also, PEPCO is another activity that is very important. That's a workshop for fishers in Puerto Rico, and that's conducted by Wilson. Wilson is the liaison of Puerto Rico and the Council. And he's very, very effective. And I have been at the workshops when there is an issue that we would like the fishers to know, I can use better the population that he has in the room to each one of the of the fishing villages. So, PEPCO. How can we have PEPCO in the Virgin Islands also? Because you have a very different sociology, you have a different way of looking at things. So, we will try to do that too. And we will request the support from the Council for that.

And also, for all the materials that we work, we would like to recommend to the Council how to make a collection of photographs that are identified by the researcher in the area, the sizes and all that, so that we don't have to take that many photograph from Google or from anywhere because we do have the resources here. The only thing is that we need a bank. We need where to deposit them. So, if the Council makes, on the website, a collection of photos with all the information that they identified, the species, where they were taken, the depth, and who took the photos so we can use the information there and we don't have to go to fish base and to all other sources.

13 Next one, please.

4 5

 Our activities for 2023-2024, and some of them are already in progress. Especially, we are working very intensely with that fact sheet or some easier to read, easier to understand document on Island-Based Fishery Management Plan. One based on Puerto Rico, one based in Saint Thomas/Saint John, and the other one based in Saint Croix. We are using the chapter five of each one of those documents to take that information and put it in that vocabulary or in that language. María del Mar has been a very great help with this. And then, as soon as we get the first draft, we will send them to the DAPs so that they can read it and say, "you know, this is not that understandable" and I can change it again to María and then we will have it distributed to each one of the islands.

They have asked the fishers many times life cycles of nassau grouper, mutton snapper, and queen conch. Those posters we have to turn them into fact sheets. Why? Because the poster is not only for a place where it has to be covered and protected from sun or protected from water. We want something that they can have in a restaurant. That they can have it anywhere. And that's what we're working for. And also, in the meeting that we had on the outreach and education last month there was a very good recommendation. They came from Adyan, and they came from—— I don't know, who was the other one——No, I think Adyan was the one that gave us more recommendations.

That fishery ecosystem plan has conceptual models that we have to try to explain in a more understandable way than the way that they have in the conceptual models now. Because, you know, as I say all the time, they look at me like I'm spaghetti salad. And then, we still have to get, you know, which of them are the very, very important issues and how they connect in a more direct way. That doesn't mean that the conceptual model for fisheries is easy. No, it is not. But we have to make it the easiest way that they can be understood.

1 2

4 5

 There was a recommendation also that we make materials for students in secondary and high school. Especially recognition of fish species. The same way that we did with the cookbook, with the recipe book, that each one of the fish that are used in a plate, you have the definition, you have the description, you have the sizes, where they are. And that's something that we should do probably with the students.

And then, the integration of the-- and this is something that I have been dreaming of all my life and some time I'm going to get it --is that we integrate this concept of fisheries in all education in the curriculum. Why? Because the new generation of fishers, we can get that from seventh grade. And we have seen many, many, many kids, many, many children that work with their family and they enjoy it. So, if they get all the technical information in a vocabulary that they can understand, we can have it. And we are trying to work, or we're working with a school in La Parguera, one of the Montessori schools where they are willing to do it. And this is not just ecology or marine sciences, this is the entire curriculum. The first thing they have to learn is to swim, because that's part of the education. And then, even cooking, everything but within the curriculum.

Next.

And the other projects that we are still working on are some of the illustrated booklets. Especially, we are working right now on one on climate change and fisheries. What are the concepts? what are those issues that we keep listening about climate change? how to understand the possible effect of ocean acidification, high temperatures in the water? How does that affect the life cycle or the behavior of this species?

So, next.

The calendar. With the calendar, I don't feel happy. We have not produced completely the calendar for 2023. This calendar was to be dedicated or is to be dedicated to families in fisheries, because we have many families in Puerto Rico, in Saint Thomas/Saint John, and in Saint Croix that they all fish and we have generations fishing. The grandfather is fishing, the son is fishing, the mother is fishing, and we also have kids fishing. So, we want to that do that. If we can't complete the materials that are needed—because the problem with this is that they had the person that was in charge or the liaisons that were requested to give the information, they had to take the pictures or have the pictures, and they also

have to have the description, a short description of the family. And for some reason, something we have not completed yet.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Alida, that calendar will be out in 2024.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Okay.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: There will be no calendar for 2023.

**ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR:** But I'm going to finish it. Okay. So, and for the other calendars we'll be working on. Probably these calendars will be on different topics, probably related to island-based management. But the information for 2023, we still going to complete that.

And with that, I finish my presentation. I'll answer any questions and wish you all a very, very happy New Year.

#### Discussion

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Alida. Thank you very much. And we are paying attention on all the development. In my case, I'm very aware of what is going on. The other Council members have something to say? Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sorry. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. As always, I want to thank Alida and the staff for all their great work. I think I am one of the most that uses all those materials asking practically monthly. I need to share two special things. One, the importance of continuing supporting in this kind of jobs to go to the school. Education is very important. And for the first time we are looking for and seeing a new emerging generation of young fishermen. So, that's very important that all these materials are not only produced, are also distributed around the schools and around the marinas and around the communities.

And I also want to recognize the presence today of Mr. Pozzi. He's from the municipality of Cabo Rojo in federal funds. He's the one that is in charge to help our fishermen and he's really involved, and he wants to be also collaborating in Cabo Rojo with the service and provide anything that could be under his hands to take all these materials and provide the space for workshops and everything we need to share. This not only in the municipality, also in the West Zone. So, with this, I just need to say thank you, thank you always for all the developing all these materials. And remember, please continue sending this to all the island around, so that the

commercial fishermen and the next generation could have those in their hands. Thanks.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Vanessa. Can you repeat the name of the person that you're talking about?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Oh, yes. Mr. Gabriel Pozzi.

MARCOS HANKE: He want to say some words to the Council?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: If he can. Yes, please. Pozzi, you can come here. I want to explain, this is the only municipality in Puerto Rico that recognized the commercial fishermen. In 2014 they made a municipal legislation and recognize the commercial fishermen as small business owners. So, that's the way that they can help with federal funds to get equipment. They give up to \$10,000 every two years to get equipment and get also security. And there's something important going on. that the graduation is going to be this weekend. We have for the first time a group of commercial divers, younger divers and experiences divers, that are taking their license for scuba diving between a grant from Sea Grant with the municipality of Cab Rojo. So, we are going to have 14 commercial divers already with their license that could collaborate with the federal projects for the next year.

MARCOS HANKE: Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Vanessa, will that be something that the mayor of Cabo Rojo can take to the Association of Mayors in Puerto Rico? Because this is very important for many years, we have tried to do that and I believe that Cabo Rojo is an example to follow by others and that will help a lot the fishermen around Puerto Rico, Vieques and Culebra.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes. Of course, they already had that meeting and brought the example of Cabo Rojo to other municipalities in the association. And for now, they already started with Culebra. They went this past month, in November, commercial fisherman from Cabo Rojo with Mr. Pozzi went to Culebra to start practically sharing the techniques and also started sharing how we administrate our fish markets in Cabo Rojo.

 We started that in 2015 with the visit of a couple of fishermen that were interested in getting together and making an association there. As you know, I'm part of the commercial fishermen in Puerto Real. That practically is the one that has been using the agricultural department to teach the others that if you want, you

can make a community and you should not only wait for the government because we know the status in Puerto Rico.

But right now, they started with that last month, in November. They brought, I think, it was five commercial fishermen with him. They spent there a week. They have also the issues about the areas, and they still have mines and all that, but we already made the first step. I think that's very important. And specially to give also to those Islands the equality to get the access to all this information. And especially now that we have the new plans, it's very important that this could be not only in the social media because I know that Christina make a great job with that, most of the commercial fishermen love the Facebook, but we have now a generation that they also have YouTube channels, and they provide their videos every day when they are fishing. They provide photos as Alida says. So, that's a good tool that you can also use if you want to see live videos every day.

MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa, can you please introduce Mr. Pozzi? Please. Go ahead.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Okay. Please. Mr. Gabriel Pozzi from federal funds in the municipality of Cabo Rojo.

GABRIEL POZZI: Okay. Buenas tardes para todos. Gabriel Pozzi del municipio de Cabo Rojo. Desde el 2015 estamos ayudando a los pescadores. Aproximadamente le hemos dado cerca de \$1.5 millones con todas las ayudas para ellos desde lanchas, equipo, GPS, asesoría. Últimamente estuve en Culebra para ayudarlos, en noviembre. Y seguiremos ayudando a todos los pueblos también de Puerto Rico que estamos ayudándolos también para que tengan ese proyecto a través de Vivienda. El municipio los ayuda con fondos CDBG y con fondos ARPA. Próximamente vamos a dar otra entrega de unos cuantos chavitos a los pescadores de Cabo Rojo. Eso es todo, muchas gracias. [applause]

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. One thing that I'm really interested on is the link between giving facilities or engines and boats and things that are super important for the fishing community. But if you're facilitating organizations and fish houses and so on, also, maybe there is an opportunity to collect fishery data for best fishery and sustainability into the future. And I put myself in the position to help you out and to make the connections with the right people. Vanessa, for sure is a very good connection. But please think about it the way that once you train those fishermen, you give those engines and facilities also to capacitate and to educate and to engage them into providing fishery data in a correct manner and the importance of it.

1 2

And we can talk after the meeting. And I have a few ideas and venues for you to engage your fisherman, for example, MREP that gives you a good background of what is this about. Thank you.

Go ahead, Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record, I have to say also that we should continue on supporting MREP. That's a great tool. We have been practically for the last two times, in 2019 and now this past August, attending that. And we see the difference between the commercial fishermen and recreational fishermen they get there, get involved, discuss situations, and they make, practically, they have the experience to be there as a practice to be here. And I know that we are going to continue having more, more participants as we saw the last time. We had more than a hundred applications. So, that's great because in the beginning they just received like 15 or 20 applications. Now they are practically waiting for the next one. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: I see the value of expansion. If you do a holistic approach and expand to the other municipalities, it would be great. Especially if there is data collection involved. Julian, very quick before we go with Christina, which will be the next one.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Yeah, good afternoon. Julian Magras, for the record. I just want to say also from the Saint Thomas/Saint John District through the Saint Thomas Fisherman's Association. We are willing to work with MREP to pull off MREP meeting training over in our district. We did one a few years back. I think now that we have some new fishers into the fishery, it's a great opportunity to get them to understand the processes that we go through to allow these different meetings. So, I look forward to working with the team from MREP. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. James and then Christina.

**JAMES R. KREGLO:** I just had a quick question. This is something I wanted to do on my Facebook page, to put on some recipes. Do I have to get special permission to put these on my Facebook page?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, that's government book. It will be loaded up in our webpage. You're free to use it. Actually, the more distribution by anybody we have the better. And the book can be downloaded by anybody free of charge, of course, but feel free to use it the best way you can in any way possible.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Okay, great. Thank you so, much.

1 2

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, James.

3 4

5 6 7

MARCOS HANKE:

8

9

10

11

12

18 19

20 21

22 23 24

25 26

27 28 29

30 31

32 33 34

35 36 37

38 39 40

41 42

> 43 44 45

46 47 48

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Also, if you try the recipes and invite us, we--[laughter]

I don't know if I'll go. Yeah, it's okay. You convince me. Christina.

# Social Network Activities Report

Good afternoon. My name is Christina Olán, and I CRISTINA OLÁN: manage the social media of the Caribbean Fishery Management Council. Thank you for letting me present a quick update on what we have been doing with the social media. And to answer James' question. Yes, you can. Also, if you want to take pictures of the recipes or anything that you are doing related to that, you are free to do it. The book will be in ISSUU. We have also a page in that platform.

Just to let you know that in Facebook we have 6,100 followers plus. Instagram almost 1,500. It is increasing a lot. In Twitter, have 113 followers. And also, in YouTube we have new followers since, during the meeting, the meeting has been broadcasted through YouTube, so we have 352.

Those graphs are just only to show you that our reach has been increasing during the year in Facebook and in Instagram. And also, the population that we have in the two main platforms, in Facebook and in Instagram. We have a lot of people between the ages of 25 to 54 years old. Mostly men, but also women there too.

The content that we usually publish is related to seasonal enclosures, meetings, workshops, educational materials, pictures, videos, content produced by other organizations, and agencies, for example, NOAA, DPNR, DNER, National Water Service, Saint Thomas fisherman Association, VI-EPSCOR. Also, influencers like el ISSUU, for example, and AmandOcéano. Also, el Programa De Estadísticas Pesca Recreativa has been collaborating a lot, recently, with the Caribbean Fishery Management Council sharing content too. We also publish a CFMC monthly bulletin. We receive a lot of direct messages in the inbox with questions related to fish id, documents, regulations, workshop, fishing license, and where to buy fish.

That's an example of one of the bulletins. That one was published in August. In that issue we highlighted how fishers can use CARICOOS and the boating app.

Since the proposed rule to list the queen conch as a threaten species under the ESA has been a very hot topic. We did a lot of publications related to the topic on how people can comment, deadlines, the dates and the links for the public hearing and updates that were provided by NOAA fisheries. Also, where they can get the information, the official information, too. All of our content is published in English and Spanish. I am just showing you some examples of what you can see on the page. Questions and answers. Also, where to find the reports.

4 5

As I mentioned, we have also the page in ISSUU where you can get documents and also download them. We provide also information for WhatsApp that is managed by Wilson Santiago in Puerto Rico. Also, Nicole Greaux, now has a WhatsApp broadcast list, and I will be collaborating with her sending information too, for her list.

Those are some ideas that have been given by followers through our social media. They need more products related to fish ID measures and quantity, use of descending devices. That's a topic that I have been talking a lot with Marcos because we want to develop more videos and reels and publications related to that topic. And interviews to fishers, they want to see that. That image is one of our followers asking for a product related to measures and quantity of fish.

As always, thanks to all our collaborators, they are a lot of people. I am very thankful for all the CFMC staff that is always collaborating, all scientists, agencies, and the people that follow us and share our content. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask them now. And, as always, I'm open to any ideas and happy to answer and receive your ideas and suggestions. Thanks.

#### Discussion

MARCOS HANKE: Great job, Christina. I want the whole Council and the people in this room to know that Christina is our voice, the agile and the quick voice, responsible voice to take the message out there. You are essential to the future of this Council. Your professionalism, you know, every time we call you, doesn't matter what, if there is something that we need you to clarify or to do something, you are always there. Please know that we know how hard it is and we know with the passion that you do it, and we really appreciate that. Thank you very much. [applause]

CRISTINA OLÁN: Muchas gracias. Agradecida. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Jack.

JOHN MCGOVERN: I wanted to echo what Marco said. We really appreciate all your help Christina, and getting the word out to folks, it's great. Thank you.

CRISTINA OLÁN: Thank you very much. Muchas Gracias.

MARCOS HANKE: Any other question? We need a break, five-minute break. We'll be back in five minutes.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MARCOS HANKE: Please take your seats. For the next presentation we are going to hear from the liaison officers and going to start with Mavel Maldonado. Please, liaison officers, move forward. Alida.

**ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR:** Just a momento. Mavel Maldonado called today and excuse herself because she's fishing and couldn't present.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Mavel Maldonado will not present. We have Nicole Greaux.

# Liaison Officers Reports Nicole Greaux- Saint Thomas/Saint John

NICOLE GREAUX: Et enfin, Christina. Good afternoon. I am Nicole Greaux, the Caribbean Fishery Council Management Liaison for the outreach and education to Saint Thomas and Saint John. I'm very happy to be here.

CRISTINA OLÁN: Nicole, could you see it instead of being there and where—

NICOLE GREAUX: Allá.

CRISTINA OLÁN: Allá? People in zoom will see you better.

**NICOLE GREAUX:** Si, pero no. Is that better?

41 CRISTINA OLÁN: Yes.

NICOLE GREAUX: Okay. next page please.

 So, this year has been a pretty full one and I am really happy to announce that we are finishing the year strong with outreach and with public events in Saint Thomas and Saint John. Christina mentioned earlier the WhatsApp broadcast that I've started, and

I'm very proud of that. That has gotten a lot of positive feedback. I do like the fact that it is an easy way to get information out to many fishermen at one time. Currently I only have 28 fishermen that are signed up but I'm hoping that that number is going to grow. And what's really wonderful about the WhatsApp broadcast, as Wilson had recommended, is that when Fishers respond, they don't respond in a group. They get to ask their questions and they're secure with knowing that there's no criticism. If they don't understand something or if they need more information, they can send their message back, reply to the broadcast, and it comes back directly just to me.

4 5

I've done two public event tables with wonderful information and some really neat products that I got from the Sea Grant. I got some boxes sent over to me through Jannette, and they were very well received. I'm now going to look for other publications or the same ones that I received in English. Because a lot of the material that I received was in Spanish. Y entonces en San Thomas el primer idioma es en ingles no en español. So, I had very few people interested in taking the products, but the people that did take them were very happy that there were things like recipes for lionfish and information on a wonderful story about this character called Pepe Uca and that was the favorite thing. I've helped out with online information, with helping fishers do things like create their SAM's numbers, being able to help them move around and navigate the DPNR and the DFW website, which is something that they can use, and they don't have to keep calling us or calling the office. They can do things like register their boat online now instead of having to worry about going back and forth to the office.

Next page please.

 So some of the things that we were discussing, and this came through the FAC as well, there was a presentation on the Marine Debris Location app. That is something that's going to be very greatly utilized by a lot of our fishermen when it comes to something of a nuisance to certain fishermen out on the East end of the island with derelict abandoned vessels that need to be removed. The MyCoast app is going to help the fishermen locate or put a location to these particular vessels, and therefore that goes to an organization that needs to collect this information so that those vessels can be removed. It's really important that we move these vessels out of the way, especially since they have grown in numbers since hurricanes in 2017. A lot of these vessels are in marine protected areas and worse than that, they're tied to the mangroves. With the fishermen's help that actually utilize these areas where these derelict vessels are located, the MyCoast app is

going to help identify the position of these boats readily for removal.

There is a new coral restoration and out planting organization called CWORI. I did a video interview with the lead biologist for that particular organization and that's going to go up soon. Once I put the video together, that's going to go to Christina, so she can send that out. It is an organization that is in collaboration with the University of the Virgin Islands and a Florida University to help with the stony tissue coral disease and they do out planting and they also do testing on the stony tissue coral disease that we have that's affecting not only the Virgin Islands, but also the rest of the Caribbean as well.

We have finally installed a few of our outreach and education information boxes. There is one located at the Frenchtown Fish House and there is another one located down in Hull Bay. The other two fish boxes, unfortunately were not able to go up. One because one of their locations was our only fully equipped fishing store, Neptune's fishing. They had a fire, so they were not able to have the boxes put up and set out. And then also in the Crown Bay area, which is where larger boats also go out, we were not able to put those boxes up as well. Uh, with the island-based Fisher Management plan information that we're getting, not only are they going to be able to see the information in these information boxes, but some of the flyers and notifications are also going to go out on the WhatsApp broadcast as well.

Next, please.

I'm very much looking forward to 2024. The Fisher Involvement studies that I was just speaking about with the IBFMPs, the workshops that are coming up. Better communication with the Department of Planning and Natural Resources. We now have new enforcement officers, so I look forward to introducing myself to them and working with them to help better communicate with the fishermen. Also, we have two outreach and education things planned for two schools on Saint Thomas for 2024. So, I will be requesting information from the Caribbean Fishery Management Council, so that I can take with me when I do these presentations at the schools. One of them is about marine protected areas and critical habitats, critical marine habitats. And the other one is about fish identification. So, that concludes my report.

Next page, please. Thank you. That's my favorite fish, by the way. Go haemulon, yay. Any questions? Thank you all for having me. It's really great to be here.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Any questions for Ms. Greaux? Okay. Hearing none. Thank you. It is Wilson turn.

# Wilson Santiago- Puerto Rico

WILSON SANTIAGO: Hello everyone. I am Wilson Santiago, Puerto Rico Fisheries Liaison. I'm going to do two or three slides on the report. Very, very little. I just presented in the OEAP meeting almost all my report.

So, for the 2022 liaison participation I gave the educational program PEPCO. PEPCO is an educational program for commercial fishers. I continue supporting Christina Olán at the CFMC with the social media we call it "Repaso de PEPCO." It is topics from the educational program that we divided and weekly send it to all the fishers in the island via the WhatsApp broadcast. I participated in the MREP workshop in Puerto Rico as a moderator beside Vanessa Ramírez. And I participated in Florida, in the MREP in Florida. And as Alida told, we have to continue supporting the MREP program. It has made a huge impact in the fisheries in Puerto Rico, in the recreational and commercial. When I went to the Florida MREP, I learnt a lot of new things for filling the PEPCO program, the educational program for commercial fishers. So, it was wonderful.

 Like I said, weekly, we send out, in the WhatsApp broadcast information about the meetings, closures. All information that the fishers, commercial and recreation fishers, need to know about the management of fisheries in Puerto Rico. We continue supporting the fishers with features and information. I travel around the island to all the fishing villages giving educational materials, talking with the fishers, like my presentation yesterday with Jannette Ramos about the afterward of the hurricanes in Puerto Rico around the fishing village. So, I visited around the whole island. We're continuing to do that, giving them all educational materials and information and collecting all the issues and concerns and listening to the fishers because one important thing that I have learned in all my 10 years, 11 years' experience on this job is that you have to listen to the commercial and recreational fishers. If you don't listen to them, you don't know what is going on with them. We bring them information because it's very good to listen to them, to sit with them, have a conversation. In a conversation, I have learned that you can learn more than asking them questions. You know, this is some things that I have learned in my experience. So, like, you know, yesterday we presented the assessment on the impacts of Hurricane Fiona in Puerto Rico Fishing Villages and Communities.

So, our outreach and education next steps for the 2023. We are continuing the PEPCO program for the commercial fishers, and also, we are restarting the Educational Recreational Program for recreational fishers. Starting in January both of the program. We are going to give them in person. We will continue supporting the CFMC, DNER and other agencies as Sea Grant with communication and distribution of educational materials for the fishers and the communities around the Puerto Rico. Continue giving support to the social media at DNER, CFMC and Sea Grant. Continue educating in the process of license statistics, state laws to maintain their responsibility with the management agencies.

4 5

For those who don't know, the other work that I do is as a port sampler for DNER in Puerto Rico. So, the commercial statistic program is one of my-- it is like the major for me. You know, I always I'm teaching and continue orientating them. So, coordinating effective communication with the fishers regarding the Island-Based Fishery Management Plan. We have, in the OEAP meetings and with Alida, we have talked about starting in 2023 with making the workshops around the island for the Island-Based Fishery Management Plan. So, for 2023 those are some of the next steps.

Some issue and concern from the fishers that I have heard. It's like always is like almost the same. The queen snapper and cardinal snapper state permit. The HMS permit for Caribbean Small Boat. This has been attended with the PEPCO and with the Fuete y Verguilla Magazine from the Puerto Rico Sea Grant program. The Puerto Rico commercial fish license and permits, there are some issues that since Hurricane María have been more.

Information about the proposed rule to list the queen conch as a threatened species, there have been a lot of issues about this. You know, you heard yesterday the fishers from Naguabo and Andy Maldonado from Cabo Rojo. Right now, there are a lot of issues and concern about this topic, but part of my worry is giving them the information, orienting them and via the WhatsApp broadcast, via the social medias, we give the outreach to those fishers. The other concern is the Caribbean lobster federal closing proposals.

So, these are all the issues and concerns that I have heard from the fishers in my visits. So, I am done. Any question? That is my contact information if anyone want to contact me. Thank you.

#### Discussion

MARCOS HANKE: Any question for Wilson? Vanessa and Alida.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. I just want to recognize the great job that Wilson does practically daily. Not only with his work with the statistics department but also because he's practically one of the persons that is hand by hand with the fishermen and he's always accessible. This WhatsApp is a great, great tool. I think it's the best thing that we have after Facebook not only for the commercial fishermen and the recreational. It's the way that he manages it and how accessible he is to answer. I think, we know that sometimes the conversation between fishermen and government or Council is very hard to encourage them to participate but I think that the way that they are seeing this now and the simple language that is used when they make the approach, that's one of the best things that they are doing. So, thank you. And we continue working.

4 5

WILSON SANTIAGO: Thank you for that word.

MARCOS HANKE: Alida.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: I just want to recognize the work and the effort that the liaisons make for outreach and education. They are our first source of information and just to get what's happening in the fishing community, but also to get the information to them. So, without their work we wouldn't be doing, you know, all the thing that we have to do. So, thank you so much, Wilson. Thank you so much, Nicole. And we are here also to help you in everything.

WILSON SANTIAGO: Thank you all.

MARCOS HANKE: Any more question? Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelson Crespo, for the record. Wilson is the tower for our tears. All the fishermen in Puerto Rico recognize the huge labor that this man is doing in benefits of the fisheries in Puerto Rico. When we are frustrated because we cannot find nobody in the government, in the Department of Natural Resources, the only person that answers the phone is that man. Every time we need something regarding our license, any doubt, the only guy who clears our doubt is that guy. Wilson, I appreciate your friendship. I appreciate your dedication.

WILSON SANTIAGO: No problem.

**NELSON CRESPO:** And thank you very much for all the things you are doing for the benefit of the fishermen in Puerto Rico. [applause]

WILSON SANTIAGO: Thank you, Nelson. Thank you for your words.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Wilson. Next presentation is a National Marine Fisheries Service/NOAA Office of Law Enforcement.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. This presentation comes from the meeting that the Coast Guard put together with the international delegation. I thought it was an excellent presentation because sometimes you see these gentlemen sitting in the back there, but we talk about enforcement, but they do more than just what they present at every meeting here.

So, I asked Miguel, and Miguel checked with the boss and the presentation that you are going to hear today is all the activities that the NOAA Office of Law Enforcement does for the U.S. Caribbean. Miguel graciously accepted. So, if you have any questions be short, but try to get any question that you may have answered by Miguel. Go ahead Miguel. Thank you very much for the presentation.

# NMFS/NOAA Office of Law Enforcement

MIGUEL BORGES: Okay. Thank you, Miguel Rolón. My name is Miguel Borges. I'm the special agent here in Puerto Rico for NOAA Office of Law Enforcement. In this presentation, I'm going to talk a little bit about efforts internationally that we do, other than the normal closed season and closed species that we do locally, we also have efforts internationally to do capacity building with other countries to fight IUU and to try to do some traceability of the seafood that gets imported here. So, we're very few and far in between. So, if we have the help from other countries to avoid getting IUU harvested fish to our ports, that goes a long way.

Next slide, please.

So, we'll talk about the domestic international operations, the interagency cooperation and information sharing, and the capacity building efforts that we do internationally.

Next one.

40 Here's just a picture of our officers doing inspection in the 41 Northeast, in New Jersey or New York.

Next one.

So, just as an overview, the law enforcement office does have five divisions, 51 field officers approximately, 65 special agents and 70 enforcement officers, that is approximate, and 74 support staff around the nation.

Next one.

We are divided into the five regions seen there in the colors. We obviously are the green one, Southeast, going from Texas all the way from the Gulf and the East part of Florida all the way to North Carolina and the Caribbean. The others in Northeast, the Pacific, the Alaska region, and the Pacific Island division. We cover more than 3 million square miles of open ocean and over 95,000 miles of coastline.

Next one.

This is just a couple pictures of what we do. We work closely with CBP, with Customs and Border Protection in airports, seaports and land borders to inspect the shipments and seafood being imported. They have all the information of everything that's being imported into the U.S., so with them we inspect the containers, ships, cars, anything that is bringing seafood to make sure it complies with the regulations and the permits required. That could be seen with a sometimes mislabeling of fish. That's one of the things we will check for. And the proper paperwork that they need for the traceability of our seafood.

Next slide please.

The primary loss OLE enforces is obviously the Magnuson-Stevens Act, which is the primary, the National Marine Sanctuary Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, which we've done a couple cases here, especially in the East. The Port state measures that I'm going to talk a little bit more now. Endangered species and Lacey Act.

Next one.

So, domestic operations are the typical operations that most of you are familiar with, which is patrolling, enforcing seasonal closures, protected areas. We have the JEA program with the Joint Enforcement Agreement with the DNER and DPNR in the Virgin Islands, which NOAA gives funds to these agencies, and they provide the patrols in the federal waters. The cases are then forwarded to OLE. We collaborate with the U.S. Coast Guard, which is our main partner in the water for the LMR boardings as they call it Living Marine Resource. Fish and Wildlife. CBP, Customs and Border Protection are the main agencies.

Next one.

Internationally, we do investigations of IUU fishing, which is the illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing. We do tracking of IUU fish and fish products. We do the port state measures and other IUU fishing. We do engagements in bilateral and multilateral arrangements and the capacity buildings with international partners like Interpol.

Next slide please.

So, IUU fishing, like I said, is illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing. This fishing activity does not comply with national, regional, or global fisheries obligations.

Next one.

The impacts of the IUU fishing, which could be ecological, economic, social, and security impacts. To give an example, the economic impact is important because the imported product, if it's illegal, it could flood the market of that product and then compete with a local product lowering the price for the product. So, that's a way that we also protect the local product and the local fishermen, making sure illegal product is not coming in and flooding the market lowering the price.

Next one.

 So, the Port State Measure Act entered into force globally in 2016. Currently, there are approximately 72 parties in this agreement. It aims to implement effective port State measures to support sustainable fishery resource use. Works to develop enforcement capacity at PSMA ports. And our success relies in international collaboration and information sharing between all the countries.

Next one.

This is just an example. Our aim in the Port Safe Measures Act is for countries to deny entry of IUU harvested seafood at the port. So, it makes it harder for the IUU harvested to be sold, lowers the price of the IUU harvest, and protects the consumer and legal fishing industry.

Next one.

So, some takeaways of this Port Safe Measures are that it removes those financial incentives for IUU fishing. Gatherers and communicates valuable law enforcement data and improves the ability to detect the IUU product.

1 Here's the photos of the capacity buildings in Indonesia.

2

Next one.

4

5 Here are examples of all the countries that we've been in. We've been there to do these workshops to provide them with the tools so they could do their proper enforcement in their ports. Colombia, 8 Ecuador, Philippines, Peru, Thailand, Vietnam, upcoming. We already did that at Thailand again, but Ecuador, Indonesia, Philippines, and Colombia where we will continue to do more capacity buildings.

11 12

13 Next one.

14

These are specific examples of our partnerships that we've done the workshops. Coral Triangle in 2012, the counter IUU fishing workshop in 2015, the inspector training in Manado with the government of Indonesia in 2016, port State measure, Indonesia, and that's it.

20

21 Next one.

2223

24

25

So, the next steps for our capacity building are new partnerships for the next few years with the government of Indonesia. Continue to help develop and implement Indonesia's port state measures inspector training, curriculum and models.

262728

Next one.

2930

This training for 2022, in October this year, we already went to it, I didn't go personally, but the agency went to Indonesia and did another training for another workshop there in Indonesia.

323334

31

Next one.

35 36

37

38

39

40

So, there's another picture of us giving this training there. We are focusing on training the trainer workshops so they could continue training more of their officers to continue the work there in the specialty workshops. And the end goal is to do a hundred percent of Indonesian led and sustained Port State Measure Act programs.

41 42 43

Next one.

44

And just a picture of the trained people there. Next one. And that's it for that presentation. If you have any questions, more than glad to answer.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any questions? Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Miguel, do you have trainings for the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico enforcement agents on a regular basis? or just once in a while and then-- how do you do that for this area?

MIGUEL BORGES: For the Virgin Islands? In this specifically, this is for the imports and exports. So, we don't do specifically with them these types of trainings because in the Virgin Islands we do with CBP. With CBP we do some trainings I participated in their trade week. That's a training they give to other stakeholders. And I present our enforcement regulations and the products we regulate. So, I give training to the OFOs, which are the CBP, Customs and Border Protection.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, thinking about the queen conch and the listing and CITES, does this apply to that kind of category? I mean, CITES has specific permits and, you know, if it was coming into the port in San Juan or Charlotte Amalie or whatever and we needed to look at, you know, what illegal stuff was coming in without the permits, etcetera, is that part of this illegal fishing or CITES is not considered.

MIGUEL BORGES: Yes, Graciela, it is and it's a big topic. Thank you for bringing it up, because we do have a lot of conchs. This year the price has soared in the market for the conch so we're getting more import of conch to the island, to Puerto Rico. From everywhere, Nicaragua, Mexico. They need a CITES permit, obviously, as you said. To Virgin Islands, I was there last week, and we received some import. It has to have CITES permit.

To be clear, the conch is enforced by Fish and Wildlife for some reason, but I work closely with them. Actually, we share the same office, so I go with the inspector and do a lot of these inspections of the conch when it's brought in. So yes, this applies directly to the conch as well.

 GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Follow up. So, this would be something that if the people who are interested in providing comments to the listing of queen conch should mention and should take it into consideration. So, it's another agency that deals with the permits from CITES. They call you, they call NOAA, when there is that issue of bringing the conch into port. I know that it doesn't have anything to do with the socioeconomics of the fishery, but it does have to do with the illegal conch that it's coming into the U.S. territory.

1 2

I mean, I will encourage people to think about that kind of, you know, thing for the listing. How those imports into the regulations, because that's something that was mentioned by Richard and was mentioned by Orian during the presentation.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Let me clarify something else. CITES is a voluntary activity by the countries that are signatories of CITES. What the United States does is that one of those countries, the United States is also a signatory, so the office of the Department of Interior, Correspondent Office and National Marine Fisheries Services and Customs, they check for the manifest and that's the first, the reason. But there is other two or three laws that are involved with imports and export of Marine products, intervene. But the Endangered Species Act and this are two totally different things. Actually, for ESA, socioeconomic is not an issue, but it doesn't hurt that anybody who has any information regarding this topic can send it to the appropriate agency. And of course, in this case, it should be sent to OLE as much as possible, or the Council.

I have received through the years report from Council jurisdiction, fishers and dealers about this kind of things. And sometimes it's different. I was called a long time ago by custom, because they caught a fish, I mean a fish boat with a strange looking marlin. Well, it was swordfish, not in marlin and we were allowed to use it. But the point is that the people in the field we help with the Coast Guard. I participated several times, Graciela and Marcos, with the U.S. Coast Guard.

So, the point is that this is a collaborative effort and that's why I asked Miguel. Thank you. Because in many instances we only think about the immediate enforcement issues that we have. But the office that Miguel is part of has other branches that may, you know, if you know more about it, you will be able then to be more effective out there. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: We have you have James then Julian.

JAMES R. KREGLO: James Kreglo of Saint Thomas/Saint John Virgin Islands. Yes, I have a question. You're providing training for some other countries, but is U.S. supplying any materials or funding to protect the fisheries and their waters?

MIGUEL BORGES: International?

JAMES R. KREGLO: Correct.

MIGUEL BORGES: Not that I know of. At least the o--

4 5

JAMES R. KREGLO: Okay. I'm saying like you showed the Philippines, think Indonesia, some of those but a lot of times they don't even have their own vessels to be able to patrol their waters. So, are we providing any aid to them in that way?

MIGUEL BORGES: At least the Office of Law Enforcement, that I know of, doesn't provide that type of equipment. It's just more the training in the ports for bigger imports of seafood, not directly for the protection of their fishing industry. It's more for the bigger fishing industry that's going to be exported from their country to ours. So, that's why everything we do with their training has to have a link with the U.S. because that's probably product that's going to then be imported to the U.S. So, our capacity building is more for the product that's going to be then imported here. So, bigger shipments of commercial seafood.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Thank you.

MIGUEL BORGES: Yeah, we do provide that type of equipment in our JEA program to the local governments, the state governments, state and territory governments, we do provide funds for the patrols and for equipment. But that's locally to the states and territories.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Yeah. Within U.S. waters.

MIGUEL BORGES: Correct.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Okay. I guess my question, or my comment is that we're able to train some other countries so they can help protect their waters from, you know, foreign vessels coming in and essentially raiding their waters but some of these countries, they don't even have the vessels. I know they actually have contractors come in, I don't know if you've seen that, but they'll hire contractors to come in and then put their agents on board the contractors' vessels so they can control their own waters.

 MIGUEL BORGES: Okay. Yeah, yeah. I know it's tough that they don't have the, sometimes, the vessels to do the enforcement. I mean, we don't have to go so far. We don't have it either here the vessels that we need as well. So, completely understand your point.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Okay. that's it for now. Thank you very much.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Miguel. One second Julian, I got you. Miguel and Julian. You ask me to speak?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Oh, me Miguel. Not to discuss it more, but those countries have agreements with the United States, specific agreements, for joint effort. The United State, in the past, they provided vessels, for example, a vessel that has been seized from another country that was given to the Dominican Republic. And I know that because I was a member of the delegation. Unfortunately, they didn't have enough money for the fuel. They have a beautiful boat there, but they don't have money for the fuel.

MIGUEL BORGES: It happens.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: And this is a problem that we have. So, in the past, the Coast Guard has engaged in training session. Countries have asked the Coast Guard to patrol the waters. The answer that came from Washington was, "No way, Jose, we cannot do that because there are other laws beyond the National Marine Fisheries Services that apply here." But going back to your question, yes, in some cases, depending on a case-by-case basis, the United States can agree to engage into a cooperative agreement for enforcement, but they go to a certain extent, beyond that it's another ball game.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Julian to wrap up this presentation question round.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Yeah. Julian Magras, for the record. I just want to say thank you to you and your team because we've been having a lot of issues in the Saint Thomas/Saint John district with illegal conch import, lobsters and fish. And over the last three months, it has made it very difficult for the fishermen to sell their product. We're in the middle of a nice lobster season this year, and the product is so hard to sell because of illegal imports that's been coming in and flooding our markets. But, you know, Alex has done, Alex is our dedicated officer for the U.S.V.I., and he has been doing a lot of work and getting out there and trying to close the loop in and stop a lot of this stuff that's been going on, which is very important for us in order for us to continue supplying our fresh product.

So, I just wanted to say thank you to you and your team for at least on those imports that's been coming in, trying to get a handle and slowing it down. So, thank you.

MIGUEL BORGES: Thank you, Julian.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you all. Next presentation. It's DPNR.

Enforcement Reports
USVI DPNR

HOWARD FORBES: Good afternoon. Howard Forbes. Department of Planning and Natural Resources, Division of Environmental Enforcement. Federal Fishery Summary for fourth quarter of 2022 is as followed. The NOAA Fisheries Cooperative Enforcement Agreement for 2022 has been executed on behalf of the territory of the United States Virgin Islands.

4 5

DPNR officers have also completed the mandatory online training necessary to carry out the enforcement responsibilities, who performed GE activities as part of their regular duties as deputies federal law enforcement officers. Also deputised ID cards and NOAA magnet decals for the patrol vehicles was issued to carry out this mission.

A synopsis of the territory's enforcement activities actions. Report of turtle meat being sold by a confidential source led to officers traveling to location of concern. Upon arrival, officers inspected the area with negative findings. This violation is under investigation.

Our second case is based on lobster entering into the district of Saint Thomas from unknown location flooding the market. This is an active investigation. Several commercial fishers reported that lobsters are flooding the market. DPNR Officers, along with NOAA agent Alexander Terrero has made several inspections to the location that was reported for the lobsters being sold. DPNR Follow up a lead on Facebook where a private individual messaged for the location to purchase the lobsters, to which the individual got no response. DPNR and NOAA continues to monitor social media to curtail the activities.

Our patrol hours at sea are 30 hours, and our dock site hours is 168. Our commercial contacts for fishers is 108, and our recreational fishing contacts is 34. This concludes my report. Short and sweet.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. And I apologize that I cut Miguel. He a short, very important report on his presentation. We are going back to Miguel Borges.

### Office of Law Enforcement- Miguel Borges

MIGUEL BORGES: Okay. This is the enforcement presentation. Christina, if you could get that presentation when you have a chance. But in the meanwhile, I'll present Alex Terrero. He's our enforcement officer for Saint Thomas. He's right here, in the back, right there. He's stationed in Saint Thomas. He's the enforcement officer. So, he covers Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix.

He comes with a lot of experience. We're glad to have him here. I'm glad to have a partner, at least in another island, but closer at least. He's done a really good job over there in Saint Thomas. Last week I was there with him doing port inspections, we have another one now, so. One second.

Okay. There it is. So, you can start the next slide, please.

So, we did a criminal case recently, and it was with Director Howard Forbes from DPNR and the Office of Law Enforcement, myself. We investigated a case where a sea turtle was taken. This is a hawksbill turtle, a big, large one. And those are the photos of the species. Thankfully, it was alive, and it was released alive thanks to the DPNR biologist who also responded and was able to inspect it and release it under his own power at the beach. So, after investigating this case with the DPNR officers and myself and Alex Terrero as well, we were able to submit a criminal case in federal prosecution in Saint Croix, where two subjects were charged with three counts, two misdemeanors under ESA and one felony under Lacey Act. Count one, was taking an endangered species. Count two, possessing an endangered species. And count three, taking with the intent to sell. This is the felony. We already indicted and they were charged and it's in the process of, right now, at the federal court.

So, next slide please.

 Other activities that we've conducted since the last Council meeting. I participated in the MREP in Parguera on August 26th. Special thanks to Vanessa, Wilson and Lauren for creating an awesome workshop there for all of fishermen. It was a very good workshop and I believe that enforcement should be involved in the education as well. So, I'm glad to participate there and I look forward to participating in other educational programs as that one.

 So, I also participated in a training for all DNER officers here in Puerto Rico and a training led by Michelle Schärer. She organized the training with the commissioner of DNER. They gave two trainings. The first one was 30 officers from the West coast of Puerto Rico, and it was specifically for grouper ID, specifically nassau grouper done by Michelle Schärer. And then, I did more of the federal regulations, federal jurisdiction and case package for the DNER officers. Then the second one was in San Juan for the East coast of Puerto Rico, officers from DNER. The same presentation. It's two days.

what else? We also met with the U.S. Coast Guard, and we are planning to conduct joint patrols in the protected areas with the other officers here present. And also, in the, the U.S. Virgin Islands, our enforcement officer initiated an incident involving IFTP, which is the International Fishery Trade Permit, and mislabeling seafood violations. The officers working with DPNR to review U.S.V.I. license violations. In another case, our enforcement officer in U.S.V.I. initiated a Lacey Act violation of importing undersized Caribbean spiny lobsters into the V.I.

So, these are the updates that we have so far for OLE law enforcement updates. Thank you. You have any questions? More than welcome to answer them.

#### Discussion

MARCOS HANKE: I'm glad that I went back to you. That's really nice to see there. Thank you very much.

MIGUEL BORGES: You're welcome.

MARCOS HANKE: Any questions? Quick question, one question to finalize this presentation. No? I'm happy to see that I know that everybody shared the feeling. Thank you very much. Next presentation—Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: I just wanted to make a comment to Howard Forbes presentation because we didn't have a chance for questions for him. I wanted to say also thank you to him and his officers for also working with the federal officers on some of these cases to try to help the fishers, especially with the one with the lobsters. And also, congratulations. I see you got some new officers, and we are seeing their presence more now. So, I think with your team building we see some future enforcement along the way that can slow a lot of the activity, illegal activity that's been going on throughout the Virgin Island. So, I wanted to thank you for that also.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Julian. Great point.

HOWARD FORBES: Thank you Julian.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Howard. And we have the next presentation which is U.S. Coast Guard. Please proceed.

## U.S. Coast Guard

ANDREW MCGRAW-HERDEG: Hey, good afternoon. My name's Andrew McGraw-Herdeg for anyone who has not met me yet. See if we can pull up our report here. So, first, huge thanks to Miguel and OLE. As you'll see, we rely on OLE pretty heavily for enforcement. We appreciate all the work they do, the consultation, they're the subject matter experts and we are appreciative of them.

6 7 8

9

10 11

12

13

1

2

4 5

> So, the bottom line. So, I'm representing Sector San Juan, which is principally Puerto Rico and the U.S.V.I.s. As far as living marine resources, LMR enforcement goes, it's been a challenge for us as it is pretty much all the time. The Coast Guard would like to do as much fisheries enforcement as possible. We have a whole fleet of patrol cutters. We have a small boat station in San Juan.

We have two boat force attachments in the V.I.s.

14 15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

The problem is we have 11 roles and missions that Congress says we have to do. The counter drug mission in the Mona Pass and around the V.I.s and especially the migrant surge, I'm coming from Haiti and Dom. Rep. has been pretty brutal for us in terms of operational tasking. So, all that being said, the actual report here is essentially zero. We have logged zero boarding, zero dedicated hours for fisheries because of all those reasons. It seems every time we try to plan a dedicated op some drug case or some migrant case happens to pull our assets away. And that's unfortunately just how balancing the enforcement goes.

25 26 27

28

29

30

31

One bit of illustration for that, if you don't mind scrolling down to the table here. I do have some data just to show the migrant surge we've been seeing. We're on, I think, past the day 100 of Operation Vigilant Sentry under DHS and it's just been a non-stop surge of Haitian migrants specifically. So that's still very, very heavy for us operationally.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

If you go up a bit to that paragraph, we do have some good news. We've got a plan in place as Miguel mentioned. We do have some tasks we might be able to do in terms of LMR for the Nassau grouper spawning periods. There is a way we can maybe balance, say, "hey, if we have assets in patrol in certain areas already, there are ways we can try to do some LMR," you know, while they're not busy with a mission actively. But again, that's all very tentative and it's difficult to commit to that as like a dedicated resource because we just have to be standing by for search and rescue, drug enforcement, migrant introduction and the other missions.

43 44 45

46 47

So, again, some hope for dedicated fisheries enforcement in the near future. I can't comment on too much else, but things are looking okay for that. We also appreciate Michelle and the other

biologists for consulting with us. Again, appreciate their expertise and sort of guiding our actions.

We can go through the rest of the report, but like I said, it's just going to look like zero dedicated hours, zero boardings for all those reasons I mentioned. The only other thing I do want to call out is we have a Living Marine Resources Boarding Officer course. It's a one weeklong intensive training on Caribbean specific fisheries topics. That's been very popular in the Coast Guard, and it frequently fills up pretty quickly. We had, I think, two sessions in the last year and we have more tentatively scheduled. And to my knowledge, we also offer that to international students as well. So, there is a bit of training that we do offer. Unfortunately, like I said, very popular, fills up quickly. I'm in fact still trying to get a seat in that myself.

Besides that, I think that's about all I have to report for Coast Guards activities here. Pending any questions for me?

### Discussion

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Andrew. I have a question for you. You're referring to the training that we go? Yes? Okay, perfect. No problem. In terms of the coordination, in the past we have worked very well with the person that was prior to you. they contact us, contact me or Graciela and the group that usually attend, for me to collect the samples to do the fish ID training and the things that we do in support to your effort. Please try to do it with as much time possible in order for us to plan. Thank you.

ANDREW MCGRAW-HERDEG: Understood. Sure.

MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. I just want to make a question. Is there any way that we can make like a plan to collaborate for, especially in the West we know the issue that you're presenting here. Practically every day we have illegal boats coming in and the issue is that most of these boats are left in the water and in the ocean and sometimes in fishing areas or in our coast. Is there are any kind of program that we can ask for so that any association, for example, where I live, that we can take care of taking out those boats, so they don't affect our corals and ecosystems.

ANDREW MCGRAW-HERDEG: Andrew McGraw-Herdeg, for the record. Appreciate that, I think that's a good thought. In terms of new

strategies for enforcement I think that's something we'd be open to discussing. If you're able to maybe take that offline, could probably see what next steps would be for that. Of course, again, any new strategy for enforcement would take a bit of planning and, you know, careful research. But we'll definitely be open to conversations in that area.

4 5

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you. I already have the experience. I have commercial fishermen that practically stay for 10 hours waiting all the mission, and then they call me, and we start the negotiation to not let that boat in there because it was an aggregation, especially for grouper. I have to say and recognize that between the conversation, they let us bring that boat out, and of course we have to make the report and practically take care of all the garbage and everything out of the water. But I really appreciate that, and I wish that this could be done every time that a boat comes around. Right now, if you see the coast in the West, practically, we have more than 12 around the coastal area that are practically debris there and this is really affecting our ecosystem. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. And next presentation or next item on the agenda. It's the CFMC Advisory Body Membership. Uh, Nelson, you want to say something?

### CFMC Advisory Bodies Membership

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelson Crespo, for the record. Everyday we're getting older, and I believe in young blood that can bring a fresh input to the work we are doing. This morning I had a nice conversation with Vanessa regarding this issue. We concur we have two guys, two young people that have the desire and confirmed us that they are open to contribute with the Puerto Rico DIP. Their names are Anthony Elizo and [inaudible] Fernández. So, I suggest if you can consider that suggestion, it would be appreciated.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. I know one of them and have good references about the other one, but I think Vanessa wants to say something.

 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. As Nelson says, we practically get together this conversation and I want to put on the record that Anthony Elizo is pelagic fisherman. He also has a YouTube channel. He also already did the MREP with us and he express his interests to participate actively in all these things that we do in the Council and in the DAP. So, he has been fishing for more than 20 years, so I think, he's a young one, but has a lot of experience.

he's a young one, but has a lot of experience.

1 2

4 5

And also, [inaudible] Fernández, he's from Cabo Rojo, so I know him well. He practically is one of the youngest fishermen that we have but has more than 15 years. So, he's commercial divers and a dive master, and also his son is in the industry. He was recognized one time as the youngest fisherman by the federal and had the opportunity to go to Costa Rica also in one project. He also directly explained to me that he wanted to be active in all this.

So, if I can make a motion. I make a motion to get Anthony Elizo and Mr. Fernández for a membership of the DAP.

MARCOS HANKE: And second.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Second.

MARCOS HANKE: Any further discussion? All in favor say aye.

**GROUP:** Aye. Aye.

MARCOS HANKE: The motion carries. We are going to send the appropriate letter to them, but we need you guys to provide us the contact of those people. Please share that with Diana.

**DIANA T. MARTINO:** I would like if you can send me an email with their names, address, sector they fish in, telephone number and email address. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Well, now we are ready to go to other business. At this time on other business, we have a short presentation from the HMS office.

# Other Business HMS

BRAD MCHALE: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Brad McHale. I'm a branch chief with the Highly Migratory Species Management Division, and I'd like to thank you all for having me here. This, in 22 years of a career, is my first opportunity to join this Council meeting.

The presentation really is just kind of a brief overview of where our kind of management and jurisdiction falls. As it was mentioned throughout the meeting, there are overlaps and various concerns across regions. But in a nutshell, what our group is tasked with managing tunas, sharks, swordfish and billfish throughout the range of Maine through the Gulf of Mexico and down through the

Caribbean and then for those U.S. flag vessels that might be operating in international waters.

Next slide, please.

And as far as the tuna that fall underneath our direct jurisdiction, we're looking at albacore, bluefin, bigeye tuna, skipjack, and yellowfin. I know that Blackfin in little tunny have been mentioned although technically they do not currently fall underneath our jurisdictional authority. So these are the five Atlantic tunas that our rules and regulations directly apply to.

Next.

I guess I jumped ahead of the slide here. But here we have the blackfin and little tunny.

So, next please.

So, I know through some various correspondence from Marcos through the HMS advisory panel as well as informal conversations that some issues have been raised, I think, in particular to skipjack tuna. Some of the existing rules and regulations that are on the books as far as how these fish need to be, their form, while at sea. Here's kind of some of the information that we have that relays what the current rules and regulations are that apply to those five regulated Atlantic tunas of how they can either be cut, gutted, primarily headed and gutted with the upper and lower lobes of the tail. Predominantly for species identification for our offices of law enforcement as well as data collection processes to make sure that our domestic as well as our international obligations are being met as far as reporting out on any known mortalities for each of those five species.

So, I know that times of the essence here in the tail portion of the day, so I wanted to keep it brief and just kind of do that introduction and kind of let you all know that I am a resource to collaborate with the Council in regards to kind of how our respective jurisdictions overlap when it comes to the management of these species that cross our collective waters. Thank you.

 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Brad. I am the representative of the Caribbean Council at the AP of HMS for many years, and I am following up with the letters and the comments received by V.I. and Puerto Rico fishermen of some points that need to be enhanced or change or evaluated by the HMS office.

First of all, I want to say that the HMS office historically had been very engaged into customizing or addressing with scientific based analysis and so on, to the extent possible, the Caribbean situation. The best example of that, they created a permit for the Caribbean. And I want to recognize that and the atmosphere that I breath around them is very professional and I can see the intention of illustrating me and making a very professional conversation. What I want to bring to my friends in the Council is that we are in good hands, right? We have a healthy, productive conversation and we're going to be abiding by the laws, by the science and so on. The process is start on this evaluation by this conversation that started when we received the letters. Fair point?

4 5

BRAD MCHALE: Fair point.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. I sent a letter, but I don't want to go over everything. I'm just going to highlight a few points. Here are some possibilities of enhancing Caribbean small boat permit and closing the gap of the gray areas that interfere with or affect our dynamic of multispecies fishery, the way we perform the fishery culturally for many, many, many years. And simply, there are some aspects that are essential in terms of acquiring the permits and the other ones are because addressing the quotas or the use of the skipjack as a resource.

I'm going to start with the forms and the way people engage into the Caribbean small boat permit. Simplifying the form to acquire the permit is essential. Fishermen have expressed that it is a little bit hard, it is not very easy to find right there on your face. The recommendations that I received from everybody is to create a bottom or an area on the main page where you click and you have the contact information of somebody that speaks Spanish or English, that can guide them through the process. I'm not asking a for a form but something that opens the possibility for a Spanish-speaking person to do it, or an English-speaking person to do it. Basically, it's not changing anything is just making an easier, it's a multi-avenue.

 Data collection is essential for all of us, and I will encourage the coordination with the Caribbean branch and local government and HMS to acquire this data. We have a system in place but there is a lot of room for improvement. We already discussed with the long lining situation on different species that María brought to the Council, that is not related to Skipjack, but they are possibilities of making the data collection more efficient and better for our Caribbean Council.

One thing that is super important is to state, an estimation at least, of the total cost to acquire the Caribbean small boat permit. Not just the nominal fee, but the affidavits and all the other costs related to that, or at least a list that you're going to have to provide those things that have a cost. Because most of the people that will acquire this, and there is a lot of people, they have to plan up ahead. They engage into the permit process, they're going through all the paperwork, but if they don't have the money to follow through. It's better to know up ahead is what I'm trying to say.

4 5

This is all comment I received. Okay. Now getting to the meat of this. Skipjack tuna has been used like little tunny and other tuna like species for bait for deep-waters snapper. That's the key and the driver for the deep-water snapper fishery bait on the West coast of Puerto Rico, right? And we recognize-- that image is perfect --the need to identify the species and the need to make everything enforceable. And what we are requesting is to allow X amount of skipjack for bait, but in an enforceable way.

Let me read this as to not get lost. Allow x number of skipjack bait, keeping the carcass on board, or a minimum number of pounds of frozen or chunks of fresh skipjack on board with the skin on. But reaffirm the prohibition on the other BAYS tunas. I mean, you cannot use yellowfin or the others. It's enforceable also by using the DNA sampling that nowadays is very accessible and it's not too hard to do it. Skipjack tuna carcasses are easier to distinguish from other tuna because of the skin, the color, the pattern, you know, for many reasons, and you guys know all of that. I don't want to be repetitive. And it is important to remember that skipjack tuna doesn't have a minimum size at the time, but in the future, under this scheme, if we hold the carcass, that can provide a fork length measure if it is needed on the future. We are not cutting our legs. It's expandable, right? The main priority is to allow skipjack tuna for bait.

 And I'm going to mention this before, but something that I keep hearing from the fishermen because they have been using the skipjack for many, many years and we are addressing this into enforceable regulation now, is that requesting for three tunas or five tunas on the trip this what they need, right, Nelson? Very quick.

**NELSON CRESPO:** Yeah. Depending on the size. Yeah. Between three to five, six. That's depending on the size.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. This is just a drop on the bucket if you compared to any other fishing style. Pole fishing, the one you use

the nets, or if you do industrial fishing, or even a medium size approach to catch skipjack. Right? Even the recreational fishermen have more freedom to catch a lot of skipjack and that creates another problem because it creates a venue for a black market where the commercials just have a 10 fish limit when they find the school to keep for bait, obviously they cannot, but let's say they keep it, but the resource now is potentially coming from recreational, creating another problem over that. Right?

4 5

And to cut to the chase here, also, we have a recommendation from a fisherman from Saint Thomas on the bag limit for the Caribbean small permit. Our yellowfin, that are available all year around here, that comply with the minimum measurement tend to be on the smaller size under 60 pounds, 75 pounds, 25 pounds on that range. We are not talking about bigger fish. And because of that, because of the cost of gas and so on, they would like to see a little increase on the permit of yellowfin because bigeye we don't have available here. The real two tunas that we fish are yellowfin and skipjack. Just, in the case of the yellowfin, to make it profitable, to engage and for the people to buy the permit or to engage into the permit and make it make sense to acquire the permit.

The preferred alternative based on all the input I received so far is up to 15 yellowfin per trip. One incidental bigeye just to keep the eye open in case of incidental catch and 30 to 50 skipjack that you can catch with the permit, but you cannot use all of them for bait. You'll be able to have cut it and the carcass available on the boat and so on, just three to five. There are a few things that we have to work out there, maybe just allowing frozen to avoid the problem of people catching 35, if that was the limit, and cutting a few and you don't know how much they are cutting, right? Then, they are using maybe just frozen. There are ways that we can find a way there.

The other thing, increasing skipjack from 30 to 50 represents just a drop— I'm repeating a little bit—just a drop on the bucket. If you compare it to with larger scale commercial gear, like purse seine nets, pole fishing, and other methods of fishing for skipjack. Even more when the other permits are more problematic, including the recreational permits which allows for unlimited or much bigger amount of skipjack per trip that the Caribbean small boat permit don't allow.

I just remember something that is important to highlight for the Council members. The reason that we have the limits that we have now is because HMS office, when they develop the Caribbean small boat permit, they use the best available information they had at

that moment, but they have the interest to facilitate and to do this permit. Now we are requesting an evolution of that process and for consideration on the office. You know? It's not that they want just those numbers arbitrary. It was the best they could do with the information on hand at that moment. That's fair to say?

BRAD MCHALE: That's fair to say.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. We need to update the Caribbean's small boat permit to allow practical compliance venue for local communities and buy-in on the Caribbean small boat permit. Remember, the skipjack are the most common HMS tuna species available in our area and it's used for consumption and baits. It is part of our local culture and socioeconomic dynamic way before Caribbean small boat permit was created. Enforceability is key, like I said, using DNA sampling and carcass chunks or fillet of any tuna like species must have the skin on all chunks and fillet must be available. I don't know if there is a language that can be included for DNA sampling when they are boarded and there is a coordination in there. Important to remember skipjack tuna doesn't have a minimum size at the time, but in the future the carcass will allow for us to pursue that to make enforceable.

I just highlighted the key points. The letter was much bigger than that and this is what I needed to say for now. Brad.

BRAD MCHALE: Thank you for that. I think all those requests are reasonable. And, you know, just like you all are aware, there's a regulatory process that needs to happen with Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Management. We're actually not part of the Council process. We're all secretarial authority. So, that's why we actually have that HMS advisory panel that Marcos sits on. So, we'll be taking all those kinds of suggestions back to my colleagues and trying to figure out which way we might be able to move. Obviously, consulting with our Office of Law Enforcement partners to find out what's feasible, what's realistic. I think you hit a lot of the key highlights that species identification is less of a challenge when you're talking skipjack versus some of the other species, whether it's in a round form or if it's in a fillet or chunk form.

So, again, I think the requests are reasonable and the information is there for us to sink our teeth into and try to figure out which way we can move forward with these. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Brad. Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelson Crespo, for the record. Thank you, Marcos. I concur with your words. We talk a lot about decision in the past, and I appreciate your suggestions. To clarify something, when we go out fishing for deep-water snapper, we bring between 3, 4, 5 and 6. No more than six. We only take out from the cooler one or two to let it defrost because we don't want all the bait getting bad during the day. If you don't use it, we have the ability to bring it back and you can use it for the next day. So, that's how we operate.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And I just remember on the HMSAP, they reported to me that there was, on other regions of the U.S., a request for filleting at sea bigeye, and yellowfin tuna, a discussion. This is a different scenario because we are not dealing with a minimum size. We just need to address, at this point, the ID in terms of enforceability to know if it's a little tunny, a bigeye or whatever. But we are not measuring the fish for a minimum size because if it is a skipjack, at this point there is no minimum size for it. That simplifies the process a little bit and makes the discussion a little different than the request and petition of some fishermen sometimes on other situations when they are trying to do similar stuff with bigeye and yellowfin. I have a chat question.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos, I have it here because you wanted me to see it. For the record, from Ricardo Lugo. "One item that we need to discuss further is the use of Bacora as a bait, fishermen bring with them for deep water fishing historically and even though it is not written as is, that is an interpretation. I am working to collect information on the topic."

 MARCOS HANKE: Okay. I just need, because of the common name. Is this Ricardo Lugo? Yes. Ricardo, can you put on the chat if Bacora is blackfin tuna just to confirm that we are talking about the same species.

RICARDO LUGO: Bacora is the—it's not a blackfin tuna. It's the one that—

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: The skipjack.

RICARDO LUGO: Skipjack, yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. I just asked because there is no point for me to go over and not knowing exactly because on the East coast, they call Bacora, some people call blackfin tuna Bacora. Right? Your point is well taken. This is exactly what we are doing now, Ricardo. I invite you, if you have any specific points, you can

send me an email, or a letter and I will be happy to send it to the HMS people for them to include on the analysis and on this exercise in the beginning of this analysis. Thank you.

RICARDO LUGO: Right. And I would like to make a comment, you know, I have been working with some of the other team members there and they have provided me good information and it's a little bit different on the case of the vaquita, where allow you to cut it, put it in brine and bring into the fishing, into the boat already cut. It gives you even the sizes of the pieces that you need to cut. So, there some information that probably we can look at later on to see how we can advantage of some of the investigations that you have done and is already in the regs.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Ricardo. And I remember something else, Brad. The vaquita, the first runner up to substitute Skipjack, right? You can make a case, "Oh no, we have vaquitas to do it." What happened is that in the last 11 years, the vaquitas are not getting to the shore because of sargassum influx and the deterioration of the water quality on the shorelines and the baitfish. And that's super important because they don't have that option available anymore. Just to inform. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. I just want to make the comment that as commercial fishermen representative in here, you make a great summary of the reality of the fishery right now and I hope that we can move on with this to help any information that you need.

And also, especially with the commercial small boat permit, I had the opportunity to help some fishermen complete that. It's really hard, not only for me, also for them. And that suggestion of having someone that can translate at the same time that they are writing is a great opportunity to help get more kinds of permits. That would also help to get better statistics and real numbers because most of them, if they don't have that permit, then they put in the study if that they are mile nine miles inside. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. There are very broad implications on everything and especially on a multispecies fishery. Thank you, Brad, for your time. I want to thank Delisse too for her presence, because she has been instrumental on educating and she gained a lot of respect from the fishermen here. Thank you. Thank you again, and

BRAD MCHALE: Thank you Delisse. Lots of respect from us as well.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Yes, sir.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Alrighty. Since the fishermen have a big ask there, I have an ask also. I'd like some guidance on how-- since you've been here for the last couple days --how we are proposing to prohibit the use of gillnet and trammel nets and trawl and purse seins. I want to be able to get some guidance on how I can extend that to prohibit those gears for harvesting tunas.

4 5

BRAD MCHALE: Excellent question and thankfully I was here for that discussion. Most of those gears are actually already prohibited for highly migratory species. So, we just finished a rule that'll be enacted on January 1st that prohibits purse seins gear. The gillnet gears have been prohibited for swordfish, for tunas for years now. So, I think the level of coordination between the EEZ as well as into the territorial waters, the prohibitions for HMS are already in place, so I don't see that being a hurdle that or a challenge that'll come up in your deliberations.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Thanks

MARCOS HANKE: María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Hi. This is María López. So, I just want to remind the Council that two of those tunas that we were talking today, the blackfin tuna and the little tunny (la vaquita) they are being managed by the Council now, in Puerto Rico. So, those regulations that we were talking yesterday for prohibiting the use of gillnet and trammel, etcetera, if the Council is interested, that would apply to those two species as well.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Thank you. Thank you, Brad.

**BRAD MCHALE:** And maybe just-

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

BRAD MCHALE: And Marcos, just one other item. Regarding the challenges in the application for the Caribbean small boat permit. Those permits are actually issued out of the Southeast regional office. So, the HMS Management Division doesn't issue them directly, but we have a very close relationships with those folks because they also issue our pelagic long line. So, we can take that feedback to them and try to figure out ways to minimize some of the burdens that some of the applicants are experiencing in trying to attain that permit.

MARCOS HANKE: And if there is, at the beginning, if there is not many resources or personel for doing that, when you press the button, if you have a morning hours or afternoon hours, a specific

hour that there is a dedicated person or a specific day of the week that the person can go there, if it's not possible to have it fully available, that person, all the time, I think it'll be good enough to help for what we need.

BRAD MCHALE: And reflecting back to the word respect that we just shared in regard to Delisse Ortiz. She has just offered that folks could definitely reach out to her for some direct assistance so we can make sure that contact information is available until we can find some more permanent solutions to the challenges that are being experienced. So, thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. María?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yeah, I just want to add to what Brad said about the permit. So, because we are going to be looking at federal permits for Council-managed species, and they will probably come from the Southeast regional office, I think something that we could all start thinking about is how to provide perhaps the same services to everybody given that it's the same people.

So, it's something just to think about. Like, if there are needs for language, that's something that we will definitely look into in our office in terms of how we can provide that service to our Spanish speaking constituents as well. So, I think it will be a good opportunity for all of us to think about how we can get that done for those other permits too, for the future.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Not to make layers of permits if you can. Making a coordination possible is, for sure, super important because at HMSAP, you here, other regions, what the fisherman are requesting, try to sit down together and try to do something simpler because we want to comply and to follow the rules and regulations. It's not always easier to do, but we are in the early stages. Maybe that's a very good opportunity to do that kind of coordination. Thank you.

Any other question? No. Well thank you Brad. Thank you very much.

BRAD MCHALE: Thank you.

#### Public Comment Period

MARCOS HANKE: Next item on the agenda, will be the public comment period. Anybody from the public that would like to make a comment. Five-minute comment. Do you see anyone? Nobody from the public has comment at this time. Next meeting, Miguel.

### Next Meetings

4 5

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. As we have stated in the past, this is the time that the Council selects the tentative days for the meeting for the following year. One of them, August 15-16 is because, as I remember, we need to have a meeting during the week where the term of a Council member expires, and the term of a new Council member starts. So, we have April 18-19, today's meeting, in 2023. August 15-16, and December, the 5th and 6th of December. Those are the three days that we have for our meetings in the 2023. Of course, if the situation calls for, we can have a meeting in between those dates, virtual, a hundred percent virtual or hybrid as the need arises for the Council to discuss any particular issues that you may have.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Miguel. We are ready to adjourn. We are ready to finish the meeting, and I really want to say thank you to all for the patients, for the professionals, for the good discussions to agree and disagree, but looking for the sustainability of the resource and in a respectful environment. Thank you, all. Safe travels.

And I want to specially thank the translator that I keep hearing him on the back and I keep hearing that everybody saying how amazing he is, and he can change the tones and is like hearing the person talking to him, live, right there on your ears. He is amazing. Thank you very much for the translation. [applause]

The meeting is adjourned. Remember that Brazil is still on the World Cup. [laughter]

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on December 07, 2022.)