## Table of Content

| 1              | Call to Order and Roll Call   |
|----------------|---|
| 2              | Adoption Of Agenda 9  |
| 3              | Consideration of $180^{\rm th}$ Council Meeting Verbatim Transcription . $10$   |
| 4              | Janet Coit Address to the Council   |
| 5              | Comments  |
| 6              | Executive Director's Report   |
| 7              | Update on Amendments to the Island-based Fishery Management   |
| 8              | Plans   |
| 9              | Questions/Comments  |
| 10             | 2023 Accountability Measures Discussion   |
| 11             | Questions/Comments  |
| 12<br>13<br>14 | Review Draft Framework Amendment 2 to Update to the Spiny Lobster Overfishing Limit, Acceptable Biological Catch, and Annual Catch Limit Based on SEDAR 57 Update Assessment 43 |
| 15             | SEFSC US Caribbean Projects - Lobster and Other Work 49   |
| 16             | Questions/Comments  |
| 17             | Review Draft Trawl, Net Gear and Descending Devices Amendment. 70   |
| 18             | District Advisory Panel Reports   |
| 19             | St. Croix, USVI-Gerson Martínez, Chair  |
| 20             | St. Thomas, USVI-Julian Magras, Chair   |
| 21             | Puerto Rico-Nelson Crespo, Chair  |
| 22             | Questions/Comments  |
| 23<br>24       | Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Technical Advisory Panel Report  |
| 25<br>26<br>27 | Review Draft Amendment 3 to the St. Croix and St. Thomas/St.  John Fishery Management Plans to Develop Management Measures for  Dolphin and Wahoo                               |
| 28             | SAMAR Sea school - Abdiel Connelly  |
| 29             | Questions/Comments  |
| 30<br>31       | Update on Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission Spawning Aggregation and Queen Conch Working Group meetings 145   |
| 32             | Questions/Comments  |
| 33<br>34<br>35 | Review Draft Amendment 3 to the St. Croix and St. Thomas/St.  John Fishery Management Plans to Develop Management Measures for  Dolphin and Wahoo- Cont                         |
| 36             | CFMC Best Practices Discussion  |

| 1        | Questions/Comments  | 172 |
|----------|---|-----|
| 2        | SEFSC Caribbean Data Review for Stock Assessment  | 174 |
| 3        | Questions/ Comments   | 182 |
| 4        | Southeast Fishery Science Center Acknowlegements  | 188 |
| 5        | Southeast Fishery Science Center Quick Update   | 189 |
| 6        | Marine Spatial Planning for Aquaculture and Offshore wind   | 192 |
| 7        | Questions/Comments  | 193 |
| 8<br>9   | NOAA Fisheries' Equity and Environmental Justice (EEJ) Strateg<br>Regional Implementation Process, and Schedule |     |
| 10       | Questions/Comments  | 205 |
| 11<br>12 | Application of CFMC Queen Conch Training Modules in a European Union/FAO Funded Pilot Program                   |     |
| 13       | Questions/Comments  | 219 |
| 14       | Outreach and Education Report   | 221 |
| 15       | Questions/Comments  | 227 |
| 16       | Social Media Report   | 232 |
| 17<br>18 | Development of Educational Resources on the Shark Species (Infraclass: Selachii) of Puerto Rico                 | 235 |
| 19       | Questions/Comments  | 243 |
| 20       | Liaison Officers Reports  | 246 |
| 21       | St. Thomas/St. John, USVI - Nicole Greaux   | 246 |
| 22       | Questions/Comments  | 248 |
| 23       | Puerto Rico - Wilson Santiago   | 248 |
| 24       | Questions/Comments  | 250 |
| 25       | Enforcement Reports   | 250 |
| 26       | Puerto Rico - DNER  | 250 |
| 27       | USVI-Department of Planning and Natural Resources   | 252 |
| 28       | NOAA's Office of Law Enforcement  | 252 |
| 29       | Using DNA Barcoding to Identify Seafood Fraud in Puerto Rico.   | 258 |
| 30       | Questions/Comments  | 261 |
| 31       | U.S.V.I. Grouper Guides for Distribution - Evan Tuohy   | 273 |
| 32       | Questions/Comments  | 273 |
| 33       | Other Business  | 275 |
| 34       | Public Comment Period   | 279 |

#### TABLE OF MOTIONS

4 5

<u>PAGE 60</u>: Move to select Action 1, Alternative 3 for Puerto Rico to update the OFL and ABC for spiny Lobster for the period of 2024 through 2026 based on the constant catch approach and set the ACL equal to 0.95 of ABC until modified. <u>The motion carried on page 63</u>.

 PAGE 63: Motion to select Action 2, Alternative 3 for Saint Croix to update the OFL and ABC for spiny lobster for the period of 2024 through 2026 based on constant catch approach and set the ACL equal to 0.95 of the ABC until modified. The motion carried on page 64.

<u>PAGE 64</u>: Motion to select Action 3, Alternative 3 for Saint Thomas/Saint John District to update the OFL and ABC for spiny lobster for the period of 2024 through 2026 based on constant catch approach and set the ACL equal to 0.95 of the ABC until modified. The motion carried on page 64.

<u>PAGE 77</u>: The Council moves to select Action 1(b), Alternative 2, Sub-alternative 2(b) for Puerto Rico. <u>The motion carried on page</u> 80.

PAGE 81: The Council moves to select Action 1(c), Alternative 2, as preferred. The motion carried on page 84.

<u>PAGE 84</u>: The Council moves to select Action 1(d), Alternative 2, as preferred. The motion carried on page 85.

<u>PAGE 88</u>: The Council moves to adopt Action 2(b), Alternative 2, Sub-alternative 2(b) as presented in the document modified. The motion carried on page 92.

<u>PAGE 93</u>: The Council adopts Action 2(b), Alternative 2, Subalternative 2(b)presented in the document as modified. <u>The motion</u> carried on page 94.

PAGE 94: The Council moves to select Action 2(c), Alternative 2, as preferred for the Saint Croix District. The motion carried on page 94.

<u>PAGE 95</u>: The Council moves to select Action 2(c), Alternative 2 as preferred for the Saint Thomas Saint/John District. The motion carried on page 95 with all in favor.

PAGE 96: For the Island of Saint Croix, the Council moves to select Action 2(d), Alternative 2 as preferred. For Saint Thomas/Saint

John District, the Council moves to select Action 3(d), Alternative 2 as preferred. The motion carried on page 98.

<u>PAGE 118</u>: The Council moves to select Alternative 3 in Action 1(a) and Action 3(a), to establish a 24-inch fork length minimum size for dolphin in federal water for all sectors. <u>The motion carried on page 122</u>.

 PAGE 122: The Council moves to select Alternative 3 in Action 2(a) and Action 4(a), to establish a 40-inch fork length minimum size for wahoo in federal water for all sectors. The motion carried on page 129.

PAGE 130: The Council moves to select Alternative 2 in Action 1(b) and Action 3(b), to establish a recreational bag limit of 10 dolphinfish per person per day, not to exceed 32 dolphinfish per vessel per day, whichever is less. The motion carried on page 136.

<u>PAGE 137</u>: Motion to reappoint Jason Cope to the SSC. <u>The motion carried on page 137</u>.

PAGE 156: Council moves to include in Action 2(b) and Action 4(b) a new alternative, two wahoo per person per day bag limit, and 10 wahoo per vessel per day. The motion carried on page 160.

<u>PAGE 164</u>: Council moves to have Actions 1(c), 2(c), 3(c) and 4(c) be eliminated from the amendment and moved to considered but rejected. The motion carried on page 165.

<u>PAGE 166</u>: Council moves to add Actions to Amendment 3 for size limits and recreational bag limits for dolphin and wahoo in Puerto Rico. The motion carried on page 169.

PAGE 173: Motion to adopt the draft document as final the SSC's best practices and procedures regarding objectivity and conflicts of interest on peer review of scientific information and best scientific information available. The motion carried on page 174.

| 1  | CARIBBEAN FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL                               |
|----|--|
| 2  | 181 <sup>ST</sup> REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING                          |
| 3  | Isla Verde, Puerto Rico  |
| 4  |  |
| 5  | 7  |
|    | April 18-19, 2023  |
| 6  |  |
| 7  | The Caribbean Fishery Management Council convened on Monday        |
| 8  | morning, April 18, 2023, and was called to order at 9:04 a.m. by   |
| 9  | Chairman Marcos Hanke.   |
| 10 |  |
| 11 | Call to Order and Roll Call  |
|    | Call to Order and Roll Call  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 | MARCOS HANKE: Good morning, everyone. Please take your seats.      |
| 14 | We're going to start in a few minutes.                             |
| 15 |  |
| 16 | Good morning, everyone. Cristina, are we recording? Yes. Thank     |
| 17 | you.   |
| 18 | you.   |
| 19 | Modernia Appil 10th 2022 Which is the CEMC 101 pecular mosting     |
|    | Today is April 18th, 2023. This is the CFMC 181 regular meeting.   |
| 20 | Thank you for attending this meeting. It's 9:04 AM We are going to |
| 21 | start the meeting with the roll call and at this time for the      |
| 22 | benefit.   |
| 23 |  |
| 24 | CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Marcos. Good morning, Cristina, for the    |
| 25 | record. The interpreter needs me to check something during Zoom    |
| 26 | before we continue the meeting.                                    |
| 27 | To to to to to to the total medianing to                           |
| 28 | MARCOS HANKE: I am sorry, Cristina, I couldn't hear you. Can you   |
|    |  |
| 29 | repeat please? Slow.   |
| 30 |  |
| 31 | CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: That the interpreter needs me to check     |
| 32 | something in soon before we continue the meeting. Thanks.          |
| 33 |  |
| 34 | MARCOS HANKE: Oh. Thank you very much. I will wait for your sign   |
| 35 | to start.  |
| 36 |  |
| 37 | MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Cristina, no hay que interpretar el roll call.    |
| 38 | We can go ahead with the roll call and then whenever he is ready.  |
|    | we can go anead with the roll tall and then whenever he is ready.  |
| 39 |  |
| 40 | MARCOS HANKE: Okay, let's keep moving with the                     |
| 41 |  |
| 42 | Okay. Good morning again, everyone. We're going to start with the  |
| 43 | roll call at this time. Please, for the benefits of the people     |
| 44 | that are attending the meeting for the first-time, state not just  |
| 45 | your name, but what you do and your title for the benefit of       |
| 46 | everybody. Go ahead.   |
| 47 | 5.52 <sub>1</sub> 253 <sub>1</sub> . 55 anota.                     |
| 47 | T.TA.TAY RIVERA CARCÍA: Buenos días Liajay Rivera García Council   |

staff.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Good morning. María López, NOAA Fisheries Caribbean Branch and Sustainable Fisheries in the Southeast Region.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Good morning. Nicole Angeli, Director of the Virgin Islands Fish and Wildlife Division.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Morning. Carl Farchette, Vice-Chair CFMC.

MARCOS HANKE: For the benefit of Janet Coit, who is attending the meeting today, I'm going to request, especially the industry people, to add a little more detail, like, I'm Marcos Hanke, the Chairman of the Caribbean Council, charter operator, ex-commercial fisherman a long time ago and passionate about fishing. Fish on the east coast of Puerto Rico, used multiple gears. My background is in marine biology, and I have been on the Council for many, many years. I think those are the pertinent details for Janet to know where each of the industry participants are. Please follow my steps and give some more details to her and to have a better meeting and for her to know what to address and what to say to you guys. Go ahead.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Good morning, Vanessa Ramírez, Council member for the Commercial Fishermen of Puerto Rico. I work in the West Coast in Cabo Rojo, specifically, where we have more than 400 commercial fishermen.

**JAMES R. KREGLO:** James Kreglo, Council member of Saint Thomas Virgin Islands. Thank you. Good morning.

JOHN WALTER, III: John Walter. I'm the Deputy Director for Science and Council Services of the Southeast Fishery Science Center in Miami. And I'll represent the Center for Clay Porch, who is on a much well-earned vacation for the month. Thank you.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Andy Strelcheck, Regional Administrator, NOAA Fishery Southeast Regional Office, Saint Petersburg, Florida.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Miguel Rolón, Council staff. Those of you who need the radio for translation services, please raise your hand and the technician will bring it to you.

JANET L. COIT: Good morning, everyone. I'm Janet Coit. I am the Assistant Administrator for NOAA Fisheries. So, the head of the National Marine Fisheries Service, and it's a pleasure to be here this morning. 1 2

MARCOS HANKE: Next.

SENNAI HABTES: Good morning, all. Sennai Habtes, Chief of Fisheries, Division of Fish and Wildlife. I also serve as the Ecosystems-Based Fisheries Management Technical Advisory Panel Chair.

**VANCE VICENTE:** Yeah. I am Vance Vicente, recently appointed Chair of the SSC. So that's it.

**ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR:** Good morning. My name is Alida Ortiz Sotomayor. I am the president of the Outreach Education Advisory Panel.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Hey, good morning. My name is Julia Magras. I'm the District Advisory Panel Chair for Saint Thomas/Saint John. I'm also a commercial trap fisherman. I'm also the president and one of the founders of the Saint Thomas's Fisherman's Association. So good morning to everyone and thanks for being here.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Good morning, everybody. My name is Gerson Martínez. I'm the Chair of the DAP, District Advisory Panel. I'm also a commercial fisherman, trap fisherman in Saint Croix, and also a diver for lobster and conchs.

**NELSON CRESPO:** Good morning, everyone. My name is Nelson Crespo, DAP Chair, commercial fisherman, expertise in deep-water snappers and trap lobster fisherman.

DIANA T. MARTINO: Diana Martino, Council staff.

**SEAN MCNALLY:** Hi everyone. My name's Sean McNally. I'm the Advisor to the Assistant Administrator, Janet Coit.

JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: Morning. Jannette Ramos-García from Puerto Rico Sea Grant program and also member of the Outreach and Education Panel.

WANDA M. ORTIZ BÁEZ: Hi. I'm Wanda Ortiz. I'm an educator at the Sea Grant College Program and a master's student at the Department of Marine Sciences in University of Puerto Rico.

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

**ABDIEL CONNELLY:** Good morning, everyone. My name is Abdiel Connelly. I'm a commercial fisherman from Vieques.

1 2

RUTH GOMEZ: Good morning. Ruth Gomez, member of the DAP, member of the OEAP panel and the Saint Thomas Fisherman's Association.

 DARYL BRYAN: Daryl Bryan, commercial Fisher, Saint Thomas/Saint John District, current President of the Saint Thomas Fisherman's Association. DAP Members Saint Thomas/Saint John and FAC members Saint Thomas.

**DIANA T. MARTINO:** We're good, Mr. Chairman.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Good morning to everybody. My name is Ricardo López from Puerto Rico DNR.

MARCOS HANKE: Welcome, Ricardo. Diana, do we have everybody else from the room? No? The table here? Sarah.

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** Sarah Stephenson, NOAA Fisheries, Southeast 19 Regional Office. Sustainable Fisheries, Caribbean Branch.

MIGUEL BORGES: Good morning, everybody. I'm Miguel Borges. I'm with NOAA Office of Law Enforcement. I'm a special agent in San Juan and I cover all the Caribbean as well. Thank you.

MATTHEW WALIA: Hey, good morning. I'm Matt Walia. I'm the Compliance Liaison with Office of Law Enforcement. I'm based up in Saint Pete at our Regional Division Office. I work with all the Councils to try to get compliance with the fishermen.

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** Good morning, everybody. Kevin McCarthy. I'm the branch Chief of the Caribbean Fisheries Branch, located at the Southeast Fishery Science Center. I'm in Miami, but I've got folks kind of spread around a little bit, but most are in Miami.

**JOHN MCGOVERN:** Good morning, Jack McGovern. I'm at the Southeast Regional Office, assistant Regional Administrator, NOAA Fisheries.

MARCOS HANKE: Well, I think we need to address the virtual participants. Can Liajay or Cristina read it, please. For the record.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Okay. For the record, people in Zoom are Matt Walia, Brandon W. Taylor. Let me open the list of participants. Adyan Rios, Brandon W. Taylor, Helena Antoun, Chelsea and Evan Tuohy, Jesus Rivera Hernandez, Katherine Zamboni, Laura Cimo, Matt Walia, Rachel Eckley, Rachel O'Malley, Refik Orhun Ricardo Lugo, Yamitza Rodriguez, Julie Neer, Sarah Stephenson.

Also, I have to introduce myself. Cristina Olán, CFMC staff.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Cristina. Now we're going to-- before we adopt the agenda, I would like to highlight some changes on the order. Cristina.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Sorry. Cristina, for the record. I also want to say that interpretation is available already. Thank you, Guillermo.

#### Adoption Of Agenda

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Cristina and thank you, Guillermo. Before the adoption of the agenda, we going to have Janet Coit make some remarks to the group. That's why I ask for everybody to give a little more detail on their roll call to create the best scenario for her, to address the Council. We have also other business that we're going to list in a moment. Today, the other business is going to be a presentation of young fishermen initiative for Education of Young Fisher School in Vieques by Abdiel Connelly. And tomorrow on other business, we are going to have Using DNA Barcoding to Identify Seafood Fraud in Puerto Rico by Natalie Báez and U.S.V.I. Grouper Guides for Distribution to U.S.V.I. fisher by Evan Tuohy.

And we going to change also the order a little bit, the order of the presentation where— one second here. I want to make sure I have it correct. The presentation that Laura Cimo going to pass for the first part of the meeting on the second day. I would like the assistance from Liajay to see if I miss anything.

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Yes. You also have, today at 11:00 AM, we'll have a shift and move up the Review Draft Framework Amendment 2 to Update to the Spiny Lobster Overfishing Limit. That's going to be from 11:00 AM to 11:45, followed by a quick presentation from the Southeast Fishery Science Center with Kevin. And then we have launch. After that, then we have the original agenda of Review Draft Trawl, Net Gear and Descending Devices Amendment with María López. That's for the first day. In the second day-- That's it.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much, Liajay, for the support and all the team for the support on putting this together.

And I'll need a motion to adopt the agenda or comments. Anything else for other business.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Move to accept the agenda.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Carl Farchette, second.

1 2

MARCOS HANKE: All in favor say aye.

**GROUP:** Aye.

### Consideration of 180th Council Meeting Verbatim Transcription

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. The agenda is approved. The next is the consideration of the previous meeting, 180<sup>th</sup> Meeting Verbatim transcription. I need a motion or comments. Carlos?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just one correction on page six, under adoption of agenda, I believe the comment Marcos made about a "short presentation", they put "sharp presentation". So, I believe Marcos meant short presentation. That's all I have.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much for all the time reading the transcription and noting that. Like always, thank you very much. Take note and about it, we're going to make the correction. Thank you. I need a motion.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Nicole Angeli, move to accept the minutes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Carl Farchette, second.

MARCOS HANKE: All in favor say aye.

**GROUP:** Aye.

MARCOS HANKE: It's adopted, it's accepted. Now we going to have, like we explained before the participation of Janet Coit addressing the Council. Before that, I just want to welcome you again and I want to express our gratitude to be sensitive and to be proactive to the Caribbean issues. I can testify that on the first hand. I really appreciate all the job and the support of the Caribbean over those years, and I want to do that in public. Thank you very much, Janet.

#### Janet Coit Address to the Council

JANET L. COIT: Thank you very much, Marcos. How is the sound quality? Good? Okay. Thank you.

Thank you, Marcos. That means a lot to me, and I appreciate the introduction and I'm going to want to thank everybody for the warm welcome. It's a pleasure to be here. There's nothing quite like being in person and having a chance to talk with, and listen to, and have dialogue. Fortunately, I've actually met a lot of people.

I met Nelson and Julian in Puerto Rico about a year ago when I met you at the MAFC Marine Advisory Fisheries Committee. I met Nicole Angeli in San Diego where she was representing the Caribbean at a meeting of states and territories. And many others I've had a chance to meet informally and look forward to the occasion this evening, to do that and have some more conversations.

4 5

This morning I wanted to spend a few minutes talking about my priorities and some of the things I believe are also important to you. I'll start by saying that I really relate to those of you who are the state agency, territorial agency representatives because for the 10 years previous to this position I was overseeing and I was actually a member of the New England Fisheries Management Council as I oversaw the state agency in my home state of Rhode Island and was responsible for managing fisheries and handling all the responsibilities of a state agency, which now feels very manageable now that I'm the head of NOAA Fisheries and we're looking at a scope, of course, out to 200 miles from American Samoa up to Dutch Harbor in Alaska here where the issues are so similar in some ways and very, very different. So, I think this Council has a special and unique role, and I know that we have very strong relationships between the NOAA staff from the Science Center and the Regional Office and this Council. I appreciate that spirit of collaboration.

I think the brilliance of the Magnuson-Stevens Act as having representatives who represent industry at the table with the state and federal representatives where we can really grapple with difficult issues, disagree, agree to disagree, and then move forward in some of the innovative ways that you've dealt with how the federal tools and requirements touch down in the Caribbean, which isn't the same way they touch down in other places, are things that I really admire about this Council.

So, I wanted to also recognize the Caribbean team from NOAA María López and Sarah Stephenson, and Kevin McCarthy in particular you three for all the work that you do consistently day in and day out here, caring about conservation and fisheries. Already mentioned, Nelson Crespo, Julian Magras and also wanted to mention Ed Schuster as the people who are doing their District Advisory Chair work, which is a really important role.

And then Marcos, I just want to thank you for your 18 years in total of service to this Council. Your warmth, your optimism, your science background combined with your enthusiasm for fisheries and nature and people have made you particularly effective, I think, as a member and as the Chair, as someone who's engaging the public in a way that we're all responsible for in our service roles. So,

I think you're an extraordinary person and leader, so thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you.

4 5

 JANET L. COIT: I want to thank Miguel Rolón, as well, for his effective work as the executive director. That's a difficult role. As opposed to Marcos, we're not expecting you to go anywhere. Hopefully.

So just a few minutes on my top priorities, and I really, again, think they align with yours. The first would be grappling with climate change. The changes that we're seeing in the ecosystem to your coral habitats, fisheries that are shifting, and how we work together to understand those scientifically and to be proactive and create more resilient systems, whether that's infrastructure management rules. We see the impact of climate change, sea level rise, intense storms and they really affect our fisheries, and we can see that with all the fishery disasters that we've had associated with some of the hurricanes.

Part of climate change is reducing greenhouse gas emissions and I've been spending a lot of my time on offshore wind, which is burgeoning and growing off the coast of the Atlantic particularly in the Northeast where I'm from, but I do believe it's coming to the Caribbean. So, I think being proactive about the marine spatial planning the sighting of offshore wind, working with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management from the Department of Interior, getting to know them upfront and making sure as the territories and as the federal government work on potentially floating offshore wind or other offshore wind in the Caribbean, that we work together on that, right from the start, to make sure that we avoid and minimize the impacts on our living Marine resources.

 Another area of focus and commitment from me is environmental justice and equity and providing access to fisheries. So that's a place where I think there is a lot to be done and a lot to be learned here in the Caribbean. And then really just working on the conservation agenda that is so important in regard to protected resources. Particularly, concerned about the corals here in the Caribbean, and applaud the work that's going on among many institutions to look at how to understand and restore those habitats. And in fact, I know the U.S.V.I. just received an Endangered Species Grant to do work on all the listed corals, looking to assess their status and their abundance and to look at how to restore them. So, we're glad that you're taking the lead on that.

So, I know you have a ton to discuss. So, I wanted to highlight a

few of the things that I've learned about the Caribbean Council. One, is— I was talking earlier with Andy about innovation, and I really want to applaud the island-based fishery management plans for Puerto Rico, Saint Thomas, Saint John and Saint Croix. I know that was a tremendous undertaking, and I think it's an example of you taking a look at processes and statutes and requirements that maybe don't fit as nicely in the Caribbean and figuring out how to make them fit in a way that works for you. So, I think those island-based plans and that approach really allow for accounting for the different fishing sectors, the different socioeconomic factors, and are a much smarter way of addressing fisheries management. I know it was a heroic effort, a lot of work, and I just want to congratulate you for what I think was a really fantastic step forward.

4 5

Another area that I wanted to highlight was just the continuous effort to improve data collection. I know that's ongoing, it's a work in progress. I was talking to Marcos about some of the challenges around collecting recreational fishing data, and I know that's something of great concern to all of the territories, as well as some of the challenges with the commercial data collection, working with the State and the ACCSP. Do I have that right? But I think as we work on science-based fisheries management, you know, it starts with the data. The work that this Council has done, together with our region and our Science Center, to improve data collection, is something I think you should take credit for the progress you've made. But I know it's still a source of frustration and something that has quite a long way to go.

I wanted to call out the work that has been done by our Southeast Fisheries Science Center working with all of you on the spiny lobster update, the Southeast data assessment and review of the SEDAR 57 and I know that I enjoyed some delicious spiny lobster last night. It was fantastic. But I know that the stock assessment is kind of the foundation and something that the SSC and that this Council needs to determine catch limits. So, the partnership that we have with all of you on that is critically important.

I mentioned the recreational fishing. Again, Marcos, I know that everything you do is probably a team effort, but I just wanted to commend your work with the descending devices trying to make sure that people are aware of them, that they're affordable. That's very important for the reducing the mortality and the work that you've done. The Council, I know, matched the grant that you got from our regional office to develop educational and training materials around those descension devices. That's something I think we can learn in other parts of the country with from what you've done here. So, I want to thank you for your strong support

for that project.

4 5

I see that we have a couple members of our law enforcement division here. Welcome. I'm glad that you're here. I know you come to the Council meetings but just wanted to flag that I know enforcement issues are top of mind in terms of making sure that the rules that we set are complied with and the partnership that we have on the work of our OLE, which has a tremendous geography to cover and needs to coordinate with the territories in the US Coast Guard, is something that I understand is on your mind. And it's on our minds everywhere. You know, we set all of these rules and standards but if they're not complied with or we can't enforce them, we're really not accomplishing our goals. So, that's something we want to continue to work with you on.

I mentioned listed corals. I also wanted to mention the queen conch and just put it out there because I know the proposed listing is something of great concern to folks. It's a very important species. It's of great concern, and we want to ensure the sustainability of queen conch, but we also understand its importance for food and for seafood. So, I wanted to simply raise that, we're going to do a lot of work on understanding both the biology and the socioeconomic impacts. The proposed listing at the moment is kind of in the works because it's a proposed threatened listing there aren't specific regulatory measures that are going to come down on folks, but of course, once it's on the endangered species list, there is the expectation that NOAA Fisheries will take action if needed to regulate further. So, I understand the concerns and I think it's something I'm happy to discuss further. I mean, it's the 50th anniversary of the Endangered Species Act, this year. A law that was passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support. and we're proud of a lot of the successes but of course, part of that statute comes with the expectation that we will mitigate and reduce the threats that are imperiling listed species. And when it comes to things like climate change, that's a very difficult thing to do.

So, I want to continue to, again, support the work on important coral habitat. As we celebrate the Endangered Species Act, I've been through a lot of endangered Species Act issues and continue to focus very hard on endangered whales, on threatened and endangered pacific salmon and, you know, it all comes down to habitat. In the end, if you don't have the habitat, then you're not going to persist and that's one of the things that we want to work with you on. We have significant new funding through the bipartisan infrastructure law. And, you know, working to provide grants to protect habitat and to conserve habitat is something I'm very excited about having the opportunity to do.

And then I mentioned the equity and environmental initiatives. Those are from President Biden on down. Things that we're looking at. Where do we have areas where our statutes have resulted in people not having a seat at the table? Where have we had places where access to the fisheries or public resources is limited? So, and then back to the data that I was talking about earlier, do we have places that don't have the same ability to avail themselves of science, to have the stock assessments? So, one of the things that we're fighting for is more resources to go to the Caribbean for science. So that's part of President Biden's FY24 budget. Our additional funds, I think the budget has -- I have it somewhere here, but I want to say it's \$1.2 million. Let me just check my notes. Yes. To provide additional funding for science and management to support local fisheries management agencies. And I think that's important, both because it would be additional resources, but also, I was at a meeting last week with the house appropriation staff. It gives us a chance to talk about data poor places, and that if we're going to talk about ecosystembased fisheries management, we need to talk about the basic data that we need to collect and analyze in order to make sure that we are promoting sustainable fisheries. So, it gives us a chance to both advocates strongly for the funding and hopefully to secure additional funding that is earmarked for the Caribbean in the FY24 budget.

1 2

 Lastly, I wanted to highlight that I'm promoting a national seafood strategy. The seafood that you catch and consume here is outstanding. But part of it is just to try to engage with more people around as we manage fisheries sustainably, as we're proud of what the work that we're doing that it's part of providing protein and delicious food livelihood subsistence to people and never lose that connection with the work that we're doing and the fact that this is food that is providing nourishment and health to people who look to the ocean for their source of protein. I think we want to talk about the work we're doing many different ways to many different audiences and not lose that connection to the fact that this is important food for Americans.

Finally, I just wanted to again, emphasize that we value our partnership with this Council that we look forward to working with you to continue to grapple with these difficult issues. Marcos and any of you that do a stint on this Council, you know, you learn a lot and when you go off the Council, you continue to be an ambassador and somebody who advocates and is important to explain to the public how they can get involved and how we can do a better job for this critical, critical and consequential work. So, you know, the value of the Caribbean fisheries is not necessarily

reflected in the numbers, the landings data, as much as they are and what they mean to you locally and culturally for the food that you put on the table and the lifestyles that you support and sustain.

So, I will close by saying I'll be here for the morning and for some time this evening and would be happy to entertain some questions now or to have further discussions throughout the day. And thank you again for welcoming me here to the Caribbean.

#### 11 Comments

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for being here. I'll give the floor to the Council members for questions. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Janet, welcome to the Caribbean. And as always, we said the commercial fishermen in here are always open to collaborate with all your questions. So, we think we are going to have a nice lunch today. We can talk in there. Thanks, and welcome.

MARCOS HANKE: And I want to add to my first remarks and appreciation is that I'm being on the Council -- this is what happened when you are around for a long time, right. I'm being on the Council for 18 years or so, and for the last years is where I felt that the doors that need to be open are open and the action is connected to what's being said. And through your leadership and open door and being accessible to the people, not just to be there but really listening and that percolate to the other people that work underneath your office. And they are all kind and open to the conversations and to action. And it is now, not easy, but really, I can see the difference and I don't know if you know that, but this is the best moment in terms of advancing right things for the Caribbean. And this is the way I feel before I leave. And it is a good note to end, and you are a great part of that. Thank you very much.

Before I get anybody else, Julian?

 JULIAN MAGRAS: Yeah, Julian Magras, for the record. Thank you, Janet. Excellent presentation and thank you for recognizing the DAP members. On behalf of the Saint Thomas Fisherman's Association and the commercial fishers of the U.S.V.I., you know, I love the area where we are sitting right now. I see great opportunity for us to work with NOAA and its whole team and fill in the gaps that are needed to do assessments and to get all the information to make the scientists jobs a lot easier. So that opportunity, like Marcos says, has been the greatest over the last couple years, few

years I would say. And we look forward to continuing the collaboration and working to get the best available data that is needed to do these stock assessments. Because what I see happen on many occasions is we go in to do assessments and we don't have the information to complete those assessments. If we close those gaps, I think it would make the job a lot easier for the Southeast Fishery Science Center and their teams for us to have a positive assessment and get the true count outcomes that are needed for the Caribbean. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Julian. Thank for your engagement and the engagement of everybody from this Council. Anybody else? Nelson?

**NELSON CRESPO:** I joined to Julian's words and thanked you very much for your words. I'm pretty sure that now we are in the best moment to work for the benefits of our marine resources. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Nelson. Anybody else on the table? No. Thank you very much, Janet, for your remarks.

JANET L. COIT: Thank you. If I could just, again, thank the NOAA Fisheries team because I think the opportunities in this moment they're constantly advocating for resources for the Caribbean, are in large part a reflection of the leadership of Andy, Clay, John, and the attitude and openness that they have as they work together with their excellent team here. So, thank you again.

MARCOS HANKE: This is exactly the comment. Everybody from the top to the Council participants have opened doors on every level, and that was not seen as clear as we have been seeing in the last years, and I really treasure that, and I really appreciate it. Thank you all, María, John, and the everybody. Thank you very much.

Next on the agenda Executive Director Report. Miguel?

#### Executive Director's Report

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to be very brief because I want to do something else at this time. I want to recognize Ruth, Daryl and Julian. These are fishers from the U.S. Virgin Islands, Saint Thomas and Saint John. Usually, we do not invite people unless they have a presentation to make but they had a really important meeting with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and that's what we sponsored when we talk to Julian about it.

We have good news about the descending devices. As you know in other Councils they are working on, or they already have regulations for the descending devices. Trying to see if we can save as many fish as possible when they are under size, etcetera. So, we receive some funding from the office of Russel Dunn, NOAA Fisheries. That funding will be used to acquire the descending devices and distribute to key fishers who would like to experiment with that gear. Hopefully everybody recreation and commercial will be able to use it in any future.

4 5

In addition, we have a video that is going to be put together by Dr. Michelle Schärer. She's a member of our SSC. She's very well known among the fishers, recreational and commercial. So those are two steps in the right direction for the descending devices. And hopefully in the future, the Council will have a regulation to recommend to the Secretary of Commerce regarding this aspect of the fisheries.

We also are going to engage in a project with Sea Grant. Safety While Diving for Commercial Fish and/or Recreational. That's a partnership that we have with them.

I also would like to encourage Council members, anybody who is interested, to offer your comments regarding the Southeast Fisheries Science Center strategic plan. As you know, this is a document that is very important, it is a lot of work involved in it. So, if you have not seen it yet, please let me know and we can send it an email with that. But the deadline is the  $24^{\rm th}$  of April for them to have this plan together.

Also want to join the words of everybody regarding Janet Coit. I've been around for a long time, sometimes I'm older than the devil is. But in recent year, I have found a lot of, let's say, partnerships, real partnership with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Regional Office and the Washington office. And you have done a lot of work. You understand the soul of the states, and you have been able to combine those two. And at the CC meetings, we have found that we have your cooperation and the openness of your office to be closer to the needs of the nation, through the Council, etcetera. And for that, we are very, really grateful.

The other day that somebody asked me if I got along with my Region and my Center, because, well, there are some issues and problems in what area. We don't have any problem. And we are three Councils. We have the South Atlantic and the Gulf, and we are happy with it. We are happy with. We used to be happy with Roy Crabtree. Now we are happy with Andy Strelcheck and of course with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

But I want to, in front of Janet Coit, recognize a couple of people. María López and Sarah, because they do a lot of work that we used to do and now is because of them that we are becoming more effective in drafting documents that are needed for the Council to make the decisions that we need. We are always grateful. And Kevin where is Kevin? Right there. He's our scientist and he always tell us, you know, what can we do? Or how to improve the system, how to improve the data collection. I believe that we have a very good team. As Marcos said, that was another way a long time ago. But 10 Bonnie Ponwith, one time, she used to be the Science Director as you know, she and I made a bet because we wanted to share some money. I said, "well, if we help you this year, you can help us the following year" and she said, "I can help you in the next decade." And she did it. The people that came after her they have done an excellent job. You know, when you have three Councils, you have millions of dollars involved in other fisheries, and then you look at the Caribbean, small area, etcetera. But in principle, we are all the same. We are treated the same. And to be recognized such by the NOAA Fisheries in Washington and the two entities, Southeast Fisheries Science Center and the Regional Office is really appreciated.

1 2

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

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

And talking about appreciation. This afternoon, we are going to have a special occasion for the presentation of a book that was an idea by this lady to my right, here, Diana Martino. One time, several years ago, before the pandemic, we had an activity with the local fishers and the fishers representing the area here, the Council member, etcetera, and it was a success story because we were able to present one of our chefs a series of dishes prepared with lionfish and others. It was a success story. So, Diana told me, "Why can't we make a book out of this?" I always say no to her, but she's insistent. She kept telling me, "We need to have a book. We need to--" "Okay, we're going to have a book, but we need to have a champion for that book and see we can convince somebody." So, we talked to Alida Ortiz and Alida said, "that's a great idea." You know, Alida is the Chair of our Outreach and Education Program. She's a marine biology, but she had been an educator for all her life. And she took it upon herself to put together the book. Then Alida and I were talking about the benefits of having the book and a President giving an executive order that we should promote the underutilized species, that we should promote the use of local caught fish across the nation. It was not this president by the way, but anyway, it was another guy. And we said, "well, now we can put money into it." And we did it.

So, at this time, taking advantage of your time here, we would like to officially-- we have to stand. Cristina, toma la foto.

Alida, ven pa'ca, please. Pero rápido.

Okay. Alida is a principal author.

4 5

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Nice to meet you.

JANET L. COIT: So nice to meet. So wonderful.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Alida is a principal author of the book, but we have a lot of contributors. We have Wanda Pantojas. Dr. Wanda Pantoja she's on expert on culinary arts, University of Puerto Rico. Juan Carlos Vicéns is the main chef, he's the one who put together the whole thing. But we also have Cedric Taquín. You are going to meet these people this afternoon, this evening, at the Guancha. Corey Magras from Saint Thomas Islands. Carlos Farchette. Carlos told me that he's not a chef, he's not a cook, he's a chook. He invented that word.

16 Ca

**JANET L. COIT:** He is what?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: A chook. It is a mixture of a cook and a chef. None of the two, but one in the middle. He created that word, so I love it. We have, Michael Funk. We have Nicole Greaux, she's a liaison officer in Saint Thomas/Saint John. Sol Carbone, Delia Escribano, Juan L. Gómez and Cynthia L. Gotay. These people were the one who put together the recipes that we have here. The two editors are Diana and myself. So, I want Diana-- And special thanks to Helena Antoun, because when you write a book, sometimes you think that everything is grammatically correct and everything. Then you give it to an editor and crisscross the whole book. So, we are very thankful for that.

So, at this time, I would like to-- she hates this, but she has to say a couple of things to give the book to the big boss.

**DIANA T. MARTINO:** Good morning. Janet, this was part of our sustainable seafood campaign, so that people can learn that there are many other species that are really good and that can take the pressure out of the other ones that everybody knows. So, I hope you enjoy — if you are able to make any of those. I know you will.

JANET L. COIT: Thank you. Thank you very much. That's so exciting. This is beautiful. And I think promoting underutilized species is a win-win and I look forward to it looking at this. Congratulations. [applause]

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Okay, miren para acá. Say chook! [laughter]

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. Marcos, no te sientes. Diana, búscate la vaina esa.

1 2

Okay. For those of you who don't know this gentleman here. Marcos Hanke is a charter boat operator. He's a marine biologist. He told us a little bit about it himself before. A marine biologist. I call him a friend, him and his family. He has two beautiful daughters and beautiful wife and excellent family. But he has been working with marine resources through his life. He was born in Brazil. The first time we spoke in Brazil, he was so nice I thought that he was gay, but he wasn't. He came to Puerto Rico, landed in Puerto Rico, and he became a member of our society. So, he got a dual citizenship, I call it, but a dual soul. One in Brazil and one in Puerto Rico. He has been with us for 18 years. Unbelievable, but he did nine years. Three years at a time. Spent some time outside the Council came back three years at a time.

This year he finishes on August  $10^{\rm th}$ . Probably we will ask him to join the DAPs. So, the institutional memory that he has will be with us, and I'm sure that he will say yes. For that we are really grateful, Marcos. Today we wanted to present to you our reef in a bottle but now it's a [inaudible]. Diana wants to read what we wrote.

**DIANA T. MARTINO:** Marcos Hanke. In recognition of his excellence, participation, and work as a member and Chair of the Caribbean Fishery Management Council throughout these 18 years of service. Thank you, Marcos. [applause]

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. You guys all know-- one second. I happen to be very informal on my approaches. What I want to say now is something that somebody on this room is probably going to be Chairman or going to be on the leadership position. My message to all of you is what I believe has guided me through life. That is that the world is tired of polarization, of fighting for everything. We need to find common ground because we all benefit from it. And then after we have accomplished those common grounds, then we discuss the complicated parts.

If you follow those steps, our world, the work on the Council and so on, is going to be way better. I see myself and I try to be a bridgeman to create productive conversation between all of you guys and if there is just one thing that you remember from Marcos, I want to be a bridgeman. Be a little bit of that and that's the key for happiness for everybody. Thank you very much. I feel like this is part of my family, right. With my faults, with my good things or whatever, you guys have the best version of myself, and

thank you so much for caring of me, of my family, of my beliefs, or giving me the freedom to express myself and to keep being a child after 54 years of existence. I hope I never lose that. You guys have helped me do that, to be happy, to be effective, to make silly jokes, but to work hard. Thank you very much. [applause]

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Before we finish, the teacher of Marcos Hanke wants to say something.

**ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR:** This is my pride. Marcos was my student and my biologist. [applause] So, after many, many years, I have him as a chef, as a chief, and I think this was the best student that I ever had. [applause]

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, guys. Let's go. Business is on.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Now we can continue with agenda with the good stuff.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. Let's go. Thank you. On a good note. Next part of the agenda is Update on Amendments to the Island-based Fishery Management Plans, María López.

# Update on Amendments to the Island-based Fishery Management Plans

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. Good morning, everybody. Thank you, Marcos. So, this is a presentation that we do at every Council meeting where-- can you? Yeah, it's coming to the screen in a second. In the meantime, this is a presentation that we do at every Council meeting in the morning just to start the process. It's a review of everything that we have that we are working with right now, the things that still need to be done, the things that are in the Council agenda, and then it has also action items for the Council to address.

Okay, you can go to the next slide.

 Okay. So, everything that it's-- before I start, everything that's in here that is in red are things that I want to highlight. Okay. The first is just to remind you that since October 13th, 2022, the Puerto Rico FMP, the Saint Croix FMP, the Saint Thomas and Saint John FMP, otherwise known by the Island-Based FMPs, have been in place. So that means that we are currently, we have been operating under island-based fishery management since then. That means that all of the amendments that we are working on are going to be to one or all of the islands.

The first amendment that was done to the island-based FMP, this one applied to each one of the islands, is the Generic Framework Amendment 1. It dealt with spiny lobster reference points, and this was based on the first successful stock assessment for the spiny lobsters on all three islands, which was completed in 2019. This amendment was submitted by the Council on September 26th, 2022, and it just recently became effective on April 15th, 2023. So, this is our first amendment and it's now effective. And this is the one that has new management reference points and new ACLs that were derived from those reference points for the spiny lobster in all three islands. It also revises the process for evaluating annual landings relative to the ACLs to determine if the accountability measures need to be triggered.

4 5

The next amendment is the Generic Amendment 1 or Amendment 1 to the island-based FMP. This was another one that applied to each one of the islands. This one deals with the definition of buoy gear and its use. As you all recall, it prohibits the buoy gear use for the recreational sector because this is a commercial, gear type. And it allows up to 25 hooks on the buoy gear for commercial fishers to basically represent kind of like the same number of hooks that fishers use in state waters. So, this amendment was submitted by the Council on November  $2^{\rm nd}$ , 2022. The notice of availability of the amendment was published on April  $6^{\rm th}$ , and the comment period on the amendment is open until June  $5^{\rm th}$ , 2023. The proposed rule for this amendment is going to be published soon. Probably within the next week or so. That will provide another opportunity for comment on this amendment.

The next amendment that the Council is working on is the Generic Amendment 2 to the island-based FMPs: Trawl, Net Gear and Descending Devices. This is also another amendment that's going to be to each one of the island-based FMPs. This amendment, as you recall, may prohibit the use of all trawl gear in the Caribbean EEZ or in the marine managed areas. May also prohibit the use of gillnets, trammel nets, purse sienes in the EEZ and may require the use of descending devices when fishing for reef fish in the EEZ. Where we are right now with this amendment. We have a draft environmental assessment, which is the document that evaluates the effects of the amendment. As you all know, we have the amendment and the evaluation all combined into one document. It's ready for the Council to finalize selection of preferred alternatives at this meeting. And if that is something that the Council does today, then this final action may be able to be taken in August of 2023. So, we will be discussing this in the afternoon today.

The next amendment that we're working on is the Generic Framework, Amendment 2 to the island-based FMP. This is another update to the

OFL, ABC and ACLs for spiny lobster. This is based on the 2022 update assessment to the SEDAR 57 spiny lobster assessment. From this one, what has happened is that the SSC recommended OFL and ABCs for 2024 to 2026 for each FMP. This is where we are. There's a draft amendment. The draft has been done and the Council can select preferred alternatives at this meeting. Final action may be in August, depending on the actions of the Council today. And this amendment will be discussed this morning.

4 5

> The next action is the Amendment 3 to the Saint Croix FMP and to the Saint Thomas and Saint John FMP for New Management Measures for Dolphin and Wahoo. So, this is an amendment that evaluates establishing recreational bag limits, commercial trip limits and/or recreational, and/or commercial size limits for pelagic stocks. What we are bringing today to you, is a split amendment. Before, we had the amendment dealing with, not only U.S. Virgin Islands but for us in Puerto Rico. At the last Council meeting, the Council decided to divide it in two. U.S. Virgin Island will be dealt in a separate amendment. So, this is a document that's going to be discussed today. There are four actions. There's additional guidance that it's needed from the Council on the scope of the actions. The Council can select the preferred alternatives at this meeting, and depending on the outcomes of that, final actions may be in August 2023. And this amendment is going to be discussed this afternoon.

Next slide, please.

Okay. Then the Amendment 3 to the Puerto Rico FMP, New Management Measures for Pelagic Species. This is an amendment, as I mentioned before, the pelagic amendment was split into one for U.S. Virgin Islands and one for Puerto Rico. This one was decided to put on hold until additional information could be gathered from Puerto Rico. So, the idea will probably be if the Council is interested to discuss this in August. Again, also considers establishing recreational bag limit, commercial trip limits and/or recreational and/or commercial size limit for pelagic stocks.

Okay. And then the next actions, I'm not going to call them amendments because we still are not working on those amendments, but these are actions that need Council attention.

So, we have discussed before the importance of developing a federal permit system. We discussed it the August and December 2022 meetings. This had been previously discussed since 2016, and at the time, it was decided that we were going to wait until the island-based FMPs were in place. So, this could be done as an amendment to the island-based FMPs as appropriate. So, this will

be discussed at the August 2023 meeting, and there's a need for guidance on the Council on the scope of the action. So, we will be bringing a presentation that will highlight the different paths that the Council can take with the development of a federal permit system. And it's very important for the Council to provide guidance as to where they would like to move with the development of a federal permit.

4 5

Another action that has been discussed in the past is a trap reduction plan for the U.S. Virgin Islands. This one would evaluate compatibility with U.S.V.I. trap reduction program. The Council received an update at the December 2022 meeting. They were pending some actions that they were going to take the U.S. Virgin Islands, and then they will bring that to the Council. This is something that staff can work with the U.S. Virgin Island in terms of the things that are needed, so we can bring that. And we already have that collaboration that we're going to establish.

Then the last two actions were discussed back in 2021. One is the timing of seasonal area closures for the red hind grouper in the Puerto Rico EEZ. A discussion paper was discussed back in December 2021. There were still some actions that went pending. For example, the Council wanted to go ahead and do some informational workshops with fishers. And then we also had some data requests, and those things are pending. Therefore, the staff hasn't received the go to move forward with this. So, this is one of those action that, maybe, the Council at some point may decide if they want to move forward with the action or not at this time, or if they want to gather more information. For example, task the SSC or something like that.

And then the last action, it's a modification of red hind seasonal closure in the Saint Croix EEZ. There was a task to develop a scoping paper to evaluate modifying the Lang Bank red hind closure to allow fishing for pelagic species during the closure. This is something still pending, additional guidance for the Council as to if they want to move forward with this or not. And the, our staff has been in communication with, for example, highly migratory species staff to discuss some of the background information of this. But this is something that will benefit too, from the Council taking a look and deciding if this is something that they want to move forward with.

So that's all I have. Mr. Chair, if you want to have some discussion about this or otherwise, you know, everything that was presented in the first page, we're going to be discussing throughout the day. Some of these actions that are still pending, then whatever you decide to do. Thanks.

#### 1 2

3 4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah, I think I request the Council to reserve the meaningful discussion of this later on, like you suggest. But keep that table on mind because it is good guidance for us to be effective on that discussion. But I need to say something. You and Sarah have been so helpful and proactive with the Council, accepting amendments and things that are great overload of work for you guys to speed up the improvement of the Council in terms of the management tools and all the discussions that we are having.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:

MARCOS HANKE: Miquel?

step up to the plate. Thank you.

Marcos.

13 14

15

16 17

18

19 20 21

22 23

24 25

34 35

36 37 38

39

40 41

42

43

44 45

47 48

46

ANDREW STRELCHECK:

MARCOS HANKE:

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay.

and ask for the Council motion or whatever?

Andy.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes, I can.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you.

what we're going to see is with the April and now August meetings,

Questions/Comments

I want to express in public our deep appreciation for your team to

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. One question to María. From what you need

from this Council, is there any action that we can take at this time that you consider could be the easy ones so we can get the

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: María López, for the record, my recommendation

will be when there is appropriate time in the agenda later on, we

can bring this table back and then some of the items that are here

in red, pending, particularly for the ones that are actioned, the

timing of seasonal area closures, the red hind seasonal closure.

I think these are decisions that maybe the Council will need to

think a little bit about if they want to move forward with those.

So, Marcos, I believe you said that you would like to see this

later today. So, we will keep this table in a presentation and

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Can you guide us as to the time that we can stop

then we can continue just discussing the rest of the actions.

Council moving toward the direction that we need to move.

Yeah. Thank María and team for putting this

together. So, in response to what you just asked Miguel, I think

there's going to be some amendments that obviously are going to be completed and moving into the rulemaking process. So, we want input from the Council as to what we want to prioritize, right? What are we going to work on moving forward? I think a lot of that, if you can think about what's on this list of kind of, why did we put it on hold? why did it stop work for the time being? and do we have enough information at this point, or can we bring that information back at the August meetings? That will then help us to prioritize those actions thereafter. So, we can talk about that further later in the meeting.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, María. Next on the agenda, we have a break and we'll be-- Go ahead, María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Mr. Chair, I think we can move forward with the accountability measure, discussion, and then the break. If that's okay.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Go ahead. Andy.

**ANDREW STRELCHECK:** Yeah, so I'm going to open up about accountability measures and then have Sarah Stephenson give the presentations. Are you ready for that?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, I'm ready for that. I'm sorry, I just misread here. Go ahead.

### 2023 Accountability Measures Discussion

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Thanks Marcos. So, as you're aware, we have implemented the new island-based fishery management plans as of October of last year. Those established new annual catch limits for each of the islands. In early part of this year, my team put together a report of the landings data for the most recent years of information we have. That's 2021 for U.S.V.I. and 2019 for Puerto Rico. We identified as many as 10 catch limits that were exceeded and so, I was very concerned, obviously, in terms of the implications of that. They have socioeconomic consequences as well as conservation consequences. But as part of our accountability measures, we do have provisions with regard to if the catch limit was exceeded due to data improvements, then we would identify that, and the accountability measure would not be triggered.

And so, we had asked for input from our Science Center to review the data and information, and Sarah's going to go through that in more detail. But we wanted to walk through this and just explain the accountability measures. We're also working on some Outreach and Education with the District Advisory Panels in terms of

accountability measures.

4 5

But I want to, I guess, lead with the take home, which Janet also mentioned, which is the data's improving and that's a good thing. We're paying very careful attention to that. We don't want to arbitrarily trigger accountability measures because of data improvements but there will be some work this Council needs to do to adjust catch limits going forward as that data stabilizes in the future. So, with that, I'll look to Sarah to give the presentation. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Sarah.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Thank you. Next slide, please.

So, Andy touched on a lot of this, and I'll just go through it kind of quickly since the-- oh, that does that to me all the time. Okay, I'll just talk really fast.

So, the FMPs outlined a specific process, the years to use. In these first few years after the FMPs were implemented, just kind of in recognition that there may be a little bit of, kind of like a lag or whatnot. So, they identified that the first year of FMP implementation that we would do ACL monitoring, you would use the most recent single year of landing. So as Andy explained and is a little bit later on the slides, for Puerto Rico, the most recent landings that we have that's complete is 2019, and then for U.S.V.I. is 2021. So, for this year, those are the years that we used.

Next year we will use another just single year of landings. And then the year after that, which would be the third year of FMP implementation we'll use an average of two years of landings and then thereafter, we'll start using the three-year average, which is what we were using before the FMPs were implemented. And then I just did want to point out that last bullet that there is currently no recreational data information. So, for Puerto Rico where recreational ACLs were set, the commercial ACL will become the ACL for the stock. So, I just wanted to make everybody be aware of that moving forward.

Next slide, please.

So, accountabilities for reef fish stocks and stock complexes and for spiny lobster are different than for the pelagic stocks. So, I'll talk about those first.

If NMFS estimates that landings exceed the ACL, the length of the

fishing season will be reduced by the amount necessary to prevent landings from exceeding the ACL in the current year of fishing. So, there are a couple of caveats to that. That AM would not be applied if NIMFS determines that the fishing season reduction is not necessary based on best scientific information available. And then the AM would also not be applied if NMFS determines that data collection or monitoring efforts improved.

4 5

So, any fishing season reduction that is required will be applied the same way that it was before. So, this bottom bullet is not a change from what we had before. The length of time will be estimated and there'll be a closure that starts sometimes early in the year and will end on September  $30^{\rm th}$ . But if we need more time from January  $1^{\rm st}$  to September  $30^{\rm th}$ , then it will be added on starting October  $1^{\rm st}$  and moving towards the end of the year. And the reason it's set up that way is to try to avoid any closure around Christmas time because we heard that that was, you know, a big time for lobster and some of these other reef fish, so that's why it was set up like that.

Next slide, please.

So, for the pelagic stocks, which in the U.S.V.I. is just dolphin and wahoo and for Puerto Rico includes those, as well as, a couple tunas, a couple mackerels, great barracuda and tripletail, we established an annual catch target, which is 90% of the annual catch limit. And so, during this monitoring process, landings, they'll be compared to that ACT based on the same process that we just saw in the first slide.

So, for this year we compare the landings to the ACT for those stocks. If landings exceed the ACT, NMFS in consultation with the Council will determine if any appropriate corrective action is needed. And that was set up because these are stocks new to management, they're pelagic, they go all over. And so, we recognize that corrective action, like a season closure, may not be the best way to manage these stocks.

Next slide.

 So, as we transition from our previous FMPs to the island-based FMPs, there will be this lag in landings. So, as we mentioned, we use 2019 for Puerto Rico and 2021 for U.S.V.I. And of course, those landings were from a period where we were managing under the U.S. Caribbean wide FMP. So, the reef fish FMP and the spiny lobsters FMP. And so, the ACLs that we have in place now weren't even thought up back then. So, there is this lag. So, what we've specified in our regulations and in the FMPs is that during this

transition period, we will compare landings to the new ACLs or ACTs. And our question is, if they are fishing at that same rate in this fishing year, would they exceed these ACLs or ACTs? And then once we catch up to a time period where we are using landings from say, 2023 and later, the question was, did they exceed? In either instance the overage, if there is an overage and it's determined to be from increased catch, the AM would be applied as we saw on the previous two slides. So different for pelagic stocks. And then the fishing season closure for reef fish and spiny lobster.

4 5

Next slide, please.

So, there's a lot on this slide, but I wanted to show everybody. So, these are the 10 stocks that Andy mentioned that for this year when we compared 2019 landings for Puerto Rico and 2021 for the U.S.V.I. FMPs to their ACLs, the ones that were over. So, you can see in the third column there, the landings that we had. The very next column is the ACL, and the one after that is the ACT. You can see that for most stocks on this list, there is no ACT, there's only one that has one and that's the pelagic stock in Puerto Rico of great Barracuda.

And so, after we determined that they were above their ACLs or ACT, we sent a memo to the Science Center requesting that they look and see if they could determine why these overages occurred. And so, the second to last column is kind of the short response from the Science Center memo. So, you can see that several of them were due to improved reporting. Some of them were due to increased catch. And those are all the species that we have a zero ACL in federal water. So, we prohibit harvest in federal water, so the assumption is that those landings occurred in state waters.

And so, there is one on there that needs further evaluation. And so, I'll discuss on the next slide a little bit more detail, the improved reporting and that explanation for great barracuda. And then there's the last column, which is the good news of this slide, which is part of the reason why I agreed to give it instead of Andy is that there's no closures necessary for this year for any of the stocks that there was an overage. So, good news.

Next slide, please.

So, improved reporting, what does that mean? It's slightly different for each of the stocks, but I'm going to try to explain this because it's a little complicated. For hogfish and grouper four, which those were the stocks that went over the ACL under the Saint Thomas and Saint John FMP. Grouper five and misty grouper,

which is a stock under the Saint Croix FMP and then cubera snapper for the Puerto Rico FMP the improved reporting basically came down to the species were not on the reporting forms during the time period that was used to set the ACL. So, it's a little bit different for some of those and I can go through the table a little bit more.

For great barracuda, which is that pelagic stock in Puerto Rico, the Science Center suggested that more investigation is required because the reporting forms only have a general category of barracudas, but we are managing specifically the species great barracuda. And so there needs to just be a little bit more look at that to see, is that appropriate? Should this maybe have been lumped all of them together? So, that's the last part of that one. If the ACT is exceeded, NIMFS must consult with the Council to determine appropriate action. For this one the action could be, take a closer look at those, you know, how they're reported and determine if this one need to go back to the SSC.

So, in the table- Oh, Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yes. Sarah, can you please explain the difference between ACL and ACT and why the barracuda have an ACT? Because that's a question that they asked me.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Okay. So, the ACL is the annual catch limit, set using the ABC control rule, the Acceptable Biological Catch control rule that's in each management plan. Then once the ACL was established, and we did that for all the stocks pelagic, reef fish, bunny, lobster, but for the pelagic stocks, when we were developing the accountability measures for these new species that we're going to start managing, we decided to develop an annual catch target, which the Council set at 90% of the ACL. So, if the ACL was a 100,000, then 90,000 is the ACT. So that ACT is going to be kind of like our trigger. If we compare landings to that, it makes us take a step back and take a look at the stock. The difference is with these pelagic stocks, there's no immediate follow up action, like a seasoned reduction. We're going to take a closer look. We're going to determine why was there a large influx of recruits or juveniles? Was there something else that was outside of the fishery's control that that led to that increase in catch? So, the pelagic stocks all have that ACT. And so, that's our management.

They also have an ACL. but the accountability measure is tied to the ACT, the target, not the limit. Does that-- Okay. Kevin?

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** So, Miguel, does that answer the question? Because there's another way to frame that. [crosstalk] say no more.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, I explain it to a couple of people, but I wanted to hear from Sarah for the record.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Okay. So, looking at the table the first row you can see hogfish, the reference period of landings that was used to set the ACL for hogfish was 2012 to 2016. But the year that hogfish was officially added to the U.S.V.I. forms was 2016. So, that's why this one falls under improved reporting because any landings that occurred during that reference period were writeins and so, they might not have captured all the catch for the hogfish. So that's why that one's on the improved reporting.

So, then all of the groupers, and this is going to apply to the Saint Thomas/Saint John, as well as the Saint Croix because they use the same process. So, they use the landings by species. The 2012 to 2016 forms had most species of groupers written on them that we are going to manage. Before that time, all of the groupers were just reported as a lump aggregate, as groupers, but it was a more historical time period. So, what the SSC and the Council did through the FMPs was they looked at the species-specific ratio during that five-year period and they applied it back to the historical landings.

 And so, like I said, most of the species of groupers that we're going to manage under the new FMPs were on the form. But there were some that weren't, some that were added in at a later period. So, for instance there, black, red, tiger grouper, which are three of the four stocks managed in both the Saint Thomas/Saint John Grouper four complex and the Saint Croix Grouper five complex. Those weren't on the form until 2016. So, any kind of speciesspecific ratio might be a little off when you then back apply it to groupers. And the same thing with misty grouper that that's going to, even though it was on the form, all of the groupers are likely a little off because they were using species specific from that period and applying it backwards. And so, if there was one missing or not really reported, it was write-ins. You're not going to get the best snapshot of that species specific to apply to the historical landings. So, that's why it says the species-specific ratio is likely inaccurate. And so would fall under enhanced reporting.

 And then last cubera snapper for Puerto Rico. The period used to set the ACL was basically 88 through 2011. There were some known errors with the 2005 landings, so that wasn't used for any species, so that's why it's missing here. But cubera snapper wasn't added

to the Puerto Rico catch form until 2014, so it's the same issue of anything that was on in the landings data during the reference period use was likely due to write-ins and wasn't because the species was included on the form.

Next slide please.

And with that is the end. So, the next steps for these-- we're going to obviously keep monitoring each year, but now that we know that this has occurred, the Council could revisit ACLs for stock or complexes that include species that weren't on the reporting forms. We know of some because we identified them during this year's process, but more could probably be looked at there. And then also, start a discussion, if you'd like, to determine any appropriate corrective actions, if any are needed, for ACT overages. For those pelagic stocks since they are new. Just start the discussion of, since this is going to be an annual process, what steps could we, as SERO and the Science Center take?

So, Andy, with that, I'll turn it back to you.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. Thanks Sarah. So just a couple things to add and then, certainly, interested in input from the Council. With annual catch limits the goal is obviously to have a sustainable level of harvest. And in this instance, we have a moving target where the data's improving, right? And the catch limits, at least for these species, likely are set too low relative to how the data is collected historically.

So, what we need, obviously going forward, is then a stable period for landings data where there's not change happening to the reporting in order to set new catch levels that are appropriately set relative to new reporting regime. Right. And in Puerto Rico, I know you're going through a tremendous amount of work right now with ShellCatch and the electronic reporting on the commercial side, and so that's still in flux. I don't know from your perspective, Nicole, where we're at in terms of kind of stabilizing reporting for U.S.V.I. But we just want to raise this because we do see future action. We don't have a timeframe for when that future action might occur at this point, and I think it'll be contingent on when we believe that stability in reporting has finally kind of occurred and when we can reset the ACLs. You know, what we want to obviously do is have a system of functional ACLs and accountability measures so that if in fact the catch limits are exceeded, you know, there's corrective action taken and we don't also trigger them when reporting is just simply improved, like we're talking about today.

Then the last thing I'll note is that although we've identified these 10 species that kind of triggered our review, there's likely other species where data improvements have occurred, but for whatever reason, the catch limit wasn't exceeded. And so, I think it's going to need to be more broadly looked at with the Science Center going forward in terms of updating our catch limits under the island-based FMPs.

4 5

So, we just wanted to present this. As I mentioned, we're going to be bringing this to the District Advisory Panels as well to share with them the implications of this. And ultimately, going forward, we'll want to work with the Council to update the catch limits.

#### Questions/Comments

MARCOS HANKE: I was just making some notes here. Sarah, do you want any discussion about barracuda to put on record now or later?

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** Yes. If you know of anything that will help us when we start looking into that it would be appreciated.

 MARCOS HANKE: Okay. In Puerto Rico, the great barracuda is prohibited by law to be commercialized because of consideration of ciguatera. I went around the room, and I confirm with Nelson, with Wilson, there is a minimum landing of it, usually for bait and for community consumption. For personal use, which is minimum, very, very small. Saying that there are three species of barracuda present in the Caribbean. Sphyraena barracuda, which is the great barracuda, sphyraena picudilla and sphyraena guachancho. The two smaller species are the ones that aggregate in schools that you can see landings for different gears. Usually artisanal is a small, very small-scale fishery that is very good to eat without chances of ciguatera because of the biology and the communities use them. That's what we need to adjust and to understand on the barracuda group fishery. That's the reality that is going on.

I would like to hear from the DAP if I'm missing anything.

 NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelson Crespo, for the record. Marcos, you said correctly what I want to express. The barracuda is a small-scale target. It is only for some communities, and it is an artisanal fishery. It's not a big market. In the big one, the big barracuda, we only use it when we don't find any other bait for the deep-water snappers then we go for the barracuda. For a few ones, just to complete the one day of fishing. That's all.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Vanessa?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. As you said, also, only the smallest one is the one that we use for practically house consumption. It's not commercial and from the point of view of the commercial divers, the only way that they have to kill them is if they are aggressive to the divers. But it's not for consumption, it's only to prevent accidents. Thanks.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Do you need anything else? Any aspects of it? Miguel?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, but the issue is that we deal with numbers. Ricardo, do you have statistics on barracuda and the three others? Have those been shared already, or they're still in the process?

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: I was looking for the numbers right now and we have about 1000 pounds landed. 1000 of barracudas.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: But that's a group of barracudas, you cannot tell them apart yet?

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Well, we don't have separated species. We just have barracuda, its standard name. We know that we have different species but the great barracuda, which is prohibited, as you said, to be sold for food, is the most fished. Is the species of barracuda that is mostly caught in Puerto Rico and report.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. This is what the numbers, which is important what Miguel said. Even though in terms of how the fishing is performed, the great barracuda is an accident of when you go for king mackerel, for reef fishes, for pelagics, that you catch them accidentally, versus the little barracudas, which is the guachancho and the picudilla in which the small, very, very small scale fishermen go with sardines and rowing boats and so on, close to the shoreline, to fish on the schools of them. I mean, the approach to the fishery is different. The gear is different. The size of the fish is different. There's a very big distinction between, especially the two species that don't grow very big versus the great barracuda.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, Sarah, the question is, does any of this help you in the writing of the document?

SARAH STEPHENSON: Yes. I think where it will be helpful is if this gets kind of sent back as a request to the SSC to look at this stock again, we could include all the discussion here and the rationale, as well as the discussion and the reasoning of why it was included in the Puerto Rico FMP. You know, what category did

it fall under? Was it in environmentally important? Was it economically important? Was it, you know, we know it wasn't managed before, but we can take all of that information and present it to the SSC and then they can make the determination of, "should we-" And basically how it's landed, how it's reported, knowing all this information now, would they recommend any changes to the ACL and the ACT?

4 5

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, Mr. Chairman-- Liajay, take notes of that last statement from Sarah and be sure that Graciela incorporates it into the agenda for the SSC that topic. Vance is the Chair now, so he is taking notes also. Then by the next meeting of the Council, in ours, we may be able to provide Sarah some other guidance.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Ricardo.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes, I would like to correct. The barracuda species mostly fish in Puerto Rico and sold are the picudilla and guachancho. My mistake.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Ricardo. Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Oh, thank you, Mr. Chair. Can I go to that slide where the Saint Croix numbers are? Down, down, down. Right there.

Okay. I know I mentioned this a few years ago, and I don't know if it's misidentification by the fisher or what's going on there, but I don't see black, red, and tiger and yellowfin grouper at all in the markets. I don't know if the fishers are misidentifying that. 1,300 pounds I can tell you I would've seen them. And maybe I can get some clarification from fish and wildlife port sampling if they have identified those species when they sample. But I really don't see them at all in the market, especially the tiger and the black. I see misty, maybe they're misidentifying the misty for black, but I don't see red, and I don't see tiger. And I think I've seen a yellowfin grouper about 12 pounds, maybe about seven years ago at the market. So, I'm not sure where those numbers are coming from.

MARCOS HANKE: Julian.

**JULIAN MAGRAS:** Julian Magras, for the record. Okay, so, since we are in this slide, I'd like to ask a question, make a comment. The nassau group landings of 3,117 pounds.

The Nassau grouper has been closed from back in the '80s. It's a no take. So, I know on the form there's a section where they ask us to write-in discards. Has this been the issue where it's been

written in as discards and it's actually showing up as landings. And if it is showing up as landings, what enforcement has been done to the individuals that's been showing this landing on their reports?

So, I think that needs to be clarified. That's one. Can we go back up another slide? So, I'm looking for the one with the dates for the accountability measures. Okay. So, I know, I know-- Okay. We went up one too much. Let's do this one. I have a comment on this one also.

So, I see we want to use the most recent year of landings, which is 2021 to set new ACLs. The problem with that is that's during the pandemic. And this was put on the record before. You're going to see a difference and hopefully a big difference in the numbers of landing during these times, because our catch was down due to the point that our hotels were closed, our restaurants were closed. So, the only people that was consuming our fish were the local residential people that we were able to get to. So, I think some more discussion on how we're going to be using those landings for comparison should be looked at. Your best year that's coming is going to be 2022 to 2023 because of how the calendar year of reporting is used. I think if we're going to be looking at comparing anything it needs to be prior, I think it needs to be 2019, which would get us out of the pandemic area. So, I'm just throwing that out there.

Can we go at the accountability measures dates. Go the other way? All right. This one here. So, I know also, I see here that we are looking at setting the accountability measures from January  $1^{\rm st}$  to September  $30^{\rm th}$ , but recently in prior meetings, we agreed on September 30th, going the opposite direction. So, I don't think this is correct, so if I could get some clarification on the three issues that I brought forward, that would be great. Thank you.

 SARAH STEPHENSON: So, I will let Kevin answer the question about nassau grouper and I will answer the other two with this question first. The way that you described the AM closure is correct. So, we calculate it from September 30th back until some date that's required to prevent the same overage from occurring. So, for instance, if only two weeks are needed, then it would be, you know, September 15th and it would end September-- It's very -- it's not-but that's verbatim from the regulation. So, I probably should have tried to phrase it in a way that makes more sense to you, but you are correct.

The other question about the years used in comparison to the ACL, we've also recognized in these processes that a lot of the ACLs

that are set that are new under the FMPs are very low ACLs and that was due to the process used, so that could be part of it. But using landings from 2021, which was a covid year, theoretically the landings would be low, right? And so, they would be lower than your ACLs. So, when we're doing the comparison, you shouldn't trigger, you shouldn't go above the landings would not exceed the ACLs. What you might be more worried about is what happens in a year, like you just mentioned with 2022 and 2023, when it's going to increase, when fishing gets back to normal following. But those are all things that are now on the record. And that first bullet there that talks about best scientific information, some of that is not necessarily stock assessment related, it's what's happening in the fishery. And so that's where that first bullet is kind of encompassing as well as stock assessments is, what's going on. Are we under a pandemic that has changed everything? So, and then if that answers those two, I'll let Kevin answer your nassau.

4 5

JULIAN MAGRAS: Alright. Yes, thank you. That clarifies it a lot more for us. And just one other comment that I made here. I think due to the fact that we have gone to island-based fishery management plans, I don't know how difficult it is or not, that when we are doing the slides, if we could just put one island with whatever the issue is, using the same statements that you have there. I think it would be a little bit more easier for us to understand it because looking at the three different sectors there, it makes it a little confusing. I'm just throwing that out. Not that I want to give you more work to do, but you guys are doing an excellent job. Thank you.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Well, and hopefully you'll see when we get to the amendments that that's the way we're structuring the amendments. So, for instance, if there's one that's addressing all three FMPs, you can go straight to the Saint Thomas section and just find out what's pertinent to your island. And so, we are being cognizant of that, but thank you for pointing out that it could help for the presentations too.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Sarah. And Janet. Janet wants to make a comment.

 JANET L. COIT: Yeah, actually mine is a question. Could you go back to the slide with the numbers? I don't normally get in the weeds, so this may be-- go back to the one that Carlos asked you about. Or forward, sorry. Yes.

Sarah, so again, this may be uninformed, but you said for the species where there's no harvest in federal waters, that we assume that all those landings are at state waters. I just want to ask a

question, maybe for the record, is that just an assumption? What is the basis for that and kind of maybe related to what Julian asked about enforcement? Is that something that we have confidence in?

SARAH STEPHENSON: I'll let Kevin take that one too.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Hi. So, the fishers can report on the form, did they fish, in the Virgin Islands, within three miles or beyond three miles? in Puerto Rico? Inside or outside nine miles, nine nautical miles? So, when they report that, we just accept that as the way it is. It's not always reported. So, there's a big uncertainty around how much fishing was going on inside or outside, given the large number of unreported or not filling out that section. So, high uncertainty.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for the question. Andy.

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** Can Kevin answer really quick the Nassau grouper question?

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** Sure. I'm going to wait until Julian-- he's got a sidebar going. I just want to make sure he hears the answer and-- Okay, I'll try this.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, I passed.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Hey, Julian, I'm going to respond to your nassau question. So, what we can do—you were concerned that maybe those are discards rather than landings. What we can do is work with DFW because they still have the forms, right? So, we can identify those trips that reported nassau because in the data set, it comes up as landings, right? Because they're very clear within the data set, but, you know, lots of things happen. So, we can work with them so that they can go back and actually look at the form. We'll tell them which trips they were, and then they can look at the forms and see how it was reported on the form.

MARCOS HANKE: You want to go first, Julian?

JULIAN MAGRAS: Thank you, Kevin. Yeah, because it's very important. You see, one of the tricky things on how our CCR reports are, they ask you for a total landing to the end of complete and everything. So even if you have reported, say, 200 pounds of discards, that still ends up in your total number to the very top right-hand corner of that CCR. And I think that's something that needs to be revisited. And the nassau grouper, as an example, it's closed both federal and local, zero harvest. So, I'm glad you say

you can revisit that with Fish and Wildlife and see what happened there. And let's fix that problem because this looks bad when you're saying, you got 3,117 pounds of fish being a close species of fish that's not supposed to be caught and knowing nothing was done. So, thanks. Thanks again.

MARCOS HANKE: A, follow up, just to clarify the concept of discard. Julian, please. Discard when you are estimating the amount of discard because you did on the water is estimation of the discard or are you weighing the discards, getting the discards on the dock and weighing that. Just for to understand.

JULIAN MAGRAS: It's an estimation that we, the commercial fishers, make. So, what we do on the catch report, the different species that we release, like, say right now we are going through the lane and mutton snapper closure, we would say, "well, guesstimation, we're going to write in release 20 pounds of lane, released 50 pounds of mutton" that goes on. But it's a guesstimation of weight, by the fisher, that's put on the catch report.

There's a section on the lower right-hand corner that you have for discards. So that's written in. So, all the different species, like right now, we are in a sector of the grouper unit four, I think it is, or five, grouper unit five, that's closed, and the mutton snapper season is closed. So, you can see a large variable of species with numbers next to it that have been discarded because it's no take right now.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for the clarification. But it's important to be clear when we talk about numbers, if it is an estimation or not. And I have the chat, but I want to give a follow up to Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, this has been a really good conversation. So, I wanted to follow up on Julian's comment earlier, and I think this is the challenge right now with large time lags in the data, right? Because a lot can change whether we're talking one, two, you know, three or more years in some instances. Both from issues like hurricanes and covid to changes in recruitment to the fishery, right? Fisheries are going to be going up or down. And so, the closer we can have the timeframe in terms of when we get the landings data and comparing it to that catch limit, the word relevant is going to be going forward and I know we're all striving to accomplish that. I was going to make a similar comment that several have made about nassau, but I also wanted, I quess, check with queen conch. Is queen conch prohibited in territorial waters in Saint Thomas/Saint John or is that authorized harvest as well. Is that another situation where we might have reporting of a species that's prohibited?

1 2 MARCOS HANKE: Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: The queen conch is closed in the Saint Thomas/Saint John district in federal waters, not in local waters. So, the annual catch limit for federal waters is zero, but it can be harvested in local waters.

MARCOS HANKE: Anybody else? Kreglo. I was looking for the hand. I knew that I had a hand.

JAMES R. KREGLO: James Kreglo, Saint Thomas Council. Looking at this chart, I see what's the chances, I see the hogfish and the nassau grouper numbers are exactly the same. Is there a chance that it's just a misprint for the nassau grouper and somehow the chart got misprinted? I'm just making a point. I'm just pointing that out.

MARCOS HANKE: That's a good point. It has to-

JAMES R. KREGLO: It could be that nassau grouper is zero, but it got printed wrong on the chart.

JANET L. COIT: You should play that number.

MARCOS HANKE: Maybe we should use the number for the lotto and make me a millionaire. It's a popular number. Anyway, thank you for the good catch. And I want to tie this to something into the future here, in terms of the data improvement. We going to get into the scenario because these Council is proactive with descending device and there is descending device that can be applicable to trap fishermen and so on. I don't want to go to the details. But going to be very important into the future. This is for the representatives of the government. Maybe have a box, if the descending device is being used by those fishermen for the discards, because the mortality of those discards will be different and that is going to benefit, is going to be good for the fishermen to do, good for the environment, good for the release. It just makes sense to document from scratch if the fishermen are using descended device to release those fish. Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. So, James, great catch, nice eyes there on the landing. So based on the memo we have from the Science Center it was 575 pounds of Nassau groupers. So, it was greater than zero, but it was less than the 3000 pounds. Yeah. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa and Carlos.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you. I just want to make a point of clarification about the queen conch in Puerto Rico. There's in the chat a comment from Ricardo Lugo and it's about those pounds, are they state water landings? So, I will let Ricardo López answer that, please.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Sorry, you said Ricardo Lugo in the beginning. Can you repeat the question?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Oh, yes. In the chat, the comment of Ricardo Lugo about the landings of the queen conch. We know that in federal waters is prohibited and those number, we would need to clarify if those are state water landings.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yeah, it should be state water landings.

MARCOS HANKE: I want to give the word to the chat first, then Carlos. Cristina. Thank you.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Okay. What Ricardo Lugo wrote was, "it is a concern with the 203,640 for the queen conch reported. Will be interesting how much in reported in local waters since some of the section in the zone map split in EEZ and local waters. I could understand few pounds reported as an error, but that number is too big and needs to be validated.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And I want to add a reverse analysis on this. The available grounds on federal waters in Puerto Rico to harvest conch on federal waters, if that's the case, that number, that's the most productive queen conch fisher in the world. Right? Very dense. A lot of queen conch in living in there, which is not the case. Anyway, Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah, I just didn't want to be misunderstood when I said that I don't see the black, red, tiger and yellowfin landed. I'm not saying that they're not out there because I know there's a scientist from U.V.I. who did a study in Lang Bank, and he's seen yellowfin grouper. They're just not landed. I'm not seeing them in all the selling sites that I've been to.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Carlos. I don't want to keep spinning this. I think we have a very good record. Is there anything else you need from us, Sarah?

SARAH STEPHENSON: No, thank you and sorry about that error.

MARCOS HANKE: No, thank you guys for great presentation. Like always. Now we have the break. Let's go for the break and we'll be

back in 10 minutes.

JANET L. COIT: I will be back. I have a short call at eleven, so I'll be a little bit late.

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah, don't worry. Your seat is going to be reserved.

JANET L. COIT: Okay.

(Whereupon a brief recess was taken.)

MARCOS HANKE: Hello everyone. Please take your seats. We are a little behind a lot of good conversations on the room, but please take your seats. [loud gavel sound] I love this. I just realized how good it is.

Cristina, are we recording? Yes. Thank you very much. The next presentation is the Review Draft Amendment. It is going to be presented by Sarah. Sarah, you are welcome to the floor again. Thank you.

Review Draft Framework Amendment 2 to Update to the Spiny Lobster Overfishing Limit, Acceptable Biological Catch, and Annual Catch Limit Based on SEDAR 57 Update Assessment

SARAH STEPHENSON: Thank you. So, we talked a little bit about this this morning when María showed our list of active amendments. And so, this is going to be an update. The first time the Council has seen the draft framework amendment, which is number two, for all three islands, which is going to update the overfishing limit, the OFL, acceptable biological catch (ABC) and annual catch limit (ACL) for spiny lobster in all three islands. And these updates are based on the 2022 update assessment to the 2019 SEDAR 57 spiny lobster stock assessments.

Next slide, please.

So, just a little background, the SSC determined that the SEDAR 57 stock assessments, there was one for Puerto Rico, one for Saint Croix, and one for Saint Thomas and Saint John, were suitable for management and advice. And so, Framework Amendment 1, which as María mentioned this morning, was just effective this past Saturday, updated the management reference points based on those stock assessments. So not just the three, the OFL, the ABC and the ACLs, but it updated some of our other management reference points like the maximum sustainable yield. So, it updated all of those that we use in management. And it did that based on the model that

was used in the SEDAR 57 stock assessment and the ABC control rule that's included in each of the FMPs.

So, the Framework Amendment is going to, or it did, update OFLs, ABCs and ACLs using a constant catch approach, which means the limits that are set are constant for each year, as opposed to ones that changed or were variable from year to year. So that was one of the decisions that the Council made in that amendment. And that will actually be mimicked in Framework Amendment 2. We're going to just set constant catches, so we don't have to change regulations or ACLs each year. So, they also, at that time, set the ACL at 95% of the ABC. So, the Council said for spiny lobster, for all three islands, their management uncertainty, which we'll discuss in a little bit, was only 5% for spiny lobster. They felt pretty confident that they could manage to the true catch of the stocks.

So, the amendment set values for 2021 to 2023, and then more conservative values for 2024 and later. And that was based on a recommendation that the SSC had, just in the amount of time between the data that was used in the SEDAR 57 stock assessment and the years that ACLs were being set for. So, they just wanted to be a little bit more conservative. The regulations that were just effective only set values for the year 2023 because the other two were in the past. So, we just set it for this fishing year.

The Council in that framework amendment intended to request an update assessment by the year 2023 to update OFLs, ABCs and then of course, the Council would update ACLs using the same data inputs that were used in SEDAR 57. So just go in, do a quick update using those same data that were used and generate new OFL and ABC projections, which the Council could then use to set ACLs.

So, as María mentioned, the Framework Amendment 1 also updated the accountability measure process for spiny lobster. What years of landings we're going to use in comparison to the ACL. So, for instance, with the AMs that I mentioned this morning, there's that spin up process, the using one year of landings, then a second year, and then the two-year average, the three-year average. The framework that was just implemented goes straight to using a three-year average. So, we don't have that spin up.

Next slide please.

So, from the last meeting just a quick update. The SSC, at their December meeting, accepted the 2022 update assessment and recommended both variable catch values against ones that changed from year to year and constant catch values, ones that remain the same over the three-year time period for the years 2024 to 2026

for spiny lobster for each fishery management plan. At that time, the Council directed staff to begin a second framework amendment to each island-based FMP based on those projections from the 2022 update assessment and to update spiny lobster OFLs, ABCs and ACLs using the constant catch. So, in December, the Council identified that they would like to continue using constant catch values as opposed to variable catch. And so that's what the framework contains. And I'll show you those values in a few slides.

8 9 10

1

2

3

4 5

6 7

> following then, the December Council meeting, interdisciplinary planning team was formed to draft Framework Amendment 2.

12 13 14

11

Next slide.

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Just a reminder, what that IPT is. It is a group of scientists and other aspects, like law enforcement is on the planning team, economists, data analysts. So, we all get together, and we look at what we are tasked with, and we put forward the best amendment that we can. So, you can see it's comprised of staff from our regional office, from the Science Center and the Council. And so, we met in January, and so I'll be showing you results from that today.

23 24 25

Next slide.

26 27

28

So, we did produce a draft amendment, which is in the briefing book. And so, it's number Framework Amendment 2, and it's called generic because it's amending all three FMPs.

29 30

Next slide, please.

31 32 33

34

35

36

37

38

And so, there's three actions included in the draft amendment. They're identical. They just, one applies to each island. So, Action 1 applies to Puerto Rico FMP. Action 2 applies to Saint Croix FMP and action three to Saint Thomas and Saint John. But they all are identical in what they say. And so, there's four alternatives identified, and those are very similar to the alternatives that were presented in the first framework amendment.

39 40 41

44

And so Alternative 1 is no action, meaning that the OFL, ABC and ACL for spiny lobster would remain the same as what Framework 42 43 Amendment 1 includes. Alternative 2 would update the OFL and ABC for spiny lobster for these next three years, 2024 to 2026, based on the constant catch approach selected by the Council and set the 45 ACL equal to the ABC. So that means that there's no management 46 uncertainty. You believe that the catch reported is the true catch. 47

48 Alternatives 3 and 4 will have the same exact OFL and ABC because they all stemmed from the 2022 update assessment. So, all three alternatives will have the same OFL and ABC. And the only difference is what level of management uncertainty the Council feels there is for spiny lobster in each island. So Alternative 3 is going to set a 5% buffer. So, it's going to set the ACL equal to 95% of the ABC until that number is modified. And then Alternative 4 is going to set a 10% buffer and set the ACL equal to 90% of the ABC until modified.

4 5

Next slide please.

So, just a quick comparison of these different alternatives. Alternative 1, which would not change anything, would be inconsistent with requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act to base management measures on the best scientific information available. So, in this instance, the 2022 update assessment is best scientific information compared to the SEDAR 57 Assessment.

Alternative 2, and you'll see it here, Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 will say the same OFL and ABC values as the other action alternatives. And action alternatives just mean ones where we're changing the management measures from the baseline. The baseline here being Alternative 1, which is what's in place now. So Alternative 2 would have the same values for OFL and ABC as Alternatives 3 and 4. The only degree is in that degree of management uncertainty.

 And so, you can see at the bottom of the slide the definition of what management uncertainty is -- I've mentioned it slightly or a little bit before -- the ability of the Council to constrain catch to the ACL, the limit that you set and the uncertainty that you may have in actually getting the true catch amounts. So, there's at least some sources of management uncertainty that have been discussed in the past, late reporting or misreporting or under reporting of catch amounts. And then, a lack of sufficient inseason management, which we obviously don't have hearing that our data is usually not available to use in comparison to ACLs to one or two years after the fishing occurred. And then also, the end season closure authority. So, when we close in federal waters, the state doesn't always close it. It's not required to. We ask them to do it for the benefit of the stock, but they're not required to do it. So those are all areas of management uncertainty. You can think about those for spiny lobster in each island as we move through this presentation and what buffer would you like to have between the catch and the acceptable biological catch. Like what you should be catching versus the limit that you set for each year.

And so, you can see for Alternative 2, there would be no management

uncertainty. The ACL would be equal to the ABC. This would allow for the greatest amount of lobster catch but it would also take the most amount from the stock, remove it from the biomass.

And so Alternative 3 is the same OFL and ABC. It's going to have a 5% management uncertainty buffer which is a lower amount of catch allowed than number 2, but more than Alternative 4. And so just to remind you, the 95% buffer was selected under Framework Amendment 1 for all three islands.

And then lastly, Alternative 4, the same OFL and ABC as Alternatives 2 and 3, but a little bit more management uncertainty. So, a bigger buffer, 10% buffer. The ACL would be set equal to 90% of the ABC. And so, out of the alternatives, this would have the smallest amount of catch allowed but would leave more lobster in the water for future catch.

Next slide please.

So, we're going to go through the actions for each island so you can see the values. This is table 2.1 and the draft amendment that's included in the briefing book. So, it has each management measure under each alternative.

So Alternative 1, the no action. These are the values that are in the Framework Amendment 1 for spiny lobster for Puerto Rico. And as I mentioned before, Framework Amendment 1 did set two different time periods of reference periods one for 2021-2023, and then more conservative ones for 2024 and later. So, the no action alternative, the values that you see here, are those more conservative values. So, the ones that will be in place in years 2024 and later. So, we wanted to compare the new options Alternatives 2 through 3 to not what's in place in 2023, but what would be in place for next year, just because they're more conservative. So, you can see the OFL and ABC for Alternatives 2 through 4 are the same. Only the ACL changes and that change is based on whatever perceived management uncertainty the Council has.

 We use the same ones as previously used in both the FMP and the Framework Amendment 1. We use the same buffer, excuse me. But you're free to change the level of management uncertainty. You don't have to use these values here. You could change it if you'd liked. So, these are the values for Puerto Rico.

Next slide.

48 The same exact setup but these are the values for Saint Croix. So,

this is table 2.2 in the document. The same, no action based on those conservative numbers that would be in place for 2024 and later. The exact same OFLs and ABCs for Alternatives 2 through 3 with only the ACLs changing as you increase your management uncertainty buffer.

Next slide, please.

9 And then lastly the same for Saint Thomas and Saint John. This is 10 table 2.3 in the document. You can just see here it's the exact 11 same setup. So, I won't repeat all that.

Next slide.

So, next steps, if the Council is comfortable with these management uncertainty buffers as presented, you could select your preferred Alternative for each island at this meeting, either one action, but probably separate actions would be better. So, select that management and buffer uncertainty for Puerto Rico, for Saint Croix, and then Saint Thomas and Saint John. And then, the IPT could take your selections back and develop Framework Amendment 2 hopefully for final action at the August 2023 Council meeting. Since this is very similar to Framework Amendment 1, since it's based on an update assessment, a lot of the document could be incorporated by reference from our last document. So, it should be a fairly straightforward amendment to work on.

And I believe that next slide is just questions.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Sarah, for a great presentation. That lobster is looking at us. Behave. Questions.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos?

35 MARCOS HANKE: Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Not a question, but the hour that we have here between lunch, half an hour. My background music when I talk.

JANET L. COIT: Flash mob.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Anyway, the question is that the three islands will have available as presented by Sarah and the three DAPs will discuss this. We have the three Chairs here, so I would like to hear from them one by one. When we talk about Puerto Rico, then see what Puerto Rico is talking about. Of course, if I'm a fisherman, I would like to fish as much as possible, and I would be scared whenever I see a number that is coming down rather than

up. The issue with the lobster is that most fishers believe that we have lobsters all over the place. We found that in Puerto Rico they're under reporting, but they, at the same time, they're complaining that the ACL is coming down and we have to harmonize all that.

In addition, we talked today about what will happen if we get to the level that you need to have accountable measures, and you heard this morning that we don't immediately go into accountable measures. We have to find out—— We, National Marine Fisheries Service has to find out what is the cost of that overage.

Sarah, you have it in order. You have Puerto Rico first, second. Is that kind of the decisions that you want to hear from the Council?

SARAH STEPHENSON: If I may, since we're kind of limited on time. Kevin McCarthy was going to give an update right after this one, because they kind of go together on just updates that the Science Center is working on. So, I would recommend that, unless the Council has any discussion that they want to talk about, management uncertainty buffers, that we then turn it over to Kevin who can talk about just improvements with the process.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: The other thing I was going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, is this is very important for the fishery here. So, take as much time as you need, maybe push some other stuff. This is key to the decision-making process that we have for this particular species.

MARCOS HANKE: Andy.

**ANDREW STRELCHECK:** Yeah, I would encourage that we go ahead and let Kevin speak and hear from him and then we can circle back and discuss the preferred alternatives for the amendment.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And after the presentation and after the presentation to hear from the DAPs, then we will be in the best position to take a step forward. Kevin.

## SEFSC US Caribbean Projects - Lobster and Other Work

 KEVIN MCCARTHY: Thank you. Great. So, I'll just dive into it. I'm Kevin McCarthy. I'm the branch chief of the Caribbean Fisheries Branch at the Southeast Fishery Science Center. I'm going to show you the work that the Science Center's been doing. Sort of the outcomes and lessons learned from the from the various lobster assessments. Somebody referred to me a little earlier, I don't

remember, maybe it was you who said, "Oh, he's our scientist" I'm going to show you the work of all the scientists that I supervise. They do all the great work. I try to get money and sign time sheets and stuff like that now.

So, next slide, please.

So, let's briefly review what goes into a stock assessment. So, there's abundance data, there's biological data and there's catch data, right? So, abundance data are things like fishery, the FI stands for fishery Independent. You'll see that a lot. So, fishery independent survey. So, we have, for example, in the U.S. Caribbean the Reef Visual Census survey. So that's a diver survey that's run with a bunch of partners including the Southeast Fishery Science Center, the University of Miami and various other folks here in the region. But that doesn't do lobster. That is a finfish survey.

So, then another way we can get at it is from the logbook forms that the fishers report and we can get a catch rate. essentially, we get a catch per unit effort time series. So, that's how we get at abundance in a stock assessment. Then there's biological data, which is size composition data. So, all those port samplers that come down and ask to measure all your fish, that's where those data are going into the biological component of the stock assessment. And then we also have life history information like maturity and age and growth and that sort of stuff. So, Virginia Shervette, for example, does a lot of that work. One of our partners or collaborators, I guess is a better way to put it, at the University of South Carolina. But there are other folks who do that work as well. And then there's the catch data that we're all familiar with. So, there's the commercial logbook which provides the commercial landings. Recreational landings, as we all know, have been a challenge in the Caribbean. We had an Emirate program in Puerto Rico for a number of years, but that ended during 2017. It was already sort of struggling and then the hurricanes didn't help, and it has not started up again. But we do have some projects going that I'll talk about if there's time.

Next slide.

So, what did we have for the SEDAR 57 update assessment that was just finished by Adyan Rios in the fall. We had commercial landings by gear. That's coming out of the logbook data, but we don't have, as I just mentioned, recreational landings. Even when MREP was happening in Puerto Rico, it was only finfish. MREP did not sample lobsters. We have size composition data, again, from the port samplers. Those data are by gear. It's very important to get size

information by gear. We'll talk about selectivity a little bit, but different gears, as we all know, can catch lobsters and fish at different sizes. And so, to understand that size composition data, you really have to know something about what the gear is likely to catch. We don't have any fishery independent size composition available, meaning there isn't a diver in the water or some other means of catching lobster that give us an idea of what the size composition of the animals are, that are not necessarily caught by the fishery. And that's important. Especially if there're a lot of big lobsters out there that we don't see at the dock because they're not being landed by the fishers. That's one example anyway.

So, we did have life history information. We know a lot about the life history of lobsters, as it turns out. So, things like size of maturity, we know about that. We assumed gear selectivity to being dome shaped, meaning that there are animals that are too big for the fishery. Either they don't get in the traps, or the divers don't want to deal with them, or there's not a market for it. But whatever the case there was an assumption that there is big lobster out there that we don't see in that port sampling. And critically, there were no indices of abundance available. We're still able to do a stock assessment without an index, which was good because we didn't have one in this case.

So, next slide.

So going back to that earlier diagram. What we had is circled except we didn't have recreational landings and we didn't have that index of abundance.

So next slide.

So, what we ended up with, as a result of the SEDAR 57 update, was a small reduction in the OFL, which means a concurrent reduction in the ABCs. But we're hearing from the fishers that there are a lot of spiny lobsters out there. So, what this says is we really need a fishery independent index for spiny lobster. The reason there's an asterisk there is so that I define FI as being fishery independent. So, what that means is we've got some kind of way of getting at the abundance of the lobsters in the water that is independent of the fishery, because fishers are very good at catching lobster, and so we need something independent of that. Because fishers could have high catch rates until there aren't any lobsters there. I don't think that's what's happening but that's the importance of a fishery independent index. It doesn't rely on the dynamics of the fishery for its catch rates. It is more a better reflection of the number of animals in the water.

So, a high catch rate in a fishery independent index would mean there are more lobsters in the water. A low catch rate would suggest that there aren't as many. So, that reliable index of abundance would greatly improve the stock assessment. We know that because it immediately responds, or much more quickly responds to a change in abundance than just the size composition information in general. And if we have a fishery independent or an index of some kind, we could allow adjustments in the ABCs based on the performance of the index. We wouldn't have to wait for the next stock assessment. But we also believe, at the Science Center, that a cooperative research program, that's the CRP there in that third bullet, a cooperative research with the fishing community, is critical to getting these kinds of data. You all have the boats, you all have the knowledge, and I think a partnership with the scientist at the Center in Miami is the best way to go.

So, next slide.

4 5

So, giving the importance of spiny lobster and given the fact that everybody's very, very concerned about where the ACLs are, this spiny lobster will be assessed again next year. This will be what we used to call, in SEDAR, a benchmark assessment, meaning we'll have an in-person data workshop that's open to the public. But we also would like to ensure that we've got people coming to the meeting, fishers in particular, but the regional partners, the regional scientists, the DNER and the DFW scientists, contribute to this process.

We have suggested at the Science Center, and I believe that the Council has agreed that because of the importance of spiny lobster, we ought to be doing stock assessments on them every three years or so. And we could do interim assessments that we can update the catch limits more frequently. So, the important thing to understand here is that the catch limits are not static. We're not going to set an ACL, and that's what it is forever. It's a population of animals. It's very dynamic. Some years there are a lot more lobsters, other years there are fewer and so those catch limits need to reflect the fact that we've got a dynamic system.

Again, we strongly encourage the fishing community to participate in workshops, and particularly in the SEDAR stock assessment, you can ask to be part of that. It is something that the Council can nominate people to attend, and SEDAR pays for your travel. We also need the SSC involved in addition to the local scientists at the DNER and DFW. It would be great to have someone from the Council join in and see that process. In particular, we're going to have a data workshop that will be in person. It's up to SEDAR to set

that up. So, I don't know where it's going to be, but it'll be in the region. It's not going to be in Miami.

Another thing that the center is looking to do are stakeholder workshops. This would be working with the fishers to understand changes in how the fishery operates and what you all are seeing on the water across time and space. That kind of information can be incorporated into stock assessments. Right now, we don't have any funding for it, but it's something that the Center particularly wants to do. Mandy Karnauskas and some of the folks in our social science group are really interested in doing that kind of work. Many of you have met Mandy before and worked with her. So, there's a great deal of interest in that.

Next slide.

So, some of the projects that are happening that specifically go at the data limitation of the spiny lobster indices, or a lack thereof, is a Puerto Rico fishery dependent lobster survey that is in collaboration with the commercial fishers. That'll get its size composition, not just the stuff that is landed, but everything that comes up in the traps. It is a trap study. And abundance information. So, catch rate information. This is a direct result of a fisher-initiated study from several years ago. That study, that fisher-initiated study where you all were recording sizes and amounts of catch, that led to a gear selectivity project and that has since morphed into this larger fishery-dependent survey. So, we've got funding for that. That's right now happening in Puerto Rico but that's something that also we can always use more participants. So, I'll have to talk with our contractor who's running the project because they're constantly looking to get additional people involved. They have an upper limit as to how much they can handle, but it would be ideal to have fishers from around the island. So, I'll have to talk with them to see how much capacity they have for bringing on new people, but I know that they're interested in doing that.

We receive some additional funding to continue a fishery-independent lobster recruit study. That's also in collaboration with commercial fishers. And I know-- I'm much more involved in this one and I know that we would like to have more fishers involved. It is the goal of the Science Center, from Clay Porch, the director, all the way down to our scientists who are working on these projects, to establish more collaborative research with U.S. Caribbean fishers. I was really pleased to see that the fishers in Saint Thomas in particular are now able to compete for federal projects. So, we now have a way of working with you all more directly. So, we'd really like to get some things going in

the Virgin Islands as well.

Next slide, please.

Okay, so that was it for lobster. We've got five minutes, so I'm going to push on through. I have another presentation tomorrow. So, if there are questions that we don't get to before lunch, I'm happy to discuss them during the breaks or tomorrow, later this evening. Whenever you'd like to chat.

So, we've also got some finfish centric projects. One, we're funding a couple of graduate students at the University of Puerto Rico. They're collecting size composition data. They're piggybacking on another project with MER Consultants that have an ongoing port sampling project, also with the University of Puerto Rico.

We've got additional funding to expand a deep-water snapper survey that's happening here in Puerto Rico as well. Both of those are getting size composition data. The deep-water snapper survey, which is using hook and line and also cameras in the deep water, they've figured out how to-- the cameras are really tricky, but they've figured out a lot of the technical issues around that. So that also is an abundance survey.

 So, what we'd like to do is have this overlap with the dive survey which of course is limited to fairly shallow water so that we've got a finfish survey basically from the shallowest waters out into the much deeper waters where those deep-water snappers occur. And we've got some additional money to collect life history samples, because that can also be a hold up in a stock assessment. If you don't have the necessary life history information, we're really stuck when it comes to trying to do a stock assessment.

Next slide.

So, we've also got some port sampling projects. I mentioned that we didn't have recreational data, but we're trying to resolve that. In the U.S. Virgin Islands where we're partnering with division of Fish and Wildlife, they're really doing the heavy lift of getting people out in the field, collecting size composition data and landings data. On our side of it, we're helping with the survey design and with the funding, but we've got port samplers that are going to sample whoever comes to the dock, whoever comes to the boat ramp. If your commercial, they'll be sampled. If your rec, they will be sampled. If you're for hire, they'll be sampled. We're trying to get the entire fishery.

 We're also working with DNER, they're very much the lead agency in this. We're providing a little bit of support when it comes to survey design and some of the training. But they're focused on a recreational port sampling design, so they'll get size composition and landings from the rec side of the house. In this case, they won't be limited, like the MREP was for finfish only. If they bring it to the dock, we're going to find a way to quantify it. If they come back with a bucket of algae, I don't know why they'd want to do that, but if they did, we'd figure out a way to measure it.

And on the data management side of the house, we've received some funding to try and improve the sampling efficiency by using artificial intelligence and machine learning. So, we're taking photos of the fish as they're coming in to try and speed up that processing time that the port samplers keep you all held up at the dock by having technology solve some of the problems. So, people aren't busy writing things down, it's all being automatically collected. And so that'll get us at size, composition, and landings information.

Next slide.

We've also got our strategic plan. I won't go through all this text here. We've got our strategic planning workshop coming up in a few weeks. That will involve the folks that are listed down at the bottom there, Council staff and SSC, DNER and DPNR, DFW staff, folks from universities, University of Puerto Rico, University of the Virgin Islands, the Regional Office, the Science Center, NOAA Headquarters people, the National Park Service. So, we're getting all the scientists and managers in the building and talking about how we best collect data and the kinds of data that we need to manage the fisheries here in the U.S. Caribbean. So, we did this last year within the Science Center. And recall the Science Center isn't just Miami. We have labs from Galveston, Texas to North Carolina. So, we got those folks who are doing Caribbean work in the same room and tried to get organized, and I think we did a pretty decent job of it. So now we're expanding that to the regional partners.

Next slide.

 We recently received some funding on a few proposals. These are two examples. Jennifer Doerr and Juan Agar got some money to look at conch. And Adyan Rios and Molly Stevens got some money to look at how we handle the data as it comes in. You know, the collecting the data is one part of the picture, but then you've got to get it in a database, and you've got to be able to extract it from the database and make sense of it and to analyze it. So, Adyan and

Molly got some money to automate that process and improve the process of how we handle the data on our side of the equation.

2 3 4

Next slide.

 And we submitted a few proposals. We've got three life history proposals through what's called the CRCP, the Coral Reef Conservation Program. What we'd want to do is work collaboratively with the fishers to get those samples collected. But we've also got plans to work with Virginia Shervette's lab to get the samples processed and to work with the Southeast Fishery Science Center life history folks in the Panama City Florida Lab.

So, we've got three proposals in there. And I mentioned this idea of getting local knowledge. So, there's another proposal in to work with the fishers, particularly for the spiny lobster fishery, to collect that local knowledge and get data from the fishers that can be incorporated in future stock assessments.

So, it's critical and it's recognized by the Science Center that the fishing community has to be involved in this whole process. Not just getting out on the water to collect additional samples, but also getting your knowledge to the extent that we can and incorporating that in fisheries management and stock assessment.

Next slide.

Maybe. That's it. Thanks very much.

## Questions/Comments

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. I have the chat and I read on the chat that Mr. Lugo is requesting emails or telephone numbers to contact to get engaged and participate and to be available to participate on any effort. Which way is the best way to give that information to them, to the fishermen and to Mr. Lugo.

 KEVIN MCCARTHY: So, I think if they get in touch with me, I can serve as a conduit to the folks that are running those. We've got two consulting firms that are really handling the in Puerto Rico work and we coordinate with them. So, if people get in touch with me, then I can get in touch with those folks who are running the day-to-day operation and you know, because I don't want to overwhelm them and they're not going to see it coming. Right? So, I would, because I made the announcement, I'll serve as the gatekeeper and try and get people involved because we also have to recognize the capacity of the project as well. But I know that we want to get people from around the island involved and there's

still room for people to be involved.

MARCOS HANKE: Cristina.

4 5

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to share some information, MER Consultants already have sent a promo for the commercial fishermen, especially in this case for trap fishermen. But also, we already keep in contact with them to include divers also. Because most of the lobster in Puerto Rico at the west side, it's caught by the divers. So, we are already in contact with them in the [inaudible] in Puerto Real. I shared with Cristina also to put in the chat the promo and send Ricardo by WhatsApp, the promotion. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Ricardo, write another chat note if there is anything else you need from us. Alida.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Thank you so much. Kevin, I think that workshop, the conceptual workshop and SEDAR stock assessment is probably one of the best ideas because those are the issues that the fishers ask every time in the meetings and in the DAP. In the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel, we have Adyan Rios as part of the panel. So, if Adyan brings that information to our meetings or if she contacts me at any time, we can facilitate that contact with the fishers.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: That's terrific. Yeah, we really need in the SEDAR data workshop in particular fishers there along with all the other folks that I mentioned because we will see patterns in data that are reported by the fishers that if we don't put it in its proper context, we will misinterpret it. Right? So, we'll see, you know, the landings going along and all of a sudden, they'll drop. Okay, what happened there? And the fishers will know. We see this pattern or that pattern. Having that expert testimony for the way the fishery operates is absolutely critical. And we do need—

 So, the SEDAR coordinator, Julie Neer, has been really anxious about getting people. We've got another SEDAR coming up, SEDAR 84, which is yellowtail Snapper in Puerto Rico and Saint Thomas/Saint John and stoplight parrotfish in Saint Croix. We really need to get people nominated to be part of that process because that will happen. That will begin in the summer, this summer. So, we need to get people involved and signed up as recommendations from the Council. And then if they're recommended by the Council to SEDAR, then SEDAR pays for their travel. And they have a number of spaces that they can cover and get people involved in and paid for. So, it would be great to get some decisions maybe at this meeting about who we could recommend.

1 2

3

4

Thank you. Kevin. Actually, you respond to a MARCOS HANKE: question about these resources to make sure that the fishermen that are meaningful or that have the expertise can be there. Right. We have a venue for that. It's clear.

5 6 7

8 9

10 11

12

We have to go for lunch and to move the things along, we have time. I think it would be more appropriate to hold the comments, because it's time for lunch, of the DAPs and from that we keep the discussion and probably choose the alternatives for Sarah's presentation on the right context and follow up because we have a little space, because the Scientific Statistical Committee, the Chair, will not need too much time for his presentation.

13 14 15

16

17

Let's go for lunch. And when you come back, we going to hear from the DAPs about this issue. Let's break for lunch. We will come back at one. I'm going to take their advice. Let's be back at 1:10, we'll come back.

APRIL 18, 2023

TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

MARCOS HANKE: Okay, guys. Are we recording, Cristina? We're going

to start the meeting and we left the follow-up from the previous

presentation for the DAP to express themselves about Sarah's

presentation followed up by Kevin presentation. Let's start with

JULIAN MAGRAS: Julian Magras, for the record. Well, as far as it pertains to the alternatives that were put up for the Saint

Thomas/Saint John District, we are in favor with move in with a

18 19 20

(Whereupon the meeting recessed for lunch on April 18, 2023.)

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

35

36 37

38 39

41 42

40

43

44

45

46

47 48

MARCOS HANKE: Do you prefer if we have the presentation and the

JULIAN MAGRAS: Yes.

DAP comments about that. Julian,

MARCOS HANKE: Julian? Excuse me.

0.95 as 95% to the ABC and—

text that you're referring to on the screen? Is it possible, María?

MARCOS HANKE: Please take your seats. Let's start.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I'm going to take that away from you.

Yes? Keep going on Julian. They're going to pull it up in a moment.

2

JULIAN MAGRAS: Okay. Julian Magras, for the record again. While the presentation is being brought up, I'd like to just add in a few things towards some of the stuff that Kevin said.

5 6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

4

There's a lot going on with the lobster fishery right now. This year we are having one of the best seasons of the lobster run that even some of my fishers have said that they have seen in 25 years. Mr. Daryl Bryan here is present in the room and he's the biggest lobster fisherman in the U.S.V.I. And you know, we have this lobster run that's going on, but we are unable to show what a run that we are having due to the fact that the imports that have been brought into the Saint Thomas/Saint John District from the B.V.I. and other places, has caused us to lose a lot of our sales into the market. And the reason for that is these guys are illegally bringing in these lobsters and they're undercutting the prices in the market. Some of these restaurants are large group restaurants together, and what they're doing is they're telling each other, they're getting on Facebook and they're saying, "well, listen, we got 800 pounds, 1500 pounds of lobster coming in \$8 a pound. Who's in now?" We are selling right now, our market is selling for \$12 a pound, the commercial guys who's doing it for a living. So, when a restaurant sees that, well, we are saving \$4 and a pound, what they're going to do. They're going to get out there and they're going to buy a large amount from these guys and then we are stuck with different options. Let's use Daryl as an example, where he had a five-day fishing week. In many instances this season, he has had to cut back to two days lobster fishing.

293031

32

33

So, you're not going to see those numbers in your CCR reports showing how healthy and productive the fishery is during the season. There has to be some way, somehow that we can capture this information and make it part of the SEDAR process.

343536

Yes, Kevin has his hand up.

37 38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47 48 KEVIN MCCARTHY: Yeah, this is Kevin McCarthy. Julian, excellent point. That's exactly why these abundance projects that we've got going, they're measuring everything that comes up in the trap, right? So, whether or not it makes it to the dock and gets sold, it gets recorded as part of the catch rate, right? So, that's why that fishery-independent aspect or having a way to measure everything that comes up in the trap, whether or not you take it back and sell it, it's still the real catch rate, right? That's the true catch rate and that's why we really need an index of abundance to go with the rest of the pieces of the stock assessment because that will react a lot faster than a change in the size,

right? So, we got all that size information and that's great and it's critical to the stock assessment, but it doesn't change with the kind of speed that an index would. And the index, adding that in there, is going to be that extra piece of information that so far, we haven't had that will really inform the stock assessment.

But you're exactly right. If we rely on just the stuff that makes it to the dock and gets sold, that's not the complete picture. So that's why we've got these other projects going. Because they're directed at getting the real catch rate.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Thank you for that, Kevin. You know, I know there are a couple projects that that has been ongoing in the U.S.V.I., which one of them was a diving lobster project and the other being a trap project. We have a lot of issues with how those projects are being done. Because we feel, the fishers, the lobster fishers feel that they're not gathering the information in the areas where they should be gathering the information due to the fact that in certain areas, certain traps would fish better than other traps.

So, we're trap in the west a wire trap and excuse my language, but this is what we call it, the pussy funnel, would fish way better in the west of the island. On the east of the island, that trap does not do well, the plastic traps would do better. And then on top of that, we have different times of the year where the lobsters run or walk through. So, if you don't know when that is taking place and you're doing a study, the chances of you not capturing the information that you are looking for, is not going to happen.

So, you know, I know moving forward we have a lot of ideas and a lot of ideas to come involving the fishermen more in some of these projects and I think it's very, very important because we are the ones with the hands-on knowledge. You guys are the scientists with the book knowledge. I think at the end, our goal is to accomplish the same outcome. So, that's what we would like to see. You know, if we're going to do something, let's do it correct the first time. Stop throwing money away and let's do it right, so that we can really move forward with having a nice data set. And I think the lobster fishery is one of those fisheries right now that we can get a lot, a lot of information and use that as guidance to collect information for other species that we have identified for the SEDAR process or other stocks that we are missing that information. So, thank you for that.

The slide here is up. Saint Thomas/Saint John OFL, ABC and ACLs. And we would like to see Alternative 3, ACL equals ABC times 0.95%. That's the Alternative that the District Advisory Panel and the fishers of the U.S.V.I. would like to see moving forward for the

lobsters. That's my comment. Thank you.

2

MARCOS HANKE: Gerson.

4 5

**GERSON MARTÍNEZ:** I also agree with Mr. Julian Magras. Gerson Martínez for the record. Alternative 3.

6 7 8

MARCOS HANKE: Nelson.

9

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

2425

2627

28

Thank you, Mr. Chair. We agree with Kevin NELSON CRESPO: presentation and also with Julian statement. I think at this time it's pertinent to read part of my DAP report regarding the lobster. When we were discussing the Island-Based Fisher Management Plan the table from the lobster showed a reduction of the ACL for the next few years. The DAP members wondered why this happened since during the past seven years catches have been abundant with a considerable mix of juveniles and adults. They asked the question, if more of the catches takes place in local water, why are closures being applied in federal waters. Regarding this matter, recommend the following. A revision of the spiny lobster ACL is necessary considering the biological size data. We recommend evaluating the possibility of obtaining statistics with independent landing program. We request the Southeast Center to hold our workshop with the existing projects using lobster as a model. We want to know which projects are running the data you need and how fishermen can collaborate. Maybe creating a committee that includes all sectors related to lobster fishing, like divers, pots and trammel netters with scientific participation and direct quidance to contribute to the data of the lobsters ACLs.

293031

32

33 34

35

36

37

Also, we understand that the participation of Kevin and other people from the Science Center is necessary to do the things right once and for all. I bring that up-- Any time I have a chance, I mention this, and I think it's time that the local government steps up to the plate and attend the issues of the trammel netters. This is the only year that is affecting the lobster in our region. You cannot imagine how many juveniles are killed or end up in the market with the trammel netters.

38 39 40

41

42

43

44 45 I don't know if NOAA can provide or design a task force because the trammel netters are not using all year round. Only in specific season when the surf comes maybe to attend this issue if a provision comes this year. They also killed nurse sharks, snappers, and many species that can end in the market and you cannot imagine the line of that fish you find every time one of the fishermen pull up one of these [inaudible]. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

46 47 48

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for bringing this issue again. Any comment

from the local government that was called for participation? No, no comment? Okay. I think we have Carlos. Nelson.

**NELSON CRESPO:** Last comment. We recommend the Alternative 3 for Puerto Rico. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Carlos, do you want to make a comment or make a motion? Go ahead.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, I have a motion. Are we going to put up a screen for that or—should I do the rationale before or after I do the motion? Okay.

Okay. So, I move to select Action 2, Alternative 3 to update the OFL and ABC for spiny Lobster for the period of 2024 through 2026 based on the constant catch approach and set the ACL equal to 0.95 of ABC until modified.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos, that's your language.

Move to select Action 2, Alternative 3 for which islands? For the three islands?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: No. Okay. Just Saint Croix.

MARCOS HANKE: I'm just confirming that it's right on the screen. We are not discussing; I'm just making sure that the motion of Carlos is on the screen. This is for Saint Croix only, right? María?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Just to remind the Council that there are three actions in each one of the actions deals with an island. So, I will suggest, like when creating the motion, just to say, "For Action 1, which is Puerto Rico, this. And then another one, "For action two, which is Saint Croix, this one. And so, this is so we are clear for the record.

MARCOS HANKE: Just a question. Can we not put for action 1, 2, and 3?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Depending on if they want to do the same thing. So is that the [crosstalk]

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Wait, wait. Do it one by one so you don't have to clear for the record. [crosstalk]

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: We can copy and paste over here so it's ok.

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, can I make a quick change here then, since it's going to be an order. Action 1, Alternative 3 for Puerto Rico, and I'll just go down the line after.

MARCOS HANKE: We are going to address them, Action 1 first. We're going to open for discussion.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Do you have a second for this motion?

10 MARCOS HANKE: After we have a second for motion presented by 11 Carlos. Anybody second to open the discussion?

13 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Second.

15 MARCOS HANKE: Okay, we're open the discussion. Go ahead, Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. Based on the discussion and the recommendation of the DAPs, for Puerto Rico we also accept this motion and recommend that it should be applied to all islands.

22 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Vanessa. Anybody else? Yes, James. Go 23 ahead. James.

JAMES R. KREGLO: I'd like to also recommend those and second that, especially Saint Thomas/Saint John.

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah. We are discussing now the first one for Puerto Rico, and we're going to keep going down the road to discuss separately.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: ¿Marcos? Liajay, quita las otras dos y deja nada más que la-- vamos una a una según lo van haciendo.

35 MARCOS HANKE: Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. So, I'm going to make a couple of just general comments but want to look to Ricardo here and make sure he's paying attention.

So, I was talking to my team before lunch, during lunch and what we have right now is these buffers for management uncertainty that are fairly small. We have, I think, a lot more uncertainty in the system than we're actually capturing here. For Puerto Rico, in particular, we have uncertainty right now in terms of the catch itself because of delays in reporting and the work that you're doing to improve catch reporting. Then, we have also the potential for the catch limit to be exceeded considerably based on past 

landings history, and we've seen that at least through 2019, that the catch levels, the landings themselves have exceeded these catch limits, right? So, buffering the ACL and reducing it doesn't necessarily address that. There were concerns raised about then the accountability measures and that we have to close federal waters in order to address reductions in harvests that occur. That's really not an effective mechanism either, because it's not really greatly reducing harvest, because most of it occurs in territorial waters. So then at the end of the day, we really don't have a mechanism to constrain or control harvest relative to the catch limit.

4 5

So, I just wanted to state that in terms of the record because I think it's something we really need to carefully look to address going forward. Maybe not in this amendment, but future action after the next update assessment. But in order for the catch limits and accountability measures to work well, we need them to be set at levels that people trust. We also then need accountability measures that we can work with the territory to implement collectively if in fact we're exceeding that catch limit and it would affect the sustainability of the resource.

So, I think today what we're doing is kind of consistent with what we did with Amendment 1. I would support that. I would support obviously the recommendations of the DAP, but we have a lot more management uncertainty in this system right now that we have to kind of address and ultimately decide how to deal with in terms of implementing these accountability measures going forward. My concern is, regardless of the level we set the catch limit, we could be exceeding it just based on the landings that are going to come in from Puerto Rico and years to come.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Any more comments? Hearing none, we have a motion moved by Carlos Farchette, seconded by Vanessa Ramírez. We're going to open for voting. We're going to go one by one.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Nicole Angeli. yay.

39 MARCOS HANKE: Ricardo.

41 RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Ricardo López. yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos

45 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Carl Farchette. yes

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Andy Strelcheck. Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: James. JAMES R. KREGLO: James Kreglo. Yes. VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Vanessa Ramírez. Yes. MARCOS HANKE: Marcos Hanke. Yes. All in favor. The motion is approved. Okay. We have another language, another motion presented by Carlos previous suggested language. Can we move to that? CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, the motion is to select Action 2, Alternative 3 for Saint Croix to update the OFL and ABC for spiny lobster for the period of 2024 through 2026 based on constant catch approach and set the ACL equal to 0.95 of the ABC until modified. MARCOS HANKE: Any second? VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Vanessa Ramírez. Second. MARCOS HANKE: Second by Vanessa. We are open for discussion. Any further discussion on the motion? Nicole. NICOLE F. ANGELI: We support what has been iterated and justified by our District Advisory Panels. We believe that our uncertainty is small, and our management is strong, and we support Alternative MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Anybody else? Seeing no hands up, we're going to go for a vote again. Nicole. NICOLE F. ANGELI: Yes. RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes. CARLOS FARCHETTE: 

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes. 

JAMES R. KREGLO: Yes. 

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes. 

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

All in favor. Motion carries. The next language suggested by Carlos on the screen, please.

1

2 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Move to select Action 3, Alternative 3 for Saint 3 Thomas/Saint John District to update the OFL and ABC for the spiny lobster for the period of 2024 through 2026 based on constant catch 4 5

approach and set the ACL equal to 0.95 of the ABC until modified.

6

7 MARCOS HANKE: Any second? 8

JAMES R. KREGLO: Second.

9 10

11

Thank you, James. Open for discussion. Anybody? MARCOS HANKE:

12 13

14

15

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Again, we support the justifications provided by our fishers, our fishing community and our District Advisory Panel members in understanding that we believe our lobster stocks are strong and our management uncertainty is relatively small.

16 17

18

Thank you very much. Any further discussion? Let's MARCOS HANKE: 19 go for vote. Let's start from the other side.

Yes.

20

21

22

VANESSA RAMÍREZ:

23 24

25 ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes.

JAMES R. KREGLO:

26

27 28

CARLOS FARCHETTE:

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes.

29

30 31 NICOLE F. ANGELI: Yes.

32 33

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

34 35

All in favor? The motion carries. Thank you. Go ahead, Carlos.

36 37

38

39

40

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I guess it might be a little too late to mention this, but I was thinking about what Andy was saying. Would it have made a difference to choose for Puerto Rico 0.90? Because the overrun they had was pretty big, so it takes a long time to recover that, and I don't know if it would've made much of a difference.

41 42 43

44

45

46 47

48

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes. So, I don't think it makes a measurable difference in this place because we're not doing any sort of inseason management. We're not closing the fishery if that catch limit is met. Right. And buffering in the event that we don't hit the mark and managed exactly to whatever that catch limit is. And so, in this instance, what would've happened is we would've just

had a greater exceedance of the catch limit, assuming landings stay at kind of those higher levels that we're seeing relative to what we're setting the catch limits at. But it's setting we up for then potentially triggering the accountability measures while these catch limits are in place. And that's my concern, is we don't have a good way of addressing that and then constraining or controlling harvest in order to manage the catch limit.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for the question. María? John.

JOHN WALTER, III: Oh, thank you. And I wanted to just comment on, I think where the future is going. And I hear a lot of really positives about where we might be able to go in the future and put our kind of goal post on the 2024 stock assessment. What I think we need to focus on is ensuring that the landings and keeping track of the landings are accurate. I think what we don't want to have our situations where landings might be underreported because that means that we can't actually estimate the productivity of the stock. So, we don't want these catch limits to incentivize underreporting. We want that reporting to be accurate. I think that's where our partnerships with the territories and the commonwealth are really key there in terms of ensuring the integrity of those landings time series.

 And then, in terms of our partnerships with the fishing community is to try to develop indices that are able to track the population and get those improvements into the stock assessment. I think I'm glad to see the update stock assessment advice be approved by the SSC and then be voted on by the Council because I think it sets a path forward, but we all know that the science can be improved, and I think we're working towards that so that that next assessment is accounting for some of the things we're hearing. If there are more lobster, the indices, if we can create them, should show that. And I think that is the path forward and the future is not that far ahead. So, thanks. And I think that this is good news.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. María. I want to make a comment following up on what you said. I was talking to Nelson; I have been talking to lobster fishermen before. Yesterday we had some conversations about the importance of creating index, right? That we are already establishing the formal creation of the new index with the information that are going to arrive to our hands. But on the last DAP, we received requests of participation, stronger participation by the industry on providing complementary added data to make stronger the participation and the data.

And talking to Nelson, I don't know if we will explore simpler approaches that can be a longer-term approach— sorry for the

repetition there --with the industry, like the number of pounds attached to a validated number of lobsters per report that you can create a long-term index. Because it's not the same many little lobsters versus a few little lobsters and the same amount of pounds. Something simple like that for a long-term analysis will be helpful.

4 5

These are just ideas that the fishing community is exploring to see which way we can create this complementary highlight, complementary or added information to help with the management for the lobster. I would like to hear any comment if this is a crazy idea or is the right path.

JOHN WALTER, III: Happy to have Kevin weigh in there on what would be complimentary and useful information. To my mind, for traps, if you could get some sort of catch per unit effort, so how many lobsters you catch for how many traps were put out, and then maybe consider how long they were fishing for. So, something that would say—and I think the fishermen know pretty well whether they're lobster are abundant because they know are you having to put out more traps and work harder or let them soak for longer? I don't know. But there's some way that you have an idea of that. How do you translate that into an index that says when the index is high, there's a lot of lobster and when the index is low, there are fewer? And then if we could build that into the stock assessment, which usually you can very easily do, then that actually allows us to reflect what is going on in the population.

And then as you mentioned, Chair, getting to the size of lobster can actually influence that, because if they're small lobster, presumably they're ones who will eventually be recruiting into the fishery. And if that were able to be kept track of it, we've got a lot of undersized lobster, that's probably a good sign for what's going to come in the future. And if we knew that information, for a recruitment index, that could be valuable. Kevin, I don't know if you wanted to follow up on the things that we could get from the fishery.

 **KEVIN MCCARTHY:** Yeah, I can add a little bit. So, one of the difficulties that we have is getting a good effort measure, right? One that is meaningful. So, if you just look at per trip, that's not terribly informative because one trip may have fished 10 traps and another trip may have fished a hundred traps. And so just calling all trips the same, that's no good, right?

So, we've often had difficulty in determining that good effort measure and some conversations with fishers might be really helpful in informing that. Like, what makes for a useful effort measure?

Is it number of trap haul? Is it the length of the trap haul?

4 5

 Well, those kinds of things, you know, the things that they're keying in on when they want to— the things that they're thinking about when they're fishing. And then, do we capture that in the logbook data? Which is another whole question. So, we've run into a lot of issues with fishery-dependent data no matter where we are, right? Caribbean, Gulf, HMS, doesn't matter.

With the logbook forms accurately reflecting the kind of effort that went into catching those lobsters or those fish or whatever it is. So, I think that, again, the expert advice of the fishers at the SEDAR meetings is going to help inform us, you know, this index that we put together from the logbook data, does it make sense in their experience? Because we chose number of traps fished. As our effort measure. Does that make sense to them? So, there's a lot of those kinds of conversations about how the fishery works that will inform the way we use and interpret the data that come out of there.

MARCOS HANKE: This conversation just to illustrate the importance of it, to educate everybody, for everybody to be on the same page, trying to find the best path, what is doable, right? And they're going to hear from the report of the DAP after the meeting. A little follow up on that. Kreglo.

 JAMES R. KREGLO: I live lobsters and, in our reporting, -- well, one thing I do, I keep my own logbook, dive by dive, but in our reporting, we have so many dives per trip, how much time? And then also for lobsters, I've always put down the weight of lobsters in the column, but more recently we also have discards. So, what I try to do now is I try to make a notation. For example, if I do a dive and catch 10 lobsters, okay, I maybe have three females with eggs, and I got a short one, so I'll try to make a notation in discards three female and then one short, something like that. So, I know at least diving we've probably got better statistics than in trap as far as catch per unit effort.

MARCOS HANKE: With more details. All, I don't want to get too deep into the weeds, but all this discussion and intention from the Council is very, very loud and clear. The fishermen want to participate and be leaders on the data collection and through participants, not just somebody that provide the data, and that's it. They want to learn about science, they want to be hands-on with all this. Next, we are going to go for-- Carlos.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Yes. I think I'm supposed to give a rationale for my motion, right?

1 2

MARCOS HANKE: Well, your participation now, yes.

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah. Okay. So, my rationale was that with the list of management actions implemented in October of 2022, specific to spiny lobster, which were prohibited harvest of egg bearing females, prohibited harvest with spear hook and gillnets, trammel nets, minimum size 3.5 carapace, recreational bag limits that are in place in the EEZ, restrictions on tail weight for imports, the four-tiered ABC control rule that was defined by the SSC, accountable measure closure provisions for spiny lobster and the description of the essential fish habitat for spiny lobster.

I believe that when it comes to lobster, I think we're doing pretty good. And also, I believe that with the gear selectivity project that's ongoing, we will have better information hopefully by 2024. Although I still have some concerns when it comes to larval disbursements and juvenile retention.

So that's my rationale. If anybody wants to add to my rationale, feel free, because I'm not a scientist.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No. I have a point of order. Whenever you have a rationale like that, it has to be provided at a discussion time. That's what I told Marcos. It's good to have it on the record, but the next time the Chair has to allow you to give your rationale when we are voting for them after the fact, is after the fact.

 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for the clarification. We have a healthy discussion and we're just missing this part that I'm happy that it is on the record now. The next item on the agenda, María, is the Review of Trawl Net Gear and Descending Device.

## Review Draft Trawl, Net Gear and Descending Devices Amendment

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes. Good afternoon, everybody. This is María López with NOAA Fisheries. I'm going to be discussing the Amendments 2 to the Puerto Rico, Saint Croix and Saint Thomas and Saint John Fishery Management Plans, trawl, net gear and descending devices. This is not new. This is an action that was discussed at the December meeting. During this meeting--

I'm going to go to the next slide, please.

During the December 22 Council meeting, as you recall, the Council reviewed draft number one of the amendments and selected prefer alternatives for some of the actions. If you can look at this table everywhere that it is in red, and it says "pref", those are the

alternatives that you already selected for some of these actions. During the past Council meeting, you also recommended staff restructure the actions by island management area before moving forward, and that's what we did.

So, the IPT restructured the document into four actions with subactions by islands. Four actions, one to three. This is all reflected in the document, the draft document, that is in your briefing books that you had a chance to take a look at, since it was sent two weeks ago.

So, as I said, there's going to be four actions. Action 1 is going to be Puerto Rico trawl, gillnets, trammel nets, and purse seines. Within that Action 1, we have four sub-actions. Action 1(a) deals with trawl. Action 1(b) deals with gillnets. Action 1(c) deals with trammel nets. And Action 1(d) deal with purse seines.

This same organization is going to be followed island by island to make it easier to follow the discussion as was requested by Council members. Action 2 is for Sun Croix trawl gillnets, trammel nets purse seines. Also 2(a) trawl, 2(b) gillnet, 2(c) trammel, 2(d) purse seines. And then, for Action 3 for Saint Thomas and Saint John. Trawl 3(a), 3(b) gillnets, 3(c) trammel, 3(d) purse seines.

Now the last action it was okay to put it all together, although the decision was made by island because it was the same alternatives for everybody. During the last meeting you all decided that you wanted to choose for the requirement for having available on the boat descending devices for reef fish. So, we'll go through each one of these actions. There's going to be some actions that I would prefer, if for the sake of time, not to go with a lot of detail, unless you want me to go into that detail, because we already discussed it last time and you already made decisions. However at least for when I'm starting the discussion, I'm going to go really quick through what was the rationale for this action and then move to the ones that still need to have preferred alternative chosen.

So, just as a reminder, Puerto Rico-- I'm going to start with Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico only chose to prefer alternative for the trawl gear, but still has to make selections for gillnets, trammel nets and purse seines. Saint Thomas and Saint John and Saint Croix, they both chose preferred alternative for trawl and gillnets. But given that they were requesting reorganization of the document the Council didn't move forward to the other actions, although they were discussed. And then for Action 4, the descending devices, after the discussion, it was decided for all of the islands.

 Next slide.

Just as a reminder, these are the gear types that are included in the authorized gear list in the U.S. Caribbean, EEZ. This can be found in our regulations at 600.725.

These are the gear types that we are discussing in this amendment. For trawl gear the authorized fisheries in Puerto Rico, Saint Thomas and Saint Croix is for the commercial non-FMP species. It means that trawl gear, at this point, can only be used for species that are not managed by the Council. However, trawl gear, as we all know, is not used in the EEZ. It has never been used only for a couple of instances back in the seventies for research. It is banned in Puerto Rico waters. I don't recall there being a similar regulation in the U.S. Virgin Islands, but we can assume that it's not something that is used over there.

In terms of gillnet, the authorized fisheries and the EEZ is the commercial FMP pelagic species, which means all of the species that belong to the pelagic group that are managed commercially in our FMPs. The commercial non-FMP species, all those species that are not managed by the Council and also, the pelagic species, which would be included under that, right? The commercial non-FMP pelagic species.

On a side note, for the gillnet. The use of gillnets is not allowed since 2005 for harvesting reef fish and spiny lobster or for their use in marine managed areas in any of the islands in the U.S. Caribbean. They are allowed for using Puerto Rico waters. They're not allowed in the U.S. Virgin Island waters and there are specific surface gillnets that are used for baitfish in the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Trammel nets are not authorized for any fisheries, and the same for purse seines. They're not authorized for any fisheries. And trammel nets it's basically the same notes that we have for the gillnets. We have the provisions on our marine managed areas. They're used in Puerto Rico. They're not used in the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Next slide.

This is the Statement of Purpose and Need that is included in the amendment. You already reviewed it. 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 and associated species, and to minimize the mortality of bycatch species. This is the purpose and need that you all agreed on the last time that we met.

Next slide.

Now let's go to Action 1. Action 1 is the Puerto Rico Action. Action 1(a) is modified the use of trawl gear. For this we have the three alternatives. One, is don't do anything. We just retain trawl gear as an authorized gear type, which I mentioned previously is just for the non-federally managed species.

Alternative 2 will prohibit the use of trawl gears for all fishing in the Council managed marine managed areas year-round. And Alternative 3, which just shows as the preferred, is to prohibit the use of trawl gear for all fishing in federal waters around Puerto Rico. The rationale for decision was to prevent potential impact to sensitive habitats in the Caribbean. That's just the summary of the of the rationale of the decision.

So, as you recall, there's no evidence that trawl has been used in the past. This is mostly a precautionary action that the Council is taking. When this was discussed in the DAPs, the DAPs showed support for this action.

Marcos?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. I think it'll be better to stop there. Once we present to Puerto Rico, we make a motion, and we keep going by segments. It's going to be clear.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: However, you would like to do that. Or we can, at the end of the presentation, I have the same table that tells you what— I don't think you have to revisit this. You already made a decision on it. So maybe at the end of the presentation, I can go back to the table, and I can tell you where it needs to make a decision and you can just go straight for it. Would that work?

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah, for me. The rest of the Council, does that work?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: But the thing is sometimes you forget about what you said at the beginning, then you rehash the whole discussion again. So as much as possible try to get rid of the things that we need to do at this time.

1 2

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Right. In this case, you don't need to make a different decision unless you would like to. If that's the case, then we can proceed and go ahead.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. I think it is pertinent not to keep spinning around because we already discussed this and we have rationale on it, is to choose the prefer alternative. The guidance that I want from you, and I think you gave it to us already, which is the easiest and marked clear for the record, way to choose the preferred alternatives.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: I think I would prefer to just to do it at the end.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: That way we don't have to stop and discuss things that have already been discussed. But if you prefer, if somebody wants to stop me while-- okay.

MARCOS HANKE: I think we are all well informed. Keep going.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: All right, so I'm going to move forward to the next slide then.

Okay, so this is just a comparison of the alternatives. Again, this is going to apply for Saint Croix, Saint Thomas and Saint John as well. I'm just going to say it here and perhaps if it's not needed, I won't go back when we discussed the other islands.

So, remember, the status quo, which is the current situation or baseline, will not change any regulations that apply to trawls. Alternative 2 is the one that will prohibit it year-round in all Council MMAs. The preferred Alternative 3 is the one that will prohibit trawl gear year-round, applicable to all components of the Puerto Rico EEZ. Because it has not been used historically in the EEZ, we could say that these are mostly administrative actions and they're not expected to have any additional physical, biological, ecological, social, or economic effects when you compare it to the baseline. But they could be more beneficial to the physical and biological environment by preventing potential bycatch and/or habitat effects from any future trawling activities in federal waters. And one last thing about that is that prohibiting the use of trawl gear applicable to all fishery components of the Puerto Rico EEZ would prevent future use through a petition, which is something that could occur under the baseline Alternative 1 and Alternative 2, so at the end, it would be more

beneficial to the physical, biological, and ecological environment.

So that's all I have to say for trawl. I'm going to move to the next one. The next slide, please.

The next action is Action 1(b). Okay. So, this one we have to make a decision on. This is, Modify the Use of Gillnets in federal waters around Puerto Rico.

Alternative 1 is the no action alternative. Retain gillnets as an authorized gear type for the commercial harvest of federally managed and non-federally managed pelagic species and the commercial harvest of non-federal managed species in federal waters around Puerto Rico, and as a prohibited gear type for reef fish and spiny lobster in the EEZ around Puerto Rico and inside the MMAs. So basically, this is what we have in place right now. Okay? This is not changing anything.

Number 2, prohibit the use of gillnets in federal waters around Puerto Rico, but this one has three sub-alternatives. Sub-alternative 2(a) is prohibiting the use for all fishing. While Sub-alternative 2(b) is prohibited for all fishing except for the following fish species belonging to the halfbeaks, the gar, the flyingfish. And then I have one more species that was added. It is in red is the goggle eye or the bigeye scad, which is a species that the DAP requested be added as one of the species that they may capture with surface gillnets for bait. A surface gillnet used in the EEZ around Puerto Rico to fish for any baitfish must be tended at all times. Mesh size may not be smaller than 0.75 inches square, or 1.5-inch stretch. May not be used 20 feet from the bottom.

Now everything that is in red in this sub-alternative was added after you saw this document in December. As I said, the species was added. It is a recommendation—if you want to accept it or not—from the Puerto Rico DAP because this is a species that they may encounter when they're using in the event they use this type of gillnets in federal waters, which is something not very common. The rest of the text that is included in this alternative, it's similar text that is included for the U.S. Virgin Islands and it mimics what the U.S. Virgin Islands includes in their territorial regulations for the description of bait nets. Okay.

Sub-alternative 2(c) will prohibit the use of gillnets in federal waters, but only for managed pelagic species as this is something that it was added as a request from the Council at the December meeting.

1 2

Okay, go to the next slide, please. And I'm going to explain this a little bit more.

As I mentioned earlier some of our regulations said gillnets, trammel nets as well as pots, traps, bottom longlines are currently prohibitive year-round in the seven Council-managed seasonally closed areas. In the areas in Puerto Rico and also in the areas that are in the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The use of gillnets and trammel nets has been prohibited for the harvest of federally managed reef fish and spiny lobster since 2005 due to the potential for guy bycatch. Surface gillnets and trammel nets are allowed for the harvest of other species (for example, baitfish, where baitfish refers to species other than federally managed reef fish) in federal waters, but they must be tended at all times. So, this is what we currently have in our regulations.

Let's go to the next slide.

Now, these are bait net regulations in Puerto Rico state waters. And this is just for reference. In Puerto Rico, this fishery uses bottom and surface gillnet (trasmallo ó filete, en español) and trammel nets (mallorquín) which consists of a trammel with three net cloths tied to a line of buoys. Gillnets or trammel nets cannot have mesh size greater than six inches as measured from knot to knot of extension. For trammel nets, the outer cloths may not have a mesh larger than six inches from knot to knot. Additionally, trammel nets used for bait fishing may not be more than a quarter of an inch.

The regulation from the DNER 7949 permits the use of gillnets and trammel nets, except in inner waters and river mouths. Additionally, it prohibits the use of gillnets and trammel nets in conjunction with diving equipment, except by written authorization from the Secretary for the capture of lionfish.

I'm just giving you this, so you have a reference of what the regulations in Puerto Rico say regarding the use of nets or bait nets. And just making the distinctions that because they allow for the use of gillnets and trammel net, they have a difference between what they consider bait net versus a trammel net.

So, in our case, in this case, the Council is not looking to implement or allow the use of gillnets for other species. Just one of the alternatives is allowing for the use of certain surface gillnets for capturing baitfish so that the fishers that use this

surface gillnet for baitfish can continue to do so in federal waters. But this is not something that is very common.

Go to the next slide, please.

And you have seen this before. This is just a commercial landing with gillnets from federal waters. This may include barracuda, cero and king mackerel, blackfin and litter tunny. What we have as landing from federal waters is way less than in state waters. However, we all know that this is not very accurate, right? Because not necessarily all the time the fishers mark where they use the gear. And this is just to give you an idea of the use of trammel nets in federal waters. You can see that there's basically nothing. Whenever it says confidential, it's because less than three fishers were reporting using the gear. And then there the gear is used, for example, for ballyhoo and some of other species that are used for bait.

Next slide.

Okay. without getting to a lot of details, because this is a lot of information, and this is the last slide regarding gillnets. So, Alternative 1, no changes. As I said, it would allow fishers to continue using gillnet for these species. So, you know, it will be beneficial for them in the short term, but it has the potential for long term adverse effects because of effects of gillnets that we have been discussing to populations. Biologically, of course, one of the reasons why the Council wanted to pursue this is because they wanted to reduce or prevent the potential of adverse effects to fish populations that come from the use of gillnets.

Sub-alternative 2(a), as we mentioned before, no use of gillnet for any fishing. It will be more beneficial than all of the alternatives for the biological and ecological environment because you're banning the use of this. However, for the socioeconomic, of course, if there are fishers that are using these gillnets in federal waters to fish for anything other than what is already prohibited, then they're not going to be able to use it, although, testimony on the DAP and the Council meeting says that this is not really the norm. This one will need a lot of education and outreach for compliance, especially when you are banning something that has been used by some in the past.

 Sub-alternative 2(b), just ban it, not just allow for the use of baitfish. This will be obviously more beneficial than what we currently have because you are preventing the use of gillnet for many of the species and just allow the use of the net with a minimum size mesh and other specifications which are meant to

prevent bycatch of other species. And then it will allow fishers to continue using gillnets for fishing for those species in the EEZ. There's some difficulty enforcing because of difference in the species allowing allowed versus in Puerto Rico waters but most of the harvest of bait species are in state waters.

And then the last alternative we continue to allow for FMP species other than pelagic species. Again, potential for adverse effects because you're still allowing for the use of gillnets, and it will be the most difficult to enforce because enforcement will have to determine what are you using that gillnet for. It will be very difficult to pinpoint that.

Okay. So that's what we have in gillnets. Marcos, I don't know if you, because this one was a lot of information. I don't know if you would like to make a decision at this point with the gillnets. Okay, let's do that then.

MARCOS HANKE: You were going to present for us to choose preferred alternative of all of them, or you going to want to address the gillnet.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: I think we should just address Puerto Rico. This one is one of the ones that needed a preferred alternative. So, I would suggest a motion just regarding this particular gear for Puerto Rico.

MARCOS HANKE: What is the suggested preferred motion? I mean alternative.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: For Action 1(b). Modify the use of gillnets in federal waters around Puerto Rico. The Council selects and then you can choose any of these sub-alternatives. Andy, go ahead.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, so I noticed that Ricardo's not here and you know, I don't know if Vanessa feels comfortable weighing in, but it would be important to have Ricardo at the table for this discussion.

I did have a question. So, sub-alternative 2(b) provides the exception for certain baitfish. Those are not federally managed baitfish. Correct? We don't have them in the FMP.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Can you go one more please? I just need to remember which ones are the--

**ANDREW STRELCHECK:** You can go back to the-- Right there. So, none of those are in our fishery management plan?

1 2

4 5

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: No, they are not. But one of the things that we discussed last time is that the Magnuson-Stevens gives the authority to the Council to manage a species based on if the Council thinks that these are needed for the conservation and management of our target species or for the benefit of those non-target species.

So, it will fall-- I can look it up somewhere in my regulations to see exactly what the exact citation would be. But yes, so that will be why we're making that.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: So then as a follow up, and Kate I think is listening. She wasn't able to be at the meeting, but from a legal standpoint, Kate, if we are going to regulate the use of a gear, for example, if we were going to select this as preferred, I'm pretty sure we would have to include these in the management plan as species that we're then managing. But can you confirm or tell me I'm wrong?

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Thanks Andy. This is Kate Zamboni for the record. NOAA's office of General Counsel. I'd need to do a little bit more research to confirm your belief, but I think that's probably correct. As María noted, there is some language in the Magnuson-Stevens Act that may provide some additional flexibility, but I need to look at that a little further.

MARCOS HANKE: Anybody else? As I recall and just seeing the slide there, the sub-alternative 2(b) is the one that have the input from the DAP and from the Council. That's why you have the species that are listed there with the industry feedback and also the size of the mesh that is already established. That was discussed also on the DAP. That makes sense. I would like to hear, before I say what I want to say, from Nelson because this is addressing Puerto Rico. What he thinks about the alternatives? if the sub-alternative 2(b), is the one that should be the preferred one. Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, Marcos, you are correct. We support the Alternative 2, 2(b)

MARCOS HANKE: I'd like to hear from people from-- because this is for Puerto Rico --from Ricardo and Vanessa, if they have any comments about it.

**VANESSA RAMÍREZ:** Thank you, Chair. As we have analyzed this, also we support the same, as Nelson said that precedent, and it's going to be-- if we can't present a motion now or just discussion?

MARCOS HANKE: No, we are just discussing the text and if you wish, after I make a question to Ricardo, you can present a motion if you want to gimme just one second.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Okay.

MARCOS HANKE: Ricardo, do you have anything to say?

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: I don't have any comment.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Ricardo. Vanessa?

**VANESSA RAMÍREZ:** I would like to present a motion for Action 1(b), select Alternative 2, Sub-alternative 2(b).

MARCOS HANKE: Just to be clear is alternative-- you took the text away from-- if I'm correct, please make sure that is correct. The one that has the list of species in red was Alternative (1). Subalternative 2(b). This is what you meant, Vanessa. Yes, for Puerto Rico. Can you guide us?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yeah. Okay. So, based on the comments that Andy made we have noted the selection of the Council for the preferred alternative. We'll go back and investigate if there has to be some modification of the alternative or if there anything else that needs to be done but we want to ensure that what the Council wants to do, we can put it forward, right. So, we'll get back-- because we still have to go back with this amendment for the IPT to work on it to bring it final, we should be able to bring more information. And if we can find that today, we'll bring it tomorrow.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Just a point of order because there is a motion suggested. Is there any second for the motion presented by Vanessa?

JAMES R. KREGLO: I'll second the motion.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay, then we are open for discussion and as part of the discussion María is saying that there are some concerns about the comments that Andy presented. Correct, Andy?

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. I just want to confirm that we can implement a gear requirement for species that aren't managed in a fishery management plan.

MARCOS HANKE: I have a question. We can choose the-- we are discussing the Alternative. We can choose the preferred

Alternative this will not preclude us from deciding in the future if that is the right thing to do legally or not, right?

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, I mean, hopefully we can get an answer between today and tomorrow then if not, we'll take it back to the planning team. If we need to make some modifications before final action, we'd bring that guidance and advice back to you in August.

MARCOS HANKE: Is there any problem for us to choose the preferred alternative today?

ANDREW STRELCHECK: I don't think so. I think there's some uncertainty in terms of maybe how it's worded and if we needed to modify the wording, we could come back with recommendations to you.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Then are there any other comments? Carlos?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I know that we kind of jumped here to action 1(b), but for Puerto Rico there's still the Action 1, Alternative 3 for trawl, isn't a motion required for that one also? Okay.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: So, the question Carlos. Because you already chose a preferred alternative during the last Council meeting, unless you want to revisit it, you don't have to go back. Okay.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, I'd like to make another comment about 1(b) when it comes to ballyhoo and flyingfish and bigeye scad for Puerto Rico. Bigeye scad is really, you know, I can't speak for Puerto Rico, I'm not sure, but bigeye scad in the U.S.V.I. is not found in the EEZ. It's a migratory species that's always found in territorial water. So, I don't know about Puerto Rico though, but I know the ballyhoo and flyingfish are. That's just a comment I wanted to make.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Yes, I think we are ready to vote with the record that we have and with the flexibility requested by Andy. Vanessa?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes

42 JAMES R. KREGLO: Yes.

44 ANDREW STRELCHECK: Abstain.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Yes.

3 4 MARCOS HANKE: The

MARCOS HANKE: There is one abstention and six yes. Motion carries.

1 2

What is the next step, María?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes. I'm going to continue the presentation because we have two more of the nets in Puerto Rico and then we'll move to the U.S. Virgin Islands. So, Cristina, can you put the presentation, please, again? We should be on slide number 12.

Okay. So, the next one is Action 1(c). Modify the use of trammel nets in federal waters around Puerto Rico. And Action 1(d), modify the use of purse seines in federal waters around Puerto Rico. You have all seen this before. Alternative 1, is no action. That means that right now trammel net is not an authorized gear type for any fisheries in the EEZ. So, this is more of a precautionary approach taken by the Council to prevent the use for—through a petition to the Council in the future. Alternative 2, will prohibit the use of trammel nets for old fishing in the EEZ of Puerto Rico. And I put these two together because they were simpler ones. None of them are listed as authorized gear types for any of the fisheries in the EEZ around Puerto Rico. So, alternative 1 what purse seines are listed as, or not listed as, anything for any fisheries in the EEZ of Puerto Rico an alternative prohibits the use of this.

So, let's go to the second, the next slide please.

Really quick. Some background. Purse seines are defined as a large wall of netting deployed around an entire area or school of fish. This is as defined by NOAA. Purse seines and trammel nets are not authorized for any fishery in any of the three island management areas, and for purse seines and trammel nets and any other non-authorized gear, as I mentioned, a person could petition to the Council to use these gear types. At that time, the Council and NMFS could take action whether to allow or prohibit the use of the gear. And this is the citation 50 CFR 600.725(v).

So, let's go to the next slide please.

Comparison of the alternatives because these gears are not listed as an authorized under any fishery managed or unmanaged this could be considered as an administrative action. There's very little harvest with trammel nets in federal waters. As I show you earlier there were three instances, and they were all confidential. Harvest of any species with trammel nets is mostly a state. It happens in state waters where it is allowed. Effects to the physical,

biological, ecological, and socioeconomic environments from prohibiting the use of trammel nets and/or purse seines is not going to be different than what is the status quo, which is Alternative 1, because they're not currently authorized. However, choosing Alternative 2, which is the prohibition, either of the purse seines or the trammel nets or both, could be slightly more beneficial to the biological, ecological environment of Puerto Rico because they further restrict potential future use of these gear types through a petition to the Council, thus eliminating any potential effects from bycatch of undersized organisms or large amount of fish, preventing overfishing and also preventing any effects to Endangered Species Act listed species such as sea turtles, which is one of the problems of the nets.

Socio-economically landings seems to be constrained to Puerto Rico for trammel nets and there is no significant landings history in federal waters, thus loss of fishing opportunities is really not expected. There should be expected some long-term socio-economic efforts from healthy fisheries.

Okay. So that's what I have for trammel nets and purse seines, so if the Council is ready to make a decision for Puerto Rico for each one of these action, Action 1(c) trammel nets and Action 1(d) I would suggest the motion to be done separate because there are two separate sub-actions.

**MARCOS HANKE:** Yes. Would any Council member like to present the motions? Vanessa, the request was to try to present the motion separately for Action 1(c) and 1(d).

**VANESSA RAMÍREZ:** For the first Action 1(c), Alternative 2.

MARCOS HANKE: Action 1(c). "C" as in Carlos. Any second?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Second.

MARCOS HANKE: Further discussion? I think the record is—Andy?

**ANDREW STRELCHECK:** so, this would be-- can you go back to the alternative itself? So, this is prohibiting trammel nets, correct?

MARCOS HANKE: Mm-hmm.

**ANDREW STRELCHECK:** So, this would be contrary to what Puerto Rico allows?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: So, I'd like to hear, at least on the record, any concerns with enforcement, prohibition in federal waters relative to obviously state waters and consistency in the regulations.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. I would like to provide and talk about the rationale with the trammel nets on federal waters, which is basically a deeper water habitat. It's a tool for people to impact pelagics and the way the net is designed. There is entanglement of turtles and entanglement of other things that have a very adverse implication in terms of the environment, in terms of sustainability of some of the fisheries that we manage as well with other gears and is not used now nowadays. And we want to prevent problems in the future. Miguel?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: That's another question. The question is that you are doing this for the EEZ and then you have a different set of regulations in the local government. So, we wanted to hear from Ricardo whether this is a possible action from Puerto Rico to make the regulation compatible or do you think that in the near future or far away future trammel net will not be touched by local government.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes. As, as far as I know, the trammel nets are almost not used in the federal waters, so this doesn't change much.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: But, again, that's not the point.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yeah, I'm getting to that point now.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Because for enforcement purposes, if you catch somebody with a trammel net on board, it will be difficult because the person can say, "I was in the EEZ." We don't know what is happening, you know, people come in and out and everything. Even at the Junta de Pesca we discussed this, which by the way we have not received an answer for a year or two about the same issue? So, anyway, because this is for the federal government anyway, if the enforcement is doable and we have the enforcement people here, fine. But if not, it is another piece of paragraph that you have on the document that doesn't go anywhere.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes. To the question, if the question is, if it is doable for the law enforcement office, my answer is, yes, it's doable.

MARCOS HANKE: For the federal people, is there any comment in terms of enforcement with this alternative, if we choose it as

preferred?

1 2 3

4 5

MATTHEW WALIA: Yeah. Sorry. What's that? Oh. Matt Walia OLE. Yeah, it's doable, we can recommend. But anytime you can make regulations compatible, there's been a lot of discussions on that. It's simpler, it's easier when it's both in state and in federal waters.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for your comment. Any further discussion? Yes, I am just making the list. We have Nelson, Julian—no? Nelson and Andy. No? Nelson and Vanessa.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Andy, for your suggestion to the local government. I think this is the right way to go. You know, I appreciate all that the local government can do to make a prohibition to this dangerous gear because a part of the lobster it is a gear that has killed, how I said early this morning, nurse sharks, turtles and many commercial species. And this is going to help a lot, also, for the ACL of the lobster on the lobster fishery. I'm support strongly this action.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Nelson. I want to highlight the reason I made my comments on the rationale earlier. Once we talk about federal water, this gear interacting with species on federal water, we are talking about a different species interaction versus on the state water. The rationale behind those interactions is a little different even though the gear, I totally agree with Nelson, it'll be beneficial to coordinate between state and federal, if it's possible. But that shouldn't prevent the federal to move along to do the right thing. Vanessa?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Chair. Just one comment for the issue with the state waters. I just want to bring to the record that in 2019 already the state had a public hearings and commercial fishermen were invited at that time, thanks to Ricardo Lugo, that was with us via Zoom. He presented the position and at that time we still had around 40 commercial fishermen that use this kind of gears but were practically inside the four, three miles in state waters. That's why we are moving on.

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah. Which is consistent with the comments that Nelson brought to the table with what really happened.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

45 MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Thank you, Vanessa. I think we have a motion there that is second. We are ready for voting. Nicole.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Yes

```
1
2 RI
```

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Yes.

**ANDREW STRELCHECK:** Yes.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Yes.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Well, all in favor. The motion carries. María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. Ready to move on. So, the next Action is Action 2. This is the, all the same actions, but as they applied to Saint Croix. Can you go to the-- oh wait, I'm sorry. You have to make a decision on purse seines.

MARCOS HANKE: I'm sorry, I was talking to Carlos, and I didn't--

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: We have to make a decision on purse seines. You have to make a motion on purse seines it's--

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: You have the language on the screen. Just say so moved, and--

MARCOS HANKE: Vanessa, if you feel like it, can you read or present the motion for purse seines, which is basically the same what we did for the other gear.

**VANESSA RAMÍREZ:** For Action 1(d), Alternative 2.

MARCOS HANKE: Action 1(d) as in-- Okay. Any second?

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Second.

37 MARCOS HANKE: Further discussion? Carlos.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** So, it says to modify the use-- is it modify or prohibit the use?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Prohibit. Carlos, this is María. The motion should say "prohibit the use of purse seines." Mm-hmm. Oh, oops. Okay. Yeah, I'll fix it.

MARCOS HANKE: No, no, it's okay. Vanessa, you presented the motion. Do you accept the friendly amendment to the language?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Nicole, do you agree? Perfect. We keep the discussion. Thank you, it is clear on the record. Any further comment or discussion? We're ready for vote. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Yes.

11 ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

**RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ:** Yes.

**NICOLE F. ANGELI:** Yes.

19 MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

All in favor. Motion carries.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay, Mr. Chair, I'm going to continue to our Action 2. The first action is Action 2(a). Modify the use of trawl gear on federal waters around Saint Croix. You already made a decision as to prohibit the use of trawl gear for all fishing in federal waters around Saint Croix. The rationale for that decision was prevent potential impact to sensitive habitats in the U.S. Caribbean. If you would like us to revisit this action, I will be happy to. Otherwise, I can move to the next one.

MARCOS HANKE: Just to be clear, you have a preferred already?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes. The Council already chose a preferred for this one. If you move to the next slide, Liajay and Cristina. Yep. So, this is the same text and the same thing that we discussed for Puerto Rico. It is exactly the same thing, right? It's not used in federal waters; hasn't been used. It's a precautionary approach taken by the Council. This is exactly the same things that you saw during the last Council meeting.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah. It's the same language change, for from modified to prohibit. Up there it says modified.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yeah. Well, the action name is "modify" because when we name the action, we don't know what curse you guys

are going to take because Alternative 1 is no change, so we call it "Modify". But the alternative itself should be "prohibit".

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Any further discussion about changing the preferred or do we stay with the same? If I don't hear anything in 1, 2, 3. No? Stay the same? Let's go. Next one.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you. Okay, the next one. Next slide please.

This is Action 2(b), and this is the gillnets. You already made a preferred. However, in this one we're going to have the same issue that Andy mentioned for Puerto Rico because of the species. But I will repeat what you selected as the preferred. As a preferred you chose for all fishing, except for the following fish-- prohibit the use of gillnets in federal waters around Saint Croix for all fishing, except for the following fish species belonging to the halfbeaks, gar, and flyingfish. A surface gillnet used in the EEZ around Saint Croix to fish for any baitfish must be tended at all times. Mesh size may not be smaller than 0.75 inches square or 1.5-inch stretch. And this is one thing that was missing from that alternative and it's new. It's also similar to the U.S. Virgin Island Territorial regulations. So, it will make it mostly compatible with what they have is, may not be used 20 feet from the bottom. Because one of the things that you all mentioned that it was important that the nets didn't, not only protect the organisms in the water column, but also, we wanted to protect the habitats as well.

So, I'm not sure if you have to revote on this one because there's an addition to the text. Miguel, if you can please give us some advice.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, no. What I was going to ask you is, do we have the same for Puerto Rico yet?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: I'm sorry. I cannot hear you.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: If I missed it. Did we adopt the same for Puerto Rico.

 MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: No, for Puerto Rico is a little different because Puerto Rico included the big scad, the big-- that one, the goggle-eyed. I cannot pronounce that. But for the Virgin Islands, this is what they have in the regulations, and this is what they wanted to stay with, so there's a difference.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Because when we discussed it with Carlos and the

others. Especially with the compatibility thing, is it's easier to leave it as is if it's compatible with the local government regulation as they are.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: So, Miguel, you're saying that-- yes. So, this one will be, I'm going to say, "partially compatible" because there's a couple different other things that they have in the regulations such as the length of the net and this is something that this Council decided not to address at this time.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Exactly.

**MARCOS HANKE:** The recommendation then is to choose a preferred to keep the process going and discussion, or no?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, what you can do is you follow what María is saying. You can adopt this as preferred and keep it that way. You don't have a limit as to the size of the gillnet. You do have a limit around Saint Croix with the U.S. Virgin Island government. And that's what she's saying. So, if you want, you can make a decision here now or instruct the staff to add anything else that you want. But if you feel that you're ready to have the motion or just keep it as preferred, so be it.

MARCOS HANKE: Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: I just want a little clarification. Maybe I could be reading it wrong where it says, "may not be used 20 feet from the bottom." Shouldn't it say, "may only be used 20 feet from the bottom?" I'm just trying to understand, because it's 20 feet up, so you can't go. I could be reading it around, but that's how I read it.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, but what it means is they wanted you to fish in the water column. So, anything below 20 feet is going to be prohibited. Yeah, yeah, I know, I have to read it twice. Yes.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: This is María. We can correct the text of the alternative to make sure that it's clear.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Carlos, do you want to say something? No, no. There is no motion on that, we keep going then?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Honestly, I don't know if the procedure, if you have to, I will ask our GC if you guys have to reelect again because there's a change in the preferred. If you want to be just clear, let's just vote on it again. Yes, Miguel.

1 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, it's better to have a motion with the language there, so we'll make it idiot proof.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. So, Marcos what proceeds right now is with action 2(b). I believe that you are going to reselect an alternative.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos.

10 CARLOS FARCHETTE: For a motion. Yeah, a motion, okay.

Action 2(b), Alternative 2, Sub-alternative 2(b). Prohibit fishing for all fishing except for the following fish species belonging to the ballyhoo--

16 MARCOS HANKE: Go slow so that they--

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Oh yeah, yeah. Okay. Sorry about that. I always 19 forget about you.

**MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:** If you want to make it easier it will be, a 22 motion to adopt under Action 2, sub-alternative 2(b), as written on the screen.

25 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Sub. Sub-alternative 2(b). right.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: And then the Chair, once you have the motion, the Chair would say, "well, this is why we do it." So, you don't have to rewrite the whole thing again.

MARCOS HANKE: That's your motion?

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Right. With the same with the same language. 34 Yeah. Right. Same language in 2(b).

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: You can say, "as presented in the document." And then Marcos, once we have a second, you can say, "The motion will be this, which will have the--" and then you read the whole paragraph.

41 MARCOS HANKE: Yeah. Can we see the language apart just to--

**MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:** Ponlo como estaba, con la moción. Súbelo un 44 poquito para que ellos lo puedan ver.

46 Okay, so the Chair-- maybe I can't read it for the record.

48 MARCOS HANKE: I don't see-- Carlos, can you read your motion and

make sure it is stated correctly on the screen, please?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Well, it was there. Sure, go ahead.

4 5

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: If the Council would like to fix the alternative for clarity for the record regarding what Julian said. Andy has a suggestion.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, if you could scroll down to the red text. Keep going. So, it says, "May not be used 20 feet from the bottom," which to me is very exact, you know, and so I think what we want to say is actually "Must be used 20 feet or more above the bottom," right? That's the intent really. It's a surface net, it may go below the surface, but we want to keep it off the bottom. So, must be used 20 feet or more above the bottom.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Above the bottom. Ponle la palabra "above" antes de "the bottom." Above the bottom.

MARCOS HANKE: That's the language?

**ANDREW STRELCHECK:** And then I think your motion would be changed rather than as presented in the document. As modified.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: As modified, yeah.

**ANDREW STRELCHECK:** Yeah.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Espérate, espérate. Vete a donde dice "presented in the document" "as modified for the document." Punto, punto después de "modified."

Let me read it for the record as it's supposed to be. Okay. The motion will be Action 2(b). The Council adopts Action 2(b), Alternative 2, Sub-alternative 2(b) as presented in the document-quitale el segundo "as" je je con una "s" después de la 2(b). Antes de "presented". Presented in the document as modified.

Vamos a donde está la coloradita. And for the record, Subalternative 2(b) is the preferred Alternative, which reads for all fishing except for the following fish species belonging to the halfbeaks (Family Hemiramphidae), gar (Family Belonidae), and flyingfish (Family Exocoetidae). A surface gillnet used in the EEZ around Saint Croix to fish for any baitfish must be tended at all times. Mesh size may not be smaller than 0.75 inches square or 1.5-inch stretch. Must be used 20 feet or more above the bottom. So that, Mr. Chairman, for the record, is the valid motion.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. As the motion, as Miguel said, is it accepted with the language by Carlos?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So moved.

MARCOS HANKE: Any second?

JAMES R. KREGLO: Second.

MARCOS HANKE: The language expressed by Miguel was accepted. Any further discussion? Carlos?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. I know that there's some concerns with the territorial regulation on the length of Baitfish, but now the way that this is written for the EEZ, if we're not specific, that means I can probably deploy a 4,000-foot net.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, but similar to what you did before for Puerto Rico, which personally I think that will never happen, you are dealing only with the EEZ. So just keep it as is. Just vote for the thing.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: So, we have briefly discussed this in the past, if the Council desires to add a length to the bait net, they certainly can do that. You know, this is something that we just bring back to the IPT.

MARCOS HANKE: And I think it makes sense to make the step in the right direction. Like your motion is Carlos, and your concern is on the record. And because that decision of the length has to do with the size of the boat, the capability of deploying the gear and other things that probably we don't have the expertise on the table right now to make the decision, but the record is straight that we might need to revisit to add something in terms of how long the net is.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos.

41 MARCOS HANKE: Is that fair enough?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos, may I say something? When we discussed this at the DAPs, the idea was to leave this open as an alternative for the fishers. If you start closing the door to fishers, just because you think about it, it won't work. If you approach this here, with a length, and Virgin Island changes the length, you have to come back again and change it. The way it is now, you have it open. But anyway, it's up to you, whatever you want to do.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I agree with what María said and I would urge to the experts in the IPT if it's a concern to them, they'll come up with something.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay, we are ready. I think we have a rationale. Everybody accepts the language. I think we are ready to vote. María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Just for clarification then. That means that we have to bring back this whole action again to the IPT and add something for the length of the-- is that what you want? I couldn't understand very well what you were-- Carlos, are you wanting us to revisit this action with the gillnets and add an adequate or alternatives for a length?

Because if that's the case, I don't think this is what we are-- I mean, what is presented here will not cover your concerns. So, it will have to be revisited.

 ${\bf CARLOS}$   ${\bf FARCHETTE:}$  Okay. let me let it go for now. If something happens, then we can always—

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. And to that point, Mr. Chairman, just go ahead and do this because this is not in concrete and later you may be able to change it. You have time to change it. Remember, what you're doing is preparing a document for the Council to take the public hearings. So, we are first, yes. So probably by the time that we finish this process, we'll have better information. We'll have public input as to the best way to proceed as a Council. I remind you that the agenda is way behind.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And I think we are dragging our feet here and I think we are ready for to vote.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes

JAMES R. KREGLO: Yes.

**ANDREW STRELCHECK:** Yes.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Yes.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Yes.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

All in favor, motion carries. Next item on the agenda.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: No, no, I'm not done. You mean next action.

MARCOS HANKE: Next participation of María.

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Okay. I need to know who second for the record. Who seconded the motion? The recent motion, who second? Thank you.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. For the essence of time, I would like to request the Council, because we did divide the presentation and the actions are divided in the document by island, right. Saint Croix and Saint Thomas. It's exactly the same actions for Saint Croix and Saint Thomas. For Saint Thomas we will have to choose an alternative for gillnets as well, and trammel nets and purse seines. My recommendation will be to, if you want to go ahead and choose for Saint Thomas for the gillnets, and then choose for Saint Croix and Saint Thomas for trammel nets and purse seines. Otherwise, this is going to take a little bit longer because this is how it is set up in the document.

MARCOS HANKE: Can you explain because Carlos stepped away.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes. So, what we have next is Action 2(c) and Action 2(d), which is trammel nets and purse seines. Right. Which is a provision similar as Puerto Rico. There's an Action 3(c) and Action 3(d) for Saint Thomas and Saint John, which is exactly the same. I was going to suggest that if those motions could be done at the same time, however, by island, without having to go through the whole slides for Saint Thomas if they're okay, because it's exactly the same information that was provided for Saint Croix. And then we will have to make a decision for gillnets for Saint Thomas, which can be done now if you want as well. Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: María, can you help with the language? What will be the motion that will combine both so we can put it on the screen. I'm asking you to [crosstalk]

MARCOS HANKE: We're requesting for suggested language for what you say.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Combinando las dos cosas que tú dices.

4 5

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yeah. You can have the same language that was used for Puerto Rico for trammel nets and purse seines. I think Cristina and Liajay can just copy that. And then for gillnets, the same language that was just used for Saint Croix and then make a decision on those three.

And then in the meantime, before that is done, I just want to remind you that on Action 4 you already made a decision, and this is descending devices. So, in descending devices I can go in really quick after we make these motions and then that should be done. So probably within the next eight minutes, this should be done.

MARCOS HANKE: María, please help Liajay with the suggested language for the motion.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay, I think we are ready. So just to clarify here, right, in the essence of time, so the Council needs to make a decision for gillnets for Saint Thomas and Saint John. You could, if the Council is interested, can choose the same alternative that was chosen for Saint Croix, which will be what's Liajay has in there. So, you guys take it from here.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos, the suggested language. Are you in agreement?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes, I am. So, moved.

Okay. The Council adopts Action 2(b), Alternative 2. Subalternative 2(b) presented in the document as modified.

**MARCOS HANKE:** Any second?

35 CARLOS FARCHETTE: For Saint Thomas and Saint John.

JAMES R. KREGLO: I'll second that.

39 MARCOS HANKE: And it was second by Kreglo. Further discussion? 40 Hearing none, let's vote.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

**JAMES R. KREGLO:** Yes.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

```
1
 2
    CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.
 3
    RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Abstain.
 4
 5
 6
    NICOLE F. ANGELI:
                       Yes.
 7
 8
    MARCOS HANKE: One abstention and six 'yes'. Motion carries. Next,
 9
    María.
10
11
    MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. The next one is trammel nets for Saint
12
    Croix. Remember, Alternative 1 is to not make any changes.
13
    Alternative 2 is to prohibit the use of all trammel nets in the
14
    Saint Croix EEZ.
15
    CARLOS FARCHETTE:
16
                         The Council moves to select Action
    Alternative 2, as preferred for the Saint Croix District.
17
18
19
    MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: You need to vote.
20
21
    MARCOS HANKE: Did you present the motion? Any second?
22
23
    NICOLE F. ANGELI:
                       Second.
24
25
    MARCOS HANKE: Further discussion? Hearing none, let's vote.
26
27
    VANESSA RAMÍREZ:
                      Yes.
28
29
    JAMES R. KREGLO: Yes.
30
31
    ANDREW STRELCHECK: Do we not already have this as a preferred?
32
    Isn't this already a preferred in the amendment? It says it's
    preferred in the amendment I'm looking at. Okay. Yes.
33
34
35
    MARCOS HANKE:
                  Yes.
36
37
    CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.
38
39
    RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes.
40
41
    NICOLE F. ANGELI:
42
43
    MARCOS HANKE:
                   All in favor. Motion carries.
44
```

45 What else, María?

46

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: The same thing for -- that's purse seines. No. 47

The decision has to be made for Saint John for trammel nets. 48

```
1 2
```

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, for trammel nets, for Saint Croix? Oh, Saint Thomas/Saint John, yeah.

Trammel nets Saint Thomas/Saint John. The Council moves to select Action 2(c), Alternative 2 as preferred for the Saint Thomas Saint/John District.

11 MARCOS HANKE: Second?

13 JAMES R. KREGLO: Second.

15 MARCOS HANKE: Further discussion? Hearing none, let's vote.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

19 JAMES R. KREGLO: Yes.

21 ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

25 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes.

**NICOLE F. ANGELI:** Yes.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. And the last one purse seines will be Action 2(d) for Saint Croix and Action 3(d) for Saint Thomas and Saint John. And the same thing, purse seines Alternative 2 will prohibit the use of purse seines in the Caribbean EEZ and Alternative 1 is not do anything.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: For purse seines, the Council moves to select Action 2(d) Alternative three as preferred for Saint Croix.

**MARCOS HANKE:** Any second?

42 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Wait, wait. You can have both of them.

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: And also, for purse seines for the Saint Thomas/Saint John will be I think that's 3. Okay. Select Action 3(d), Alternative 3 as preferred for the Saint Thomas/Saint John District.

MARCOS HANKE: Just for the clarity on the record, can you read what the motion will say.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Just repeat it over.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, for purse seines, for the Island of Saint Croix, the Council moves to select Action 2(d), Alternative 3 as preferred. And for the Saint Thomas/Saint John District on purse seines, the Council moves to select Action 3(d), Alternative 3 as preferred.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. María, correct me if I'm wrong, we've already selected or preferred for Saint Croix. At least it's listed that way in the document. Unless that's a cut and paste there.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Um, it could have been that.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Okay. All right.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: In the presentation, we can follow the presentation. In the presentation in the table that I showed earlier it says that the trammel nets and the purse seines were not selected because this is when the Council was-- but we will make that correction in the document. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Any second for the motion presented by Carlos?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Second.

MARCOS HANKE: Any further discussion? Hearing none, let's vote.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

36 JAMES R. KREGLO: Yes.

38 ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

42 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

44 RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes.

**NICOLE F. ANGELI:** Yes.

48 MARCOS HANKE: All in favor. Motion carries.

1 2

One more and we need a break because people are requesting it.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: All right. And then the last thing that we're going to talk about, and I apologize, but you know, we wanted to separate this by island. It's better to have some clarity, even if it's repetitive. Okay?

We'll tighten it up a little bit more for the next one. Action 4. Requirements for the use of descending devices in the reef fish component of the Puerto Rico, Saint Croix and Saint Thomas and Saint John. You already chose a preferred alternative, which is "require descending device 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. And this is all included in the amendment. I'm going to read it for the record.

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 60-ft. 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.

This is the information that you received last time. If the Council agrees and doesn't want to make any more changes, then this is the last action.

MARCOS HANKE: I think we are very clear that this is the intent of the Council. Thank you.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Mm-hmm.

MARCOS HANKE: Anything else?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Nope. Just we will bring this document, we will make the clarifications regarding the gillnets and the species of baitfish, listing the species of baitfish on the alternative, as part of the management. We'll have to look into that. And then once we have that said, we will bring it back to the Council for further review. Okay. And we will be bringing the document back in August for your consideration. Thank you.

1 2

MARCOS HANKE: We're going to go for a break, but just before very quick, Julian.

**JULIAN MAGRAS:** Just a quick question for María. Is this voluntary or is this mandatory?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: So, the Council it's basically requiring that old fishers have that descending device on board in their vessels when they're fishing for reef fish only. So, Marcos, I think you want to probably talk a little bit more about how the Council is envisioning pursuing this? This is something that is also a requirement in the South Atlantic and in the Gulf.

### ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: The requirement is to have on board, but readily available. At this point, the way that it is written it relies on the expertise if the fish have barotrauma, which species it is, or whatever, the way you're going to use it, if you need to use, because not all the fish require the use of descending device. Right? There is some flexibility in there. If that's your concern, I want to hear what you have to say.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: But Marcos, if I may, what Julian is thinking is, you know, if you read the paragraph, it's voluntary to use it, but it's mandatory to have it on board so that's what he's asking. It's kind of if I want to be a fisherman, I will have to have all my regulations this way, I have everything on board, but I never use it.

So, at this time, probably when you will come back from public hearings and we survive the public hearings, we can inform the Council of what happened with this. But I think that Julian's question is your main to the issue here is whether this language make it, when you translate this into a regulation, whether it will be mandatory or voluntary to use the device.

I mean, the language is okay as the intent of the Council. You don't have to change it. It's just that the question is to clarify.

MARCOS HANKE: Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: So, from what I'm gathering from my peers here in the audience they're saying it's too generic. It needs to be a little bit more clarified to make sense.

And is this going to be for commercial and recreational or just

commercial? So, we need to ensure—we don't have a problem with doing it. We were in favor of the descending devices to be on board. I agree it's not everyone that's going to be using them, but you never know, depending on what type of fishing you're doing, that you're going to catch one of these species that needs to be descended.

4 5

So, I agree with it being but I, just-- the language there, from what I'm gathering, is not clarified enough. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes. So, Alternative 2 says, "Require the sending device be on board a commercial or recreational vessel and readily available for use while fishing or possessing species in the reef fish component."

One of the things that the Council mentioned is that this needs to be together with a very, very intense education and outreach campaign. Because there's many questions that fishers have. They want to know if this is something that applies to them or not. So that's something that the Council will work on and it's already working on to bring this out.

And of course, this still has to go for different periods of comments, of public comments. And there's plenty of time for all of us to prepare educational materials, which are a lot of materials out there that are available that the Council can also use to ensure that there is compliance with this.

I hope that answers your concern, Julian.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mr. Chairman, can we vote? Can we move to another screen? Did you finish?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Chat. Oh, Sarah.

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** Hi, this is Sarah Stephenson. I don't want to go back, but I just wanted to point out for the purse seines, the alternative that should be in the motion should be Alternative 2. There is no Alternative 3.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, we made the correction accordingly for the record.

46 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Sarah. We all need a break very soon. 47 I already clarified with Ruth. I was explaining to her that this 48 language comes from the South Atlantic and the intention of the language and this go to public hearing and so on, whatever, we still have opportunity to modify if it's needed, I think it is a great language and we are on the right path.

You have everything you need from us, María? Yes. Let's go for a break. We'll be back. We'll be back in five minutes. Seven and a half minutes.

(Whereupon a brief recess was taken.)

MARCOS HANKE: Please take your seats. Let's start the next presentation, we just finished with María. On this part, which is the next presentation, the report from the SSC, I just want to take the opportunity to welcome Vance Vicente as Chairman of SSC. Thank you for stepping up to the plate and being there for science and for the fishery of Puerto Rico and the U.S.V.I. Thank you so much.

I understand that there is no presentation at this time, which is totally understandable because you just were assigned to this position.

VANCE VICENTE: Okay, thank you very much.

MARCOS HANKE: And the next presentation is Ecosystem. Sennai? I'm not seeing-- is he around?

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Yeah, he went to the bathroom. He went to the restroom because I kept him on the break talking.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Let's do the DAP reports to advance and come back to Sennai in a moment for sake of time. Julian.

Are any of the DAP members ready? Go Nicky. Go first.

## District Advisory Panel Reports St. Croix, USVI-Gerson Martínez, Chair

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Good afternoon. Thank you, Chair. My name is Gerson Martínez, and here's my report for the District Advisory meeting. Seven members attended. One abstained. The Saint Croix District Advisory Panel was presented with the geographic area and responsibility for Saint Croix Island-Based Fishery Management Plan. Included in the discussion where the changes from the U.S. Caribbean wide plans to the importance of managing species that are directly targeted by each island district.

Also included in the discussion were all regulations that were

included in the island-based plan, such as queen conch, spiny lobster, snapper, grouper complex and aggregate bag limits for recreational fishers. Included from the old plan was the closed season prohibition, take species and annual catch limits.

We also discussed the status and current actions of the Council, such as Framework Amendment for spiny lobster, Framework Amendment for buoy gear, and Amendment for trawl and net gear and descending devices. We also discussed pelagic management measures for the dolphin and wahoo, possible modification of red hind seasonal closure area and for the Saint Croix EEZ and the possible development of a federal permit system.

A few members mentioned the need for compatible regulations and members discussed having separate annual catch limits for commercial and recreational whenever the recreational data became available. The District Advisory Panel members had a healthy discussion on a new species included for management, including discussing trip limits, size limits, bag limits, and the recreational and commercial sector. In the end, the DAP voted in favor, with one 'no.' They voted to include the size and bag limits for the recreational sector, but not for commercial sector.

The members also recommended the use of circle hooks instead of j-hooks for the pelagic fishery. For outreach and educational the DAP recommended introduction to commercial fishing to the junior high school level and the distribution of posters and materials to promote fishing at tackle shops and marinas.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Nicki. Julian.

# St. Thomas, USVI-Julian Magras, Chair

JULIAN MAGRAS: Julian Magras, for the record. Okay. We had a meeting on March 8<sup>th</sup>, 2023. We did have a quorum. We did have the presence of Federal Enforcement, Alex Terrero, which was very positive. We haven't had any enforcement present at our DAP meetings in a very long time. We look forward to hopefully having both federal and local at our next meeting.

 One of the outcomes on recommendations was that we needed more presence from the Division and Fish and Wildlife staff. Later in the day, we had the presence of Chief of Fisheries, Sennai Habtes that came in to clear up some of the questions that we had earlier in the day. So, with that said, we had presentations that was done on the Island-Based Fishery Management Plans for Saint

Thomas/Saint John by Dr. Graciela Moliner. And we had a presentation of the Outreach and Education Committee by Dr. Alida Ortiz

It was a very good meeting. There was a lot of discussions and one of the recommendations that came out for the outreach and education was it was put forward by a couple of our members that we need to create a book on species identification, biology, regulations, etcetera, for all areas, commercial and recreational for resource users. So, this book would be able to be put on like the day charter yachts that are going out, or weekly charter boats that are going out so they can understand the species and regulations that are in place. We have done a lot of work with placemats for the restaurants and education for some of the restaurants. What we've seen is that has been positive, and we need more of that to happen. I think this book would be a very positive because it can be placed in different areas and all of these charter vessels, which they could understand what we do and what we protect. So, they could also help us in protecting the resources.

We had some heavy, heavy discussion about the dolphin and the wahoo for Saint Thomas/Saint John. We had a motion that was placed forward by the committee where we would like to see the dolphin and the wahoo be removed from being managed by an annual catch limit and be managed in the recreational by a size and bag limit and in the commercial by a size limit. There's a lot of different rationale for this, but this is a species that is passing through. They are only passing through our waters for very, very limited amount of time. In the Saint Thomas/Saint John District, for the information that we have in the books, our ACL numbers are very low, and we see a problem where those numbers can be exceeded, especially with the new licenses that were given out this past registration for new commercial guys coming into the industry on the hook and line sector. So, it's a concern and if it is not possible for the dolphin and the wahoo to be removed from being managed by an annual catch limit, we are recommending that the Council put any accountability measures aside until we can collect enough data to set an annual catch limit that can really represent the commercial sector and the recreational sector.

 The problem with the recreational sector is we do not have a recreational fishing license in place at this present time. And from what was said at that meeting, that license will not be in place until, hopefully, the middle of 2024. So therefore, we're looking at requesting a four-to-five-year leniency on the closure of this species or any accountability measures until such time that we can collect enough data if, once again, it cannot be removed from being managed by an annual catch limit.

1 2

4 5

So that was the main, main discussion at the meeting. We did have discussions about the lobster and Island-Based Fishery Management Plan, but all what we did earlier today, that covered all of that. So, I wouldn't waste time and present that back on my report. So, I'm open up for questions and discussion, especially on the dolphin and wahoo aspect. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Julian. We are going to finish with Nelson, and we go back to the discussions and questions. Nelson.

### Puerto Rico-Nelson Crespo, Chair

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In the past meeting of the Puerto Rico DAP, which I consider was one of the best in a long time, several recommendations were made to this Council.

It's came to the light that in the past spiny lobster closure, a new site from Puerto Rico, NotiCel, published in its headlines that Puerto Rico would not have lobster until October, that they could not be fished, bought, or sold. This caused a great confusion in restaurant and refused to buy it as they thought it was an illegal act. The market of lobster was affected until the situation was clarified.

We suggest that when it's time to apply accountability measures, to use a simple and clear language to prevent it from happening again. We also recommend to the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel to issue a press release when these closures arise.

Another issue related to lobster was the ACLs table where it shows a reduction on the ACL for the next few years. The DAP wondered why this happened if during the past seven years, catches have been abundant, with a considerable mix of juveniles and adults. They also questioned if most of the catches take place in local waters, why closures are applied in federal waters. Regarding this matter, we recommend the following. A revision of spiny lobster ACL is necessary considering the biological size data. We recommend evaluating the possibility of obtaining statistics with an independent landing program.

We request to the SSC and the Science Center to hold a workshop with the existing projects using lobster as a model. We want to know which projects are running the data you need and how fishermen can collaborate. Maybe creating a committee that includes all sectors related to lobster fishing, like divers, pots and trammel netters, with scientific participation and direct guidance to contribute to the data of the lobster ACLs. We understand that the

participation of Kevin and other staff from the Science Center is necessary to do the things right and not waste more time.

In another matter, we recommend reviewing again the common names of the species and how they are named by region. An example of this is the Skipjack, this species is not the same as the albacore. In Puerto Rico, we call the skipjack 'vacora' and it's very important to clarify it since, in the past, Puerto Rico was awarded that it had fished a large part of the albacore's ACLs of the U.S. when this species is not found in our waters.

 Another recommendation to the Outreach and Educational Advisory Panel is to study the possibility of making a catalog or an identification book of species in the Caribbean, and once it has been drafted, consult with all the DAPs so they can make their comments and recommendation. It was also recommended to create a fact sheet of what the Bajo de Sico area is in term of regulations, and once that is done, send it to the DAPs for review and suggestions.

We recommend creating a workshop for DAP members, especially for the new ones, on management regulations, this way, it will be easier for them to participate and give recommendations. This could also serve of future benefit as they can guide the fishing community for the areas correctly. It could be a workshop like PEPCO or something similar.

Following the same line, we recommend to this Council to write a letter to the DNER recommending that all fishermen with a beginner license, before aspiring to obtain a full-time commercial fisherman's license, must take the PEPCO workshop as a requirement. Also, we recommend the same for the recreational fishers with the new workshop that Helena Antoun is offering--I think it's the PEPPER -- for them when they are coming to take the navigation certificate.

 It's hard and frustrating to see the disaster that occur this past Easter week in La Parguera where hundreds of boats were anchored damaging the ecosystem that is supposed to be protected by NOAA and the local government. That did not end there. Two manatees that are protected by the federal government were killed. One recreational vessel ran over two commercial fishermen who were returning to port and had to be taken to the hospital with serious injuries, and damage caused to their working vessels, with the luck that another boat was nearby and able to take the registration number because they did not stop and ran away. It's time to address these issues seriously and at least with the limited resources available, try to put some order to this situation that day by day

is growing like a snowball.

1 2 3

4 5

6 7

8

Regarding the issue of fishing nets, we recommend that the use of trawlers be prohibited in federal waters. It is recommended to leave open fishing for ballyhoo, goggle eye fish, flyingfish and species used as bait in federal waters with the gillnet. We believe that this is necessary to create a support group when describing the fishing nets, so they are more in tune with the reality to avoid possible confusion in the future.

9 10 11

12

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

In other business, we discussed a concern of the fishing community from the West side of the Island. It turns out that in intervention by the federal authorities with a charter boat in Bajo de Sico, they advised the captain that it is prohibited to catch rainbow runner during the six-month closure period of the area because this species is classified as a reef fish. We all thought that this species was classified as a pelagic and when talking to divers, they told us that they have never seen rainbow runners at the bottom, but they have seen them in the water columns. This species was captured mostly in Bajo de Sico and around the water of Desecheo Island in the water column, either by trolling or with life bait. This is a great important species for commercial fishing. Keeping the rainbow runner as a reef fish could cause the pressure fishing increase around the waters of Desecheo Island, which could consequently cause the possibility that in the future this species could be in danger. For this reason, recommend moving the rainbow runner from a reef fish to a pelagic fish. Thank you.

282930

#### Questions/Comments

313233

John.

Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE:

MARCOS HANKE:

343536

37

38

39

40

41 42

43

44

45

JOHN WALTER, III: Thank you, Nelson. There was a lot in there. Actually, all of the reports from the DAPs are very valuable and I'm wondering if there's a written version of it because I didn't catch all of it and so much of it went by fast, but there's a lot of details that I think are important. Could you submit the written version to the briefing book for all of the DAP reports, because I, maybe I missed them because I think it helps us to then follow up with one of the topics and see what we could do about that. Because I think it touches on science topics, it touches on management and then it touches, it looks like on some other issues as well. And I thank you for that very comprehensive readout.

46 47 48

NELSON CRESPO: Yes, sure. Liajay has the paper already.

1 2

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. I think the request is super pertinent because the DAP, what they can support the work of the Council is tremendously important. We need to register and to have those written on record and available for everybody to see it and to benefit from it. I think that's a good point that you guys should be ready for it. Miguel?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yes. Just send it to Cristina and it will be part of the record.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: I've already received the document from Liajay, and I will include in the briefing book.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. Well wait until they send each one of the emails because they add a little bit more information.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Alida.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Yes. I did participate in the meetings with all the DAPs, each one of the Islands and what Nelson said, we have already included it in the report that I'm going to make tomorrow. I will request the Council to approve what they want.

MARCOS HANKE: Because of time and this your opportunity, I want, because there is a lot of things brought to the table, I don't want to miss anything. I'm going to go one by one.

Julian, which issue you want the Council to address or to move forward or to analyze. A specific one.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Julian Magras for the record. Well, I think right now the most important issue that we have standing is the issue with the mahi and the wahoo. We would like to know, if at all possible, that we can remove these two species from being managed by an ACL and to be managed recreationally by a bag and size limit and commercially by a size limit with mandatory reporting for both sectors. So, the powers that be, if you can let us know if that is possible and then from there, I will give my next statement.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. You and I talked a little bit about it before. So, we are going to send a communication to Kate on those two questions, our legal counsel, and then probably at the August meeting, we will be able to provide you with the information that

we need to move forward. We are going to also discuss the dolphin and the wahoo here, so probably we'll knock on your door for comments when we get to that in the agenda.

MARCOS HANKE: And, Julian, just because we are going to consult with Kate, is there anything else to be consulted?

 JULIAN MAGRAS: Well, the second part of it, if those two species cannot be removed from being managed by annual catch limit, it's the accountability measures issue that we would like to be addressed, if can be. So, you know, it's on the record what we want. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, and certainly Kate can weigh in as well. So, I guess a couple things. One is we just added this right to the management plan through the Island-Based FMP. So, there was a rationale record as to why they're in need of federal management and that happened seven months ago, right? In terms of official rule making.

So, the Council, if they wanted to remove it, would have to come up with a justification of why it's no longer needed of federal management, right? And I think it's probably premature to decide that even if you didn't remove it the Magnuson Act requires federal fisheries to have an annual catch limit and accountability measures with limited exceptions and there's very limited exceptions with regard to what could be excluded from annual catch limits. So, under federal fisheries law, you would have to have the annual catch limits and accountability measures and could also impose other management measures at that time.

In terms of the accountability measures, I mean, certainly would look to María or Sarah, but right now they're fairly generic with regard to setting the catch target and not really triggering specific accountability measures. So, I think those are up for discussion revision based on what we continue to learn about these pelagic species going forward.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think in our case, I support Julian's statement regarding the mahi, and I think it's better to consider a size limit between 20 and 24 inches for the Dorado. I think it's very important Marcos to attend the issue of the rainbow runners. This fishery is really important in the West coast of Puerto Rico. It's a big market right now, and we are

really concerned about this issue. For me, that's the most important topic because regarding the lobster is attended already, and I think we are good with that.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. I'll go back to the Rainbow Runner. Katherine Zamboni.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. For the record, Kate Zamboni, NOAA's office of General Counsel. Just wanted to address the question about removing dolphin and wahoo from federal management. Andy summarized it perfectly there. It's basically the same process that the Council would undertake for determining whether to add a new species for management. So, there would have to be findings made and a record to support that these species are no longer in need of federal management. Again, as Andy said, as long as they are part of the FMP and federally managed there really does need to be an ACL. There isn't really a process by which you can just set one aside, but it sounds like the ACL is not currently constraining the catch. So, I don't know that that's, that's necessary to pursue further. You can let me know if you have any other questions.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Thank you very much. Eddie. [Laughter]

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Gerson Martínez, for the record. I think it's very important that I bring across this thought. We have been trying to take off the effort from the reef by protecting the reef resource and if we take away the ability to catch pelagic in a dangerous or un-- I don't know if I-- I don't want to say the wrong words --in a way that brings back that pressure on the reef, then we are going to be defying the purpose of protecting the reef and the species that are more important than fishes that are passing through. Because pelagics just passed through our waters, but the reefs are here, the reef fish and the reef structures are here to stay.

So, in my years of fishing since 1993, I've noticed, I was one of the fishermen that normally when the polices were running, I stopped targeting reef fish and I move into pelagics and if we do that, if we move back to put in that effort back to the reef, then we are not going to be doing our homework and protecting our reefs and the reef fish that are more important than those pelagics.

 MARCOS HANKE: Yeah. Thank you. I think we will be addressing the dolphin and this issue, and there is a path already stated by Miguel to address your request and the concerns into the future. But at this meeting later with the presentation of Wess, we're going to discuss this a little more. María, about the rainbow

runner was very loud and clear and I identified something that we can be proactive with the rainbow runner issue. Can you say something about it?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yeah. So, in terms of the species the Council can always recommend, perhaps, task the SSC, for looking into the species and see if it merits a reclassification from the reef fish to the pelagic group based on the information that they are able to gather and then report back to the Council.

And then after that report back, then the Council can decide if they want to add it into one of the actions as a, if it's merited, to reclassify it as a pelagic species. Based on all the testimony that we have heard today, some information that is included in the Fishery Management Plan and the information that the SSC may be able to gather, then you guys can recommend it be included as a measure in a future amendment, but one amendment that is already on the works, for example.

MARCOS HANKE: I did my assignment. I consulted with Council members of Puerto Rico and the DAP, and I was on the DAP meeting, and I would for them to hear what just you say, to include on the agenda of the SSC, the discussion of the rainbow runner, to move them from reef fish to pelagic. Nobody in opposition to. Okay. So be it. Go ahead.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Just a clarification, this will be for this upcoming meeting of the SSC.

MARCOS HANKE: That's correct.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: We have a pending presentation from Sennai.

## Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Technical Advisory Panel Report

 **SENNAI HABTES:** Yep. Good afternoon, everyone. Just an update on the EBFM Technical Advisory Panel and I'll keep it brief because I know we have a lot of things to get through. We will be meeting in three weeks from May  $1^{\rm st}$  to May  $5^{\rm th}$ , along with the SSCs. At that meeting, we'll be doing the drafting for the outlines for the EBFM for the Fisheries Ecosystem Plan.

 During that time, we hope to have everyone in attendance to allow us to create an outline. I will also introduce our panel to the technical writers that we have been able to hire thanks to partners that are working with us on developing the Fisheries Ecosystem Plan for the EBFM. Our hope is to have a completed framework for the Council to preliminary review after it goes to the SSC by the end of the year. That will be drafted in part by the technical writers as well as myself and the co-Chair of the panel.

In addition to that, we have had two presentations that have been given by partners on Lenfest, that was J.J. Cruz Motta as well as Tarsila Seara, one at the National SSC meeting and another that was a webinar provided by them for the Lenfest Ecosystems Group that just happened last week. They have completed all of their conceptual models and compiled all of that information and that will be provided to the technical writers for drafting in the FEP. So that's where we are at this point with the development, the FEP and the EBFM TAP. We are looking forward to the joint meeting with the SSC and hope for it to be very productive.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for a very informative short report. Thanks so much. The next presentation, no questions. The next presentation is Sarah about dolphin and wahoo.

# Review Draft Amendment 3 to the St. Croix and St. Thomas/St. John Fishery Management Plans to Develop Management Measures for Dolphin and Wahoo

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** Okay. We strategically placed this one after the DAP reports because what they said will be relative, pertinent, to this discussion. So, I'm going to just give a quick update of Amendment 3 to the Saint Croix FMP and the Saint Thomas and Saint John FMP, which would establish new management measures for dolphin and wahoo.

Next, please.

So, from the December meeting, if you remember, we had this generic amendment, so all three FMPs. We gave a presentation on that draft amendment. We reviewed a list of data and information needs that the planning team had. We discussed some of those in-house such as the seasonality of the species. We reviewed commercial landings data. Again, we didn't have any recreational landings data for the U.S.V.I. We did review some for Puerto Rico from 2000 to 2016 for these management measures.

And then, we reviewed draft options for size limits, recreational bag limits, and commercial trip limits. At that time, the Council recommended splitting the Puerto Rico FMP out and so, what we're left with is the Amendment 3 to the two individual U.S.V.I FMPs. And another amendment to the Puerto Rico FMP will come at a later

time.

Next, please.

4 5

So, the restructured draft amendment is going to look very similar to what María presented. We split it out first by island and then by species.

So, there's four actions, one for dolphin in St Croix, one for wahoo in Saint Croix, and then dolphin in Saint Thomas/Saint John, and wahoo in Saint Thomas/Saint John. Under each of those actions, you have the A, B, and C sub-parts to establish either size limits. Right now, it's structured to size limits for both sectors, so it's just for all fishing. To establish recreational bag limits is the (b) of each of the action numbers. And then commercial trip limits is the (c).

Next slide, please.

The draft purpose and need that was included in the original draft amendment pretty much just came right over, except now it's only pertinent to the Saint Croix FMP and the Saint Thomas and Saint John FMP. The words that are in red, size limits, recreational bag limits and commercial trip limits. That's what we currently have in the amendment and if that gets modified here today, staff will come back and modify the purpose and need as applicable.

And similarly, the need, the second bullet point here, the need for the amendment as of right now, is to develop conservation and management measures for dolphin and wahoo to ensure undersized individuals adequate time to mature and reproduce and then, consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the National Standards, to protect against overfishing or prevent annual catch limits from being exceeded, while achieving optimal yield. And so, that second couple points kind of go towards the bag limits and the commercial trip limits.

Next slide, please.

So, during our IPT meeting that was had between the December meeting and now, the IPT had a couple additional questions, which really came down to why do you want these management measures? It was pretty clear from the rationale for the size limits, why you might want that when we hear of fishing of undersized dolphin on the sargassum mats that come through. But they really wanted to know what the problem is, especially now that we've split it out and these are specific to the U.S.V.I. What was a problem? Or is there a problem from recreational fishing of these species and

then also commercial trip limits.

2

4 5

6

7

9

10

11

And so, you can see here the kind of idea for why you might implement some of these measures. So, for size limits, they're generally based on biology of the species, and you put them in place to make sure that the fish have enough time to reproduce before they're removed from the fishery. Recreational bag limits are generally used to prevent over harvest of recreational ACLs, which we don't have for the U.S.V.I. or extend the fishing season, which for the U.S.V.I. currently is all year. And then they're also used to reduce harvest levels or discards or comply with jurisdictions or reduce enforcement issues.

12 13 14

15

16

17

18

So, those are some issues to keep in your head to think about as we move through this presentation. And then for commercial trip limits, they're generally used to slow the rate of harvest, again, to extend the commercial season, which right now is all year or to reduce the risk of ACLs being exceeded, and those would be commercial ACLs.

19 20 21

Next slide.

2223

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

So, we took those questions of, why these issues may be needed? Why are these management measures needed? to the DAPs, which you heard the report out. And forgive me if I get any of these bullet wrong, but the Saint Thomas and Saint recommendations that are kind of specific to these three management measures were, no commercial trip limits due to the seasonal nature of the fish. They're only there for a short time, so we don't want any restrictions. Size limits for both sectors commercial and recreational and that's, again, to protect the reproductive capacity of the stock. And then, they did recommend recreational bag limits, and this was a per species, so one for dolphin, one for wahoo, not an aggregate, to address the lack of recreational data available and the potential overharvest of the species from that sector. Again, there are no recreational catch limits, so this could be a way to kind of constrain that sector.

373839

40

41

42 43 They did suggest more conservative catch limits or bag limits, five dolphin per person per day/30 dolphin per vessel per day, two wahoo per person per day/ or six wahoo per vessel per day. And so, you'll see those in the draft amendment. There was enough time to get those updated for your consideration. And so, I'll point those out later.

44 45 46

47

48

From the Saint Croix DAP no commercial trip limits. Again, due to the seasonal nature of the fish. They wanted no limitations on the size of the fish. That should say for the commercial sector, they did recommend it for the rec sector. And then, recreational bag

And they didn't have specific numbers that they recommended. They asked that maybe the Saint Croix FAC, which hadn't met at that time, maybe consider that and give feedback to them that that could be brought to this meeting for the Council consideration.

Next slide, please.

So, this is a big high-level overview of the four actions with the three sub-parts, with all of the alternatives that were kind of prepared or developed for these species. So, you can see in the first row, Saint Croix dolphin for size limits, which is the (a), there are three alternatives. No size limit, a 20-inch fork length size limit, or a 24-inch size limit. And that is going to be the exact same recommendations alternatives for dolphin in Saint Thomas and Saint John and that's because it's based on the biology of the species. So, you can see in the third row there the same exact numbers.

And then Action 2, the second line, wahoo in Saint Croix, has no size limit for wahoo, a 32-inch size limit is the second alternative, and then Alternative 3 is a 40-inch. And again, those same numbers are repeated in the last row, Action 4, which is Saint Thomas/Saint John wahoo.

The middle column, the (b) the recreational bag limits, the first row, Saint Croix dolphin, there's no action. Do not establish recreational bag limits. Alternative 2, 10 dolphin per person per day, not to exceed 32 dolphin per vessel per day, would be compatible with new regulations that are adopted by the U.S.V.I. that aren't implemented yet, so there would be compatibility there. And then 3 is to be determined because at the time of preparation of this document, there wasn't a more conservative or an alternative that was proposed by anybody. So, that that could be developed, or it could just be removed, and you stick with the two alternatives.

Then the next one down, in the (b) column, Saint Croix wahoo is a similar kind of thing. No bag limits, 4 wahoo per person per day, 20 wahoo per vessel per day, which would be compatible with the U.S.V.I. new regulations for recreational fishing. And again, that "to be determined" for Alternative 3, you could add something, or you could strike it.

So, in Saint Thomas and Saint John you have the same, Alternative 2, that's compatible with the U.S.V.I. for both species. And then,

as I mentioned, the Saint Thomas/Saint John DAP did recommend numbers. And so, they're in here in red because you as the Council, have not seen them yet, but we put them in there for your consideration.

And then the last column is commercial trip limits, which both DAPs recommended not developing. And so, if the Council would like to develop, you could come up with numbers that you recommend or you could provide rationale as to why you think that those are needed and send it back to the IPT and the IPT could develop numbers. I would just point out the little asterisks there that if we do want to develop those, we would just also need to identify what unit those trip limits are in. Are they in numbers of fish or in pounds of whole weight?

Next slide, please.

So, I'm going to go break those down a little bit one by one, starting with size limits for dolphin. You'll see here that this is applicable to Action 1(a), which is Saint Croix and Action 3(a), which is Saint Thomas/Saint John. But since they're size limits, they're based on biology, it's the same number.

So Alternative 1 is no size limits. All dolphin that's caught could be kept. And this again, applies to both sectors, commercial and recreational. The Council, if you choose, you could split that out and have it be pertinent to just one sector.

Alternative 2 would establish the 20-inch fork length minimum which corresponds to about 50% of the females being mature, meaning that they're capable of reproducing before they're removed, or they have reproduced before they're removed by the fisheries.

And then, Alternative 3 would establish a larger fork length minimum which corresponds to about a hundred percent of the females. So, all the females theoretically would have spawned before they're removed from the fishery. And the rationale here, which is in black font because it's pretty solid, is to ensure that undersized individuals have time to mature and reproduce.

Next slide, please.

And so, just looking really quick at the effects of those two actions, both of the action alternatives, meaning establishing a size limit, would have more biological benefits than the first one because they would return smaller dolphin to the water, which would give them more time to mature and reproduce, which in turn would provide long-term economic benefits through a healthier fishery.

So, on the flip side, Alternatives 2 and 3 could have short term negative socioeconomic effects if fishers prefer to, or just catch smaller dolphin and want to be able to keep those. So that could impact them in the short term, potentially in the long term, but more of a short-term effect as they get used to the new regulations and just move on.

4 5

So, Alternatives 2 and 3 could have more regulatory discards because now there's a size that has to be thrown back and as we heard at some of the DAP during the discussion, sometimes these fish swallow the hook hole, and so if you have to throw them back, they're dead and so that could increase dead discards. So, we would just want to kind of consider that. Obviously, if you pick a bigger size limit, more fish are going to be thrown back unless there's nothing but large fish out there. So, both Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 would require rulemaking, which is this amendment here to implement the size limits. They would probably require additional education and outreach, and they could create enforcement issues if the state does not adopt compatible regulations.

Next.

So, this is going to look very similar for wahoo because it's the same concept. Alternative 1, no size limit, all wahoos could be kept. Alternative 2 is the 32-inch fork length, which corresponds to about 50% of the females being mature. And then, Alternative 3 is a 40-inch fork length, which corresponds about all females being mature. And again, the rationale was pretty clear, it's to give undersized individuals time to reproduce.

Next slide.

And then similarly, the effects of the action are going to be very similar to the dolphin. They're almost identical. Actually, I don't see anything that's different. So, they pretty much are the same considerations that you want to think about as they were for dolphin. Same impact to the fishers, same benefit to the biology of doing this.

Next slide, please.

So now we move on to recreational bag limits, and this is for dolphin in both Saint Croix, which is Action 1(b) and Saint Thomas and Saint John, which is Action 3(b). Alternative 1-- oh.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Sarah, excuse me. I was confirming with the Chair here would it be possible to stop and then the Council discuss the

size limit and then continue. Or do you prefer to continue and finish and come back?

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** It's up to you. I don't have a preference. Okay.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. Because I was thinking, Mr. Chairman, perhaps deal with the size limit and then continue with the rest.

MARCOS HANKE: I am super ready to discuss this. I think the Council is ready to discuss this and let's start with the size limit discussion. Carlos.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mr. Chairman, before you jump into the whole thing. we have a presentation by Wessley, Dr. Merten, this afternoon. In a nutshell, what he's proposing is a 20-inch size limit for the hippurus, for the dolphin, the big one. And also, I was going to mention just for your consideration, the Flyingfish Dolphin Wahoo Working Group of the WECAFC is going to meet in the fall this year.

One of the few things that that the countries agree on based on their biology, the socio-economy, etcetera, the dolphinfish is the size limit. So, I believe that that's the first thing for your consideration, whether that would be good or not.

 ${\bf MARCOS\ HANKE:}$  Yes. We all received the email with a letter that Wess sent to us with very important information. Carlos.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Motion?

MARCOS HANKE: No, no. Discussion. Discussion.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, no, no. Wait, wait.

MARCOS HANKE: You can do a motion if you want to.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah. I got it.

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** So, going back to the very first one, which is size limits for dolphin in Saint Croix and then dolphin in Saint Thomas and Saint John. And here's your three alternatives that are applicable to that species in both islands.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I can just cover both islands one time. Okay. So, I motion to establish Action 1, Alternative 3. Establish a 24-inch fork length minimum size limit for dolphin in federal waters for the Saint Croix, Saint Thomas/Saint John District. Okay. Oh--

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mira, tiene una piedra para tirarte.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Sorry about that Liajay. So, are we going to open up a page? Sarah.

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** I just have a question to clarify. Is that a size limit that would apply to both sectors, to all fishing.

9 MARCOS HANKE: Sarah and Carlos? Just a comment because I heard 10 from the DAP of Puerto Rico, he probably has a suggestion to make. 11 Go ahead, Nelson.

**MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:** But Marcos, this is for the U.S. Virgin Islands at this time only.

MARCOS HANKE: That's the question. Let Nelson make the question and create a record. Anyway, Nelson, let's wait for them to finish and I'll give you the floor.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Okay. So, move Action 1(a), Alternative 3 establish a 24-inch fork length minimum size for dolphin in federal waters for the Saint Croix, Saint Thomas/Saint John District. For all sectors, right, commercial and recreational.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Second.

MARCOS HANKE: Discussion? Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelson Crespo, for the record. I suggest that Puerto Rico be included in that motion.

MARCOS HANKE: Do you have your rationale for it?

NELSON CRESPO: Oh, definitely. A 24-inch mahi is about a five pounder, six pounders, no more than that. Restaurant don't want to buy small mahis. Why? Because the filet is too thin and it's not attractive for the consumers. They prefer, instead of buying the small mahi, they prefer to buy the mahi that comes already filet from outside and packaged already portions that is cheaper and faster to cook. So, it is an action to protect the fishery. I'm totally convinced that 24 inches is a good size to be included.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Just a reminder besides that, we don't want mahi to be converted into a deep fry fish small size, and we don't want, with the sargassum influx, extended pressure into the juveniles that has been happening for the last 11 years. I have a question for you, Sarah. The request from Nelson can be addressed now or what do we need to do?

2 3 4

1

SARAH STEPHENSON: So, I was going to point out that we still will need to develop an amendment for the pelagic species for Puerto Rico. We've identified the species at the last meeting, so we know 5 which one, and dolphin is one of those. When we were showing the slides with all of the actions and asking the Council to think 6 7 about priorities, that's something that maybe tomorrow, at the end 8 of the day, we could present you with that same slide and say, 9 "okay, here's the Puerto Rico one. Do you want that to be a higher priority than say a different amendment?" And we can, it'll be in 10 11 the record now that that's a recommendation, so when we get to the 12 dolphin size limit, we already know that that's what we're going 13 to recommend.

14 15

16

So, I don't want to say it can't go in here, but it should wait and go in the Puerto Rico amendment and the Council can determine priority.

17 18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for your guidance. I would like to hear from, if there-- the thing is that I have been in all those meetings and the intention of the Council about the minimum size, and the industry, It's loud and clear. Right? And if there is a way that is legal and is correct to include now, because the rationale and the language that you presented apply a hundred percent to Puerto Rico, right? It's just a procedural thing. I want to know from Legal Counsel if there is any problem with including-

26 27 28

29

30

31

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: It's not a matter of legal stuff, it's a matter of the work that the staff and IPT is doing. Right now, they already have the essence of what the Council wants. So let them do the work. Here they completed for the U.S. Virgin Islands the action for the dolphin and wahoo.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42 43

44

45 46

Sarah is very clear that in the case of Puerto Rico in the documents, they would like to have the same consideration for the dolphin, the minimum size. So, rest assured that that will be included in the document. But what Sarah is also saying is that in the case of Puerto Rico-- and remember these are the different island-based FMPs, that's the reason and the rationale why they were approved. Each one is different. But in this case, they have the same common goal of having the size limit. And they also have a preferred size, which is 24 inches. So, already Sarah has that element of information and when she presents that document to us with the Puerto Rico side, they will have the list of the priority species, when the dolphin is touched on, they will say, "okay. We also have the 24 minimum size for the dolphin" But let her finish the work.

47 48

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Cristina, you have somebody on the hands up.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Katherine Zamboni.

MARCOS HANKE: Katherine.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Katherine Zamboni, for the record. NOAA, Office of General Counsel. Yeah, it's primarily an organizational issue to try to keep all the actions related to the islands together.

But I just want to remind the Chair that there's been no vote on what the preferred alternative would be for Puerto Rico. So, I don't know, if you want to give staff that direction in the future document of what the preferred alternative would be, it would be appropriate to take a vote on that before moving on.

MARCOS HANKE: Just to be clear, a vote on the recommendation and the suggestion that Nelson brought to the table, which is the 24-inch minimum size.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Correct. For Puerto Rico. And you still need to vote on the motion. Well, you've got multiple motions going on right now, but I think you still need to vote on the motion to make Alternative 3, the preferred alternative for Saint Croix, Saint Thomas and Saint John. And then you could then entertain the motion from Nelson to identify a similar alternative as preferred for the future action regarding Puerto Rico.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, and I wanted to look to Sarah and María. So, Kate covered my first comment, which is making a separate motion to add that action and select it as preferred for Puerto Rico. But from a staff perspective, María and Sarah, is it easier to add it into this document or would it be easier to bring back a separate document?

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** I would say that's depending on as we move forward, maybe what Puerto Rico might want to do for dolphin or wahoo with the rec bag limits and the commercial trip limits.

So, if they want to do the exact same or they're okay with the alternatives as presented for the U.S.V.I., then I think we could make this an amendment for dolphin and wahoo and all three FMPs and that would be fairly simple because the rationale would be the same. And then at a later time we could do another pelagic amendment if the Council wants it for the other pelagic stocks

that have been identified. So, we could do that, if that makes sense.

MARCOS HANKE: It truly makes sense. Let's finish then with what we are doing. I'm sorry to interrupt, but it's important to bring Puerto Rico to the discussion because it's important, right? We are part of the island-based too.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: I guess we all agree on that. The problem we're talking about is the procedure. So, you can vote on this one, get it on the screen, and then the intention of the Council for Puerto Rico is that the dolphin will have a-- and we haven't talked about wahoo yet --the dolphin will have the same measure. Marcos, tienes a Andy.

MARCOS HANKE: Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. My suggestion would be vote this up. Let's get through this amendment as it's written today and present it to us and then if we need to make decisions about how to include Puerto Rico or bring back a separate document, we can do that at the end.

MARCOS HANKE: Let's do so. Any further discussion on this motion? Carlos?

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Yeah.

MARCOS HANKE: We are discussing the motion of 24 inches still.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah. Okay. So, I think I want to include this rationale here. Go ahead. I keep forgetting.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, the rationale for this Action will allow female dolphinfish to reach full maturity with the ability to release more eggs compared to the alternative two 20-inch fork length and studies show that dolphinfish can reproduce from 16 to 18 inches. A proven Action 1(a), Alternative 3, will translate to millions more eggs in the water before the species is harvested.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: ¿Lo escribiste, Liajay? No, no tienes que escribirlo. We're kidding.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Any further comments we need to speed up.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I got a question here.

```
1
 2
    MARCOS HANKE: Question. Carlos.
 3
    CARLOS FARCHETTE: I thought, isn't this supposed to be Action 3,
 4
 5
    not 3(a)?
 6
    SARAH STEPHENSON: I just had her fix it. So, you're selecting
 7
    Alternative 3, which is 24 inches in both Action 1(a), which is
 8
 9
    Saint Croix dolphin, and Action 3(a), which is Saint Thomas/Saint
10
    John dolphin. Okay.
11
12
                   Are you clear with the motion and language? Okay.
    MARCOS HANKE:
13
    No further discussion, I am not seeing any hands up. Let's vote.
14
    VANESSA RAMÍREZ:
15
                      Yes.
16
17
    JAMES R. KREGLO:
                     Yes.
18
19
    ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes.
20
21
    MARCOS HANKE:
22
23
    CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.
24
25
    RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes.
26
27
    NICOLE F. ANGELI:
28
29
    MARCOS HANKE:
                   All in favor. Motion carries.
30
31
    SARAH STEPHENSON:
                       Okay, this is Sarah again. Once she's done
32
    typing, we can do the same exercise for size limits for wahoo.
33
34
    This would be Action 2(a) and Action 4(a).
35
    CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, for wahoo. Motion to accept Action 2(a)
37
    alternative -- well, no, you already put that up. Okay.
39
40
```

36

38

Establish a 32-inch fork length minimum size limit for wahoo in federal waters for the Saint Thomas/Saint John and Croix District.

41

42 MARCOS HANKE: Any second for the motion.

43

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: 44 Second.

45

46 MARCOS HANKE: Open discussion. No discussion. Let's vote. Andy, 47 Julian, and Carlos.

48

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Go ahead. I'd like to hear from Julian first. JULIAN MAGRAS: Well, I just have a question that was just asked to me by my colleagues. We see that this is the size limit, is there a different motion that will address the bag limits? Okay, thank you.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes. So, my question for Carlos. I heard the rationale for dolphin in terms of avoiding, obviously, undersized fish. We selected the preferred as a hundred percent maturity, right? for Dolphin, but we're selecting the size limit that corresponds with fifty percent maturity with wahoo. So that's obviously great, it's a good step in the right direction. But is there any reason to select the smaller size limit for wahoo based on your experience fishing in U.S.V.I. versus the 40-inch size limit?

MARCOS HANKE: The rationale is that the way the fish is used and fished there's a different yield and a different use. For example, you can stake the wahoo at that size. It's going to be a valuable product into the market on that size. Which is a different scenario on the rationale for the mahi, on the smaller mahi, because it's a filet fish. There are others, but that's the main one. We have Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: The Saint Thomas/ Saint John District requested a 40-inch size minimum size limit for the wahoo. So, if Saint Croix wants the 32, I think it needs to be two separate motions. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: It's fine. Okay. Andy, you were going to follow up.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: We'll just have another question now for Nicole, but I'll make the comment that I would support either size limit in this instance, the 32 inches obviously provides size of 50% maturity, so we are protecting at least some portion of the fish that are going to be undersized and not mature enough to reproduce but would ask Nicole, what challenges does a size limit for Saint Croix being different from Saint Thomas/Saint John present the U.S.V.I.?

 NICOLE F. ANGELI: Yeah. Thank you for the question, Andy. We would support having consistent fork length measures in both districts for enforcement purposes. We currently have one, NOAA OLE. We have approximately six officers in each district. It's very difficult for us when we're in the middle of our waters to be looking at where you're catching fish for the enforcement issues. I just don't think-- and we also have fishers that fish in both waters. And so, I would just put that to everyone. We want to do what's best for

the resource and we additionally recognize that we have consistent issues with a lack of capacity for enforcement and management actions.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I mean, I can probably simplify this by changing this, the 32 to 40. We know that wahoos are not as abundant as mahis are. So, the bigger the fish, the more they have a chance to reproduce at maturity. If that's not a problem, I'll change it.

MARCOS HANKE: One second. Gerson wants to add something.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: I can't remember the specific numbers that we discussed on the DAP meeting. I don't know if Miguel can recall those numbers, but it was close to the 40 inches because they were using numbers that when they do tournaments, those were the numbers that were legal to keep when they were doing those tournaments. So maybe we can look back into the DAP minutes and figure out, because the motion was made to use those exact numbers. I cannot say 40 for certain, but those meeting minutes have what the DAP discussed on accepting.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: They also discuss what is the minimum they have in the Virgin Islands. You have a size limit for wahoo in the Virgin Islands?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: No. I'm not sure, but I know they have a 32-inch minimum size for mahi in tournaments.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So that's my point, that in wahoo, as far as I know, you don't have a size limit at this time for wahoo.

Okay. That the point that you don't have that. So, if we follow, then you have to look at the correct language from the presentation that Sarah put together and see where you could--

MARCOS HANKE: Sarah.

SARAH STEPHENSON: I believe I remember from that conversation that they talked about 36 inches. I can verify it from my notes, but you are free to suggest an alternative size than the two that were presented here. So, for instance, if I verify, and the DAP recommended 36, and if both DAPs are more okay with that, then that could be added as an alternative and you could select that. So, if you like, I can go check.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. But the other thing is that you have to

add a language as to why you're choosing that. It's not to pick a number out. So, for example, the ones that you approve already is that this size will protect 50% of the females. These other side will protect a hundred percent of the fish. That's what you need, that's the information that you need for your rationale.

So, my suggestion is that we allow the people, the staff to find the biology or the information, the biology of the animal and that percentage, you do the same thing that you did with the dolphin, but the intent of the Council is to establish the size limit for wahoo, as big as possible, to protect the spawners. And then it will be anywhere from 34 to 40.

MARCOS HANKE: Just a point of clarification. We are discussing the motion that was presented and second as part of the discussion. And there is a language being suggested change in terms of the number and you are the owner of the motion.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. But, Marcos, point of clarification. The motion that you put together was 36 and then he decided to change it, so we started doing that.

MARCOS HANKE: 32. Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, I mean, so we haven't voted on the motion, so just as a point of order, if you wanted to change it from 32 to 40, you're welcome to do that, but you need to get your seconder to agree to that change as well. Yeah, yeah.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Yeah. Director Angeli made a very good point here. We have fishermen in Saint Croix that go to north of Saint Thomas to fish. So, to have a different size limit in both districts is going to be very problematic. So, I would go ahead and agree with a 40-inch. Change to 40-inch for standardization.

MARCOS HANKE: And Vanessa, do you agree with that change?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes, I agree.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. We can keep the discussion. Is there any further discussion on the motion? John.

JOHN WALTER, III: Mr. Chair, I guess one question I might ask some of the DAP Chairs about whether there are small fish landed and what the mortality of those fish might be. And one of the concerns is we think that these are all good measures to protect fish, but if there is a substantial mortality either from the fishing experience or after release, you wind up not achieving

that protection that you want. And so, that's just something that I think needs to be discussed, because we can— and maybe I'd like to hear— from my experience with wahoo, if the fishery is a trolling based fishery, those small wahoos often are somewhat drowned by the time they come back in. And so, I don't know if mortality is an issue, and I just wanted some conversation there. Thank you.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. There is two very general lines in terms of what happened with the wahoo fishing. Typically, there is two ways of fishing for wahoo, drop-off wahoo fishery that are larger wahoos, fast trolling and so on, that you do catch a smaller wahoo, but it is not the target. The hooks are not for that and so on. We are talking about bigger fish.

But we do have mix with the mahi, on floating debris and weed lines, schools of very small wahoos. But because you're trolling, fast trolling, you are normally using lighter tackle and so on. The way the fishing is performed is much more manageable. You don't drown the wahoo. The wahoo is going to get to the boat alive, right, on the smaller scale.

I don't think because of the fishing style and the way we fish here in the Caribbean, that's of big consideration versus Bahamas, for example, and other places where the wahoo fishing is a little different than what we have here. Julian?

JULIAN MAGRAS: I just want to make a comment as it pertains to the size. Once you pick a nice size of a fish of 40 inches, if you run into a school of fish switches on the size, you're not going to stay there trying to catch undersized species, both the wahoo and the dolphin, you're going to move on. You're going to try to go to somewhere where you can catch a legal-size fish, which can be landed for your market. So, your mortality rate is going to be low. You're not going to stay there killing fish, hoping that a big one is going to come in. You're going to move on. That's the practice of the commercial fishers. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Gerson.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: For the record, I went through some information, and I do agree with my friend Mr. Magras about the 40 inches.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: So just to confirm with staff, this should say, "select Alternative 3" because that's 40 inches. Correct? Okay.

I'm going to actually speak in opposition to the motion. I

supported the original motion of 32 inches. I applaud the DAPs in terms of what they're trying to accomplish with the 40-inch size limit, because that's certainly a huge step for conservation. But I'm concerned about release mortality. Having a lot of release mortality, even though it might not be substantial, I've just been doing some quick literature search and it could be as much as 25, 30%. And so, I think taking a little bit more of an incremental step of going from no size limit to a 32-inch size limit and seeing how that performs is really important before we take a larger leap to the 40-inch size.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Your suggestion is a stepwise approach into the minimum size. I am using here a conversion table for wahoo with the fork length of 40 inches, which is 13-pounds and 14-ounce fish. Just to put numbers in terms of pound, what it means for a 40-inch wahoo. which is not a very big wahoo.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos, the other part is the consideration of the biology of the animal. I was checking, actually the web page of NOAA and when you are talking about 40 inches, the wahoo, in order to save 50% of the females, it has to be 50 inches long. 40 inches is less and fork length, of course, is close to that. According to that. And if you are talking about feet is 3.3 feet.

But what Dr. Strelcheck is saying now is that if you are— the goal is to protect as many as possible so they can spawn again. So, if you make it too big and you have a mortality too high for those that you discard, then probably having a smaller fish that is able to reproduce at least once is better for the stock than going to a big one, assuming that they are going to survive when you turn it back. And that's the kind of thing that you need to balance.

I don't think that you will have the exact answer to that question, but at least you know in the direction that you could be going. So, one hand you have 40 inches that will have 30% mortality. So out of a hundred you lose 30 animals. In 32, if you have less mortality, then you will lose less. And then between 32 and 40, you'll be saving a lot of fish too.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And to the point of, Andy. Andy, the 32-inch wahoo fork length, is six pounds. I don't remember ever catching a six-pound wahoo. Right. And I don't think we are doing much addressing the request and the spirit of this measure creating a minimum size by putting something out there because of the gear.

What I said before, we are talking about 10 knot hooks, [inaudible] islanders that barely fit on the mouth. You have to open the mouth

and put the hook on the six-pound wahoo, that is not the reality. You're not going to have a lot of that. Right. I just want for that to be clear, that's why I'm not so much concerned about the release waste or mortality that we're going to lose a lot of fish and release that fish because we are not going to catch that much of that class of six-pound wahoo.

4 5

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. And I appreciate that, Marcos, and I will be the first to admit, I'm not an expert when it comes to wahoo fishing in the Caribbean. Right. That's why it's great to hear from all these fishermen around the table. My concern isn't so much the 32-inch fish being six pounds. It's the 37, 38, 39-inch wahoo that's going to have to be discarded and go to waste and have that release mortality.

MARCOS HANKE: Vance, then Julian.

VANCE VICENTE: Yeah, I'm looking here at Adams and Adyan Rios study Life History Compilation of Caribbean Fisheries and looking at the dorado, the dolphin, mahi-mahi, c. hippurus and the length at maturity is 450 millimeters, which is 17 inches. 511 individuals we're analyzed from Florida and LM was 450 in Florida. For North Carolina it was also 458 millimeter, 17 inches. Just for the record.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Vance. Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: I am here doing a little research as well, and it clearly states that a wahoo can grow up to eight feet, 156 pounds through they are commonly between 3.3 and 5.4 feet long. So, if you take the 3.3, we're right there at 40 inches, it is immature fish. And the males can start reproducing at 34 inches. So, if we say 32 inches, the males still are not ready to start reproducing. So, I'm just going off of the information that is out there. I understand Andy's concern about mortality, but the fishers are asking to put the protection out there at 40 inches. We are the ones that are willing to give up the smaller size fish for what we think would help our fishery. I don't think there is going to be any high mortality rate.

As far as the concern comes to enforcement with the difference of the islands. It's going to be an issue no matter what because we have gone to Island-Based Fishery Management Plans. So, Saint Croix is going to have different regulations than what Saint Thomas and Puerto Rico are going to have. So, what enforcement needs to do is they need to step up their game in doing their jobs. But you asked us to partake and give suggestions in what we can do to help the resources, and this is what the group of fishers, both

recreational, commercial, divers, have requested to what they think can help the fishery. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Sarah.

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** So, as your motion stands right now, you've selected Alternative 3, which was the 40 inches for wahoo in both Saint Croix, which is the 2(a) and Saint Thomas/Saint John, which is 4(a) and this is for all fishing again, correct? Yeah. So, are you still good with that?

12 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Go ahead and vote on it.

14 MARCOS HANKE: You stand on the motion, right?

16 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah.

18 MARCOS HANKE: And we had a lot of discussion. I think we are ready to vote.

21 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Yes.

25 ANDREW STRELCHECK: No.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Well, so then I would also, if we're thinking of adding Puerto Rico FMP to this amendment, or vice versa, would Puerto Rico vote or accept one of these alternatives as presented? If not, we can come back with alternatives for Puerto Rico, or we don't have to include wahoo for Puerto Rico.

Motion carries. One no and six yes. What is the next discussion?

MARCOS HANKE: I will feel comfortable consulting directly to the Puerto Rican people on the table if they want to pursue to create the discussion for Puerto Rico, the minimum size and the similar discussion.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the

record. I think that we should take the recommendation of the DAP also, and we should take the same actions. I don't know if we can include it right now, or we must leave it for tomorrow or for next meeting.

MARCOS HANKE: And you agree with the concept?

**VANESSA RAMÍREZ:** Yes. And practically the same size also applies. 9 Okay. Ricardo?

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yeah, I agree completely with Vanessa.

13 MARCOS HANKE: Nelson.

**NELSON CRESPO:** Yeah. I support Vanessa's statement.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, all the Puerto Rico representatives have the same intention and we're going to follow your guidance whatever is the best way to proceed.

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** Okay. So next time we bring this amendment back, you'll have size limits for all three FMPs with preferred alternatives identified and fully analyzed.

And the reason why we're not adding the motion up here is because the IPT needs to see this and discuss it. I was just wanted to make sure that the alternatives that were presented for the U.S.V.I. were acceptable for Puerto Rico and that you would, if you could, identify a preferred alternative.

So next we can look at the recreational bag limits on the slide, and you can do the same thing. If you have motions prepared, recommend those.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos. Liajay, be ready for the motion.

We have a time with translation. We need to try to be super effective at this time to finish this discussion and to move all the presentations for tomorrow. We are going to start at 8:30 tomorrow.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE: What?** 

MARCOS HANKE: Keep going.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, I move to have, for bag limits on dolphinfish, Action 1(b), Alternative 2.

SARAH STEPHENSON: For a reminder. Alternative 2, which is 10 dolphin per person per day, or 32 dolphin per vessel per day would be compatible with the new U.S.V.I. regulations once they're implemented. You can see here the rationale on the screen is in yellow, and I just wanted to make sure if you could, during the motion discussion just talk about rationale for why you would endorse a recreational bag limit for dolphin in the U.S.V.I. And it could be the same rationale, or it could be separate per island, but just, in your own words, provide a rationale, please.

4 5

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Sure. Do I have to put the motion up there?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Please. I will request the cooperation of the Council to try to be as objective and effective with the time, for sake of time, with this discussion. And remember all the discussion that we had on the past not to start over again.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Are you ready? Oh, okay. I'm sorry. So, to establish a recreational bag limit of 10 dolphinfish per person per day, not to exceed 32 dolphinfish per vessel per day, whichever is less. last to establish recreational. Yeah, that's it. She just got it.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: ¿Carlos, está bien?

MARCOS HANKE: That's the language, Carlos? Can you read it for the record?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Alright, to establish a recreational bag limit of 10 dolphinfish per person per day not to exceed 32 dolphinfish per vessel per day, whichever is less. Right.

MARCOS HANKE: Any second?

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Second.

MARCOS HANKE: Open discussion. Ricardo?

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes. It's kind of two questions. The first one, is there a formula for that bag limit? How do we get that number?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No se oye bien. Tienes que pegarte al micrófono.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Kind of two question. Ricardo López, for the record. Is there any formula for that number of bag limit? How did we get to that number? That's the first question. And the second one is, if we are limiting the size of the dolphinfish to big

dolphinfish, does that change the size of the bag limit or are we going to keep those numbers?

MARCOS HANKE: We have a second from Nicole just making sure. Okay. Do you want to address—Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Esperate. Liajay and Cristina, can we go back to the slide that Sarah put together about the rationale behind the size limit, bag limit and the trip limit. This goes to Ricardo's question. No, the one that—no, más para arriba. Es la que es más general que te dice pa' qué diablos tú quieres cada cosa.

Okay. This goes to Ricardo's question. These three can go together or separate, depending on the goals and objectives that you may have. So now you have a size limit that you are recommending, but still, you want to prevent overharvest of recreational annual catch limits. The first one ensures the reproductivity, as you know, the second one goes to the overharvesting, and the third one is also similar.

So that's why it is important for the group to decide whether the bag limit is important or not, or I mean, acceptable or not. Also, you need to talk about the-- in the case of the bag limits, you land at the dock in Puerto Rico or at the dock in U.S. Virgin Islands, you don't land at a foreign vessel somewhere in the EEZ. So, if you don't have compatible regulations, it will be kind of difficult to enforce.

If Puerto Rico, for example, have a bigger size bag limit, no problem. But if they have a smaller one, then you have a problem.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yeah. Still for me, 10 huge dolphinfishes per fisherman in a boat is a lot. To me that's a lot. You know, we are not talking anymore about the small one. We're talking about the huge one because we are regulating the size.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: But what's your point? You want a bigger bag limit or the smaller bag limit?

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Smaller.

**MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:** How much smaller?

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: I don't know. How much do we need if we are recreationally fishing? If I'm going in a boat and I'm not looking for fishes to put some fuel in my boat, I'm just recreational, I'm not selling the fish. How many big fishes do I need? 1, 2, 3 is a lot for one person. If we are five together, maybe two per person

is enough. That's my criteria.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Ricardo, Sarah.

 SARAH STEPHENSON: What I was going to say is, so the alternatives here were 10 per person, 32 per vessel, and then another alternative that could be proposed. And if you would like to propose something for Puerto Rico since now that's going to be part of this amendment, I think you could do that. You could come up with numbers and if the Council agreed and if the fishermen supported it, I think we could add that as a different alternative for Puerto Rico. You wouldn't have to have the same one.

This one is compatible with U.S.V.I. regulations, so it'll just be a little bit easier for enforcement while still reducing the unlimited catch that is currently available for dolphin right now. I know Puerto Rico has a bag limit, so you're already one step ahead as far as kind of controlling what the recreational fishers can catch. So, please, if you have some numbers that you would like to put out for us to consider, please do so.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Thanks for the answer and for the opportunity.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Ricardo. Any further discussion before we go to the vote?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: I will want, if maybe some member of the DAP can make us like an example of their recreational in Saint Croix and Saint Thomas for the mahi and wahoo. Because I'm in the same line as Ricardo, if we make the exercise in the fishing in Puerto Rico, we know that there is going to be a lot of fish in there for a house, but they are the expert in Saint Croix and Saint--

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: But let's, this is only for the U.S. Virgin Islands at this time, and what they're doing is they already have this in the books for the U.S. Virgin Island. So, what Sarah has done is just to make compatible regulations in the EEZ. Puerto Rico is another [inaudible].

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes. Thank you. But I will love to hear from Julian and Martínez if they are okay with this number.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: According to the DAP meeting, we had a while back with all the Fisheries Advisory Committee in Saint Croix, that was a big issue in determining these numbers. So, I agree with 10 and 32, but as I said, I'm only one person, I'm just bringing forward the information that was discussed there. Because

a big issue that we came into was whether that person who's going out for that day can cover the expenses. Because if you want to eat fish, you still have to spend 3.79 a gallon to go out. So that was the issue, the amount of money they spent to go out and everybody agreed to 10 and 32.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: And, Vanessa, some of the members on the recreational sector, they wanted a bigger quota.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Okay.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Any further rationale or are we ready to vote. Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Well, I have a question for DFW if it could be answered either Director Angeli or Sennai Habtes. So, what's the recommended numbers for the new recreational license that's supposed to go into place in 2024? Because I think what's happening here is we are trying to have the same numbers that are working in federal waters to also be in compliance with territorial waters as it pertains to these two pelagic species. Because the DAPs had come up with a different number and I heard Mr. Ricardo's comments, which makes a lot of sense, where you're going to be catching a larger fish, so why do they need to have such a large number? From hearing from my counterpart from Puerto Rico also, he has a concern with the number of fish that's going to be allotted to one individual and the maximum number at the end. recreational license complete? Can that number be changed for U.S.V.I. territorial waters? And what are those numbers? Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Nicole.

**NICOLE F. ANGELI:** Yeah, thank you for the question, Mr. Magras. The recreational fishing rules and regulations were adopted, signed into rule and regulation on October  $7^{\rm th}$ , 2022. We are waiting to implement those rules and regulations until we have a licensing platform and all of the components necessary to fully roll out the recreational rules and regulations.

 I'm going to read the regulation for the dolphin and wahoo. There is a combined recreational bag limit of no more than 10 dolphinfish or wahoo per person per day, not to exceed 32 per vessel per day, and not to exceed four wahoo per person per day, or 20 wahoo per vessel per day.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Ricardo.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yeah, I would like to share with our friends from U.S.V.I., what Puerto Rico has as regulation for the recreational fishermen. For example, for Dorado, I mean for the dolphinfish we have five individuals, five fish per species, per fishermen per day, or a quota of 10 in total for the boat. That's a lot smaller than 10 per person. And that's for the dorado, for the dolphinfish.

For the peto, we also have a regulation, which is smaller than what we were--

MARCOS HANKE: Ricardo. I'm confused. We have, how many mahi per angler? Five? Can you repeat, please? Slow.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes. Of course, I will do that. It says fishing mahi, wahoo or sierra per quotes. In the case of sierras and wahoos, the limit is five individuals per species. Okay. Is either five wahoos or five dorados or five Sierras per fisherman per day or a quota of 10 fishes per boat per day, whichever is less.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Ricardo.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Okay.

 **SARAH STEPHENSON:** This is Sarah. María and I were looking at the regulations and I believe what Mr. López just read was for wahoo and mackerels combined. There is a five per species per day, but for dolphinfish it's 10 dolphin per person per day, or 30 dolphins per boat per day, whichever is less.

When we brought this amendment in December and we had the management measures in there for the Puerto Rico FMP, the alternative for the recreational bag limit, one alternative was to be compatible with the DNER regulations, the 10 and 30. And the other one that was in there was a recommendation that was made by the Puerto Rico, DAP, which I believe was five dolphin per person per day or 15.

So, we had that in there for Puerto Rico, we could, if we're putting dolphin and wahoo back into this amendment, we can put those back in for consideration from the Puerto Rico constituents.

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead Ricardo.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yeah, thanks for the clarification.

1 2

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. At this time, everybody is overwhelmed and trying to put the best information on the table and it's totally understandable. Thank you.

This is part of the discussion and I think we are ready to vote. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Abstain.

11 JAMES R. KREGLO: No.

13 ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes.

15 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: I will abstain.

**NICOLE F. ANGELI:** Yes.

21 MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

We have four "yes", two "abstentions" and one "no." Motion carries, by majority.

We are going to stop because we had a fisherman from Vieques that is going to present. Unfortunately, very unfortunately, he cannot present today because of sake of time, but he will stay with us and do it very early in the morning, tomorrow at 8:30. We're going to start 8:30 tomorrow to allow the fisherman that came all the way from Vieques to present to us, Abdiel.

Miguel already spoke to him, Cristina. María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: So, Mr. Chair there was a presentation today at 4:15 to 4:45. it was an update on the Island-Based FMPs Biological Opinion, which was something between PRD and NOAA Fisheries and we made the decision that it will be fine if we can present it in August because it's not something that is time sensitive given that we are running a little behind schedule, if you're okay with that.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

45 MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Anything else Miguel?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: We were supposed to have a closed session, but we don't need it because I reviewed DAP vacancies and all that and the only thing that we need to do at this time, to reappoint Jason Cope to the SSC. We can leave the other stuff for the August meeting.

MARCOS HANKE: To reappoint you mean?

**MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:** Motion to reappoint Dr. Jason Cope to the SSC. 10 Julian.

**JULIAN MAGRAS:** At this time before we close, I had a letter that 13 I would've liked to read. It's a very small letter to read into 14 the record. And if I may, Mr. Chair.

16 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Eso es para mañana. That is for tomorrow.

18 MARCOS HANKE: It's possible to do it tomorrow, or does it need to 19 be today.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Well, if you're not having the after session today, tomorrow morning, it's fine.

24 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. Tomorrow morning.

MARCOS HANKE: Please. Thank you. Miguel?

27
28 **MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:** We need a motion to appoint Dr. Jason Cope to the SSC, reappoint.

31 MARCOS HANKE: We cannot hear you, Miguel. The name of the person.

33 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Jason Cope.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Oh, yeah. *Motion to reappoint Jason Cope to the SSC.* 

38 MARCOS HANKE: Any second?

40 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Second.

42 MARCOS HANKE: All in favor say aye.

**GROUP:** Aye.

46 MARCOS HANKE: He is appointed.

48 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Then the vacancy is

another that we are going to discuss in the next meeting in August. And we are finished.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. We're going to adjourn now. There is nothing pending. Ready to adjourn. I'll remind everybody that there is an activity tonight of alternative species, I'll see you all there for underutilized alternative species.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. On the screen you have the-- you can put it in your GPSs. It's the Dinner La Guancha, Ponce. Tablado La Guancha, Ponce.

MARCOS HANKE: The meeting is adjourned. Thank you all, see you in a bit.

(Whereupon the meeting recessed on April 18, 2023.)

- - -

APRIL 19, 2023

#### WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

MARCOS HANKE: Good morning, everyone. It's 8:34 AM second day of the 181<sup>st</sup> CFMC Council meeting. We have some presentations and things to address from yesterday, but we're going to start with the video that a young fisherman, a leader of the young fishermen from Vieques, will present to us very quick because this is one of

the things that we have been requesting is to promote the an engagement of the young fishery into the fishery.

Let me introduce to Abdiel. Please state your name and before the video, a little brief presentation and let's go.

Actually, I am on speed mode, which means that I didn't make the roll call, you have to wait a little bit. Let's make the roll call. Let's start here with Cristina.

**CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ:** Good morning. Cristina Olán, Council 43 staff.

**LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA:** Buenos días. Liajay Rivera García, Council 46 staff.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Buenos días. María López, NOAA Fisheries.

```
1 2
```

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Good morning. Nicole Angeli, Virgin Island Division of Fish and Wildlife.

5 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Morning. Carl Farchette, Vice-chair, CFMC.

MARCOS HANKE: Good morning, Marcos Hanke.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Miguel Rolón, Council staff.

11 ANDREW STRELCHECK: Andy Strelcheck, NOAA Fisheries.

13 JOHN WALTER, III: John Walter, Southeast Fishery Science Center.

15 JAMES R. KREGLO: James Kreglo, Council member Saint Thomas

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Vanessa Ramírez, Council member, Puerto Rico.

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

**MIGUEL BORGES:** Good morning. Miguel Borges, NOAA Office of Law 22 Enforcement.

MATTHEW WALIA: Good morning. Matt Walia, NOAA Office of Law Enforcement.

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** Good morning. Kevin McCarthy, Southeast Fishery 28 Science Center.

**JOHN MCGOVERN:** Good morning, Jack McGovern, NOAA Fisheries.

**NELSON CRESPO:** Good morning, everyone. Nelson Crespo, DAP Chair, 33 Puerto Rico.

35 GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Gerson Martínez, DAP Saint Croix.

**JULIAN MAGRAS:** Julian Magras, DAP Saint Thomas/Saint John. Good 38 morning, everyone.

**ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR:** Good morning, Alida Ortiz, Outreach and 41 Education Advisory Panel.

VANCE VICENTE: Vance Vicente, SSC Chair.

**SENNAI HABTES:** Sennai Habtes, Virgin Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife and EBFM TAP Chair.

48 RUTH GOMEZ: Good morning, Ruth Gomez, Saint Thomas Fisherman's

Association.

DARYL BRYAN: Good morning. Daryl Bryan, Saint Thomas Fisherman's Association.

JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: Good morning. Jannette Ramos-García, Puerto Rico Sea Grant program, OEAP Panel member.

GABRIEL POSI: Buenos días. Gabriel Posi, Municipio de Cabo Rojo.

WANDA M. ORTIZ BÁEZ: Wanda Ortiz, Sea Grant Puerto Rico y Universidad de Puerto Rico en Mayagüez.

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

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: That's all, Mr. Chairman.

MARCOS HANKE: Just state your name for the roll call.

**ABDIEL CONNELLY:** Good morning. My name is Abdiel Connelly. Fisherman from Vieques.

MARCOS HANKE: The mic is yours. Let's start with your presentation.

### SAMAR Sea school - Abdiel Connelly

ABDIEL CONNELLY: Thank you.

Good morning. My name is Abdiel Connelly. I'm a fisherman from Vieques and today I'll be talking about the sea adaptation program. But first I'd like to properly introduce myself. I was homeschooled since an early age. The see was one of my classrooms introduced by my grandfather and father. Understanding the see became my passion. Eventually, it became my job at the age of 15 until I left to study Marine Transportation in California. But it wasn't only after three years that I came back to where I felt I belonged.

It has been believed that to be a fisherman you need to pass heritage or to take from our ecosystems but there's a way that we could make this a healthy fishing by not only scuba diving fishes that is normally practiced. I'd like to enforce that we can also adapt to the water by making a healthy art of fishing, fishing with the water. Thanks to all these beliefs, fishing has been decreased also our fisheries have been decreased, but fishermen have turned to be more normally elders and major people.

I started sharing what my lifestyle was in social media to try to

motivate the young to get out there and know where we are and appreciate where we're from, and that this is an opportunity that we all have. I believe there's a way that we could work in harmony with the water and make this a healthy way of fishing, adapting to what we live nowadays and not what we've been living, in the past. That's why we moved to make a school program working directly with the kids to develop a movement of these young fishermen and use this to our advantage, that the young are not fishing, and create this new way for fishermen to adapt to what we live nowadays, kind of a fishing evolution.

4 5

We go through all the risks, the preparations to get in the water first, which is stuff as basic as swimming, preparing our own gears and mainly educating of our ecosystem so we can move with it not on top of it, so we can have a healthier tomorrow. This is, I believe, the opportunity we were all given, it is to get to know where we are. By getting to know where we are, we get to know and appreciate where we are from. And when we appreciate and know where we are, we're going to protect it. So, I believe this is our first step. To keep growing, we hope that we can make this a step that we could be used all around. Right now, we currently have—what I have is an 18-foot boat, my personal gears, but we aspire for more. We aspire to make this a reality. We aspire to make this even a university, one that we don't have in Vieques. Thank you. Any questions?

#### Ouestions/Comments

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. The uniqueness of what you're doing is— I had the opportunity to talk to you yesterday. Your mindset is, from scratch, to do it right. To educate the kids, the regulations, to educate them about the new opportunities, including development of market for the alternative species, which is totally related to what we did yesterday at the activity with the consumption of alternative species. I think this Council should be paying attention to you and should support you in any way that is possible, your effort in Vieques. Especially because it is an underserved community in Puerto Rico, it is isolated from the main island and it has its uniqueness, especially uniqueness in habitat. There is no place in Puerto Rico with the mosaic of habitats and fishery grounds that Vieques has.

 If there is a perfect scenario for development of deep water, squid, swordfish, coastal pelagics and other alternative species, the model should be considering Vieques as the pilot or the first venue to start that. After that, it just can grow around the island, the rest of the island, Culebra and other places. Miguel. Gerson.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Thank you. I want to applaud what Mr. Abdiel has been doing there. There is always -- Gerson Martínez, for the record. There is always a hero in a fisherman's mind, a person that guides us to become who we are today. And I really appreciate what you have been doing for these young people in the island of Vieques because if you don't train them to find a way to support themself and their family, they going to always go to the wrong direction and end up in jail, dead, or doing bad things. What you are doing is very beautiful. 'Te aplaudo por eso' because we always look for a hero in our life and you are one of those. In the future, when you grow old and you grow a white bear like me, somebody's going to look up to you and say, "that's the quy that teach me to fish. That's the guy that teach me to maintain my family." That is very good what you're doing, and I want to give you an applause for this.

ABDIEL CONNELLY: Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Andy and Miguel.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Andy Strelcheck, NOAA Fisheries. Thank you for the presentation really inspiring in terms of the work that you're doing. One comment I wanted to make is we have a Marine Resource Education Program here in Puerto Rico and I think there's real opportunities to work with you and the work that you're doing in terms of young fishermen and education in the partnership with that Marine Resource Education program. So, we will get your contact information and definitely would like to connect with you with regard to that program.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, either Vanessa and myself, we are in that group, but we would appreciate if it came from you and we, Vanessa and I, we can follow up on it for sure. You have to be there. It's going to be at another venue. Miguel and Vanessa.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: After you, Vanessa. I follow you.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. Well, I have to congratulate you for your initiative in Vieques. As Marcos says, we are going to have an MREP coming soon for the East coast. Usually in the next May we are going to be around bringing some information for all the commercial fishermen and new fishermen especially. So, I hope that we keep in contact, and I will see you in May. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Miquel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: ¿Tienes a alquien en el chat, Cristina?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Okay. Michelle Schärer. What is the deepest you can dive safely to catch seafood?

ABDIEL CONNELLY: Well, personally, I don't try to commercial fish below 90 feet, but to dominate 35 feet and 40 feet, I think you could be able to be a consistent commercial fisherman.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. And before I hand the word to Miguel, because people don't know who is your champion, who inspired you to get into fishing?

**ABDIEL CONNELLY:** My grandfather introduced me to the water. He had an education program in Vieques, which me, without realizing, ended up enjoying and being in the same view that maybe he had.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Que diga el nombre del abuelo.

ABDIEL CONNELLY: It is Charles Connolly.

MARCOS HANKE: Everybody knows him. Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: I met your grandfather a long time ago. Never thought of having the grandchild here in front of us. I met you through Jannette Ramos and there are several things that we cannot help you with, but others we can. Help you with the material for education and everything.

So, for the next step-- and thank you again for coming and taking your time to come here. Alida, Jannette, Diana and I will meet you or talk to you later on and see where we can help with your project. And also, if you want to expand, disperse your project to other areas, we can contact other champions.

I believe that the generation change, something that you mentioned, 40 to 60 is the average age, but the average age of fisherman Puerto Rico is over 55. So, it is really, really encouraging to see young people like you teaching other young fishers to come in. We have a fisher that we met that was the Chair for a few seconds. He's 11-year-old fellow from Saint Croix. One of my heroes by the way. And I believe that the Council will continue working toward developing more opportunities for youngsters, especially education about the role of a fisher within the ecosystem. The role of a fisher as an entity to promote safe fishing, sustainable fishing, etcetera. So, we are going to be talking to you soon, this month.

ABDIEL CONNELLY: Appreciate it.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: John quiere decir algo.

MARCOS HANKE: John.

JOHN WALTER, III: John Walter, Southeast Fishery Science Center. Yes, Abdiel, I really appreciated chatting last night about spear fishing, and I think one thing that really resonated was the movement of younger fishermen into the fishery and how that's necessary because you need recruitment into a fishery and probably given the changes that are going to occur with climate change, with environmental change, that you need people who can adapt. I think that's where younger fishermen have that adaptability that you can see new markets, you can see as a new species comes in, that there's a market for it. I think that's where it's valuable to have that and that otherwise our fisheries won't recruit if there aren't new people getting into it and our youth getting into it. So, I think that's something that kind of resonates across almost all of our fisheries where they're often aging and need new people to get into it. So, I applaud the effort. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, John. Thank you, Abdiel. We wish to have way more time to make many questions. I invite you to stay around as much as you can. I know that you have to go back to Vieques, to your place, today, but please keep this conversation with him on the breaks in the meantime that he's around. Thank you. Thank you very much.

ABDIEL CONNELLY: Thank you.

 MARCOS HANKE: Now we are going to go for the presentation that was left from yesterday, from Sarah? I'm sorry. Okay. From Laura Cimo Update on Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission Spawning Aggregation and Queen Conch Working Group meetings.

Hello, Laura, good morning.

Update on Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission Spawning Aggregation and Queen Conch Working Group meetings.

LAURA CIMO: Good morning. Can you hear me, okay?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, we can. You can proceed. Thank you very much and welcome.

LAURA CIMO: Okay, perfect. Sure. Thank you. First of all, let me make sure I've got everything ready to go because I think, in fact

if it's okay, I actually was hoping-- Cristina, would you mind basically putting the presentation on screen?

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Hi Laura, this is Liajay, for the record. We are your presentation to the screen, so allow us a minute.

**LAURA CIMO:** Sure, no worries. Great. Cristina, is it okay to start?

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Yes.

LAURA CIMO: Okay, perfect. And if it's okay, Cristina, maybe I can just let you know when to turn to the next slide. Is that okay?

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah. Cristina.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: There you are Laura.

19 LAURA CIMO: Okay, perfect.

MARCOS HANKE: She can turn the slides for you, don't worry.

LAURA CIMO: That'd be wonderful. Thank you so much. Well first of all, so my name is Laura Cimo and I'm from the NOAA Fisheries Office of International Affairs Trade Commerce. And I'm here to give some updates related to the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission or WECAFC. The focus on my presentation today will be primarily to provide some updates from two recent working group meetings that were held in mid-March.

And next slide, please.

Okay. So, as we've presented for WECAFC at several of the previous Council meetings, I won't go into a whole lot of detail on the background, but just wanted to share a couple reminders that WECAFC is a regional fishery body under FAO and that basically the purpose of the organization is to provide non-binding recommendations and guidance for the conservation and management of living marine resources in the wider Caribbean. And although the recommendations are non-binding, of course, we feel like it's really important to have participation in the organization so that we can promote the sustainable fishery management of our shared resources throughout the Caribbean. And just one more note is that we are among 34 members of the organization.

And next slide, please.

48 During my presentation, I'll focus on, just like I said, I

mentioned there's two working group meetings that were recently held. So, I'll just give a little bit of background on the Spawning Aggregations Working Group and then share some updates from the meeting of that particular working group. Then I'll provide a little bit of information on the Queen Conch Working Group and share some outcomes of that particular meeting. And then finally, I'll share some other updates that are likely going to be of interest to the Council.

4 5

Next slide, please.

So, the Spawning Aggregations Working Group of WECAFC was established in 2012 at our meeting in 2014. Just as a reminder, this actually is a joint working group. It's a joint working group between WECAFC, the Caribbean Fishery Management Council, the Central American Fisheries and Aquaculture Organization or OSPESCA and the Regional Fishery Mechanism, or CRFM. And there's been a lot of work that's been conducted by this organization, the working group in particular, but just wanted to highlight a couple things that I think are noteworthy.

First, that is that the working group has supported the development of a 10-year communication strategy. That was endorsed by the commission at its meeting in 2019. Second, that the working group supported and contributed to the development of a Regional Fish Spawning Aggregations Fishery Management Plan. That's focused on fish spawning aggregations of nassau grouper and mutton snapper. And although this FMP is focused on those particular species, I do want to mention that this will provide a useful framework for the management of other species that aggregate to spawn. This particular plan was just endorsed by the commission at its meeting in 2022.

The United States has been extremely active in the working group. There's the participation of both the Council and NOAA Fisheries and we've been very supportive of its work. At the most recent working group meeting NOAA Fisheries provided a presentation that showed how U.S. management and protection of species that aggregate to spawn in the Caribbean are consistent with this regional plan that was endorsed. And we also shared some information on the implementation of some recent recommendations that were adopted by the commission to conserve fish spawning aggregations.

I do want to also make one quick note that we feel it's really important to have participation of these Caribbean at this meeting given the implications for some of the transboundary management of species.

 And next slide, please.

Next, I'd just like to highlight some important conclusions of the recent meeting, which took place in San Juan, Puerto Rico. The meeting which was held in a hybrid format was graciously hosted by the Council and of course, we supported that meeting. There are 10 countries that were participating, although most did participate virtually, and we were lucky to have broad representation by NOAA Fisheries at the meeting. María López, Kevin McCarthy, Orian Tzadik and I were there. And I do want to take this opportunity to thank the Council and my NOAA colleagues, both, for their support and participation in the meeting.

We had a really packed agenda. We had a lot of updates and information on pending work in the region to both assess and conserve fish spawning aggregations. But just for purpose of this meeting, I'm going to highlight just a couple that I think are important. First, that is that at the meeting the members basically reviewed the implementation status of the Regional Fishery Management Plan in sought to identify any gaps. And the gaps that were identified included a need to have better knowledge about the management plan. Also, there was a need to have better information about the location of fish spawning aggregation sites. And finally, there was a recommendation that we really need to have basically better measures to protect those sites.

Participants also received an update on a key component of the communication strategy, and that is a two-year trilingual public education campaign that's titled Big Fish. The campaign, basically, is designed to protect fish spawning aggregations with a focus on Nassau grouper and mutton snapper by raising awareness of aggregations and the importance of their protection for species conservation. This campaign will be officially launched in August of this year with the international release of a one-hour film.

 I do note that we're lucky, we found out just this morning, it looks like the film will have a release in the states actually as early as next week. And also, there's some other education outreach materials that have been developed or are in the process of development under this campaign and they include everything from posters, short films, podcasts, there's radio kits, public service announcements, booklets, and also a platform that'll be used to share the resource and materials. These communication tools are geared at fishermen, decision makers and the general public. And in case you haven't seen the short films yet, I did provide a link on the slide where you can find it on the NOAA Fisheries website. But just to note that these resources are also available on the Council website. I really appreciate the Council making these

available. Certainly, if you haven't seen them, I would encourage you to look at the materials. They're very informative, they're well done, and the footage in the short film in particular is just incredible.

Next slide, please.

So other key outcomes of the meeting include an update of the working groups the work plan that basically would include some new activities that were de determined to be done in the intersectional period. And this new work will include several pilot projects that'll be conducted in Belize, The Bahamas, and Cuba. And the aim is to compile information on fish spawning aggregations of nassau grouper and mutton snapper to improve our understanding of the species status. There were also several recommendations that were adopted by the working group at this meeting, and they'll be considered by the full commission at its meeting later this fall. And these recommendations include the establishment of a fish spawning aggregation coordination committee, which will basically focus on advancing implementation of the regional plan. There was also a recommendation to prioritize nassau grouper and mutton snapper for the purposes of data collection reporting in WECAFC. And finally, there was also a recommendation on the use of descending devices as a best practice for basically releasing deepwater species to hopefully increase their post release survival.

And next slide, please.

So, next I'll provide just a brief overview of the Queen Conch Working Group. This working group was also created in 2012, and this is also a joint working group. This is between WECAFC, the Council, OSPESCA, CRFM, but another partner is the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora or CITES. CITES plays a particularly important role in this particular working group since queen conch is listed in appendix two under the convention.

There's been a number of activities that have been conducted by the working group since its creation, but just want to highlight a few here. First, was the development of a Regional Queen Conch Conservation Management Plan which was endorsed not only by the 17<sup>th</sup> conference of the parties to society, but the 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of the commission in 2016.

Sorry. My apologies, I'm in a conference room and the lights went out. Also, another outcome of the meeting that was important and actually something that the working group has been focused on for quite some time is establishment of a Queen Conch Statistical

Scientific and Technical Advisory Group. That group is comprised of a number of experts with multidisciplinary expertise, and they provide guidance on a number of priorities and issues. Also, the working group has supported the development of several tools and resources to facilitate CITES's implementation support sustainable fisheries management, and also to improve our trade monitoring.

And similar to the spawning aggregations working group the United States has played a really active role in this particular working group. At each of the meetings NOAA Fisheries presents basically its implementation of the Regional Fishery Management Plan and any recommendations that have been endorsed by this particular body. And again, we just want to emphasize how important it is to have to U.S. Caribbean participate in these meetings.

Next slide, please.

Okay. So, the most recent meeting of the Queen Conch Working Group was held back-to-back with the Spawning Aggregation Working Group in San Juan, Puerto Rico. Again, this meeting was hosted by the Caribbean Fishery Management Council with support of NOAA Fisheries. There was similar participation in this meeting in the similar delegation among the us. And several key outcomes of the meeting that I do think are important to highlight is that we had a discussion of the status implementation of this regional plan. And then the aim, we've done this at every meeting, is to basically monitor progress and just identify any continued gaps that need to be addressed.

So, at the meeting we identified several gaps and some needs that need to be addressed. The first is that there was a need to improve our landings data and apply some recommended regional and national conversion factors to hopefully facilitate the standardized reporting of our trade and production statistics.

 Also, there was a recommendation that we need to have an enhanced understanding of local consumption of queen conch. And also, there's identified need to develop guidance for the making of non-detriment findings as required for the export of queen conch under CITES. The CITES secretary at the meeting provided several updates on projects that are aimed at ensuring the sustainable harvest and trade of queen conch. And there was also an update and readout of some decisions that were made on queen conch at the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of the conference of the parties to CITES in November of 2022.

 And then finally the queen conch working group learned of an exciting pilot project in Jamaica, which is aimed at improving landings and effort data in artisanal and industrial queen conch

fisheries. And the hope is to help determine stock exploitation and determine some sustainable annual quotas.

Next slide, please.

So, several outcomes of this meeting included also an update to the group's work plan to reflect some new activities. The working group also proposed several recommendations that will be considered at the next commission meeting in the fall. These recommendations include improving the reporting of landings data by processing grades and the application of some recommended regional and national conversion factors. Also, to advance the development of a genetic toolkit to help track illegal queen conch in trade. And also, to improve data on socioeconomics, which would include an understanding of local consumption and trade at the national level. And then finally, to investigate and consider climate change and its impacts on queen conch and the fishery.

And next slide, please.

And now I'd just like to share a few other updates I hopefully will be of interest to the Council. That is that the Moored Fish Aggregation Working Group is meeting actually this week. And the aim of this meeting is basically to finalize the development of several documents. First, is to finalize a draft MFAD Management Plan for the wider Caribbean. Also, to finalize a guide for improved MFAD catches and basically, assessment of the impact of catches on those stocks. And also, a manual for MFAD governance. Just to note that these documents were considered at the last working group meeting, and they had been considered at the last commission meeting. The United States had provided input into their development and was very supportive. Unfortunately, however one particular member the European Union expressed opposition and basically wasn't willing to accept the documents, so they requested an additional meeting. And so, we're hoping that the meeting this week will hopefully finalize these documents and they'll be considered at the commission meeting in the fall.

 And speaking of the commission meeting in the fall, basically the dates have been set for September 6<sup>th</sup> to the 8<sup>th</sup> of this year. And then finally, we want to give an update on a topic that we've raised at the Council several times. And that is that we have finally secured funds for the first meeting of the Flyingfish-Dolphinfish Working Group. And actually, that meeting is scheduled to take place hopefully in June 2024. The exact dates and location will be determined, hopefully fairly soon. And we do want to express our extreme gratitude to the Council who has graciously offered to host this meeting with support of NOAA Fisheries Office

of International Affairs Trading Commerce.

4 5

 And of course, you know, with all these updates, we'll continue to share new information with the Council and with respect to this Flyingfish-Dolphinfish Working Group meeting in particular in advance of the meeting, we'll definitely be looking to the Council to provide your input in coordination with our regional colleagues and look forward to continued collaboration.

Okay, next slide.

This is the end of the presentation, so I just want to express my sincere gratitude for your interest, your collaboration and all your engagement. And happy to take any questions if there's time.

## Questions/Comments

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Laura. Thank you for the great job. Your office is doing with those working group that is basically connecting the knowledge and the management throughout the Caribbean. It's open for question. Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Not a question, but for the meeting of the Flyingfish-Dolphin Wahoo Working Group once we set the date, we are going to collaborate. We are going to receive money from NOAA Fisheries. Those monies were allocated from other activities that we had. So, we already set aside some time and money to discuss it with the coordination committee and Laura Is part of the committee.

In the case of National Fishery Service, local waters, Southeast Region and María López is our contact. So, we will inform you in due time about this development with the Dolphinfish Wahoo. The importance of this meeting is that yesterday and today we are going to be discussing the dolphinfish again and etcetera. One of the key management measures is establishing of the size limit, so the Council will participate, and Dr. Merten also, at the meeting in June of 2024. So, hopefully by that time the Council will know what is it that you would like to do and how we are going to be progressing with the management of the dolphinfish and the wahoo so we can present at that meeting at least an idea of where we are going with this. The only thing that we can do is lead by example. We cannot go tell other countries "This is a great idea" if we think that it's not in our area.

 So, thank you Laura, for the presentation. It was very comprehensive and I'm looking forward to keep working with you. I probably will see you in September, isn't it. September the 6<sup>th</sup>? Maybe it'll be virtual. Did you mention the place?

**LAURA CIMO:** No, thank you. Oh, sorry Mr. Chair. Is it acceptable to respond?

2 3 4

1

MARCOS HANKE: Go ahead.

5

7

8

9

10 11 LAURA CIMO: Oh, thank you. No, thank you very much, both Marcos and Miguel. Yes, so the meeting that will take place in September, will take place in Jamaica. We have not heard if it's going to be a hybrid meeting. We hope that it will be to allow more participation, but unfortunately, that decision hasn't yet been made. So certainly, I'd be happy to share any further updates that we receive.

12 13 14

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you.

15 16

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. No, I don't see any further question. We keep in touch. Thank you very much.

17 18 19

Next presentation now is Sarah.

20 21

Review Draft Amendment 3 to the St. Croix and St. Thomas/St.

John Fishery Management Plans to Develop Management Measures for

Dolphin and Wahoo- Cont.

232425

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

22

SARAH STEPHENSON: Okay, so this is Sarah. Where we left off yesterday was, we had made it all the way through size limits and we did recreational bag limits for dolphin, but we need to look at recreational bag limits for wahoo. So, here's the slide that has the three alternatives for Action 2(b), which is Saint Croix, and Action 4(b), which is Saint Thomas. So, Alternative 1 is no bag limit. Alternative 2 would establish a bag limit of four wahoo per person per day, or 20 wahoo per vessel, per day, whichever is less. And that would be compatible with the new U.S.V.I. regulations whenever they're implemented. And then Alternative 3 is a kind of a placeholder right now but it could be a more conservative bag limit compared to Alternative 2 if the Council likes. And the example that is put in there, the two wahoo per person per day or six wahoo per vessel per day was proposed by the Saint Thomas/ Saint John DAP at their meeting this past March. And then again, the rationale that's there for right now is to protect against overfishing the resource by this sector. So that's where we left off.

42 43 44

45

46

47

48

There is— the next slide if you would please — kind of talks about the pros and cons of each of the alternatives. So not establishing the bag limit would still leave it to unlimited harvest by the sector, which could potentially deplete the local resource. The two alternatives, the action alternatives, the four and 20 or two and six if you so choose, would allow for greater biological benefits than the no bag limit, because they would leave more wahoo for future catch, which in turn could provide for economic benefits through a healthier fishery. But alternatives two and three could have short term negative effects if recreational fishers typically catch more than those numbers. For instance, if they're used to catching 15 wahoo per person per day. And then you have to think about compounded, we did add the size limit yesterday, so how might that affect fishers?

4 5

So, it could increase discards, alternatives two and three, because if they're catching small fish and they have to throw them back now or if they were going to do that anyway because for whatever reason, this isn't the fish I want, and they throw it back. So that could increase discards or discard mortality, again, if the fish swallowed the hook hole.

Alternative 2, as I mentioned, would be compatible with the new regulations. Alternative 1, would not be compatible at all and could create enforcement issues. And then depending on what was selected for Alternative 3, if it's a more conservative bag limit in federal waters, there would still be some conflicts there, but it would be less because they would be they wouldn't be allowed to catch as many as they would in state waters. So, it would still be kind of difficult for enforcement, but maybe not as difficult as number one. And then lastly the two action alternatives would require rulemaking to implement these bag limits and then education and outreach for the new regulations.

So that's kind of the pros and cons to think about. And if you want to go back to the previous slide now it's ready for any kind of discussion or motions.

MARCOS HANKE: It open for discussion and motions. Julian?

JULIAN MAGRAS: Yeah. Julian Magras, for the record. This is the same problem that I had with the dolphin yesterday, and it was clearly said by Sarah just now. We have increased the size limit of these two stocks, and here it is now, we are looking to set a compatible regulation along with the territorial waters. The recreational license has not been implemented in the territorial waters. It's been approved, it's not saying that it can go back and be amended to drop these numbers. We have increased the size limit, so these guys who will be allowed to catch up to 20 wahoo per day per vessel with a bigger size fish will definitely overrun the existing commercial ACL because there is no recreational ACL. And I know I have an FAC member in here, Daryl Bryan, he is here, and he has a lot of concern with this. He had a lot of concerns

with the dolphin yesterday also. I think it needs to be brought back to the Board Fishery Advisory Committees in territorial and a request to the commissioner to revisit the bag limits for these two species. Because here it is, we are trying to protect, but then on the other hand, we are blowing the stock out of proportion and it's a big issue. Mr. Ricardo said it yesterday, if we have bigger fish, guess what? Your numbers are going to be higher.

4 5

So, I am asking and requesting that something be done to address this issue before we move forward with adapting compatible regulations. Thank you.

# MARCOS HANKE: Sennai.

SENNAI HABTES: Morning. Sennai Habtes, for the record. I just want to clarify a couple of things and maybe we can have NOAA weigh in on this as well. First, Sarah and María, maybe you can explain, are there any current recreational data used in compiling information towards ACLs used by SERO for managing any of the stocks within the U.S. Caribbean?

SARAH STEPHENSON: The answer to that is no.

SENNAI HABTES: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. So, in reference to the first point Mr. Magras was making, there would be no use of any recreational information coming in towards considerations for ACLs, which are currently only managing the commercial stocks within the territories of the U.S. Caribbean because we use data from the CCRs. We do have an indication where we are moving in the U.S. Virgin Islands to using hook and line fisheries, which may cause an increase in landings for some of the pelagic fisheries. At that indication, that is information that can be used to change the way measures are taken for current fisheries and how we consider the management of those current fisheries, but we need to indicate that data to use for that.

Second, although there is not an actual recreational fishing license that is being enforced, those rules and regulations are in place. My concern in that not having any of these regulations in place could lead to no sort of management actions towards these stocks, which is part of the reason for putting those in.

The last thing I think I would also like to clarify is it is not simply within the U.S. Virgin Islands for that bag limit of 20 per vessel, it would be 20 per vessel if they have at least four or five persons on that boat. If there's a single person on that boat, the limit for the wahoo would be a bag limit per person bag limit. So, I just wanted to make sure that those things were clarified

before we move forward with any discussions for this particular measure. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: So, I'm going to go right back to Sarah and to María and to the higher ups. So, correct me if I'm wrong, I know because we don't have a recreational quota or a recreational that's being reported, once this license is implemented, it's going to take at least three years minimum to collect data on the recreational side. So, as far as I understand the process for the years I've been involved, because we don't have an ACL for the recreational, the commercial ACL would reflect both sectors once it's being reported, because they don't have a number.

So, say for instance, next year, the recreational guys report 5,000 pounds of wahoo, 10,000 pounds of dolphin, that's going to go towards the commercial landings that's already in place. That ACL that's been set already because an ACL has not been set for the recreational fishery as yet. So, I want some clarification on that because I'm listening to what Sennai is saying, and I totally disagree because we have an opportunity for compatible regulations right now with a lower number.

 These guys are considered recreational. They don't need 20 fish. The commercial guys need 20 fish. So, this is the problem. Why, why do you need 20 fish to feed a family? The charter boats that are going out, they already been paid for the day. We don't get paid until we catch a fish and get back to the market and sell it. So, if you want to go there and catch fish for consumption for your family, you don't need 20 fish. What you need is maybe two fish. So, I don't understand what we are trying to protect, but I think we're going the wrong way. Thank you.

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** So, I'm going to try to answer all of that and hopefully it will make it clear.

The commercial landings are reported through your catch forms. When the U.S.V.I. gets the recreational landings system up and running that, I'm assuming, will be a separate system. So, you will have a bucket of data of commercial landings and then a bucket of data for recreational. Anything that the recreational guy's report will not go against the commercial ACL they are separate.

 What we would want to do is, given enough time of having recreational landings, is to establish recreational ACL. So, they would have their own separate ACL, which would likely be a lot higher than the commercial ACL. So, anything that the recreational

fishers report would go, would count against theirs, it wouldn't go against the commercial.

In the meantime, since we don't have that, the recreational guys, they can report, but it's just basically it goes nowhere. It doesn't go towards commercial landings or commercial ACLs. However, if the commercial landings exceed the commercial ACL, remember the AM, the accountability measure, is different for pelagics, we would take a look and the Council and NMFS would decide if any action was needed. If they decided that a closure type action was needed, then the closure would apply to everybody. So that's where they're kind of tied together in absence of recreational. But whatever they land doesn't count against you and your ACL as a commercial fisherman, but you as a commercial fisherman, if you take too much, it could impact the recreational guys. So that's how that they're kind of connected. Does that answer your questions?

JULIAN MAGRAS: Well, it clarifies it a lot more, but then I go back to the Council, and I say, our ultimate goal is to protect the resources for the future generation, future use for everyone. So, if we are protected by increasing a size limit of these species, we should decrease the bag limit because it's not the same. Before you had a bag limit with a smaller fish, and you were able to catch this quantity of fish. So, I would like clarification. We need to do better than how we are doing this.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. I want to bring the discussion to hear from the Council members. Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. Thanks, Marcos. So, I guess a couple of things, right? So, bag limit often is interpreted as everyone's going to go out and catch that bag limit, right? It is an opportunity to go out and catch up to that bag limit or up to that vessel limit. The data in all areas of the country show that commonly we don't catch the full bag limit, but it's the potential to obviously catch that bag limit. Here, my understanding is U.S.V.I. has not even implemented this bag and vessel limit that it's still pending, so we don't have restrictions right now in terms of limiting harvest. So, anything we do would be to the betterment of conservation, assuming people are exceeding this bag and vessel limit.

 What I'd like to recommend, because I generally kind of agree with some of Ricardo's comments yesterday about dolphin and some of the concerns that Julian is expressing, is that I think we do need a new alternative here, Alternative 3, and would recommend a two fish bag limit with a 10 fish vessel limit. So, it's half of

essentially the proposed Alternative 2. Doesn't mean we have to select it as preferred, but I think it gives us a range of options for consideration. And then based on that, if we're ready to select or preferred, we could certainly discuss that today. But there's always the option amendment to change that if we wanted to change our position before final action.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. I want to bring to the table something along the same lines that Andy is bringing. Based on my experience, fishing for wahoo, and not my experience fishing, but my experience on the dock, to see 20 wahoos on one boat, that's not common. I personally never saw that except on the situation, rarely, where they find a log floating to catching small wahoos that we already address with the minimum size, right? But for the wahoos that you fish on the drop off, which is the valuable fishery for the Caribbean, the reality is that we are not going to have those 20 fish bag limits happening very often. I never caught more than probably eight wahoos in a full day fishing for bigger wahoos myself. Maybe I'm a bad fisherman, but I also didn't see that on other boats very, very common. I'd like to hear from Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelson, for the record. Marcos, contrary to what you said, in the West coast of Puerto Rico, in the season, I see almost every day.

MARCOS HANKE: 20?

NELSON CRESPO: 20 or more per vessel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: En La Parguera también.

MARCOS HANKE: How big?

**NELSON CRESPO:** Huge ones. 20 pounder, 30 pounder, 50 pounders.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for the clarification. Probably it's because I don't know how to fish for wahoo. Anybody from the Council that wants to speak.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Yes. James Kreglo. Good morning. Saint Thomas. I'd just like to say it. I agree with everything that Julian's been saying about--

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Can you closer to the mic?

JAMES R. KREGLO: Oh, I'm sorry. I agree with what Julian Magras has been saying about the catch limits for the wahoo. Again, to me recreational fishing or sportsmen that should take a few fish home

to eat, but not catch a multitude of fish to do whatever else they're going to do with. So, I agree with what Julian's saying. That's it for right now. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Kreglo. Nicole?

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Yeah, just a point of clarification is then what this discussion is about, is it a preference for Alternative 3. Just making a point of clarification.

MARCOS HANKE: We are discussing the whole range of options and general aspects of it. We are not referring to a specific alternative at this point.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Okay. I guess I haven't heard. So, the range of options are not establishing any limit, establishing a limit of four per person, which is compatible with the territorial regulations or establishing a more conservative bag limit. And what I'm understanding is that Alternative 3 is what the preference of the folks that are having a discussion are leaning towards. I just wanted to make sure that I understood that.

MARCOS HANKE: This is my understanding too. Andy?

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, and I'll look to maybe Miguel, as well as the Council, if you want, I can make a motion to add a new Alternative 3 with that lower bag and vessel and if that's appropriate or we can just give staff direction, whatever's your preference. Would rather have a formal motion?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: We should have a motion.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Okay. So, I'll make a motion.

All right, so my motion will be to include in Action 2(b) and Action 4(b), a new alternative, two wahoo per person per day bag limit, and 10 wahoo per vessel per day. Whichever is less.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: You need a second?

41 MARCOS HANKE: Is there any second?

JAMES R. KREGLO: I'll second that.

45 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Open for discussion. On the table, 46 anybody would like to discuss? We have it on the chat. Go ahead, 47 Cristina.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Ricardo Lugo. Can we consider pounds limits instead of number of fish?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for the question. But that's not a-

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: That is not viable way to operate for enforcement. So, the answer is no.

MARCOS HANKE: The answer is no. There is a rationale for that. Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, and just to add to the rationale, this doesn't have to be selected or preferred, but gives us another alternative to consider. I think there's been some good comments about the fact that we've raised or were proposing to raise the size limit substantially. And just to be conservative with regard to a fishery that we don't necessarily know a lot about and we don't have recreational landing statistics at this point, it seems a viable alternative.

The other thing, I think, to note here that's really important with wahoo is, it's a fast-growing fish and can be obviously caught in large quantities, so a lower bag limit obviously would be conservative in terms of conservation value.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Any further discussion? Hearing none, I think we are ready to vote. Vanessa. Actually, Vanessa, you have a comment before, right?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. The comment practically was to agree with the motion, so I'm ready to vote. Go ahead, Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

38 JAMES R. KREGLO: Yes.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Yes.

**RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ:** Yes.

**NICOLE F. ANGELI:** Yes.

48 MARCOS HANKE: Yes. All in favor. The motion carries.

Sar

Sarah, is there anything pending?

SARAH STEPHENSON: Yes. So, there's one last management measure.

MARCOS HANKE: One second.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Julian Magras, for the record. I have a question now. I know we already passed the motion yesterday for the dolphin. Is there any way that we can revisit that motion to make it look like this showing the conservative efforts. Andy can make a motion similar to this, adding an extra alternative if that can be revisited. I know we have done it in the past, so I'm throwing that out there for the dolphin. Because I have the same issue with the dolphin from yesterday and Ricardo and everybody else had issues with that. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Miquel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: I mean, we need to allow Sarah to finish and then when we finish, we can revisit that part and the Council can decide whether to consider it or not. And the way that they do it is not to substitute the motion yesterday, but the same that we have done here to add another alternative and I guess that's what Julian is proposing.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. I guess before we move on, so given the potential that we're adding dolphin for Puerto Rico to this amendment, we likely won't be able to bring this back for final action in August. Is that correct? So, we would have another opportunity to review the alternatives and wouldn't necessarily have to select a preferred for this at this meeting. But if we want to select a preferred, we could go ahead and do so. I did not recommend a preferred, I just recommended a new alternative.

MARCOS HANKE: I agree with you and actually I want to highlight, I just commented to Carlos Farchette on the side that the discussion and the numbers that we established for the mahi was established based on the mahi fishery and the biology and the dynamic, which is totally different than wahoo for many reasons that we already discussed. But we are going to have opportunity to reevaluate and to press pass through the process. If the process guides us with the rationale to change, we do so. But let's leave it the way it is and see how it goes. Sara.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay, Marcos, for the record, let me clarify

that. Remember that yesterday we were talking about when you have a size limit, the bag limit for recreational and bag limit for commercial. One is with the harvest, the other one is with the biology. Here, at this time, we're talking about the harvest of the darn animal. So, once you finish with the wahoo, then you can say, "well, for the dolphin you can do it." What Andy is proposing is to wait until the August meeting where you have all the documentation for the dolphin and the wahoo, so you can make a better decision. Because we need to allow the staff to process what we decided yesterday so they can put together the documentation. There's a lot of work between here and August that they have to put together these two ladies here.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for rephrasing exactly what I said and being more clear on the record. Sarah, keep going.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Okay. So, the last management measure that we haven't discussed is commercial trip limits for dolphin and for wahoo in both islands, so those will be the next few slides. As it's structured right now since the IPT wanted to know, well, what's the reason for establishing a commercial trip limit? Are you worried about exceeding the ACL? or are you trying to create a longer fishing season? Which I mentioned yesterday, we don't really have a fishing season because they're able to fish yearround. And then, we just established these ACLs and looking at landings for the past few years of dolphin or wahoo and comparing them to the ACLs they're not near the ACLs, so there's no danger at this time of exceeding them. So again, the IPT wanted to know what's the reason. So, we're bringing that to the Council today. And is there a need for commercial ACLs? We heard at both the Saint Thomas/Saint John and the Saint Croix DAPs that neither DAP would recommend a commercial ACL. So, now it's back to the Council to discuss and determine if they want one and that's why the rationale there is in red, and it says it's needed. And that's also why there aren't trip limits proposed under alternatives two or three, it says limit to be determined. So that's where we are right now.

Uh, will you just go to the next slide, please?

We did try to put together a comparison of the alternatives even though there weren't numbers attached to them just for Council consideration. So, Alternative 1 would not establish a commercial trip limit. So, landings would continue to be monitored to the commercial ACL and an accountability measure for pelagic stocks that are already in place if landings exceeded the ACT. Um, but we do have a commercial ACL and ACT for the pelagic stocks.

So, if you decided to establish commercial trip limit Alternatives

2 and 3 could reduce the risk of that ACL and ACT being exceeded and prevent overfishing in the future. But as I mentioned, current landings of both dolphin and wahoo, in both islands, are not in danger of exceeding those catch limits. Alternatives 2 and 3 could have negative socioeconomic effects if commercial fishers needed to change how they fished. For instance, if they had to reduce the amount that they could catch per trip or if they had to likewise fish more days, or if they're not able to meet their market demand because now there's a daily trip limit. So, those would be the negative impacts to the fishers.

4 5

Also, alternatives two and three could increase discards and discard mortality if they were forced to throw fish back during a trip. And Alternatives 2 and 3 would require rulemaking to implement limits and likely also require additional outreach and education.

So those are kind of the pros and cons of the commercial trip limits for your consideration. And now it's ready for discussion and/or motions.

MARCOS HANKE: Discussion and motions. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. I think that for now for commercial trips, it's not necessary to take any. Not only because we already know as commercial that we have our same limits because of the weather, because we don't catch what we can sell. So, the market also limits us. So, for now I will choose for Alternative 1. Does someone else want to motion or I can present the motion.

MARCOS HANKE: Let's keep on the discussion to hear what everybody has to say. Andy and Carlos.

 ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, so I think Sarah outlined obviously some good rationale as to why we would not consider a commercial trip limit. I've thought a lot about this just from a fairness and equity standpoint because we are talking about recreational limits but not commercial limits. And what Sarah talked about obviously is important in that the catch limits aren't being exceeded right now. There's really no reason to further constrain commercial harvest, but we should obviously continue to monitor commercial harvest. In the event that we need to constrain harvest, we could go back and reconsider trip limits.

On the recreational side, the difference is that we're not actively monitoring their landings and catch. And so, we want to set some management measures, at least to be conservative with regard to

the resource and helping to obviously constrain some of the harvest by setting those limits. So, I think it's reasonable, obviously at this point not to consider a commercial trip limit. And if we choose the no action alternative, I recommend we just move it to consider by rejected and eliminate it from the amendment entirely.

MARCOS HANKE: Just a segue like this, I don't need to speak up again. I agree with what you just say, Andy, and with what Vanessa said. Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Well, Andy clarified what I was thinking because I mean, if we are around a table, if we're so concerned about protecting the resource from the recreational guys, you know, why not protect the resource for the commercial guys also and have a bag limit? But Andy kind of clarifies something, so I'll stand down on that one.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Anybody who would like to present the motion?

**VANESSA RAMÍREZ:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. I present the motion for Action 1(c) and Action 3(c), Alternative 1. To select Alternative 1 would not establish a commercial trip limit for dolphin in federal waters, or dolphin caught could be kept.

MARCOS HANKE: Any second?

JAMES R. KREGLO: Second.

MARCOS HANKE: Seconded by Kreglo. Any further discussion? Andy?

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, so what I would recommend instead, unless you want this to still be considered in the amendment for August, we could eliminate it from the amendment and just move it to the consider but rejected section. So essentially, we discussed it, we reviewed it, but it's no longer on the table for consideration. And that way it avoids staff having to analyze it and prepare any additional information for the amendment. So, if you're amenable to that, I would just change the motion to move-- Would it be move Actions 1(c) and 3(c) to the considered but rejected section?

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** Just to clarify, would you do it for wahoo as well? So, you would be moving all of the (c)s 1 through 4(c) to considered but rejected.

MARCOS HANKE: In terms of the rationale, because we are discussing one, I would say is that the same rationale does applies for what

you are just mentioning. I think that's a correct move to do. I would like to hear from the rest of the Council if we want to follow the same path for wahoo and for dolphin. The suggestion that Andy just mentioned, that's the question that I'm making. Are we going to reject or use the language that Andy proposed for both of them, Vanessa?

4 5

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes, I agree with that.

MARCOS HANKE: I'm not seeing any hands or anybody in opposition. Andy can help with the language for the motion? And the then I will check for acceptance from the motion makers.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes. So, if I'm understanding Sarah correctly, it would be to move Actions 1(c), 2(c), 3(c), and 4(c), correct? And that would include trip limit for both wahoo and dolphin. That would be eliminated from the amendment and moved to considered but rejected. So, Vanessa and J.J., are you good with that change?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes, I agree with that change in the motion.

22 JAMES R. KREGLO: I also agree with change.

MARCOS HANKE: Now we are ready to vote.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

28 JAMES R. KREGLO: Yes.

30 ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes.

32 MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** Yes.

**RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ:** Yes.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Yes.

40 MARCOS HANKE: It's unanimous. Motion carries. Thank you all. 41 Sarah, anything else?

SARAH STEPHENSON: So, that speeds us through to just my last slide, which was just next steps, just to give you an idea of what to expect with this. So, you did at this meeting refined the management measures. You provided rationale, thank you. You did select preferred alternatives, so we will take all of this back and update the amendment. We will add in Puerto Rico, dolphin and

wahoo alternatives and bring that back. We probably will not prepare the codified text, I'll get with the policy, the regulations writers and see if that's something that we need to wait for, but we'll bring back this draft amendment. It won't be the final amendment anymore. We'll bring back the draft amendment for review at the August meeting, which will have analysis of the preferred alternatives selected for the U.S.V.I. FMPs, the two species. And then, we will include alternatives for you to consider for Puerto Rico, for dolphin and wahoo. So, we'll strike those last few, but I just wanted to give you an update of what to expect with this amendment. And with that, I'll take any questions.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Sarah. I have somebody on the chat.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: You have a raised hand from Katherine Zamboni.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Kate Zamboni, NOAA's Officer of General Counsel. Just to make the record clear, I don't know if there was a motion yet to add Puerto Rico Alternatives, or Actions for Alternative for Puerto Rico and whether that motion would reflect the same alternatives that have been identified for Saint Croix and Saint Thomas and Saint John. I thought we had decided anything related to Puerto Rico would be considered after we got through all the actions that Sarah had to present.

 SARAH STEPHENSON: So, Kate, I would ask you, is a motion needed? We originally had in the draft amendment that we brought in December, we had actions and alternatives in that document for Puerto Rico and we split them out fall into December meeting. So, we had previously drafted them. Do we need a motion to put them back in? We weren't expecting that the Council would pick preferred for Puerto Rico today, at this meeting. We would bring that back in August and they would do it then. But do we need a motion to put those two species back in this amendment for Puerto Rico?

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Mr. Chair, if I may again. Again, Kate Zamboni here. I would recommend doing that just to be clear because the prior version had those other species included and so just to give staff that clear direction of what the next draft will look like, I think a motion would be preferred.

 MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Thank you. Sarah, can you please suggest the language for the motion to put on the screen and just for sake of time and to see if any Council member can accept and propose the motion?

SARAH STEPHENSON: So, the Council moves to add actions to the

amendment for size limits and recreational bag limits for dolphin and wahoo in Puerto Rico. period. And if you wouldn't mind, add, "to Amendment 3." It's number three.

MARCOS HANKE: Kate, does this motion have the language needed?

**KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI:** Yes. You could clarify it by just inserting the name of the two species of fish. The Council moves to add actions to amendment three for size limits and recreational bag limits for dolph-- oh, you have dolphin and wahoo, sorry. It's, good. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: So moved.

MARCOS HANKE: She presented a motion we can discuss.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: I'll second.

MARCOS HANKE: Andy, second.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: So, for clarification, we would also want to make sure it includes vessel limits. And then can we talk just briefly about what the range of alternatives would be so that we understand and make sure we have the right range of alternatives to bring back to the Council?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** So, for size limits, we would include the same two options for dolphin and wahoo, which were based on the 50% of the females being spawned or ready and a hundred percent. So those would be those same size limits of 20 and 24. And then the same for wahoo, the 50% and a 100%, which are 30, 32 and 40. So those would be the size limit, rate alternatives for the Puerto Rico.

The recreational bag limits would likely be similar to what we had in the December document, which Alternative 1 would be no bag limits; Alternative 2 would match what Puerto Rico has in their regulations, which as we discussed yesterday, was 10 per person per day, 30 per vessel, per day. And then, Alternative 3 would likely be a more conservative bag limit. I believe what we had in the December document, which was recommended by the Puerto Rico, DAP at one of their previous meetings was five dolphin per person per day, 15 per vessel per day. I don't believe at that time the DAP recommended a bag limit for wahoo. Puerto Rico does have a bag limit for wahoo, but it's combined with mackerel, so that was the

five species of wahoo, or the two mackerels and I think the, not two exceed, I can't remember the vessel limit. So, this Council could provide input if they wanted to change that five and 15 more conservative bag limit for dolphin. And they could also recommend an individual bag limit for wahoo that's more conservative than what the Puerto Rico regulations are.

4 5

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Not to change, but to add another alternative that is more conservative similar to what we did before?

SARAH STEPHENSON: You can either direct us to include what we had before, which is going to match Puerto Rico and then be more conservative based on recommendations from the DAP or you could direct staff to, for instance, to have the compatible alternative and then the Council could provide your own more conservative bag limit. It doesn't have to be what we had in the December document.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. Because also, I was thinking, that perhaps for the next meeting the document can have all those alternative included. The other thing is that yesterday when we were around reviewing the literature for the wahoo and the others seen this discrepancy in terms of the 50% maturity for females and the 100%, 40 inches and they have difference, but I believe that you took note of that. So, the documents that Sarah is going to present at the next meeting, we will have all that incorporated, the biology that supports the difference size limit. Somebody asked me also "what size limit are you talking about? do they mean fork length, total length and standard length?" And I guess most of the species we're talking about is fork lengths because of the shape of the—so I clarified that to them that and every time that we discuss in these pelagics, these two species, we're talking about fork lengths.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And thank you very much, Miguel. And just in my opinion, we have to have an alternative that reflect the possibility of compatible regulations to be explored and discuss. I think we are ready to vote.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

**JAMES R. KREGLO:** Yes.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yes.

45 MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

47 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Yes.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: All in favor. Motion carries. Andy?

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. And one more thing. Cause we really want to, obviously, be able to bring back as complete of a draft as possible for the August meeting. It was mentioned earlier about the U.S.V.I. and dolphin bag and vessel limits. So, if I'm not mistaken, we have the compatible regulations option. And then for Saint Thomas/Saint John, we also have an alternative that would be five dolphin and 30 per vessel. But now would be the time if we wanted to consider any sort of additional alternatives like we discussed in wahoo, if you wanted that brought back to the Council in August. So, we could make a motion now if the Council desires to change the bag and vessel limit for dolphin or recommend a change of the bag and vessel limit for dolphin.

MARCOS HANKE: For Puerto Rico?

ANDREW STRELCHECK: This is for Saint Croix and possibly Saint Thomas/Saint John, if you want more of a range of alternatives.

MARCOS HANKE: I will defer to the people from Saint Thomas/Saint John, do you have an input on that? and Saint Croix?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: For Saint Croix, no.

MARCOS HANKE: Which area again?

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. So maybe really quick, can we bring up the presentation, slide seven, I believe it is.

So, if you see in the first section, Action 1, we right now have a no action alternative and a second alternative that has 10 dolphin per person, 32 per vessel. We don't have a third alternative for that section. And then you go down to Action 3, and we have the same alternatives in Action 1, but then also a five dolphin, 30 per vessel. So, if you would like further alternatives considered, looking for guidance and a motion at this point so that staff would have direction to bring back to August meeting.

MARCOS HANKE: Julian, you? anybody else from the table? Carlos?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Well, I don't need another option here because I think that dolphin is a fish that, I mean, it grows like

[inaudible]. I mean, it's totally different to the wahoo. So, I'm good with the 10 and 32, which is compatible to the state waters.

MARCOS HANKE: Anybody else? Gerson.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There was a long discussion, as I said yesterday on this, on the DAP meeting. And these are the numbers that the members, all the members in that DAP meeting decided that was feasible for us in the Virgin Islands and the island of Saint Croix.

MARCOS HANKE: Just to clarify, you're looking for a third alternative that we don't have?

ANDREW STRELCHECK: No, what I'm trying to do is, given the comments made today, right, if there's an alternative that you want to add, let's go ahead and make that recommendation today. Otherwise, it won't be in the amendment in August, right. And so, what I'm hearing, at least from the few people that have commented on this, is there's not a need to add alternatives, so we would go with what's on the board here in the amendment and not make any changes.

MARCOS HANKE: Exactly. This is what I'm hearing from the group two.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah.

MARCOS HANKE: Unless anything else? I don't see any hands up, which means that we stay with what we have. Sarah, are we done? Right?

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** Yes, unless the Council had any recommendations for those Puerto Rico bag limits, the more conservative numbers, if you wanted to give us a range to consider for the draft amendment, that would be the only thing pending.

MARCOS HANKE: The only thing that I commented before is to have an alternative that looks for the compatible regulation, to have that.

SARAH STEPHENSON: We would include that one. Did you want to direct us to have a third alternative that would be more conservative than the one that would be compatible with DNER and then recommend bag limit numbers that we consider. For instance, a two and a 10 or a two and a six or a five. Like if you don't, then the IPT will develop that and bring those back.

 MARCOS HANKE: I prefer that you guys do it based on the biology and all the discussion that you have to put the alternatives and then we discuss and decide once it's presented. Cause I don't think the group is in position now to explore that.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos, but again, the biology is for the size limit. The bag is with other considerations. So what Sarah is asking, is for some guidance as to how low they can go rather than waiting until August. So, they can have a range of what they're going to write.

SARAH STEPHENSON: I would also like to put in, if it would be possible, could we give a similar presentation to the Puerto Rico DAP that we gave to the U.S.V.I. DAPs to discuss these management measures and get their input.

MARCOS HANKE: I think that is totally appropriate. In terms of the timing of the next meetings, maybe a special virtual meeting to address exactly that, if you guys needed, an in coordination with Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, well it is a little bit more than that. I talked to Nelson, and we are going to have a virtual meeting for all the three DAPs, but this will be a in person meeting. It will be a hybrid meeting because there's a lot of things that we did with Saint Thomas/ Saint John and Saint Croix that Puerto Rico didn't have a chance to do it. So probably, I'll talk to you later and Nelson and see which will be the best time for having that in person hybrid meeting, similar to what we have in San Juan.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. I think we covered the inputs that you're going to need to make a good document. Thank you, Sarah.

Now we are ready for the next presentation, which I believe is Kate Zamboni. CFMC Best Practices.

### CFMC Best Practices Discussion

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The next item on the agenda is the Counsel's Best Practices Discussion. There is no presentation but the working draft that is in the briefing book and available on the Council's website was presented to the Council at its December 2022 meeting. And this is the same draft the Council received in December. I'll just take a few minutes to summarize what this document would do if adopted by the Council.

It would recommend certain best practices that members of the Council's SSC could follow to avoid actual and the appearance of

conflicts of interest. These would just be best practices, which is to say these are not hard and fast rules. I don't want to create an impression that a failure to adhere to these best practices would automatically mean that somebody had a conflict of interest, or it violated some rule.

The best practices are organized around three functions served by the SSC, which are conducting peer reviews, making preliminary determinations or recommendations as to whether information available for management represents best scientific information available, referred to as BSIA in the document, and making other recommendations to the Council, such as research priorities. And the real meat of it starts on page seven, where the document describes how SSC members can ensure to avoid again, either an actual or the appearance of a conflict of interest when the SSC is serving one of those three functions. Most of the rest of the document serves as background regarding the role of the SSC and National Standard Guidelines that apply to conflicts of interest in a peer review context.

If the Council were to choose to adopt this document today, you can make changes to it now before it is finalized and even after it's adopted, the Council could undertake revisions at any point in the future. And I'm happy to answer any questions anyone may have about it. Thank you.

#### Ouestions/Comments

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Kate. Thank you for the great job and all the assistance when you were elaborating this document and the conversation with the Council members for our awareness of the important issues about it. Carlos has a motion to present and he's just writing it in a paper to present on the screen. I'll ask for a few minutes until we can present on the screen and present the motion formally. It's open for discussion and question with Kate. In the meantime, Carlos is doing that.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos, to kill time. The Wesley Merten comments are in the briefing book, the letter for everybody. He might ask for a chance this afternoon when we get into the five minutes, but from correspondence with him, he believes that the document is enough. But he might be available for this afternoon.

MARCOS HANKE: I think it'll be very good if he's available. I read the letter and I invite all the Council members and the DAPs to read the letter that was sent by Wes Merten, which is a collaborator of this Council addressing wahoo and pelagics. Thank you, Wes, for sending the letter.

1

2 Let's, put five minutes of break until the motion is on the screen. 3 We'll be back in five minutes. Gerson's birthday was celebrated 4

yesterday. He brought some cake. Everybody is welcome to eat the 5 cake, please.

6 7

(Whereupon a brief recess was taken.)

8 9 10

11

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for the patience. We have a little delay, and we are ready to restart. Liajay or Cristina, can you put the motion. Please take your seats, the motion will be on the screen soon. Please read it for the record, Carlos.

12 13 14

15

16

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, the motion is to adopt the draft document on the SSCs best practices and procedures regarding conflicts of interest on peer review of scientific information and best scientific information available.

17 18 19

MARCOS HANKE: Any second?

20 21

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Second.

22 23

MARCOS HANKE: Any further discussion?

24 25

26

27

We are very aware that we discuss and talked about this many, many times over, and we read this document. Do you want to something, Carlos?

28 29

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah, I would like, maybe, to have Ms. Zamboni input on the motion if she thinks it's good or needs anything else?

30 31 32

33 34

35

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Mr. Chair, if I may. The motion is fine. I might just recommend saying, "adopt the draft document as final." You know, just to indicate that I will, if this motion is approved, I will remove the water mark that says draft and the top of the document where it says working draft.

36 37 38

MARCOS HANKE: They are making the change now. One second.

39 40

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Hi, Kate, this is Liajay, to be clear, you want me to delete, draft and replace with working draft or final?

41 42 43

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Well, you could say-- the way it's worded is fine -"Adopt the draft document" and then insert "as final" and delete "on".

45 46

44

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Thank you.

47 48

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. That's the language, Carlos?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So yeah, I accept those corrections.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Any second?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Second.

MARCOS HANKE: Any further discussion? All in favor, say aye.

**GROUP:** Aye.

MARCOS HANKE: Motion carries. Thank you. No opposition, no abstentions. All in favor. Motion carries.

Next presentation is the Southeast Fishery Science Center Updates. Kevin McCarthy.

### SEFSC Caribbean Data Review for Stock Assessment

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** Thank you. This is Kevin. So as that's opening up, I just want to point out that all the good work that you're going to see here is the responsibility of people other than me. So, Stephanie and Refik and Adyan, who are all in the Caribbean branch with me and Kim Johnson, who is in the Fishery Statistics division, but also with the Southeast Center, but she happens to be located in Galveston, Texas. So, they did a lot of great work that you're about to see. And so, all of the good stuff is theirs and any errors or omissions are mine.

So next slide please.

So, what we're going to talk about is data and data availability, and data availability for stock assessment. And you saw this slide yesterday, but I just want to reiterate that there are several data, several kinds of data that need to go into a stock assessment. So, we talked about abundance and the biological data and the catch data, so I won't belabor the point since we talked about it yesterday. But all of these are important inputs to the stock assessment. So, I don't know if they can see the slides or not, but I guess they'll comment if they're continuing to have problems.

Okay. Well, I'll just carry on and hopefully folks are going to be able to see things. We can go to the next slide.

This is an overview of the process that the review of the data went through. And I'll get into each one of these phases a little

more as we work through the slides. But ultimately the idea was let's get to a list of species that we think have sufficient data to at least attempt a stock assessment. Sometimes in the past we've begun on a species, and it turns out we didn't have life history information, for example. So, it wasn't going to work right from the start. So, we wanted to get ahead of that and not spend time and resources on something that wasn't going to be successful from the get-go.

4 5

So, next slide please.

So, this was our process. I'm going to break this down and go through it step by step, but again, we went through this four-step process. There are a couple of other steps that are still ongoing, but we got to a point where we can say, "okay, we've got a list of species that at least have, on first examination, enough data to recommend that species be something we put forward to SEDAR as a species we want to try to get an assessment on." I'll break this down step by step.

Next slide, please.

So, this first step was we've got different categories of species as we're managing them in each of the species' groups. So, in some groups we have an indicator species, so that's what we're calling Group A. So, we've got two examples of Group A, the Saint Croix Grouper Unit Three, which is coney and graysby. Coney is the indicator, and those indicators were selected by the SSC, if I'm remembering the process correctly, because in this case, coney had more information and graysby had less information. Primarily that decision was driven by the number of landings, those were the data that the SSC were considering at the time. Then we've got some other instances where there are two indicators in the group. So, Saint Croix Snapper Unit One is an example of that. Black, blackfin, silk and vermilion snappers are in the group, but blackfin and silk are the indicators.

 We've got this other kind of group, we're calling Group B, which there's only a single species in the unit. So, for Snapper Unit Two in Saint Thomas/Saint John, queen snapper is the sole species in that unit. So, we want to look at those. And then, we've got another group where we have multiple species in the unit, but there is no indicator. And so, in Grouper Unit Four in Puerto Rico, black, red, tiger, yellowfin and yellowmouth groupers are all in that unit, but there is no indicator.

So, what we wanted to do was identify those species that are in either group A, B, or C, because there are also instances like

1 those group A's where we've got graysby, for example, in Grouper Unit Three for Saint Croix, it's not an indicator, so we didn't 2 move forward with looking at data for graysby. We wanted to focus 3 4 on the indicators. That's the sort of the point I'm trying to make 5 here. We focused on the indicators, we focused on the single species units, and we then also included that Group C, where there 6 7 was no indicator, but we have to account for all the species in 8 the group.

9

10 So next slide.

11 12

13

14

So that was our first step. Was it an indicator species? Was it a single species unit? or was it a multiple species unit that had no indicator? We kept all those species. That was our first cut at identifying species for possible assessment.

15 16 17

Next slide.

18

And so, what we ended up with here is in Puerto Rico we started off with 65 species, but when you eliminate those that aren't a group A, a group B, or a group C, we're down to 53.

22

Next slide.

24

Well, I should point out if you could go back for just one second. Sorry about that. Yeah, up to that one. Perfect. Yep. Down one on the other direction back to the initial list of species, wherever that is. A couple more. Another one and one more. That's the one. Thank you.

23

30 31

32

33

So, all of that, just to tell you that sea cucumber, sea urchin and corals are also managed, but we didn't include them in this analysis. We're not going to do a stock assessment on any of those anytime soon.

343536

Uh, next slide.

37

38 So, in Saint Thomas and Saint John, we started with 49 species by 39 cutting out those that weren't indicators or single species or 40 multiple species without an indicator. We ended up with 29 out of 49.

42 43

Next slide.

44

In Saint Croix we went from 45 to 33. And those are just species that we're not focusing on because they don't meet that first criteria. It's not as though we won't, one day in the distant future, do a stock assessment on them. But we're really focused on

these three groups.

Next slide.

4 5

 So that was step one. Step two, we're now starting to look at the data. So, are there size composition data available? If yes, the species moves on to the next step. If no, it's not really yet ready in terms of data for a stock assessment.

So next slide.

So, what we're looking at is sample size and the distribution of that sample size over time. You know, we want to have samples throughout the time series that we've got data for and how many years is that? Do we have the most recent years of data? Are we missing any years? It's especially problematic if we're missing data in the most recent years. And we're looking at, do we have those data by gear and have the patterns of gear usage changed over time? This gets into selectivity. So, when you're looking at size composition, you have to know what kinds of gears are being fished because different gears may catch the fish at different sizes and so you've got to understand the gear selectivity so that you understand the patterns of sizes that you're seeing in your samples.

Next slide.

So, this is an example of one that has a good amount of data. You can see we're talking about almost 63,000 lobster that have been measured over time and you've got a little bit of a dip in the sample size in '20 and '21, that's probably a covid effect. But before that, we had, you know, thousands of animals that were being measured every year and that goes back to 1980. There were a couple years where there were fewer, and the gears have changed a little bit in terms of the proportions of animals being measured from the different gears. Diving has become much more important, and the pots and traps has a relatively smaller proportion but still steady numbers of animals being measured by those different gears over time. And when we completed this investigation, remember we had 51 species that passed step one in Puerto Rico, we're now down to 14. 14, have sufficient size compositions. We went from 29 to 12 in Saint Thomas and in Saint Croix went from 33 to four.

So next slide.

So, here's an example of when we've got problems with the size composition data. Those last several years that are in that box there on the right side of the graph. There are just not very many

samples there. You know, overall, there are almost 34,000 samples, and this is about 34 years. So had we had a thousand measured Blue Tang every year, we'd have been in great shape. But what we have is a big cluster of the measurements happening in the first half of the time series and the second half of the time series. It gets really sparse and almost non-existent beginning in about 2011. And you can see it jumps, from the scale on the bottom it jumps from 2011 to 2016. So, for several years we didn't have any measured Blue Tang.

4 5

Next slide.

So, we could then go on to step three and looked at landings because we certainly need to have a time series of landings.

16 Next slide.

And we looked at a lot of the same things as we did with the size composition data. You know, what are the distribution of landings over time? Were the species always on the form or were they writeins? We've talked about that in discussions yesterday. How many years was the length of the data set? Do we have data from the most recent years? Are we missing years? We just don't have any landings for some of the time series. And we need landings by gear because that also ties back to the size composition data. So, we need some very specific things. And you can see changes, especially, in some of the islands where the new fishers come in, they may be more likely to be divers than they are to be trapped fishers, for example, in some of the islands.

Next slide.

So, when we look at that, this is an example, this is Lane Snapper. This is an example of a great time series. We've got landings from a number of different gears, but they've been pretty steady, and we don't have a bunch of holes in the time series. And it turns out when you have good size composition data, you generally have good landings data. They sort of go hand in hand. As a species that's landed frequently is more likely to be sampled by the port sampler to get the size composition data. So, in Puerto Rico, after that second step, we were down to 14 species. Two dropped out because of insufficient landings time series. Saint Thomas/Saint John we went from 12 to 11. In Saint Croix, we stayed at four.

Next slide.

So, this is an example of a bad time series of landings data. And I can't show it to you because the data are confidential, it's so

sparse. So, we had some of those and we drop those from further consideration in this analysis.

Next slide.

So, step four, is there life history information available? We've got to have that. If we don't have life history information, we can't really do much in a stock assessment.

Next slide.

So, we spent a lot of time, well, we, the folks who were really doing the work, spent a lot of time reviewing a really nice review paper by Molly Stevens and colleagues. This came out in 2019. They're also looking at more recent data, but this was an excellent review. And the other nice thing that was done in this paper was to rank the completeness of the life history data. So, we got a score of zero to three, you could see in this little table here. And what we went with was, I believe if it had a score of two or higher, we considered that adequate. And we went, in this case then, from 12 species to eight species in Puerto Rico, 11 to eight in Saint Thomas/Saint John, and from four down to three in Saint Croix.

Next slide.

So, here's what we've come up with. So, this is in Puerto Rico. These are the species, the ones that are highlighted in yellow have either had a stock assessment or scheduled for a stock assessment. So, SEDAR 57, the 57 update, and SEDAR 91-- which is shocking to me since I think my first SEDAR was SEDAR 4, so I've been doing this a long time --that's spiny lobster. We are currently working on SEDAR 80. It's been completed in Puerto Rico. That's Queen Triggerfish, but it is still ongoing for the Virgin Islands. SEDAR 84, which is coming up later this summer we'll start some of the data prep. That's, that's yellowtail in Puerto Rico. And then, hogfish has been recommended for the 2025, yet to be numbered, SEDAR. But there are several others here mutton lane, red hind and dolphin that so far look adequate to try a stock assessment on. So, we've got several more we can do in the future.

Next slide.

In Saint Thomas, same thing. The yellow either have had a stock assessment or in the midst of a stock assessment or scheduled for a future stock assessment. I have red hind up at the top there. This is something we need to discuss. Right now, we don't have, for the Virgin Islands, a species that has been recommended to

SEDAR for a stock assessment in 2025, but we want to talk about what that will be. So, red hind is a possibility. We've also got data sufficient for redtail, stoplight, blackfin and doctorfish.

Next slide.

In Saint Croix we were down to three species. All of them either have had a stock assessment or in the middle of a stock assessment. Queen Triggerfish or stoplight parrotfish are up for an assessment in 84. We still need a candidate for 2025 and we'll talk about that.

Next slide.

So, these are species that we're still examining. What we need to do, in this case— let me go down to my notes because there was something terribly insightful, I was going to say about this. So, if we explore some alternate modeling approaches, if we are creative in our approaches and do some exploratory work, we might be able to include these in a stock assessment. I think the major issue that we have with these species is the size composition data. And if that is in fact true, we might be able to do something in a modeling framework. But if we do, it'll be really critical that we have an index of abundance.

Next slide.

Same is true in Saint Thomas/Saint John. We've got four other species that maybe we can do something with, but in the meantime, we're doing some additional data exploration.

Next slide.

The same is true in Saint Croix. Here I've highlighted red hind as a possible candidate for 2025 stock assessment. But there are a number, you could see-- 2, 4, 6, 8, --9 species it looks like, that maybe we can, with some additional data exploration and some thought into how we could model the data that we do have, we might be able to do something with those, but that examination is ongoing.

Next slide.

So that was our process. And down here in the lower left in red, these are steps that we're still working on. So, we know that we've got issues with recreational landings. The issue being we don't really have them. We don't have them in the Virgin Islands, and we no longer have them in Puerto Rico after MREP stopped sampling

back in 2017. 2017 is in a complete year, for sampling. Then we've got indices of abundance, step six and step seven. One, the FD meaning fishery dependent. So, this would be an index that we generate with data from the fishers, either the logbooks or some additional work that we could do and getting reports directly from fishers. We've talked about that a little bit, and we're going to continue those conversations. And the fishery independent data, we do have one longer term data set. This is what I sometimes refer to as the RVC data, the reef visual census data. So, these are the divers. That is a good data set for some of the finfish, not for lobsters, not for conch but for some of the finfish, not all of them, but a number of them. So, we're continuing to examine those data for the most, likely species that, that survey can inform an index. So that's our process and that gets us down to those lists of recommended species.

Um, next slide.

4 5

Okay. So, the other thing that this does is it points out the things we need to do, right? So, we've got some species that we think we can try an attempt an assessment on. We've got some confidence there that we've at least got data to give it a try. But we've also got those lower tiers of species that kind of fell out along the way. And so, they're missing pieces of data and that's where we can focus future work. You know, so we can focus on getting more length samples, for example. That was a problem for a lot of those sort of second tier species where we're doing some additional work and need to be fairly creative in how we might model those. But that's one area that we can really, I think, increase the number of species that have adequate data for assessment if we get some more length samples.

Life history was also a problem. We've lost a few species along the way because we didn't have adequate life history. Those are studies that are not long-term. Length samples, landings, indices of abundance those all are time series of data that require years and years of data. Life history studies are shorter term studies. So that's a really productive area of research that you can do on research grants. You don't need programmatic funding, although it's nice to have. We're still looking at the abundance indices and where we have adequate data for those.

And we're working with both DNER and DFW on beginning recreational landings data collection programs on all of the islands. And we continue to develop new commercial landing estimation surveys, again, on all of the islands. In particular in the Virgin Islands, we're working in partnership with the DFW staff.

 Next slide.

4 5

 So, the Council needs to provide SEDAR with a recommendation for 2025. We've already got— in Puerto Rico, you all have already recommended Hogfish. In the Virgin Islands, I'm going to suggest red hind. It's an indicator species in both Saint Thomas/Saint John, and in Saint Croix. In Saint Croix we've got low numbers for size composition samples, so that'll present some modeling challenges. So, an index of abundance will be critical input for that model, but I think we can try it. And in Saint Thomas and Saint John a much more numerous size composition data, and I think that it was in that highest tier. So, recommended for stock assessment.

So, red hind would be my recommendation. Let's keep in mind that currently we have capacity for only two species for any given SEDAR. So, the same species on two islands and a second species on a third. It would be even better if we did a single species and the same one on all islands, but my branch has only two assessment biologists. And, in fact, we only have one right now but I'm in the process of hiring. So, anybody who has some stock assessment background, you're welcome to apply. So, I'm going to pause it here and take questions and we can talk about this 2025 recommendation question.

## Questions/ Comments

MARCOS HANKE: Your questions. Vanessa?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. I was just thinking about the hogfish in Puerto Rico. We know that it is highly commercial and on demand for the restaurants here and especially from the west coast. In that case, when you're thinking about taking this SEDAR, how could we collaborate for the information and to be active with the commercial fishermen and supply those samples for you?

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** So, there are lots of ways for folks to be involved. One of the biggest ways will be to select fishers who fish for hogfish to be involved in the process right from the start. And this will be in 2025, so we don't have to have any nominations yet. But SEDAR will ask for participants, and we want to make sure that we identify those fishers and get them involved in the process.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Kevin. I think I can see on your presentation that we are lining up the previous presentation and this one, the inclusion of the industry where I'm going to make a

question and an example where we can improve on the analysis, maybe. There is a slide that you presented with the black grouper as a priority to explore, because we need information about this. As an industry member, we don't catch a lot of black groupers. I know about the ecological importance of the high predators but based on my experience, to get a life history locally of all the juveniles and all the data needed for that, I see very, very difficult in a mid-short and midterm. You know, I hope that this kind of analysis, because I would hate to put effort into that needing more information on very important commercial fishes versus this example that I'm giving to you.

4 5

Addressing the question of Vanessa, I keep seeing this question coming over and over and over. What about a little bit of coordination and leadership? Because on the life history, we want the very little and the very big ones, and creating a protocol guided by the Center saying, "Vanessa, as soon as you get a huge hogfish, which is this measurement, you're going to preserve it this way and I'm going to have my contact and my personnel go there and pick it up" And starting to make sure that, not just Vanessa but any fishermen can support the difficult parts, which is the larger ones and the little ones, right. Things like that, I think, in coordination with the industry, we can do a much better job. I would like to hear your comments about it, and I have something else to say.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: I agree with you completely. That's great way for fishers to be involved in solving some of these data scarcity issues and informing, especially life history. But it does require coordination because samples are perishable depending upon what we're sampling. We could train people—I don't know how to do it, but others do —in taking the otoliths, for example, and that is not perishable. But if we're doing any sort of reproductive studies or something like that, the samples have to be preserved in a certain way and so there's supplies that are involved, so it would take some coordination, but I think it's doable.

 I think it was on a slide yesterday. I went through a lot of stuff pretty fast yesterday, but we have proposals in for three different life history studies and we'll absolutely want fisher participation in those. So, if they're funded, we'll certainly be looking for cooperative research partners from the community. So, I think that all of those things are possible to better fill out. As you say, it's the small ones and the big ones that we have trouble getting, right, because the ones in the middle sizes are what everybody's catching. So those are easy to get. So, you're right.

MARCOS HANKE: I just think that the technical coordination with the industry goes a long way. There are leaders that can be trained and things that can be done. I know in fact— I don't want to get to the weeds and the details that we can do better —including once, there was a study being made that those scientists that were doing X study of life history or whatever, had on their grant something allocated to money, resource and materials to train and start collecting other things that were going to advance finding the guidance that you just gave us on the presentation.

4 5

I don't know. I think we can do a better coordination. It is not a better job because the information is there. We have expertise, but we need to coordinate better in a proactive way, more than a presentation, to turn into action. This is what I have been desperate for, for years, right? And we are getting there. We are seeing the engagement, but we just need everybody to step up to the plate. I have Nelson, Julian and the chat.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Kevin, I think that Marcos and I are talking a lot about this. We think that pilot training and data collection to create a long-term index of abundant for lobster is necessary. Everything has to be coordinated and supported by the Science Center. Scientific fleet formed by a voluntary trap lobster fisher, and maybe you can consider including the divers, that could be excellent for providing special information to create the index abundance. We can consider number of trips, pounds of lobster, number of top haulers, soaking time, number of lobsters, anything that you consider is pertinent, but it'll have to be coordinated by you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Nelson. I have Julian.

NELSON CRESPO: One second.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. I'm sorry, Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: I'm going to bring this issue to the DAP meeting, which I hope you can make it, for discussion and exploring alternatives.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Yeah, like we discussed yesterday, we'll figure out a way to get to the meeting and have that discussion. And we'll bring along with me either Adyan or Stephanie so that we don't have any sort of language-- we don't need to make it more complicated by-- I want everybody to feel comfortable in the conversation. So, Stephanie and Adyan will fill that role very, very well.

 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for the usual disposition of being there for the fishermen and to keep creating those channels. Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Julian Magras, for the record. Excellent presentation, Kevin. Once again, we are headed in the right direction. Like, the off the record conversation we had several times, filling in the gaps before we actually go into our stock assessment is the key. Because we're going to save thousands and thousands of dollars. Let's spend that money up front and get what's needed for the assessments and we are ready and willing to do whatever it takes to help. You know, I've sat on three or four different SEDAR assessment processes, all the way back to 2004 was my first one, and the most recent one was the Queen Triggerfish. We are still not finished with that in some areas. I saw one of the issues there was, we didn't have any juvenile fish, because the fishers only bring in the ones that can be sold. So, what I did over the last couple months, well few months, is I've been collecting some small little juvenile queen triggers that managed to stay compressed in my traps. Those we normally release right away and I brought them in so when Virginia comes back in June to do the sampling for the yellowtail snappers, the life history assessments on those yellowtails, I'm going to give-- I have a whole big bag full of them and I'm going to give her that so it can be plugged in to that assessment, so we can see that link that was missing.

 So, this is where the Fishermen Association and the fishers of the Saint Thomas/Saint John District are ready to work, once the method has been created and how we move forward, we're ready to work in getting this information together. Okay, this is what is needed. Because at the end of the day, you guys will be able to do your job and the fishers would also feel comfortable with the outcome of not using models from other areas because we didn't have sufficient data here in the Caribbean. So, I think we're headed in the right direction, so thank you.

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** Yeah, that's great. I mean, very much what Marcos was just saying, when the fishers know what to be looking for, they're able to make those collections if they know how to maintain the samples. Yeah, it's a great collaboration and you and you guys are out there all the time. You're seeing this stuff all the time.

MARCOS HANKE: Anybody else? Andy?

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, thanks, Kevin, for the presentation. Great synthesis of how you've kind of walked through to evaluate how to conduct stock assessments. I had a similar comment to kind of what Marcos mentioned earlier, which is, you know, a species

like black grouper could show up on the list but maybe isn't really suitable for conducting a stock assessment because it's not of economic importance or there's maybe limited data and information. So, I guess my comment is, I don't necessarily have any recommendations for 2025 other than I think another component of this should be looking at kind of the cultural and economic value of the fishery and how we use that to help prioritize stock assessments and evaluation of the species.

4 5

Then my question for you is, doing the triage really is enlightening in terms of the gaps that need to be filled. So historically, if we haven't collected the data in a manner to conduct a stock assessment it's like we're starting at day one and then collecting data to go forward. So, at what point do you feel like we would have sufficient information if we were able to accomplish the objectives of data collection to meet the stock assessment needs to actually perform a future stock assessment? Assuming we start that today, is it a 10-year timeframe? Is it a five-year timeframe? Is there a way of being able to make progress toward adding species to this list over time if we're able to collect the data?

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Yeah, I think it depends upon the data that's lacking. You know, so if we had, for example—a lot of this is size composition data or lack of it, right? Is where we run into problems. So, if we had a couple years from now of good size comp data and we also had it from 10 years ago or 15 years ago, now we've at least got a couple of data points. And there's some things we can do to be in the modeling that, you know, we can sort of work around that to a certain extent if we've got some other information, like an index of abundance. An index is usually going to be, you know, you're going to want five years of that because you just need to have a time series. Anything much less than five years is really not enough to track those trends.

So, I think it also depends here on what we're lacking. If we can fill in the size comp data pretty well even if we've got a gap of some years, if we've got the most recent years in adequate sampling, that makes a big difference. So, I think there's some things we can do in the next five years that really turn a lot of this around. During those five years, we can also be addressing the life history gaps for some of these species too because those are shorter term studies. You don't need 10 years of life history data to inform a stock assessment like you would need, say, five years of an index.

So, I think there's a lot of things we can do in a relatively short period of time. And hopefully when the boss was here yesterday,

she was suitably impressed with what we're trying to do that she'll look out for us in the money realm. We'll see how that goes.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. And in terms of the triage mentioned by Andy, I know by fact that the amount of fish landed is one of the main ones, but I really didn't see the part where, how many gears interact or catch that fish in, not just sectors but gears. Is there anything on the triage that considers that? Because basically what we are talking about is the potential exposition of that fish to be caught into the future or being caught now. Is there anything that we are doing to address that?

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** So, all of the data that we reviewed, the landings and the size composition data, all of that we look at it gear specific. So those graphs—we could go up to one of them —you'll see that it's by gear within those histograms.

MARCOS HANKE: Short question. If there are more gears that catch the fish that would put the ranking higher, or no?

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** No. No, we just need to track it by gear because the size composition may differ among gears.

MARCOS HANKE: No, I get it. I was just talking about the priority and the triage.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: No, this is in no way-- this is entirely data driven. So, we've made no ranking due to some other criteria. All of them are the same in the sense that there was adequate data or they're missing a key piece, or they really don't have any data at all. Those are sort of the tiers that we developed. But, within those, it's entirely the purview of the Council to decide, "Okay. We think this one needs a stock assessment more urgently than some other one." So that would be up to you all. We could weigh in on that if you asked us to, but it's really up to you all.

**MARCOS HANKE:** Thank you. Anybody else? Or we keep going with your presentation?

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** I'd like to see, if we can, if the Council agrees with red hind for 2025 for SEDAR in the Virgin Islands. So, we've got Hogfish in Puerto Rico, but we need a species for the Virgin Islands, and we can really only go with one.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. I remember. I'm going to defer to the people from U.S.V.I. to know how important red hind are on that fishery. I think it's a very important species and there are other discussions about timing on the reproduction and other things

related to the red hind. I think this stock assessment will be important, but I would like to hear from people from U.S.V.I. Carlos?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I'm good with the red hind.

MARCOS HANKE: Nicole?

 NICOLE F. ANGELI: Yeah. I think this is an appropriate species. It spans both districts. Both island-based fisheries management plans will benefit, and our data will increase. So, we support this.

MARCOS HANKE: Julian?

JULIAN MAGRAS: Yeah, I think the red hind should be that assessment for 2025. We have tons and tons of information on red hind, both from the CCR and also from all the studies that the University of the Virgin Islands and other people have studied these closed areas and everything. So, I think it's a great opportunity for us to do a stock assessment on a red hind.

MARCOS HANKE: Gerson?

**GERSON MARTÍNEZ:** I also agree with the red hind for the assessment.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. What else, Kevin, do you need to know from us?

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** If everyone's happy, if the Council's happy with red hind, you just need to tell the steering committee and I'll tell Julie Neer, I think she's on the call, so we can move forward with red hind and hogfish in 2025.

MARCOS HANKE: Please, just to take note Liajay about that. The record is clear that the red hind is the one. Thank you.

#### Southeast Fishery Science Center Acknowledgements

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** Thank you, thank you all. I've got some more slides and then I know John wanted a couple of minutes, so I'll try and get through these fairly quickly.

Next slide.

So, I just wanted to acknowledge that this was not the first sort of data review in the SEDAR process. I think it's SEDAR 4 and all

the way up to 46, had some pretty extensive data reviews. There was a special workshop, a SEDAR special topics workshop, back in, I want to say 2009 or so, that looked at Caribbean data. So, in our review, we very heavily looked at the work that had come before us. There had been a fishery independent survey workshop that was conducted at the Science Center in Miami a number of years ago. Skyler Sagarese, who many of you know, did an awful lot of work on species prioritization, not just here in the Caribbean, but also in the Southeast, Gulf and South Atlantic. And Adyan Rios began this most recent data review and then sort of pass it over to Stephanie, Refik and Kim. So, I just want to acknowledge all those efforts in the past.

4 5

Next slide. Oh, we lost-

ZOOM SERVICE: Recording in progress.

## Southeast Fishery Science Center Quick Update

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** Okay. Looks like we're back in business. Next slide.

So, this is really just a prompt for me to give you a quick update on SEDAR 80. So, as you'll recall, SEDAR 80 is Queen Triggerfish for all the islands. It was completed and accepted by the SSC for Puerto Rico. We're still working on the U.S. Virgin Islands. You may, I think most all of you know by now that Nancy Cummings retired at the end of last year. So, she was our lead assessment biologist on that on that project, so Adyan Rios has taken over. So, we've taken a little bit of time to get reorganized and moved forward. Also working with Adyan is Kyle Shertzer. He's one of the assessment biologists that normally works in the South Atlantic. He's based in Beauford, North Carolina, but he is an outstanding assessment biologist. So, he's going to be a real boost to this assessment and also, SEDAR 84. He's going to be participating in that. I think we've had Kyle for over a year, I mean, assisting with those two assessments. So that's exciting news.

 Following the presentations to the SSC at the end of November last year, there were some additional guidance for how the SSC would like to see SEDAR 80 move forward. So, those are going to be reviewed at the upcoming SSC meeting in a few weeks. That's a joint meeting with the with the TAP, the EBFM TAP. So, I'm looking forward to that presentation from Adyan and Kyle at the SSC.

Next slide. Is that the last one you have?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: That's it. That was the last slide.

1 2

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** Oh, well I've got more, so I'll just tell you about it. So, SEDAR 84-- there's nothing to show. I'm just going to talk.

SEDAR 84 which is Yellowtail Snapper in Saint Thomas/Saint John and Puerto Rico, and stoplight parrotfish in Saint Croix, we are really looking for participants in that. I know we've talked about that a little bit, so I know that the SEDAR coordinator would like to have a finalized list, if she hasn't received it already, from the Council, of folks that you would nominate to participate. So those would be you know, folks from the SSC, which I think we've already got some of them and if not, they certainly need to take up this conversation at their meeting in a couple of weeks. It is also not uncommon to have Council members participate in the process. So, if there's a Council member who is interested it'd be helpful, and we'd certainly welcome their participation. Fishers, of course we need participation, but also from the Virgin Islands Division of Fish and Wildlife participants, as well as Puerto Rico, DNER.

So many of you may have already put your names out there. I'm not chastising anyone. I'm encouraging people to participate because it's vital to the process.

MARCOS HANKE: Question. When's the date of SEDAR 84 for yellowtail?

 KEVIN MCCARTHY: We started in the summer with a data scoping call. I think that's in July. So that's just an online thing. A virtual meeting. I think there's an in-person workshop, I believe it's scheduled for October, late October. And it will be down here somewhere. It's up to SEDAR to decide if it's in the Virgin Islands or if it's in Puerto Rico. That's something that they'll be working on.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay, Carlos.

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, yeah, I mentioned this to Kevin yesterday and to Graciela a few weeks ago, but I want to put it on the record that for the Saint Croix district, for the workshop, for the stoplight parrotfish, I'm recommending Gerson Martínez and Marsha Taylor to be on that workshop as local fishers and they're also members of our Saint Croix FAC and they're also members of the Saint Croix DAP.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Kevin.

 **KEVIN MCCARTHY:** Thanks. So, are these people you're drafting, do they know that they're being drafted?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: No, yeah, I spoke to them at our December, January FAC and again, I mentioned it at the April FAC.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. And because I'm not going to be-

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Sorry. I'm sorry. And they both agreed.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Because I'm not going to be on the next August meeting and as a member of the industry, I just want to say, to be on the record, that I am available for yellowtail representing recreational and other expertise on lane snapper and yellowtail snapper in the future SEDAR process. I'll be available. I'll be glad to collaborate on that. Julian?

**JULIAN MAGRAS:** Yes, Julian Magras, for the record. Also back in December, I submitted the names recommendation for the fishers for the yellowtail Fisher fishing industry in Saint Thomas/Saint John District. I submitted them to Graciela already. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Julian.

**KEVIN MCCARTHY:** So, I've got one more thing, very brief and then I'll turn it over to John. So, all we need for this to move forward is to make sure that whatever the list of nominees is from the Council that goes to Graciela and onto SEDAR. And we need it pretty soon. So, whatever that list is, if we can just ensure it moves on to SEDAR, so that would include also the local science partners in DNER and DFW as well as any nominees from the Council.

And then the last update I want to give is on the electronic logbook data availability issue. So, this is the ShellCatch data. So, this is an ongoing process right now. The data are housed in a cloud storage the ShellCatch has. So, in order for us to use it in an assessment, we've got to have more accessibility than that. A good portion of the commercial landings are now being reported by these electronic logbooks. And I know it that the Virgin Islands is also interested in moving forward with this but there are some database issues that we're trying to solve. It's something that I would not have realized that is as complicated as it is, had I not worked for the Fishery Statistics Division for years. It's just not something you think about until you live in that world. Anyway, there's a group from DNER ShellCatch, ACCSP, which is the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program. They're going to warehouse the data that we then have access to, and this is the sort of thing they do. And the Science Center, primarily Kim Johnson and Yanet Jiménez, are working to get those data migrated over to ACCSP. There's a lot of stuff that goes on in the background that requires a lot of work. And it's a slow process because they'll fix one thing, and two other things will break. So, it's a trial and trial and trial and trial some more around the error's kind of process. But I think they're a little bit stalled but hopefully we can get, get them moving again.

4 5

So that is my update. Thanks for your attention and your decision making. I'm going to turn it over to John.

MARCOS HANKE: One quick thing from Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Oh yeah. I forgot to mention, when it comes to the stoplight parrotfish assessment, Gerson will be representing the commercial sector and Marshall will be representing the recreational sector. So, you'll have two different opinions.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Carlos. John?

#### Marine Spatial Planning for Aquaculture and Offshore wind

 JOHN WALTER, III: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Kevin, for presenting on behalf of the Center. I just wanted to follow up on two things that our topics that Janet brought up and one other topic. The one topic is on offshore wind and also on aquaculture. I think those are two things that we have, as an agency, worked on pretty extensively in the Gulf of Mexico and other areas to develop what we call Marine Spatial Planning for those kind of activities in the offshore environment. It's probably a beneficial thing for this Council to consider as well, that that planning informs where you might put offshore aquaculture and also the planning for where offshore wind might go, to try to deconflict for other ocean uses. I think it's that upfront early planning for those activities that is really critical to being able to find the right space in the ocean for all the activities, including our fisheries.

And so, what I want this Council to be aware of is a number of things, and I'll send these links to Council staff. One, the aquaculture opportunity area Atlas for the Gulf of Mexico, which was a NOAA product. NOAA administers aquaculture in the offshore waters. That is something that we'd like to begin the planning process for in the Caribbean. Something similar to what was done in the Gulf of Mexico and in California to identify good areas for aquaculture. We're going to work with our partners at NCCOS to begin that process.

There's also likely to be a strong stakeholder component of those

because we're going to need the information on what the other activities that are in that environment. Right now, we don't have a major initiative for it yet. It's just getting started. But I think that's something that it would be good, if there is support from the Council for that, to say, "Yes, indeed, we want to see that happen."

4 5

Number two is offshore wind. We think that the planning should be done for both at the same time because there is likely to be synergies in economies of scale that could be gained. Also, if you're going to compile all of the spatial data layers, you might as well do it all at once. And so, we're also going to be doing that planning for offshore wind in the Caribbean, in territories and the Commonwealth. We think that it may be possible to do that for other areas as well. Depending on the scope and nature of what we can do, that's going to involve pulling together all the data sets for where fishing occurs, where coral reefs are, where our trust resources occur. So, for instance, marine mammals, sea turtles, if we've got the data, we're going to put that into a spatial modeling process.

And then the next step is that, at least in the way that it happened in the Gulf of Mexico, is the state leadership requested a task force be stood up by BOEM. Then after they get a request from that BOEM then stands up a task force which assembles all of the stakeholders who would be involved in that and then that task force then has a series of meetings that will outline the process and the plan going forward. And so that worked out fairly well in the Gulf. The Gulf started with 30 million acres of wind to be considered in the initial planning process. Now they're offering 300,000 acres of wind for a lease sale. I think the message is start big to be able to end big and be able to deconflict for other ocean uses. And so, the gulf process was able to find good areas in the Gulf that avoided many of the major fisheries and avoided many of the major protected species.

And I think following that process of informed planning is where we would like to promote and also partner, I think, if the Council is indeed interested in that. Those are my two points there. I have something to follow up afterwards, but I'd like to hear some comments on that.

#### Questions/Comments

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, I'm ready to make some comments, but I want to hear from the Council members if you have any. Go ahead, Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: We did that before, Marine Spatial Planning, for

other purposes, and we put together, we the Puerto Rico and U.S. Virgin Island government. So how do you envision this task force? who should trigger the development and the assemblage of the task force? And certainly we, in the past, we stated for the record that we are interested in participating in anything that is related to spatial planning. Especially now with the offshore wind and the Aquaculture facilities that we're discussing. So, in your mind, what would be the next step for the Council to work on this spatial planning?

4 5

JOHN WALTER, III: Okay, so the task force specifically is administered by BOEM, and that's a request from Commonwealth or territorial leadership to BOEM to stand up a task force that would begin that process for offshore wind. The Marine Spatial Planning can happen independent of the task force because that is compiling the data sets and building the models to inform where we might want to do things to then advise BOEM. BOEM used that information in the Gulf to then determine where they were going to eventually offer for leasing. NOAA uses that information to identify the areas that it would promote or recommend for aquaculture.

In terms of how the Council can get involved in the Marine Spatial Planning, I think one, seeing what information has already been done is the first step, so that we aren't recreating work that's already done. And then two, I think in terms of being able to help compile data sets, both the socioeconomic aspects of it, which are often a little more challenging to get, as well as any of the natural resources data sets that can be compiled would be highly valuable. And in particular, we need to know where fishermen are fishing and what activities might be either precluded by aquaculture or offshore wind or promoted by it, because it has both benefits and opportunities. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: I have Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah. John, can you tell me, I keep hearing BOEM, can you tell me what that is?

MARCOS HANKE: Just explain a little bit of what that is.

JOHN WALTER, III: BOEM is the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. And so, BOEM is the agency who does the lease sales for offshore oil and gas.

And so, something that worked well in the Gulf of Mexico was that BOEM engaged very strongly and repeatedly with the Gulf Council. In the last Gulf Council meetings, BOEM would have staff explain the offshore wind process to the Council and then present on the

status of how wind is proceeding. We found that to be quite effective in being able to raise awareness of what was going on. And I think a request also to BOEM of could you please advise us of where BOEM's intents are for the Caribbean could be a useful request to BOEM from this Council. Thank you.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos?

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: The orientation that I received from BOEM people, because they also work with Atlantic and the Council, is that the two local government, maybe they already did it, but the two local government has to send a request for inclusion. That has to come from the governor of Puerto Rico and the governor of the Virgin Islands. Of course, it has to be supported by the locals, but I don't know the status of what they are doing.

They asked me if I had any document related to that because they also wanted the Council to provide the information and that's why I asked John. For example, we asked geographical information as to where the fishers are, where the marine resources are that we use for fishery, the possibility of aquaculture areas, and is the map that Graciela is working with Martha Prada, if that's something that we can provide.

MARCOS HANKE: Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah. So, I know that the U.S.V.I., the government, has appointed their Aquaculture Commission members, and I think that this would be a good place for them to start discussions on spatial planning and I'll mention that.

MARCOS HANKE: Nicole or Ricardo, do you want to mention something?

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Sure. We're very interested in helping support marine spatial planning. We already have multiple initiatives underway. The Council already has initiatives underway, and we would like to support that in a cohesive manner. Our Office of Energy is in conversations with BOEM, so I think that that might be a good integration for us that we could talk about at some point. Um, I wasn't aware the Council had been asked as well, but we have been asked in alternative ways, territorially.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Thank you for the opportunity. Ricardo López for the record. In DNR, we have an office of permits and most recently we have been gathering more applications to work with aquaculture. So, I think this comes in a good moment. Thanks a

lot.

MARCOS HANKE: Andy?

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, a couple of comments. So certainly, I think one recommendation would be if the, you know, knowing that there's potential for development of wind energy in the Caribbean, having the Council reach out to the territorial governments and express, kind of, interest in participating and engaging as this process develops would be really important.

The process in the Gulf kind of emerged from the state of Louisiana requesting this task force be developed, right? And so, they kind of led the charge with the task force, then expanded into a large group of people from both federal and state governments as well as Congress and many other participants and we've now had, I think, four inter-agency renewable energy meetings. But it's been a very productive, open dialogue, transparent process and as John mentioned, informed by marine spatial planning. And we've really been pushing, obviously, for the marine spatial planning to move forward in other areas.

For the Caribbean, it would be, I think, more challenging just because of the data and information you have, right? And so, I think the process will have to develop based on the data limitations and how we get informed, obviously, from fishermen and others. But I did want to comment on the aquaculture opportunity areas.

So that's a process that's run by NOAA, National Marine Fisheries Service. We have been selecting a couple areas every few years in order to develop around the country. And so, that process is informed by marine spatial planning, but we gauge interest, we gauge availability of infrastructure and then, based on that, we dedicate time, resources, effort to prioritize various regions in the country to develop aquaculture opportunity areas. And so, the first two that were out of the gate were the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific Southwest California but there's other areas, obviously, that we've been looking into and expanding. And so certainly, we can do that for Puerto Rico and the U.S.V.I., but it's kind of a stage process that we're developing over time based on resources and staffing in terms of what we can support based on other areas that we're working on right now.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. I want to share with the Council because as Chairman and part of the Council I have been in many meetings that address what is going on around the nation in terms of aquaculture, spatial aquaculture. I saw the value of aquaculture

activities and that it has flexibility to it, to adapt to the Caribbean needs.

I made a presentation representing you guys at the Recreational Summit about the added value if you design correctly the aquaculture activity, not just the poundage of fish that is produced, but the divers that can visit the site, if the structure helps in recruitment of other species that get into the fishery and so on. I don't want to go over that in detail, but I really think that the Council expressed on the past and should promote the aquaculture with Caribbean considerations by design since the beginning not to lose opportunities of making it work. And that addresses which species we are going to use, the genetics that are going to be in there, the design of the cages and all the technical details.

One other thing that we can take advantage. There is expertise locally that are working already with multi traffic production and also exploring infrastructure to be able to grow smaller fish to get into the cages and food for that. There are a few projects that already share with John in an informal conversation and all of those elements are there. We just need to help and guide and help line them up to do our version, a Caribbean version, to this approach of the aquaculture.

And one last point is that I believe that the wind farms are the windmills on the ocean and depend on the design we do. Considering the need of clean energy in the Caribbean is probably something that we should explore and get more educated and see where it goes but for sure an opportunity that the Council should be involved since the beginning, have an input and consider. Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: In concrete, actually, we are in line for the aquaculture opportunity areas. I talked to the, I was interviewed by the NOAA guy who's working on this, one of them, and he told me that they have the Gulf, they have all the areas, and in due time they— because they already came here, and they are going to consider us in due time but at this moment, they don't have plans to immediately come here because of what has been said. But Dr. Strelcheck said they have a priority lease, and they have personnel, etcetera.

Regarding the offshore winds. The only thing that we can do, at this time, is that the two local government representatives can inform back to the Council at the August meeting the status of any interaction that the local government has with BOEM.

And remember, this is outside natural resources. It goes to energy

and other offices in the Puerto Rico and the Virgin Island government. So, if Dr. Angeli and Dr. López can bring some light into the status of those activities, that will lead to a connection between Puerto Rico and the offshore windmill with the BOEM people. It will be nice if you can do it. You can also tell us, "Sorry we couldn't find anything." But at least we are on the right track because unless we have a connection with two local government, the Council cannot get involved directly.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: I think, Miguel, that that's a great idea and request to them. But we can go a step forward. You and I sit down and make a letter requesting the information that is probably ne needed. Anyway, do you guys want to express anything, Ricardo and-

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: It's just a question. I don't see the email of John Walter in the list that I received. So, if that email can be provided, I would appreciate that.

JOHN WALTER, III: I could certainly provide my email. I am drafting an email with a number of the key links to documents that I alluded to, and I'll send it to Council staff and so that could be submitted so that— it'll outline the BOEM process, the task force process, marine spatial planning and aquaculture. And so, I think that will help people to kind of get an idea. It's a lot of material, but as I've learned about offshore wind, when it comes to your region, it comes quickly, and you'll want to get up to speed quickly. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Do you need anything else from the Council at this point, John?

JOHN WALTER, III: I do not think so. I think there was the broad support for proceeding with this and so I think that's what we wanted to get. I do have one more thing to follow up on.

Okay. And I just wanted to say that on behalf of the Science Center, Marcos, we really respect your leadership and that you've literally built a bridge between Miami and the Council and allowed us to walk across it. And that has opened the door for us to be able to provide much more science support, and I think to be much more engaged with people. And I think it's a testament to your leadership and your ability to build the bridges and to be welcoming to us and to all of our staff. And so, we greatly appreciate that.

Don't be a stranger, which we know you won't be. And so, we look forward to you being involved in SEDARs in the DAP and to being a

voice and continuing to help build the bridges that are going to improve the sustainability in this region. So, thank you, Marcos.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. And for sure it'll be on a different position, right? But it is time for to renew, to engage more people, but I will be available to support anybody. Everybody has my telephone number, my emails, and we keep moving forward for the best interest of the fishery and the fishermen of Puerto Rico. Thank you, John. Next presentation.

We had a longer break before so we're going to skip the break. We have a presentation of Equity by, Andy? John.

# NOAA Fisheries' Equity and Environmental Justice (EEJ) Strategy, Regional Implementation Process, and Schedule

JOHN WALTER, III: Okay, thank you. Got the presentation lined up. So, Andy and Clay and I, have the pleasure of being able to go to all the Council meetings in this region, the Southeast. So, our staff asked us to give this presentation and I think I just really want to acknowledge Heather Blough and Brent Stoffle for a lot of their work in advancing the EEJ strategy and serving on the national EEJ strategy team. And on behalf of them, they actually asked us, Andy and Clay, to give this presentation because it sends, I think, an appropriate message and they felt that hearing it from the leadership was really exceedingly valuable. And so, they asked Andy and Clay and now me to give this presentation, which I have the honor to do.

 One thing before I start. I noted that at the beginning of this meeting there was a request of who needs interpretation services and that we actually have simultaneous interpretation of this meeting. I think one of the things that is part of the EEJ strategy is that we meet people where they are. And that equity means that everyone has an equal opportunity to make their case before decision makers. That means they have the opportunity to make their case in the language and manner they feel that they can most appropriately make it to a decision-making body like this Council. And I think sending the message that you are willing and able to hear them in whatever language they choose to talk in, is a good message. And I think for someone like me, who is who Spanish is not very good, I would like to hear from people if they choose to speak in Spanish, I can understand them quite well because I've got this. And I think having that in your hand, having it on your head says, I'm willing and able to hear you how you want to communicate with me.

I know the power of this, because at ICCAT, where I was the Western

Bluefin Tuna Chair for a number of years, we usually have simultaneous interpretation. Particularly, at the decision-making meetings where your words matter, and your words are intended to make a case before decision makers. That's where having that is exceedingly valuable. I think we're going to hear public comment today, in the afternoon, and I think that public comment should be available and however people choose to comment it, we can have it interpreted in real time.

4 5

I've had numerous arguments with my colleagues as well as friends across the table and across interpretation where I've spoken in English and they have spoken in French or Spanish, one of the three languages that are official languages of ICCAT. And I've found that having that ability to make your case in the language that you are most comfortable means that you are making your best argument. I think that's essential to equity and to achieving equitable outcomes in bodies like this. So, I'd say next time these come out, raise your hand, unless if you are not that comfortable in working in other languages, say "Yes, talk to me how you want to."

With that, if we could go to the next slide. So, to meet people where they are, evidently, they are not able to see the presentation right now on the webinar. Can you check to make sure that we're presenting, they're saying that they're seeing actions and alternatives, but not the presentation. Okay. Apologies then.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: On that point, John. That's important, that's why we have the Zoom, and we have the translation in zoom. During the pandemic, we learned a lot. There was a lot of people that couldn't make it to meetings physically, but there are a lot of fishers who connected with us. They looked at the agenda and when they had the time, they connect to the agenda.

Not only that, but they also asked for document translations and things. So, I believe that those two points that you're making are really important.

 JOHN WALTER, III: Thank you. Okay. So, the objectives of the NOAA EEJ strategy are equity in research and monitoring; incorporation of EEJ into policy and plans; inclusive governance; equitable distribution of the benefits; equitable outreach and engagement; and an empowering environment. It's a broad expansive strategy, but I think the goals are something that resonate with many of us, and it's something that our administration is very much in favor of and supporting us in actually implementing the strategy.

Next slide.

So, there was initial poll of people about the EEJ strategy, and it was initially sent out for public comment. Here's the regional distribution of who responded in terms of individuals and organizations by region.

5 6 7

8

9

10

1

3

4

You can see that there are many respondents from the Pacific Island region. A high number of respondents nationally and fewer from the southeast region. I don't think that necessarily speaks to the importance of it. This is just the regional representation of who responded.

11 12 13

Next slide.

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

2627

2829

30

And so, in terms of public feedback, do stakeholders support the strategy? And in large part, the answer was yes. There was a number of implied yeses, and yet there were some nos. And I think perhaps there's a number of reasons why people might not support the strategy. I think the strategy and I'll say that the idea of EEJ in implementation is going to have some difficult conversations that need to be had. And I think that some of the lack of support may be due to people being concerned about the difficulty of those conversations. And when we talk about allocation of scarce resources, which is what fisheries management is about, there are going to be difficult conversations. The key to those difficult conversations achieving equitable outcomes is to have those conversations out in the open, to have all stakeholders there and have them be able to make their case equitably. And I think then those difficult decisions are going to come before a Council process where the Council ultimately makes those decisions.

313233

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46

47

48

In terms of the other lack of support, I think perhaps we also need to continue to make the case for the value of EEJ. One way I like to think about this is that we often think that "well, it's the right thing to do" and in fact it probably is the right thing to do but I think beyond that, it is not just the right thing to do, but it creates a stronger nation. Similar to how last night we were able to have a wonderful dinner from the Fisherman's Association of La Guancha, and we had many different recipes. I think in terms of thinking about this as a recipe, that the sum is much greater than its individual parts and that's how a great recipe comes together. I think that's how a great nation comes together, that it is greater than the sum of its parts, which is how we build resiliency in terms of having diverse participation, how we overcome a lot of the obstacles that we're going to face and how we're stronger with that equitable participation. So, I think the case may still need to be made in some areas.

Next slide.

So, some of the public feedback and the key messages. One, to align NMFS work with local needs; to engage with more diverse groups; to support the autonomy of territorial and tribal governments; to collect demographic data; to measure success by feedback from the communities. And there were concerns with things such as catch shares, aquaculture and protected species, all of which have implications about allocation of scarce resources such as catch shares, who and what implements aquaculture, and then who and what are affected by protected species. And so, some of the implementation recommendations were to communicate early and often with stakeholders, work with the Council and other agencies, and then support capacity for EEJ work.

Next slide.

So, from our Southeast stakeholders of which the Caribbean is one of them, we got specific feedback that the Council supported and ranged from enthusiastic to measured. I think the measured response is because of some of the difficult questions that may arise from this. One, that we need more data, more data and more data to inform any of the decision making. And that we need boots on the ground and that is meeting people where they are at, going to the docks, meeting people in their communities, which in fact our implementation strategy, I'll go into that, we are actually planning those. And then work with and financially support the Council states and other liaisons who are already well positioned to advance outreach and engagement activities. This is essentially to work with our partners who already do this.

Then improve accessibility to programs like the Fisheries Finance Program and other federal funds. I think the national seafood strategy is maybe one other area to explore. Then support and expand training programs like MREP that has been highly successful in this region, the Gulf Commercial Fisheries program. And then what we saw is the Young Fisherman's program in Vieques, which I think is really an opportunity there to engage with people early on in their fishing careers. Then ensure equitable Council representation, ensuring underserved populations and fishing sectors are at the table. And I think of all the Councils, this Council might do a very good job at that.

 And then obviously, the "Show me the money!" is something that is sort of the lower hanging fruit, yes, it's easy to ask for money, it's much harder to get it under situations where funding is scarce.

1 2

Next slide.

 So, in terms of NOAA Fishery's EEJ strategy, one of the things is that it's going to be a framework to incorporate EEJ in all of our activities. This is something that we as an agency are trying to look at our activities through that lens of EEJ. Are all of the activities that we do meeting our goals?

And it requires a step down from the implementation plans to the regional level. So, from the national to the regional to the local. And ideally seeking to remove the barriers to EEJ. What are the barriers? Why are we not achieving our objectives? And what are things that could be done to remove them?

16 Next slide.

So, this is the timeline for this process. We're right now in the spring 2023 where we're soliciting public feedback, presenting these to the Councils. And then, we're going to start the process for our focus groups that are going to start fairly soon. Those focus groups are going to occur throughout the spring and summer, which are going to provide us the information for developing the regional implementation strategies.

Next slide.

And so, the focus groups, and these are going to be a one of a suite of ethnographic methods used to consult and collect data from local stakeholders. It's going to bring together a small group of people selected based on predefined experience or knowledge to answer questions in a moderated setting designed to shed light on a topic of interest, in this case, EEJ.

Each will include up to 15 stakeholders from underserved communities that are impacted by our work to help us understand how to advance our six national strategies, our national objectives.

Next slide.

The plan for the Caribbean focus groups is in mid-May to go to the U.S.V.I., both Saint Croix and Saint Thomas and Saint John. And then, Puerto Rico, in June, in four locations throughout the island.

47 Next slide.

1 The national strategy and regional implementation. In terms of the national strategy rollout, one of the keys is to roll that out in 3 multiple languages. We got that translated into a number of different languages to make that available to many of our fishing communities. The Council presentations, of which this one is the April Caribbean Council. It will also go out to the South Atlantic. 7 And then, the regional implementation strategy, which focuses initially on the 21 focus group meetings. The Caribbean, the Gulf, south Atlantic, and South Florida. Then we'll bring that to the 10 Council Coordination committee, and then we'll work with our other 11 internal and external partners.

12 13 Next slide.

14 15

16 17

18

19

2

4 5

6

8

9

So, a number of the basic needs to accomplish this strategy, staff training, staff time and training. That's in terms of allowing our staff the time to understand what they need to do. Work with our community liaisons, collect the demographic data, analyze that data and report out to it. Collaboration with partners and other agencies and language translation and interpretation services.

20 21 22

Next slide.

23 24

25

26 27

And so, some specific Southeast strategies. One, research and monitoring, which is using our social science research methods to collect the demographic data, incorporating indigenous traditional and local ecological knowledge and the data and information supporting our work.

28 29 30

31

32

33

34 35

36

And when I talked about climate resilience, this local ecological knowledge may in fact provide some of the keys to climate resilience. Because many of the communities that we have endured and survived through multiple different environmental changes. So, they know what has happened in the past and they've weathered those storms. How did they do that? And that's the local ecological knowledge that may provide the key to our resilience for an uncertain future.

37 38 39

40 41

Then policy and plans, ensuring that our management decisions are incorporating EEJ principles; evaluating what that fairness and equity issues are taken into account in catch share programs as well as in disaster response protocols.

42 43 44

45

46

47 48

Inclusive governance, and in this case hiring multilingual staff in things such as permitting so people can get permits in the languages that they can operate in. Obviously simultaneous interpretation, which in we have here at this Council. It's something that might be considered in the other Councils we're not sure, it's really resources dependent whether we can provide that. But I think as Miguel said, now that we are often in a hybrid environment, it actually is increasing our ability to have more participation because zoom can allow for that simultaneous interpretation and for people to attend even if they can't physically be there.

4 5

Then, the benefits, I think, improve accessibility of regional grants processes. One of the key things there is representation on the AFAC committee, of which our Chair is now the AFAC representative for the Southeast. And so, I think that's a key ability for the Saltonstall-Kennedy Grants process to include considerations that would be of benefit to the Caribbean.

Then communication and outreach. In terms of translating, ensuring that our outreach and our messaging is in ways that people can understand. And then creating an empowering environment and trusting the personnel needs. Biologists for the Caribbean and anthropologist for all regions. Organizing regional workshops and federal partners to share information and lessons learned from the focus groups. And then support for things such as scholarships, internships, and training opportunities for local residents. And I think those are all things that we can embark upon.

Next slide.

So, we're seeking your input here, in particular, your thoughts on the tentative dates and locations for the Caribbean focus groups.

I'll note that some of these dates are not exact, and they are largely the locations we think are going to be the right locations, we may need to change the dates around depending on the actual practical arrangements. And then, do you have suggestions for engaging partners and communities and developing Southeast specific implementation strategies? Are there communities we are missing that we need to be talking to and include? And then how can you inform the work we're going to be doing with the focus groups and how we can best collaborate in developing this regional plan?

So next slide.

I believe that is it. Thank you, I very much appreciate being able to present this on the behalf of our EEJ working group and on behalf of SERO and the Center.

Questions/Comments

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, John. We have Andy and Alida.

4 5

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, so John and I have been tag teaming this presentation with the Councils, but we felt it was really important that leadership give this presentation. This is not just initiative that's being implemented just because it's administrative priority, it's important to us as leaders within NOAA Fisheries to move this forward. We've talked about it, and I think John did an excellent job. This is something we want to be part of our culture within NOAA Fisheries, working with all of our constituents. And to give an example of that, I was really struck last night. What a wonderful occasion we had last night with the fisherman and how gracious people were inviting us to participate in that event. But several people mentioned to me, the fishermen were surprised that me or others from the continental United States were going to come and show up to that meeting. That really struck me as something that is a barrier, as something a perception in terms of me as a leader for NOAA Fisheries representing the United States and the territories in terms of fisheries management and the importance of how we work with one another on the fisheries issues and policies and decisions.

And so, something like that is just one example of many in terms of opportunities that we can make in terms of working with industry, collaborating with industry, communicate with industry, and trying to break down those barriers as we move forward. So, we're very passionate about this. We're really excited to be moving forward with this and really want your feedback and information and look forward to also sharing the outcomes of these focus groups with you because that's going to really help inform our regional implementation strategy going forward. So, thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Andy. You just described the reason I expressed myself earlier that we are in much better position since I saw the evolution on the Council on many things and EEJ is one of them and thanks to leadership like yours and your staff. Alida.

 ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Yes. In my next presentation of the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel, I will make all the comments for the EEJ because we do have here a working group that has been meeting with Heather and Cristina is part of that group, Janet is part of that group, Wilson and myself. And then, in the last outreach and education meeting, we presented mostly the same thing that you have, especially, what is the strategy? And then we made recommendations that made changes because before you had only two focus groups in Puerto Rico and Puerto Rico needs more than that because it's very different in terms of sociology, in terms of economy, from the East to the West, from the South to the North.

So, I see that that recommendation was accepted.

The other thing is that at the beginning we had only one management plan for all the islands in the area and there where recommendations for having one for each island that were mostly based on that environmental, justice and equity. Why? Because all our islands are different in terms of history, in terms of sociology, in terms of economics. It took a long time to get that.

So, when I give my presentation, I'll give the details that we have.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Alida. Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sweet, I like this. And I think this initiative should be presented to all DAPs so the members can start learning about this and help spread their voice.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Nelson. And addressing the questions that you left on the previous slide. Is it possible to put the slide where you lay out the pueblos where you are going to meet in Puerto Rico? Go backwards in the—

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Hey, Marcos, let me say something about that.

MARCOS HANKE: Mm-hmm.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: The lady who was putting together all this, she consulted with Diana and myself. We were the one who told them about these places. She said, "this is the first time, but it's not the last time." So, as we progress, because they have a fixed budget for this, we were able to secure four to cover the cost of Puerto Rico because they're different, they will continue to work and see if we can expand maybe some other time.

But the message is that if— this is by invitation by the way, but if you are interested, we need to spread the word. If you are interested, we encourage you to participate, because there are a lot of things and— EEJ didn't start last year. It started in the eighties and have a long history about it. So, I encourage you to participate. The Council will be involved as much as possible. I believe that this is a step in the right direction.

The other thing that we need to do at this meeting is to identify the needs of the communities. So, all the members of the DAPs, all the people, Alida, and people around the table here, can provide that information. Once they collect that information, you have seen the presentation by Andy and John, they will gather all this information, come back and say, "These are the priorities, the way to go, and these are the gaps."

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah, I have just a comment and something that we need to be careful by us inviting people to go. We need to find a way to make sure that we don't exclude people that should give us feedback on EEJ, other communities and so on. My suggestion is that we have Wilson, we have Helena and people that are on the ground nowadays with different communities that can suggest many names, and we can make a list of invitations that is based on the capacity that Miguel just described. But I just inviting and asking Miguel how we can address to make sure that we are not excluding a community or something that have special needs or a special way of doing things on this process.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: But that's the point. This is the first time on the last one. This is limited by the budget, limited by the places that they're going to meet because they have to secure a place, they have to pay for it, etcetera, etcetera. So, once we have that and they already had that information, they are going to invite the key people that will provide that information.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Alida.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Actually, we have that information already and we sent it to the group. And it is that the group is not more than 15, 20 in each group, in each focus group. That the stipends will be covered by the large EEJ and that the meeting should be in a place that is not something like this. That it should be made in the community, in the fishing villages so that we can get all the information easier.

MARCOS HANKE: (Mr. Hanke's comment is inaudible on the recording.)

 ANDREW STRELCHECK: So, I think Alida covered it. I was going to ask Heather Blough to comment just in terms of how the working groups are being assembled, but I think the point of emphasis, which was Miguel's point, it's not going to involve everyone. We can't involve everyone. It's not going to be just an open process, right? But it's also just a starting point. And we want to have this very kind of facilitated conversations, meeting people in the community to gather information to inform our EEJ strategy. But from that, it'll expand out because we're going to work on a broader implementation plan. And the work is certainly just beginning at this stage.

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah. I just want to make sure, to be on record, that we consider everything, and that we have a group of variety

of people helping to form those groups. And everything on my mind is important to be very clear, for people to know where we are going, that we want really to want to be inclusive. It's not an artifact that is of exclusion, it is the reverse of that. We want to include everything.

That's all for the presentation? Yes? Thank you very much.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. And one other thing just to reemphasize, this is a team effort and so a lot of people to thank. I'll probably miss some people, but Janet, Alida, Cristina have all been critical to this. Graciela as well. And the Outreach AP. So, thank you very much for all of the work you've done to this point and your continued help with this.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. We going to go for the next presentation. That presentation will be after lunch, which 12:18.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: I'm hungry.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: There's a presentation by Nelson Ehrhardt and it's important that we keep the time of 1:30 because it will be virtual.

MARCOS HANKE: We'll be back here at 1:20, back to the room. 1:30? No, we cannot. No, 1:20 because we need time to set up to be ready for the presentation. Okay?

(Whereupon the meeting recessed for lunch on April 19, 2023.)

- -

APRIL 19, 2023

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

MARCOS HANKE: Please take your seats.

**NELSON EHRHARDT:** Yes, I am ready.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: ¿Nelson, nos oyes? Can you hear us?

NELSON EHRHARDT: Yes. Good afternoon.

46 MARCOS HANKE: Good afternoon, Nelson. We are ready to restart the 47 meeting this afternoon. Thank you for being available. You have a 48 presentation. Right now, 1:28. Your presentation can start now. We are seeing on the screen your presentation, just instruct the staff if you want to pass the slides or they will pass for you.

NELSON EHRHARDT: Yes, please. You can pass the slide.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Go ahead.

**NELSON EHRHARDT:** Okay. Are we ready then?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, we are.

# Application of CFMC Queen Conch Training Modules in a European Union/FAO Funded Pilot Program

NELSON EHRHARDT: Okay. Well, thank you very much for the invitation. The Caribbean Fishery Management Council has been fundamental in most of the works that we are doing regarding methodologies on how to estimate the catch quotas, and how to assign exploitation rates, etcetera throughout the region.

In the last working group of the queen conch a couple of years ago, it was suggested that some training was necessary to improve the statistical validity of the landings queen conch landings in the region. The reason for that is that there is a very uncertain way on how those catch statistics are collected or even reported and therefore, we wrote a short, let us say, proposal to develop a pilot program that the FAO could find the sources of funding and then the European Union accepted this proposal and is the reason why we are here today with the implementation of this project in Jamaica. So, the first slide, please.

 CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Nelson. Good afternoon. We are having a delay with the internet here, so I'm going to put down your presentation for a moment and use the pdf version instead to see if it works faster.

NELSON EHRHARDT: Okay, that's fine.

 In the meantime, I can continue discussing the origin of this project in Jamaica. As I said, this was sponsored by the European Union. The European Union accepted the proposal submitted by the FAO and the FAO then contracted GCFI. And then GCFI is the institution that is responsible for the implementation of this proposal.

The proposal was submitted in 2021. The European Union approved this proposal in June of 2022. The GCFI then hired two consultants, me and Alex Tewfik. This was in July of 2022. The proposal then,

the activities, the field activities, were assigned to Jamaica, and we started implementing the project back in September of 2022. This pilot program is supposed to be completed by 2023.

Next.

 The objectives, and here we need to be very specific. This pilot project is a feasibility study. It is a very small-scale, short-term feasibility, and the hope is that the National Fisher Authority in Jamaica can gain experience on how to improve queen conch fishery landings. And this is without replacing the existing statistical system that they have.

At present, the queen conch statistical system for the industrial fishery is pretty elaborated, and there is a lack of fish and effort statistics that needs to be implemented. However, the main problem is with seasonal fisheries. These fisheries, the artisanal fisheries, are very significant throughout the country. Probably not in volume, but in terms of the local economics and the social impact. So, the problem here then as an objective is to enhance the technical and strategic capacities of the Jamaican queen conch Fishery Management authorities regarding statistically valid catch and effort data. And then to generate a formal understanding on incorporate to key queen conch population characteristics in the statistical systems.

The reason for this second objective is the fact that in many countries in the region, there are very many units of stock of conch and all of them are being exploited at the same time. The catch statistics are then pulled together, and it's not possible to perform any reasonable stock assessment when you are pulling from different units of stock that have different responses to the exploitation that they're being subjected to.

Next.

The basic idea then was to use the CFMC training modules that we developed through the pandemic in 2019, 2020 and 2021. The basic computational level, that is to mean the application of the statistical system to unit of stock is the computational level 1. There is a computational level 2 that is related to the estimation of conversion factors. And then, the computational level 3, which is the estimation of dirty meat and live weight.

 The live weight is required by the FAO of all the queen conch landed in the country. And therefore, you can see there that the arrows are indicating which of these computational levels are using the training modules that we developed for the Caribbean Fishery Management Council a few years ago. And this has been an extremely important documentation to support all the training.

Next.

1 2

Here we have very briefly, what are these modules? First of all, there is a final report on the consultancy that was supported by the Council. This was done in 2019 where we reviewed the data being utilized by the different countries in the region regarding these conversion factors. We performed some advanced statistical analysis for comparisons on the morphometrics of the conchs in the different regions. And how these, the percentage clean meat categories coincide or differ among countries.

So, there is an opportunity to decide if there are regions where conversion factors are common, as well as those regions where the conversion factors for the same nomination of percentage clean meat do not or are not compatible. And this is very important because the FAO, for example, in the report of queen conch landings by the different countries where do not specify anything from the percentage clean meat or even the conversion factors, then the FAO is using an average of conversion factors, which is very misleading. It is biased and it doesn't contribute to the correct expression of the total output from the conch stocks in the region.

This particular work, in the meeting we had last week here in Miami of the Statistical and Scientific Technical Committee, of the working group, the FAO agreed to publish this product and Miguel has been trying to move forward with the publication of this work, the 2019 report on the conversion factors. And finally, the FAO has agreed to pay for it. So that is a very significant contribution indeed, that we will have at least a common frame to think in terms on how to estimate these conversion factors using some statistical procedures such as regression analysis rather than recollecting data.

We need to remember that these conversion factors, they have been in the making since 2014, just about. It's a very long time for a very short task. And we discussed this last week once again, and we all agree that the content in this report is very fundamental. So, the FAO decided to publish it.

 Then we have three modules. Module one, two, and three. Module one is comprehensive training on landings and fishing effort estimation, which is the one that we are using as support, as technical support in Jamaica. And this offer is very extensive review of all the statistical sampling designs that could be or may be applicable to landing and fishing effort estimation in

artisanal and commercial fisheries with adaptation, obviously, with examples to the queen conch fisheries. This module has been written in Spanish and there is a presentation, a PowerPoint, with some 65 slides that are in English.

Then module two is a module on training in population density estimation, basically by diving, direct estimation. It's a very thorough analysis, especially on how to estimate area swept. A mayor significant error has been introduced historically in those estimates because we are not accounting correctly or very precisely on what is an area swept by a diver when searching for conch. And obviously there is a very lengthy discussion nowadays regarding what is the meaning of a density estimate for conch and we could discuss that briefly at the very end.

And fourthly, is the module three. This is a training module on assessment methods on an annual catch quota estimation. It is a major piece of work where we have reviewed and assessed all the methodologies that have been implemented in the region to estimate the annual quotas for conch. There is a very sad conclusion here, and I have to say, "sad conclusion" in the sense that some models that have been applied to the queen conch, all the assumptions are not validated with the existing data and that is a very terrific problem. We are discussing those issues and in this particular we are offering some opportunities to methodologies that could work with queen conch and their very unique population dynamics.

The issue here is the minimum density whereby recruitment can be sustained on the long range. And unfortunately, that situation [inaudible] the application of most of the fish type of stock assessment models that we use in our fisheries. And the situation then being queen conch, such an important fishery in the region that obviously the U.S. is one of the main importers the effort here and the support from the Caribbean Fishery Management Council have been truly fundamental.

Next

 In addition to the training and the modules, we're using two fairly new publications. One, in 2021 by Stoner and Appeldoorn based basically on the reproductive biology of the conch. We need to think in terms of what is happening with the reproductive dynamics of the species. If we want to understand the type of information that is needed to obviously develop the different quotas, as well as the issue with the unit of stock and populations, a recent paper by Vaz et al. provides the basic understanding of that. We are using those two fundamental papers in the definition of the unit

of stock.

Next.

4 5

 Here is very briefly the way that we have implemented the project in Jamaica, the pilot program. In September of  $22^{nd}$  we carried out a general training to facilitate a self-assessment of the statistical system in Jamaica. For this, we use the whole extent of module one of the training modules. And it is generic in the sense that it can be applied extensively to any type of conch fisheries in any of the countries, from commercial to artisanal, etcetera.

In October to January of 2023, we developed a self-assessment in the country, and we evaluated what is, what the National Fisher Authority has as a statistical division and the programs they have to collect all the data. But more importantly, we were able to define a production chain. The production chain, as we will see in the few next slides, shows that the points where you are supposed to go, and when to collect, and how to collect the data we need to have for unbiased, let us say, landings and fishing effort.

During February and March, we developed specific training modules as we made discoveries in terms of the production chain. There was a need to accommodate what was in the module one, training module one, to the very specific cases of Jamaica. And today, what is ongoing and starting next week, in fact, the field work is being implemented. There are 14 people associated in the field. Four areas have been selected and we have separated, clearly, those artisanal fishers operating in Pedro Bank from those that are operating on the island shelf. And obviously the industrial fisheries are a totally different system that we are analyzing and also collecting data from those.

During April to June, we expect to carry out all the reviews, analysis, and all the exercises, and we hope to have a final report by the end of July of 2023.

Next.

 So here very briefly again. A statistical system that is statistically efficient must have three fundamental frames, let us say. The first is a unit of stock. Secondly is related to fishing power. There is so many different fishing powers characterizations in the fisheries that we need to be careful. What do we mean by catch per unit of effort coming from those different levels of fishing power from industrial to artisanal? And within artisanal, there are very many different categories. And then by product type,

that is to mean fundamentally differences in the percentage clean meat categories from each of the above.

We hope that through a census/frame survey approach as adopted by the pilot may produce landing statistics that will have some known level of accuracy and especially on precision. That is to mean we hope to have an estimate of the variances for those cases in artisanal fisheries, where landings are estimated as opposed to the case of the industrial fisheries where the landings are all accounted for as a census.

Next.

So once again, our production chains were very critical. It allows, first of all, the mapping of the product pathways. And this is very important because it allow us then to clearly identify opportunities to collect data and not going at random to about 200 different landing places, but going exactly to points that are very hot spots for the issue of artisanal conch fisheries. And then illustrate ways on how to intercept con queen conch products as well as allocate proper conversion factors to the different areas.

Next.

This is the production chain that we developed from the self-assessment in the existing statistical system in the country. The inshore or island shelf grounds, let us say, as opposed to the offshore banks, where only industrial boats are located. The artisanal boats are very significant in numbers. However, some of them are operating in the offshore banks and they are transferring the landings, or their catch to either transfer boats or to industrial boats. This perhaps is the most complex fishing activity that marks any standard procedure on how to estimate fishing effort and the total catch is obviously obtained from the industrial fleets. But however, the fishing effort that is coming from artisanal boats into industrial boats that are carrying their catch to shore is one of the big problems that we are trying to resolve.

 There are also transfer vessels of the artisanal boat catch into the industrial sites, and the sampling will be realized in those areas. As well as the artisanal sites where sampling will also be realized. And then, there are different ways of obtaining retail processing and the processing plant where all the sampling for the industrial fisheries are carried out.

Next.

 The artisanal fisheries, very briefly again, consist of a frame survey and a fishery census. The fishery census then are simply used for an expansion of the catch and the catch per trip that is obtained from the frame survey. The frame survey consists of some 30 questions to artisanal fishers arriving in the four localities that we have selected as key and with similarities to many other localities such that the estimates of catch and catch per unit of effort can be expanded to all the country.

4 5

In the fishery census, here we had an initial problem. The last census was carried out very early in the two thousand, and the situation obviously has changed. So, in the first survey that we are carrying out next week, we are carrying out the standard questionings that are related to the actual landings. But also, we have questions regarding the census. What is the knowledge of the fishers regarding the fleets that are operating in their areas? how often they fish? etcetera, etcetera. Which are questions more related to census rather than the survey. However, these questions related to censuses are going to be integrated to the existing data on census such that we have an update version of the national census on queen conch fisheries.

And then the industrial fisheries, as I mentioned, is being based on fishery census of all the landings being recorded at the processing plant. And this is done through landing receipts by fishing trips. However, what you have at the bottom of the page there, numeral two and three, this is something new although the vessel monitoring system is not legally in place in Jamaica, it exists in the sense that all the industrial vessels are carrying this. And we have been in touch with a few of the industrial vessels and we have all agreed that we will have access to this VMS data, which is data that will be associated to each of the fishing trips for which capital logbooks will be made available. That is numeral three. So, we can compile then, the spatial temporal distribution of the industrial vessel being sampled over Pedro Bank and what is the outcome of the fishing in the different spots where you detect these spots from the VMS? The captains are keeping a logbook of all the conch that is coming aboard because it's been used to pay both the artisanal fishers that are releasing their catch to the industrial vessels, or the dinghies that are belonging to the vessels and that they go out fishing in several spots that are detected in the VMS system.

We hope to then reconstruct, doing some archeology here, on the fishing that is happening in Petro Bank in each of these fishing trips. We have selected four vessels out of nine or 10 vessels that are operating in the region. We think this is a number that is sufficiently large as to express commonality of what is going

on in terms of catching conch in the offshore banks.

Next.

4 5

 Basically, this is the let us say the production that is expected from the logbooks. We will sample the product transfer from vessels as well as in the industrial sites. And obviously the total catch of every landing will be obtained from the processing plants.

Next.

So, in summary, the statistical systems for landings and fish effort in the industrial fisheries will be, first of all, landings received from the processing plants, and then the captain logbooks. And the fishing effort is going to be through the VMS review. And the day's fishing is obviously going to come from the VMs.

Unfortunately, some of these commercial vessels are not reporting their trips and there is nothing official in terms of their activities. So, the actual days fishing will come from the VMS estimation. And the total fishing effort from the industrial fleet will come from the total landings of these vessels divided by the catch per unit of effort that we hope to analyze and standardize from the VMS data and the logbooks of the captains.

Next.

 The results emerging from the pilot project will allow two things. The first, is to expand the statistical system tested in the pilot project to the queen conch fishery at the national level in Jamaica. That is to mean, move away from the four locations for artisanal fisheries to all the main locations where conch is historically been landed. And secondly, to adopt a similar approach to improve queen conch landings and fishing effort in other countries in the region.

We hope, and we had agreed with the National Fisher Authority of Jamaica for them to train in other countries in the region. So, whatever they are learning out of this pilot program, hopefully, it will be transmitted having a multiplication factor here. We will be conducting these works and we hope then that with the help of those that learnt the procedures as samplers and as leaders will help then expand the knowledge and the experiences obtained in Jamaica to the rest of the countries.

Next.

48 As I said last week, we had a meeting here in Miami of the SSTAG.

The first two most important priorities that were defined by the group of experts was, first of all, one on the queen conch non-detrimental findings as a guidance. And module training three was requested to be adopted and followed on all the decisions regarding non-detrimental findings. And the reason is very simple. In module three, you will find all the characteristics biologically and oceanographically that affect the productivity of the conch and that then that defined the needs to collect information, to assess the stocks and obtain the proper data, etcetera, etcetera.

4 5

The request came from the CITES. The CITES were present in the meeting last week and they found that these modules, developed by the Caribbean Fishery Management Council, are paramount to the effort of the CITES at controlling international catch quotas. As you know the CITES is controlling the export of conch, however, the quotas are being generated by the CITES Scientific authorities in the countries. The Animals Committee do not have anything to say in terms of the quality of the assessments of the methodologies being used. Given the discoveries in the assessment that we find in module three, the CITES has decided that they have to get more involved in this and in fact, there is going to be an Animals committee meeting next June. Martha, who is the person linking all our efforts with the Council will be attending or was invited to and the SSTAG decided to nominate Martha representative in this meeting in the Animals Committee in Geneve next June.

 This, indeed, is a very major step. For those of us that have been participating in this Scientific and Statistical Committee for the working group on conch it has been pretty frustrating that years, after years, after years of work and providing insights on how countries should do something about better statistics and more control on the fishery mortality of conch, finally, we see that we are being heard by CITES and by the FAO that they have to pay more attention on how to control these international catch quotas.

Equally important is the priority two, which has to do with the results of the European Union funded pilot project in the region, in Jamaica, that will need to get funding from the CITES, hoping to expand these activities then to the entire region.

So that is all what I have to say today. And again, thank you so very much for inviting me. I think very many important aspects of the conch issues in the region are being tackled now from a very different point, strongly I will say from a scientific and statistical standpoint.

# Questions/Comments

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for the presentation. I'm going to open the floor for questions.

I don't have questions at this time. I just want to make a comment that this is a very timely effort and great job as presented, especially on the scenario that the conch is being evaluated for ESA. I think it's a very important job. Thank you very much for your job. Miguel, want to say something? Thank you.

Next presentation. Oh, I'm sorry. There are some hands up. Sennai, please.

**SENNAI HABTES:** Yeah. Miguel, I was just wondering if there's any possibility of getting the training modules that he's developed to be shared through the CFMC's website, or at least to individual stakeholders that are interested in developing similar statistical methods in an analysis within the U.S. Caribbean?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yes, there are two things to that. This document is not ours, it's WECAFs. We pay for it, but I can get authorization from WECAFs Secretariat and then we can distribute it. Because they will be translated into-- they already have a version in English and Spanish, and they will do the translation into French and certainly, I will work with Dr. Nelson Ehrhardt and make sure that anybody who wants it, we can send it. But I will put them on the webpage as long as I have the authorization. Cristina will load it up there.

Let me say also that we had the privilege of having Dr. Nelson Ehrhardt. I met Dr. Ehrhardt a long time ago. He used to work with the FAO and many other institutions, and he was the first one who put together the dataset for, especially Honduras, Nicaragua and those countries. And he was able to figure out the capacity of those areas to produce the queen conch. So, the other thing that he mentioned is the conversion factor.

As you all know, the scientists know, that when you have apple and oranges, it's very difficult to compare them. But also, if you have different methodologies to compare them to, you have problems. So, what Dr. Nelson Ehrhardt and other have done, and they are contained in these three models, is the conversion factor, the elusive conversion factor. For example, some countries, a clean conch is just one without the shell. In others, without the shell, without the visceral and without the skin. So, all that plays into the stock assessment that you have to do for each one of the areas to do the queen conch.

The other thing is that the queen conch is of importance for the international community, especially for CITES. The convention for international trade of endangered and threatened species is the only animal within that group that have been assessed twice, and they hate that. And they're talking about assessing it the third

4 5

time.

We have Dr. Martha Prada, as mentioned by Dr. Nelson Ehrhardt. She's well versed about queen conch and she's the one that will be representing us at the Animal committee, but she's also the liaison of the CFMC with the efforts of the WECAFC. And she had been instrumental in putting all this together.

It's frustrating because the first time we put together a map, an FMP and everything about the queen conch was about 30 years ago. We thought that all the countries were going to adopt that. Well, nope, they didn't. The reason for that is that in some countries, queen conch is a priority while in other is not. In Central America the monies are really in the Pacific, not in the Atlantic. So, we understand that. But the other issue is that WECAFC is a voluntary organization, so nobody's forced to do anything but in the case of CRFM, the Caribbean Fishery Mechanism, the countries that are part of it, they do commit. So, they have meetings of the scientists, they also have meetings of the decision makers, and they move forward with the queen conch. In the case of the U.S. Caribbean-and by the way, we were in tune all around the Caribbean. We have the same season except for Puerto Rico, that without thinking too much, they changed it for one month. I paid a thousand dollars for a survey when the survey came, already they changed it. So, this doesn't help.

 I congratulate Dr. Ehrhardt for the excellent work that he has done. He also has been a professor of applied statistics to fisheries for many years. And Mr. Chairman, I think that the reason why we brought this to your attention is because you see CFMC NOAA Fisheries contributing, but I would like to import that into the U.S. Caribbean. As I Sennai says, you know, whatever we can use we will be moving forward. The next step will for the publishing of the document, and also, we are going to have a pile of projects similar to what you have in Jamaica now with other countries. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Anybody else? No. Go ahead, Vance.

**VANCE VICENTE:** I think that this information is very relevant, particularly since there is a proposed rule to list the queen conch

under the Endangered Species Act as threatened. In order for that to follow, this kind of information needs to be updated as soon as possible before NMFS can come to a final rule. Okay. That's it.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for the observation. Anybody else? Hearing none, I think we are ready to move to the next presentation. Again, to reiterate our gratitude to Nelson Ehrhardt for his professionalism and a great comprehensive presentation. Thank you again.

NELSON EHRHARDT: Thank you very much.

MARCOS HANKE: Next presentation is the Outreach and Education Report by Alida Ortiz.

# Outreach and Education Report

**ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR:** Good afternoon. I'll try to be as quick and easy as possible so that we can cover all the rest of the materials that we have in the meeting.

Next, please.

This one, you have seen it before, but we have said that every time we will put this as our first slide. This is because we are following exactly the five-year strategic plan communication objectives that the Caribbean Council has.

So, the basic concept of Ecosystem-Based Management, the Island-Based Fishery Management Plan from Puerto Rico, Saint Thomas/Saint John and Saint Croix; the sustainable fish and seafood consumption and the marine protected areas in Puerto Rico, Saint Thomas and Saint John and Saint Croix. Those the wider areas that we are constantly covering in every activity or in every project that we have in outreach and education.

Next.

So, for right now, the outreach and education products that we have, we have been intensely working with the fact sheet for the island based. This is the one that we did for the entire issue of the island based. And it takes care of Puerto Rico, Saint Thomas/Saint John, and Saint Croix, all of them. What is the island based? It has a QR code that you can, you know, take the QR code and download the document.

Next.

But then we are working with the specific fact sheet for each one of the islands. And in those, we're using space for the information, chapter one and chapter five of the management plan that correspond to the island.

These management plans are very extensive documents, some of them with 500 pages, something like that. But if you go to chapter two and chapter five, then you have like a summary of everything that is discussed. We're still working with the Saint Thomas/Saint John and with the Puerto Rico. We are having a little bit of difficulty getting the person that designs the fact sheets, so as soon as we get rid of that, we will have all the fact sheets for the public.

Next.

We have had meetings and much of the information that we had in this meeting with the DAPs was preferred Saint Thomas/Saint John. Then we did Saint Croix and then we did Puerto Rico. They mentioned this today when they spoke about the equity and environmental justice. They have the information that we gathered from the DAPs. This something that has been discussed today by many other people. They gave us the objective to ask for recommendations and content of Fisher Managed Plan fact sheets and other products for each island.

The DAP, taking into account their own situation, the biology of the area, the sociology of the fishing communities, they made the specific recommendations. The first one that we had from the Saint Thomas/Saint John was that we had to produce some sort of book or a catalog or a big document, a complete document, that had all the species mentioned or treated in each one of the management plans. In those cases, we have some species that are the same for Puerto Rico and the same for Saint Thomas. Then, we will have an illustration of the species, the basic biology, like the color, maturity, size, life cycle, this type of thing. And then, we will have the common names. The common names like for Puerto Rico, is something very difficult because we have three or four common names for the same species one from Rincón, the other one is from Naguabo, the other one is from Cataño. But we have to have all those common names.

Then we also have to have people from each one of the islands. So, that recommendation in the DAP, in the working group in Saint Thomas, Ruth Gomez is going to be our collaborator with that. She will make sure that all the names that they use will be there. And then we have from Saint Croix—— In Saint Thomas, we also have—— no Ruth Gomez only. In Saint Croix we have Carlos Farchette, who's going to be the collaborator for doing the same thing, and make

sure that we have the correct common names and the correct description of how it's managed in the area. In Puerto Rico, we have Nelson Crespo. The idea is that as soon as we get out of here today, so as soon as next week we will have to make an arrangement so that at least we can meet virtually, and I can send you the names of the species that are included in all the FMPs. At some time, we saw that it was going to be one book for each one of the islands, but then the idea finally got to only one book.

4 5

Then, with the information, this species Puerto Rico, Saint Croix. This species, Puerto Rico, North Coast, and some other place. So that information will be in a catalog or in a book following the FAO model of the catalog. We will have that, I hope, that before the end of this year, this should be ready.

Then the DAP Puerto Rico reviewed the species common names and checked them for different regions of the island. Also, the DAP Puerto Rico requested that the Council makes a press release when the spiny lobster closed seasons commence, because there was a big mess in Puerto Rico when that happened, because it was it was prohibited in the federal area in the EEZ but not at that time in the regional, in the territorial waters. So, the information in the newspapers was just a mess. The fishers and the fisheries, the restaurants had a big problem because they were requesting lobster and they said, "you know, you cannot fish it." But it is not fished in the federal areas, in the local areas it could be. So, that thing has to be made clear to the public that is the one that is involved in this.

Next one.

 We were also asked to produce a fact sheet on Bajo de Sico and the fishery management regulations in that area, because there's also confusion between what can be fished in that area and what cannot be fished regarding the rest of the areas that are managed by, sometimes, DNR and the local government. Also, a request that was presented at the workshop in Puerto Rico with the DAP, is that there's a necessity, there's a need to offer a workshop on fishery management regulation for new DAP members. This is not just, you know, this time for everyone but it should be something very similar to the PEPCO that Wilson offers in Puerto Rico and then for the new DAP members. Every time there is a DAP member, they should have information of what they are talking about and what are the responsibilities as DAP members.

Next.

48 With the equity and environmental justice strategy that we

discussed this morning, we have been working with a formal working group. Heather is the person that keeps us in contact. We usually meet sometimes like twice a week for one hour and discuss all the things that can be done here. This is something that you saw before that was presented by, I don't remember the name, but the person that presented the equity and environmental justice.

4 5

Next one.

This is the same thing. Noticed that in the focus groups that we have there the Caribbean had four, the Gulf seven. It was before the presentation that we have today.

Give me the next one.

The focus group were local people from the area, fishers in different levels and different species of fishing. This will be conducted in each one of the islands.

Notice that for Puerto Rico, they only had in June in San Juan and Cabo Rojo. So, give me the other one.

The discussion with the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel was very intense. They said that Puerto Rico should have more than two focus group, at least four, to cover the East, the West, the South, and the North. This because of the differences in socioeconomic environment in the North, West, South and all of the Puerto Rico archipelago. When we say East many, many times, we forget that Vieques and Culebra exist, and they are fishing areas and they have a lot of fishers. So, we presented that to the group of the EEJ, and today I know that it was accepted.

The presentations in Puerto Rico must be in Spanish or with a translation from English. If they don't have a person that can speak the Spanish language, then we should have translation. And that's something that, okay, it will take a little bit more money because the translation services are not too cheap. But then I know probably that they'll deal with the Council and get the fact that we will have Spanish as a language for our focus groups.

Next.

 The other projects that we have, we are still working on some of the illustrated booklets. This one, the one that we are working right now, is climate change and U.S. Caribbean Fisheries. What we did with the material for this climate change illustrated booklet was, we consulted with the fishers and asked what are the topics in terms of climate change that you think are more important for

the fisheries? So, we have topics like water temperature, sea level, acidification, changes in the life cycles probably, or in terms of areas of different species.

So those are the material, those are the content that we took from different references and from all the projects that have been done. I think that by the next meeting we will have that climate change booklet finalized. Then the other thing is that we are still working, obviously, with the big fact sheets for each one of the FMPs. Because now that we can have better information and we have people in each one of the islands that will review that, that will give me more information, then we will have that, I hope, also for the next meeting.

The integration of concepts on marine fisheries in the U.S. Caribbean to the regular education curriculum. Notice that I am not saying fishers, you know, preparing fishers. That's something wonderful that the person from Vieques is doing. But the fact that our environment in these islands, the most important one is the marine environment, and we have very little of that content across the curriculum.

 We have been working, collaborating, with one of the Montessori schools in Parguera where the general focus of the curriculum, that doesn't mean that they are going to change the courses or the standards that the Department of Education has, but the marine knowledge about the ecosystem, about the people who live or who have their way of life from the marine environment is part of the curriculum. Not only in marine sciences, not only in in general science, but it also has to be in history, in literature, in art, absolutely every part of the learning space. So that one, we are working very slowly so that we can put something that could be used all around the island because we have many, many of these Montessori schools in the coast and none of them have any information on the marine environment.

Next one.

The products for the '23-'24. We have strong support for MREP. We meet, I believe, like twice a month to review the content, to review what the people in the fisheries need for that. So, we have to support MREP for all the information and all the work that they do for us. And the Pepco workshops.

Something that has been mentioned before, something similar to PEPCO in the U.S.V.I. Because I go to the PEPCO workshop that Wilson conducts in Puerto Rico and I have quite a bit of time to talk about the Council, about what we are doing in the Council,

especially what it has to do with ecosystem-based management, which is the important part at least for us.

Also, we have been asking the Council to request, from the people who do research, who do some kind of activity, that they can take pictures to send good definition pictures for the Council so that we can make a big catalog and have all the information so that we don't have to go take pictures all the time.

Please, next.

For 2024, this is the fact sheets that we are working on, the essential topics that I told before on the FMPs. They have been asking more information in fact sheets, in something that they can have, that fishers can have in their stores or in the landing sites as a nice fact sheet or stickers. Those stickers with only the information of the lifecycle for nassau grouper, mutton snapper and queen conch. There are large posters of those, but in the stores, probably, they don't have the place for the posters. But, Vanessa, at one moment, ask that from the poster of the queen conch, we take out the ones that differentiate the different species of queen conch and we made a sticker of that and that's been used in many places.

The content of fishery ecosystem plan. We have to understand, people have to understand the conceptual model, the Endangered Species Act and Clean Water Act, because that's what the basis of that fishery ecosystem plan. I think that we could do a lot with giving information to elementary school children. If initiate the identification of those species, we will have not just probably more fishers or more people dedicated to fishing, but also a more educated community at all levels. They don't have to go and get a marine biology diploma. So, I will work with the design and present it to the Council for their approval.

 And then, the integration of concepts on marine fisheries in the U.S. Caribbean to the regular education curriculum. Every time I'm asked for one of my science teachers that I worked with a long time ago, "Alida, can you come and give us a lecture? Can you give us some activity?" What I do is that I take the book that we made two, three years ago on the marine fisheries ecosystem and with that I make the class activity. Then they see that it is not science, that I have a lot there that is economics, that I have a lot there that is sociology. So, we can do that, and we don't have to interrupt the curriculum. We enrich the curriculum with the marine education materials.

Next.

1 2

4 5

 The 2024 calendar that we are already working on. Getting the information is going to be dedicated to the Island-Based Fishery Management Plan. So, we have four months dedicated to Puerto Rico, four months dedicated to Saint Thomas/Saint John and four months for Saint Croix. This has to be not just for review, it has to be published; it has to be produced totally by September. So, we are getting the information now.

I think, and when I heard today the presentation on stock assessments that that is one of the issues that we have to get more information to the public, with vocabulary that you use in the legal document, but what does it mean to the fishers? And we have some booklets from a long, long time ago on a stock assessment, but we have to renew that because now the way they do the stock assessment is very different. And then something that the community can understand this management terminology, optimum yield, allowable catch, limit, acceptable biological catch, and others that most of the time we put the abbreviations and then we put what it means, but we don't explain what it is. So, we need to have, I don't know, some sort of dictionary or a terms material that can make those terms clear to the public.

Next.

That's my presentation for today. Questions, comments, recommendations.

#### Questions/Comments

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Alida. I'm going to open the floor for questions. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. Alida, as always, thank you for all your work and your staff. This year you have been very helpful, especially for our community of commercial fishermen and of course all this that you present to be developed. It's very important material, especially for the community and the coastal communities around Puerto Rico. So, I hope that this could be finished soon and starts spreading out on the island. Thanks.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Great.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yeah, Alida, thank you for that information. When do you think that some of the materials for the Island-Based FMP will be available for distribution to the public?

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: What? I didn't--

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: The materials for the Island-Based FMPs?

4 5

 ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: They should be available for the public, not later than September. And also, today I got some of the things that they are having, they could be amendments, but we are going to leave that out. But there are things that, even though the document was published in October, there are things that have to be clarified a little bit. But before September, I hope that by the end of May, I can send you what I have already for the three fact sheets, the big ones.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you, Alida. Just let us know if you need any help with revision of the documents or any suggestions. Okay?

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Yes, I will. I will get in touch. And also, to me, it's very important that book or that catalog that the DAPs requested, because that's going to be the book for the rest of the life that you will have there.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Alida and I have been talking to prioritize these things. So, the fact sheet for depicting chapter five and other parts of the Island-Based FMPs is number one. And number two will be the Fishes of the U.S. Caribbean as suggested by the Saint Thomas/Saint John DAP and adopted by the other two. So those are the two priorities that we have.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Yes.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: And of course, the third one is the calendar. We don't want to have the same experience of this year that by the time we finished the year was over, almost. So those three, ¿verdad, Alida?

**ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR:** Yeah. And at I feel very confident that I will have direct contact with Ruth, that I will have direct contact with Nelson and with Carlos. So, before I give even anything to you to review, they have reviewed it already.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. The other thing about this catalog is that we are not reinventing the wheel. All the information is already there in different booklets. What Alida will do is to compile them

and then add an outline, which is the key to the document is the outline. The biology of the animal and the place of the fish or invertebrate in the fishery.

In addition, once we have that document, it will be distributed to the DAPs so they can take a look at it. And to the Regional Office and make sure that we have the information as correct as possible. If we do that by the summer, probably the book will become out before the end of the year.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Yeah, I'm sure I will though.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: And the other thing is the EEJ stuff. The book will be in Spanish and English.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Yes.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: It takes a little bit more because it takes about two paragraphs to say the same thing that you say in English when you say it in Spanish. I'm serious. [laughter]

So Alida took note of all that and she has a lot of experience doing both. So, I'm sure that by this year we will have that document out. It's important to get the momentum when you spend the time of busy fishers in a room and they come with suggestion like that, and then you end doing something in three years from now, we're not going to do that.

So, Alida is committed to get the book out. The fact sheets are number one, and the Almanac. And then we are going to review our webpage. Cristina and I will work on that to make it more relevant. The stuff that we produce, for example, the recipe book we are going to have it popup, so you don't have to chase it all around the webpage to find it. And already Dr. Wanda Pantojas, one of the chefs yesterday evening, she did that and she received a lot of people interested in the book.

So, thank you for all your effort, Alida. We'll continue the work.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: I enjoy it.

42 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you, Miguel. Any other questions? Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: So, thank you Alida for the presentation. Impressive list of priorities and work that you're doing and recommendations. A couple of comments. So, with the Marine Resource Education program, which you mentioned, I think that's a huge opportunity to continue to build upon, to be able to discuss the

science and management. And although we don't run a lot of stakeholders through that process on an annual basis, it seems to be a very effective process and so we certainly want to build upon that. My question to you is, I was struck by a couple of instances where you referred to booklets or fish pictures or, you know, physical materials. And so, I know many, not all of us have a cell phone, right. I rely on, for example, Fish Rules App anytime I go fishing and I just brought it up while we were in the room, and it pictures and information about the species regulations. And so, I think from an electronic media standpoint to the extent that fishers have a phone or could use this, it's a real opportunity as well for outreach and education. You just need to make sure someone is paying attention and updating it. So, I'm curious from your perspective about materials that are developed both electronically as well as physical paper products.

15 16 17

18

19

20

2122

23

2425

2627

28

29

30

31

32

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

1112

13

14

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: We already are part of the Fish Rules and Cristina will be working to update the Fish Rules. We believe this is a very good tool. In addition, all the things that we produce on paper will be available on a digitized format on our webpage and social network. Cristina is in charge of the social network that we have. We produce a lot of material that has been very successful. When she puts it on Facebook it attracts a lot of public. Not only that, but the fishers, they have their own pages, so they copy/paste the information and send it out. So that's an excellent point. And we want to make sure-- the other thing is, it looks innocent, but Alida presented the QR because that makes the document a live document. Because sometimes we spend a couple of thousand dollars producing a brochure and then we change the law within the lifespan of that brochure, and its obsolete. So, with the QR, we said, you know, for an update of this regulation, go to the QR and then it will take the person to the place where he or she will get the right information on time.

333435

36

37

The QR feature also was recommended and supported by enforcement, National Marine Fishery Service at the meeting that we held in Saint Thomas. So, we want to update that. I believe that's an excellent point. I have it also in my cell phone and it's working.

38 39 40

41

42 43

44

45

46

47

48

MARCOS HANKE: Andy, I need to make a comment about the Fish Rule. The work that Cristina is going to do is very important because there is information that is general information for regions that have similar species, and I'm going to address one. There are some of them that are considered ciguatoxin on the literature and they expressed that. That can change the whole effort and put the information there that is very conflicted because, many reasons, right? And we need, most likely, Cristina, will need support from people to revise that into the future, maybe from your office too,

to make sure that this kind of conflictive information or information that we want to ask Fish Rule not to include for the Caribbean once you access, are not there.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. And the other point that I really appreciated was fish are known by different names, right? And so, someone could go in and look at an electronic application and they'll be looking for it under one name and not be able to find it, right? And so being able to provide all those names or based on where your location of fishing is, be able to search for it based on the more common name is really important as well.

So yeah, I mean the tools are as good as we can make them in terms of the outreach and education, but we need to tailor them, obviously, to meet the needs of the fishermen.

MARCOS HANKE: Just to inform the Council. I'm aware that a professor from UPR from Ponce, Miguel Del Pozo and some students, they are already going to around the island working with the common names. Right. As soon as they have the product, final product, I'll make sure that it gets to your hand because it's going to be an updated list of names and it's amazing how much things are there that we don't even imagine. Things that we don't know, right? Actually, on the last DAP we have a name that Carlos Velázquez brought to the table that is meaningful for his community, how they call the graysby, I don't dare to say on the mic. But all of that most likely is going to be documented on this work that those students are going to do. Anyway, that's the only comment I have.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Michelle Schärer. Fish Rules only has recreational regulations at this time for the U.S. Caribbean.

MARCOS HANKE: Noted.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: We know. That's exactly what we're doing. Cristina will be working with the contractor to pick up and update the fish rules.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Thank you for highlighting. Michelle Schärer is probably one of the persons that we should include in this revision in some level because you have extensive knowledge about many aspects that are going to be included in the Fish Rule. Nicole.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Yeah, I just had a point of clarification for Fish Rule. Are only the federal rules and regulations included in fish rules currently? I know that we haven't paid or processed

that as a territory but had been exploring it. And so, are the territorial rules and regulations also in Fish Rules as part of the initiative by the Council or not?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: We're supposed to be comprehensive when we started with Fish Rules. We had some issues be before and that's what Cristina's doing. She's making the right connections and everything. But ideally, we should have, for every fish a picture and you have a GPS. If I'm in the middle at sea, near Saint Croix, I should be able to identify the fishes in Fish Rules. Not only that, identify the rules that apply to that fish.

So, in essence what Cristina is working with the people-- actually, we probably need to allocate some funding for them because Fish Rule is an expensive baby and the idea will be to have the fish, the regulation in English and Spanish for Puerto Rico, for the U.S. Virgin Islands, and for the federal government. That's the whole idea that we have for that. So yeah, we will probably be able to inform about an update at the August meeting, what we're doing with Fisher Rule.

And now that we are talking, I was conferring with Nicole Angeli because they're also interested in adopting one of the strategies, the PEPCO program and we are going to help the Division to work on that one. The MREP is going to Saint Croix and she's in the loop. So, hopefully this year we'll have MREP in Saint Croix and we can initiate the PEPCO program. The PEPCO program needs a champion. We need a person dedicated to that program at least half time. So, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Any further questions? Hearing none, I think we are ready to pass to the next presentation, which is social media by Cristina Olán.

### Social Media Report

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Good afternoon. My name is Cristina Olán, for the record. I manage the social media of the Caribbean Fishery Management Council, Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, Twitter, and ISSUU. I'm not going to make details on numbers, but if you want statistics on the social media, please let me know and I will provide them.

 As usual, we are providing content on educational materials, seasonal closures, the NOAA Fisheries bulletin, celebrations like the Fishers Day and Women's Month, for example, meetings, the CFMC Bulletin, English and Spanish, all the content and content from other agencies and organizations related to fishing.

1 2

We receive a lot of inbox and direct messages, mostly related to fish ID, documents, regulations, workshops, fishing license, were to buy fish among other topics.

This is an example of what we did for the World Fisher's Day. It was in a collaboration with Sea Grant of Puerto Rico, and we took a selection of fishers from the U.S.V.I. and Puerto Rico. We also, provided our followers, links to different publications that were already in our websites. So, we took advantage of that day. And also, what we did, was to invite people to revisit those publications such as the Bulletin and the Fuete y Verguilla. We also celebrated the Women's Month, and we highlighted women from the staff, women's from the Panels and Committees among others. We started that campaign on March 8<sup>th</sup>, and we did it through the month also.

As I mentioned, we always publish information about the seasonal closures. All of the information is in English and Spanish. What we do always is to try to make the message simple for the people that follow us in the social media.

We are also working on short videos. As an example, I'm presenting one that Marcos sent me, and we published as a short. Also, we already did one with videos that we already have in the page. Our plan is to continue doing that so people can revisit that content and also have shorter videos to see instead of the long ones that are already in the YouTube channel.

I'm presenting an example of the CFMC bulletin. We share information there related to research, announcement, species and seasonal closures also. I have to say that I'm very thankful for all the people that contribute to the bulletin scientists, fishers. Here, for example, we have James Kreglo, Nicole, Vanessa, Marcos, Carlos, and then so many people that already have contributed to that bulletin. So, I'm very thankful. I cannot mention all the names but thank you again for all the support and the information that you always provide me.

We also are using the feature of articles in ISSUU, so people, instead of seeing the whole publications, they can just go to an article, and we can share that in the social media too. For example, this is what we did with one of the recipes of the book that you saw yesterday that we presented, The Underutilized Species Recipe Book. We produced an article with the recipe so people can just go to a recipe instead of reading the whole book, or they can continue reading it and be interested on seeing the whole publication.

1 2

4 5

Also, as I mentioned in the meeting of the OEAP, I'm very thankful because the Council allowed me to participate on the Council Coordinating Committee Communications Group meeting in February. It was in Florida. We had a team building activity. We review the Council practices and how meetings are conducted. We discuss a lot of communications tools, social media, artificial intelligence. Again, thank you Diana, Miguel, Alida for allowing me to participate in that meeting in Florida. Some pictures of Florida also there.

We continue having the WhatsApp broadcast list. Those lists are managed by Wilson Santiago and Nicole Greaux. They are our liaison in Puerto Rico and Saint Thomas and Saint John. What we do is that I send them short messages and an image, and they send that information through their broadcast list so other people that maybe they are not so into that social media, but they received information through WhatsApp.

Thank you again. I also want to add that we have been also part of the Big Fish campaign. Now, I'm going to put down this presentation. I'm going to share with you a video that is the trailer of the Treasure of the Caribbean that is part of the Big Fish campaign. That movie will be released next week through PBS TV and also through the internet. Give me a second, I have to—

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Cristina, while you look at it. I sent an email with a link for that movie, next  $26^{\text{th}}$  of April.

(Whereupon, the trailer of Treasure of the Caribbean was played and was not transcribed.)

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: As Miguel mentioned, the movie-- Miguel already shared with you the link and that information will be also part of our social media content. Again, if you have-- Thank you, Liajay, for sharing the information in the chat. If you have any questions, comments, please feel free to do them now or later if you have some ideas that you want to share with me.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Cristina, Ana Salceda, who is the author of the film sent you the toolkit for social media. So, I believe that you already know that.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: I know it.

**MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:** And we encourage everybody who have a chance to watch it. It's called Treasure of the Caribbean. The name was changed, and this is an effort by all countries in the Caribbean

that wants to protect the spawning aggregations. The poster boy for the groupers is the nassau grouper for snappers is a mutton snapper. Thank you, Cristina.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Thank you very much.

MARCOS HANKE: Next presentation is the Development of Educational Resources on the Shark Species.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Por favor, Wanda, nos dices quien tu eres y de más. Y de dónde vienes.

# Development of Educational Resources on the Shark Species (Infraclass: Selachii) of Puerto Rico.

WANDA M. ORTIZ BÁEZ: Hi, my name is Wanda. I know I met some of you last night, but for those of you who don't know me, my name is Wanda Ortiz. I'm a master student at the Department of Marine Sciences in the University of Puerto Rico at Mayagüez. I also work as an educator at Sea Grant Puerto Rico and I'm currently the Executive Director of an educational company called Little Women, Big Sharks.

I'm here to talk to you about this project that I have been working on for the past few years and is the development of educational resources of the shark species of Puerto Rico as a gateway to inform the local public.

We can hop into the next slide whenever you can.

This project is being supervised currently by my committee members Juan Cruz Motta, Edwin Omar Rodríguez Class, who you may know as Omi, Ruperto Chaparro, and Nikolaos Schizas, who is also professor at the department of Marine Sciences.

You can go into the next slide, please. Thank you.

So why another book if there are so many already about the sharks? So, this is a question I will be addressing throughout the presentation. You can go to the next slide please. Thank you.

So, these are the subjects of these educational resources. Sharks overall are cartilaginous fish. They're mostly predators with the exception of one species that is a predator, but it also has been determined as an of omnivorous species. It can eat and also digest sea grass. They have been around for around 400 million years. So far, we do have 536 species documented worldwide, but the last number I saw was 544 of which 46 species have been documented in

Puerto Rico so far.

4 5

 The educational resources will cover the relevance of the roles that they undertake, the niches that they occupy, and how these are important for us from an ecological, economic and sociocultural perspective as well. But however, sharks are currently declining. They're amongst the most threatened megafauna invertebrates worldwide. Currently, around 31% of shark species that have been documented so far are threatened, either critically endangered, endangered, or vulnerable according to the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. Half of the species in Puerto Rico have a global status of threaten, let it be either of those three.

We can go to the next slide.

So, these are the things that we wanted to look into or have in mind while developing the educational resources. First, we wanted to put out there or make people aware of this need-to-know information about sharks in general and with emphasis for those species in Puerto Rico.

You can go to the next slide and yeah, you can go to the next slide. Thank you.

So, as a background, in these educational resources, I made sure to include the general characteristics of sharks, meaning what defines the sharks and whether we realize it or not we are also teaching by discussing the general characteristics. We're teaching people about topography, shark topography, meaning the external parts of the sharks, their anatomy. We're also teaching about their physiology, ethology, which is behavior, a study of behavior, toxicology. And we're also making people aware of all the richness within this group around the archipelago, by discussing how different these general characteristics are between each shark, each species and also the niches that they occupy because of the characteristics they have altogether.

You can go into the next slide, please.

We emphasize that sharks, overall, many species are considered k-selected species. This is due because their traits, as k-selected species, in general sharks have a slow growth. They also reach sexual maturity very late in life. They have infrequent reproduction, which means that they don't reproduce as often as a [minutillus?] fish. Some sharks even reproduce every two, three years biennial, triennial cycle reproduction, and some in alternate years even. They have low fecundity, which means that they can have very few pups per litter. And they can have long

gestation periods. Something very interesting about this is that the vertebrate with the longest gestation period is a shark. It is actually the gulper shark, which is a species documented here in Puerto Rico and it can be pregnant, the females can be pregnant for up to 36 months. That's three years, right? And also, they have high longevity, which means that they can have a long life, or they can be around for a long time before they die from natural causes. A good representation of all these characteristics is the dusky shark, as you can see here.

4 5

You can go into the next slide. Thank you.

 Other than this, what we want to say about sharks being a k-selected species, these traits vary very much from one shark to another. So, we have a high variability. We have a high heterogeneity not only considering the sharks overall, but also the shark species here in Puerto Rico because we have a little bit of everything.

And talking about heterogeneity, we have sharks with different adaptations from things as crazy as bioluminescent sharks. We have actually the largest vertebrate, bioluminescent vertebrate is a shark, and it's a species that is also here, which is the kitefin shark. We have biofluorescent sharks as well. What I want to say about these adaptations is that they could all be looked into because they might have even human applications. For example, biofluorescence in sharks has been determined to help sharks kill eliminate harmful bacteria. Other things that we can like look into are the feeding adaptations, different feeding adaptations of sharks, such as filter feeding, suction feeding, parasitism, omnivory, and even coprophagy. The oceanic whitetip shark, for example, has been observed to follow pilot whales and eat their excretions and also, follow them because they take advantage basically of their echolocation and that's how they are able to find prey as well.

 Other things we can look into is that there is this group of sharks which— this characteristic hermaphroditism was thought to not be common, but this is actual a very common characteristic within the devil catshark group. And we can look into also asexual reproduction in sharks. There are sharks that can reproduce asexually by means of parts and parthenogenesis, which means that the mother produces exact copies of her. We could also look into sperm storage, polyandry, multiple paternity. There are sharks that can, pretty much sharks that can give birth for pups from different fathers at the same time.

We can look into natal philopatry, which Cristina mentioned to me

the other day that she just thought that that was only for-- natal philopatry was only exhibited in sea turtles, but actually, female lemon sharks are known to return to the place they were born to give birth there. And also, euryhalinity. Several species of sharks are known to be euryhaline, and that's when they tolerate different levels of salinity and that's what makes them able to enter freshwater. And other sharks in other parts of the world are able to live in freshwater as well.

4 5

We also included in the materials— we wanted to include why sharks are important. These are a few examples that we usually hear about. How they keep their balance? Exert top-down population controls and whatnot, but things that we don't normally hear about them are that sharks are actually facilitators. The way they eat by shaking their heads abruptly loses pieces of their prey and these little pieces of prey are then available for other organisms to feed on. And this is why basically remoras follow sharks around or attach to sharks so they can have those feeding opportunities. So, they provide these feeding opportunities to other organisms that wouldn't have those feeding opportunities otherwise.

And also, sharks are free themselves. Not all of them are top predators. They're actually considered more mesopredator than top predators. And they have an important role in food security. They're an affordable source of protein for middle and low-income families around the world. One of example of this is in Sri Lanka.

We can go into the next slide.

Another importance that I want to make sure to discuss in the educational resources, is their economic and cultural importance such as, shark tourism, for example. This is a million-dollar industry worldwide and it creates jobs. Aside from being important in arts and creating jobs for filmmakers, photographers, and whatnot they're important in certain customs, beliefs, tales and traditions, meaning the folklore.

 They're all also the source of bioinspiration for very novel designs. Meaning, for example, the shark dermal denticles allow sharks to have less drag while moving in the water and this has been used as something that inspired a coating based on the design of those dermal denticles and this coating has been applied to boats and airplanes and has actually saved them fuel in transportation or money in fuel and transportation. It has also inspired the speedos swimsuits that were actually banned in the Olympics of 2008 because many of the swimmers that were using this swimsuit broke several records, so they were banned from then on because it reduces the drag in the water and increases somehow

their performance in the water. So, we included that.

We can go into the next slide.

4 5

However, we wanted to make sure that this information is also included. Sharks are facing several threats that are increasing in magnitude and speed. These threats include overfishing as the main threat that they're facing. Let it be from either direct or incidental fishing, but mainly at an industrial scale or industrial level as a result of mixed fisheries. And they are also facing habitat degradation and destruction, pollution. The effects of climate change, the big deadly trio are being studied right now and the effects that they have in sharks. Also, shark culling in certain countries.

This is enhanced by the level of exposure from certain species that are particularly large coastal and have a limited habitat range. And this makes them even more susceptible, this altogether, considering that their life history traits as k-selected species. And in many countries, they're being poorly managed because we're not considering that this life history traits might be very particular from one species into another and that policy making decisions and management measures need to be based on these specific life history traits.

We can go into the next slide.

So overall one 31.2% of the species of sharks are threatened worldwide, according to the IUCN global status, but if we go to the global status of shark species in Puerto Rico, specifically, half of the species here are threatened, either critically endangered, endangered, which is the majority of those threatened species, and/or vulnerable. So, half of our species here have a global status of threatened with extinction.

We can go into the next slide.

Another thing that we wanted to address is this unrealistic and negative perception that we often see and hear that people have towards sharks and their vindictive behavior as well. Also, we wanted to look into the fact that most of the information that's available out there for people is in English and conveyed in a very technical manner. This technical manner of conveying information often accompanies scientific information that is available.

Uh, we can go into the next slide, please. Thank you.

So, these are the issues that we're addressing through the projects. We're basically trying to debunk misconceptions and address that misinformation that is out there and in order to do that, we wanted to pinpoint the source. Where are these misconceptions coming from? Why is this misinformation still out there? And we found out that this is because most of the information that is available and accessible is in English and also conveyed in a technical manner. And this, if you consider this, the statistic right here, that the first language of the Puerto Ricans is Spanish for 94% of the population, we realize the fact that we need to develop more Spanish sources that people can have there and look at. Almost 77% of the Puerto Ricans do not speak English fluently, which might hinder the ability of some people to understand those materials that are already in English.

And something else is that the primary sources of information are conveyed in a technical manner, as I mentioned before. This might be inaccessible to people that are unfamiliar with science or with the topic and we want everyone to have the same opportunity to learn about sharks out there. And this information could be also out of reach for many reasons.

We can go to the next slide.

 So, these were the objectives of this project. We wanted to address common misconceptions about sharks by creating learning opportunities and helping the general public understand sharks and the nature of their importance, where this comes from, and make people aware of the local shark species richness. Because not many people are aware of how many species we have, which are those species. And also, to develop educational materials to address this and inform the local public about the sharks in Puerto Rico and in general.

We can go into the next slide.

So, this was the process. Basically, for me, this was a 14-year learning process, but it started, this project per se, started by gathering information and allocation of resources about seven years ago. And the creative process included gathering that information and sorting it into categories for making, basically, like an outline of what we wanted to do and the information we wanted to include in these projects, in these resources. And the writing process took about three years while gathering information still.

And then, there was also the task distribution. We wanted to assign illustrators to do the scientific illustrations of the different

species that we have and other explanatory material.

You can go into the next slide, please.

4 5

And finally, with the submission of the drafts, we ended up with the book. The title-- this was the first prototype of the cover page of the book but it's not going to be about the shark populations in the Virgin Islands. It's going to be specific to Puerto Rico. From this book, we're going to excerpt information and make a little brochure for easy distribution about the more commonly seen and commonly caught shark species here, with a brief description of each and a poster with each scientific illustration of each species of sharks.

We can go into the next slide.

For the book, which is the main resource in this project, this was the outline, the final outline for that book. We have different chapters. The first one includes an introduction of sharks overall. Chapter two is basically defining what a shark is, disclosing their general characteristics and why are they important. Chapter three is about topography, the external parts that sharks are known for. Anatomy as well, the organs, so we can learn also about physiology in this chapter. Chapter number five, which talks about all the shark species that have been documented for Puerto Rico so far. It describes them and also, it's accompanied with each species overall or general life history traits, at least for those that we know information about, because there are some species that we don't know much about them still. There's a lot of research still to be done. We included importance and we subdivided this chapter between the ecological importance based on their ecological roles and the environment and the oceans. And we have, also, an economic importance subchapter and the cultural importance subchapter.

 We make people aware, through chapter seven, about the shark decline. Why are they declining? What are the emerging issues that we should be concerned about? We talk a little bit also about conservation management. This chapter is very special, true or false, because this chapter was based on, or it was inspired by the common misconceptions and the questions I was usually asked while giving talks about sharks. So, I basically compiled all these questions and misconceptions, and I made a chapter out of it. So, we talk about this and try to explain them and also disclose whether they're true or not, and why giving them an explanation. And also, human etiquette. These are the appendixes that accompany or are supplemented material for this chapter.

We can go to the next slide.

These are excerpts from the book before they were edited. This is the front page of the introduction chapter and also the front page of the true or false chapter.

We can go into the next slide.

This is an excerpt page from the topography chapter and this one is the anatomy chapter. Each one signals or indicates a part of a shark and their description and their function. This is from the species Puerto Rico chapter. We divided sharks by family, and we talked about the family, described the family, and then proceeded to talk about the species giving a brief information and the life history traits for them.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Wanda? Yeah, you have one minute to wrap it up.

NATALIE MARIE BÁEZ RODRÍGUEZ: Oh, yeah, well I'm already finishing. And for the importance chapters, we made sure to include supplementary information such as QR codes that refer the reader to videos that help give the reader an idea of what we're already explaining.

We can go into the next chapter.

So, these are the conclusions. We are addressing a persistent gap of information, facilitating a learning opportunity and increasing the accessibility and comprehension of information, target misinformation and debunking common misconceptions out there and teaching about their importance. And overall providing a synopsis of the species richness around the archipelago.

We can go into the next one.

And creating awareness regarding the decline current situation in Puerto Rico and providing a foundation for teachers that they can use further on. There are limitations, of course, as with anything. And because it has to be accompanied with communication efforts so we can let people know that these are available, and we have to keep updating every few years with new information and new records emerging.

And these are the long-term implications and what we expect from the educational part of this project. It is basically an expectation of change, a change in perspective and hopefully also of our behavior toward sharks. And it's providing a framework for research projects, policy making decisions, and also management measures and guidance as well.

So, this is what I already disclosed, and it will be a huge contribution, a way of giving back to the community from everything I've learned from the community while giving talks to them. So yeah, and inclusion is essentially as this is a way to start because this is not only addressed for Puerto Ricans. Puerto Rico is also included in the narrative of this educational resource.

4 5

And yeah, these are the book production team and the collaborators. Yeah, that's it for me. I would love to answer your questions and take suggestions if you have any.

#### Questions/Comments

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. I want to say that under the ecosystem-based management that we are into, the knowledge about the sharks and importance and all of what you expose, this is very good material, very comprehensive. We might need, in the future, a little more opportunity to learn to digest. The only comment I will have based on the experience is I didn't see there any way to fix the problem of fish id because most of the publications in the past were with the regulated species and there is, for example, other species that we catch and are common on the area that if you add a feature of similar species and the features that distinguish the similar species among each other, that will be something super helpful. I know that is not an easy task, but it's possible, right?

WANDA M. ORTIZ BÁEZ: Yeah. Actually, with this educational resource in particular, well the book in particular, we wanted to take the first steps into introducing people to sharks, basically. Introducing sharks to people, sorry. So, we wanted to let people know what a shark is. Now, with this you know what a shark is. Why should we care or why are they important? And now the next step is how to tell different sharks apart. So, something I'm working on right now is photographic ID guide for the species that can be found here and how you can tell them apart. Which ones look very similar to one another and what you can use to tell them apart. So that's the next step.

 MARCOS HANKE: Just a recommendation to focus on those similar species and guide them. For example, I was talking to Carlos, immediately when he saw the dusky shark, "that's a Caribbean reef, right?" Which is a very common shark here. We should have on the Caribbean reef, on the dusky shark, the similarities and the way to tell them apart on the most effective, expedite, simple way possible.

WANDA M. ORTIZ BÁEZ: Yeah. The one in, I think it was like the

fourth slide, it was a dusky shark, and then the one before that was the Caribbean reef shark and few species that look a lot alike is the dusky shark, the Caribbean reef shark, the Galapagos shark, and also the silky shark. It's very difficult to tell them apart. But there are tricks and there are certain characteristics you can look into that would be helpful for them.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: That will help compliance and on the regulation for HMS and so on. Does the HMS office have access to this publication, this work that you are doing?

WANDA M. ORTIZ BÁEZ: They're not published yet. We're still working on the corrections of illustrations and I'm also applying the editorial corrections that Cristina made. She's part of the production team of the book. So, we're doing that, currently. I think the foreseeable, because it's forthcoming, so the foreseeable date of publication could be August 2023. So, by August, hopefully that material will be already available for anyone who wants to use it, including HMS.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Just send me an email because I am on the AP of HMS, and I want to connect you guys from now to make sure you guys can work together and know what each other need and so on.

WANDA M. ORTIZ BÁEZ: Yeah.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you.

WANDA M. ORTIZ BÁEZ: Okay. Perfect.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Just to say congratulations to Wanda. Wanda has been doing an amazing job for years. I met her many years ago in Sea Grant, and she came as a volunteer and she's now going to be graduating from the Marine Sciences Department. So, congratulations, Wanda, and thank you for all the job that you are doing in education, in marine education. Thank you very much.

MARCOS HANKE: Any other question from the group? Cristina.

WANDA M. ORTIZ BÁEZ: Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. Wanda, thank you for the presentation. Excellent. Because I see some names that I know, our connection will be Cristina Olán, so if you think of anything that we can assist, I will be more than happy to collaborate. But I'm looking forward to the publication of the book in Spanish. And this

question relates to something that Dr. Strelcheck talk before, will this be available in a digital format? So, we can put it in our webpage.

WANDA M. ORTIZ BÁEZ: Yeah. Once we're done with the Spanish version of the book. We can proceed to work on the English one.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Will it be digitized and hard copies?

10 WANDA M. ORTIZ BÁEZ: Sorry, what?

**MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:** In a digital format and hard copy? Can I use it or go to Sea Grant and download it?

WANDA M. ORTIZ BÁEZ: That will be up to Sea Grant, which is the program that is going to publish this work. But I think hard copies, I don't know if digitalized copies, hopefully there will be digitalized copies, but for now I think we're working on having that hard copy. And the book will also be accessible in the sense that it could be affordable because what people would have to pay for to get the book, the hard copy of the book, will be the cost of impression. For instance, the Marine Mammal of Puerto Rico book that Grisel wrote, it's about \$20 right now and it's just to cover the cost of printing. So, yeah.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. I don't see any other question. We're going to move along. Thank you very much for your presentation.

WANDA M. ORTIZ BÁEZ: Yep, absolutely. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: The next presentation—— I've received some texts for a break. There's a needed break for five minutes for people to stretch the legs and everything else. I'll see you guys in five minutes.

(Whereupon a brief recess was taken.)

38 MARCOS HANKE: Let's take your seats please.

Please take your seats, everyone. We're going to start with the Liaison Officers Reports. I would like to start first with Mabel Maldonado.

44 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Not here.

46 MARCOS HANKE: Who is not here, right? Nobody is going to make it? 47 Okay. Nicole Greaux?

# Liaison Officers Reports St. Thomas/St. John, USVI - Nicole Greaux

NICOLE GREAUX: Is that better? Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Nicole Greaux. I am the outreach and education liaison for the Fishery Management Council to the islands of Saint Thomas and Saint John. You can contact me via my email, and I'd like to thank you all very much for having me here today.

So, these are some of the activities and events that have been done presently. We have information boxes, which was a project and put together through Ruth Gomez for information to be widely dispersed at different fishing ports on the island. The video on pertinent points of the lobster ruling, I was asked to do a follow up video for that, and I've done that as well, that got very nice reviews. The initial meeting with MREP was something that I'm really, really glad that I had a chance to be a part of and to attend. That's really important. We touched on MREP a few times today. The foundation building for the upcoming workshops, which is taking place this summer, I think is going to be something very productive, not only for our fishermen, but also for the understanding and for the connection between the people that make the rules and explain the rules to be there to this particular group of people and shareholders. And then my favorite thing that I've done so far for this quarter was the afternoon on the green.

So, the information boxes that I was talking about. Currently there are two boxes that are up. There's one located in Hull Bay, which is a very well known, very frequented spot for not only fishers, but for people that interact with our fisheries. That is the display that is on the right-hand side. And then in Frenchtown at the most, I suppose, populated fish vending site, there's a fish box that's located there as well. What you're looking at inside of those fish boxes is an introduction to the island-based fishery management plan. I had lots of questions about that as well. So, these are what's going into the boxes. Information about not only the fishery management plan, but any notification that involves the fishermen and our fisheries as well.

Proximo.

Ah, this is the lobster information video. So, the key points such as what the lobster video or what the lobster ruling was about; questions on why it was implemented; things about the catch limits for the surrounding waters that involves the lobster study.

Proximo.

And then the WhatsApp broadcast. This is something that's been really useful as far as my communication efforts with several of the fishermen is being able to send out the WhatsApp information through via broadcast with things that I pick up off of the web, the Caribbean Fishery Management Council page, and definitely information that Cristina sends me that we need to get out. So, as it was mentioned earlier, I don't remember by who, a lot of the fishers do not have a chance to go onto social media. Some of them are just not very interested in surfing or going through the different webpages to find out information. Sometimes the NOAA website, where a lot of this information comes from or is readily available, is very difficult to manage and to navigate. So, this is a really great way to get the information that's pertinent out too many fishers. I'm hoping that I can have more phone numbers added to that broadcast list, but this is also shared with our DAP representative and the spokesperson for the Saint Thomas Fishers Association. So hopefully the information can be more widespread that way as well.

18 19 20

1

2

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

1314

15

16

17

Proximo.

2122

23

24

Afternoon on the Green. This has been what I think the most successful outreach engagement that I have had so far. Not only with fishermen attending or going to Afternoon on the Green, but the general public as well.

252627

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

What it is kind of like a fair of education and information and everything that the University of the Virgin Islands is involved in and is a part of. I had a table, and I was allowed to have space there to talk about things like the species that are the most prevalent in the U.S. Virgin Islands. Down in the lower corner, there is a poster that was done through Sea Grant and different collaborations about the different species that are found in the Virgin Islands and in Puerto Rico. That was very popular. That was a giveaway. Activity books were really popular too, given by the Division of Fish and Wildlife. That is something that contributed to a lot of conversations. And then, people were really interested in just ways that they can be more sustainable when it comes to utilizing our marine resources. Um, magnets and posters, I've realized is a really popular way to get people interested in information. So that might be something that we would want to look into in the future.

42 43

44 Next.

45

46 And that's it. Thank you all very much.

1 2

### Questions/Comments

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for an informative and precise presentation. We really appreciate that. Thank you. The next presentation— we have a question?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Just to say thank you to Nicole for her support for the newsletter and the WhatsApp broadcast list. Thank you very much.

MARCOS HANKE: Next presentation is after Alida's question.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: It is not a question; it is just a comment that the type of work that Nicole is doing as a liaison is the contact that we need with the fishers and with the consumers. It doesn't matter where you are, it doesn't matter what type of information, as long, of course, as the information is the right one. But you can do almost anything to make contact with the people. Thank you, Nicole.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Nicole, again. Yes. Anybody else? No? Then we are going to go to the next presentation, which is Wilson Santiago.

#### Puerto Rico - Wilson Santiago

WILSON SANTIAGO: Yes. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Wilson Santiago, the Puerto Rico Fisheries Liaison. This is my presentation on my participation and next steps and issue from the fishers of Puerto Rico.

So, in 2022 I started again coordinating the educational program for commercial fishers, the PEPCO program. We are sending weekly educational posts via WhatsApp, like Cristina said in her presentation. Thanks for all the material that weekly she gave me. Continue supporting the fishers with issues and information, giving educational material for the fishers and fishing communities. For this, I try to get all around the island sometimes some fish houses or fishing villages. I haven't gone to all of them, but I will try.

So, I work in an assessment on the impacts of Hurricane Fiona in Puerto Rico fishing villages and community. This is a work together with Jannette Ramos. And I also participated in the Ocean Acidification workshop. That was in 2023. I did not put in in the presentation, but I also participated, thanks to Vanessa Ramírez, in a [conversation?] with commercial fishers next to officer Miguel

Borges. Miguel Borges talked about the federal water regulations and I in a [conservation?] of state waters regulations.

Next, Cristina.

Okay. So, as liaison, my next step is resuming what we call the PEPER, the Educational Program for Recreational Fishers. It is a program that my partner Helena Antoun is working and probably—this past week we just passed the flyer via the social medias, so persons that want to get the workshop they have called us. We are making a list to see which places we are going to start giving this workshop. Continuing the Pepco program and continuing support of the CFMC, DNER, Sea Grant and other agencies for the fishing communities around Puerto Rico, in the social media too. Continue educating in the process of license, statistics and state laws to maintain the responsibility of all the fishing communities. Communicate the fishers regarding the Island-Based Fisher Management Plan.

So, right now, myself, I'm starting to make a second part of the PEPCO program. I have a lot of topics that I want to add, but naturally the PEPCO program is some basic topics. The program is a three-hour workshop. So, I don't want to fill more that first part. I'm starting to make a second part with another topics of interest for the fishing communities.

Next one, please.

So, issues and concerns from fishers. All around the island, one of the major issues is the queen and cardinal snapper state permit. Right now, those are the top species in Puerto Rico that everybody, new commercial fishers, and the old ones want to fish for, because of the high prices. The HMS permit for Caribbean small boat permit, we are attending that with the Sea Grant magazine Fuete y Verguilla. And the Puerto Rico commercial fishing license and permit. This is the commercial license that DNER gives. So, myself, I always assist the commercial fishers and trying to help them in every possible way that I can.

 So that will be my presentation. And before I finish, I want to say thanks to Marcos Hanke. This is my last presentation that you're going to hear from me as a Chairman. This is not the last one, but as a Chairman. Thank you for your guidance and all the ideas that you always bring to us, and especially for me.

So, any question, comments, idea?

#### Questions/Comments

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. I have to respond to this because, Wilson, you personify what we need in the Caribbean. You are sincere, you're honest, you are proactive, you connect to people, and you gain the trust of everybody, the managers, the fishermen, and everybody. And at the same time, you don't know, maybe, or you already felt it, but you are part of my extended family on a professional level and beyond. Thank you very much for your job.

WILSON SANTIAGO: Thank you, Marco.

MARCOS HANKE: Alida.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: I also want to thank Wilson. As a liaison he's my first, and many times, my only contact with the local government, with the communities, with the fishing communities, with anyone. When I need some information, the first person that I can call and know that I'm going to get something and if it doesn't work, he will do it again and again and again, it's Wilson. So, Wilson, thanks a lot.

WILSON SANTIAGO: Very welcome. Thank you, Alida. Thank you, everyone.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Rapidito. Wilson, gracias. Lo voy a decir en español. Gracias por el apoyo siempre. Un abrazo. Y por todo el trabajo que haces. Igual que Alida, cada vez que uno necesita alguna información tu estas ahí para brindarle ese apoyo a uno.

MARCOS HANKE: En la misma nota positiva. On the same positive note, we will keep moving with the meeting. The next is a break, but we already had the break. I saw your face, Liajay. I'm going to have a long break, but that's me. Enforcement Reports. Puerto Rico Department of Environmental Resources.

# Enforcement Reports Puerto Rico - DNER

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Okay. This is Ricardo López for the record. This is going to be only a one hour and 30 minutes presentation [laughter] but I'm just going to do a summary for you.

I did have some help from the Puerto Rico, DNER Ranger Corps, especially, Yamiré Pérez Román, who sent me all the data and with that I was able to do this presentation.

Please, next.

1 2

4 5

Okay. As you can see there in that figure, you can see many of the violations that were attained since December 1<sup>st</sup>, 2022, to March 31<sup>st</sup>, 2023. From those interventions we have a total of 242 interventions. Many of them were for the Law 430, which is Puerto Rico Water Navigation and Safety Act. That was followed by the Regulation 6979, which is Regulations for Registration, Navigation, and Aquatic Safety. So, the majority of the interventions were related to safety, but we do have some interventions about fisheries.

Please, next.

As you can see here the ones that are in yellow color are the ones that I really want to present to you. The first one to the left is the sale in clandestine fish market of 33 groupers during the closure. And then to the right, Regulations 7949 Fishery's Regulations, you can see the illegal possessions of species in closure dates; lobster does not measure as required by law; and possession of quench conch not complying with the size limit. And for the last excess queen conch possession on recreational and commercial fishers. Those are the only ones that are really related to the federal regulations and the reason that we are here today.

Please, next.

On that one you can see a couple of pictures, right? One with the groupers and the other with what we call 'chopas.' 'Chopas' is from the genus lepomis, and it's prohibited to fish them and sell them in Puerto Rico. The same group of people had those fish to be sold. In that intervention, we have the collaboration of Yamiré Pérez Manuel Rey and Miguel Borges, who is here with us today. So, I really appreciate that.

I believe this one is the last of the-- Yes. With that one I finished. Those are the telephone numbers and contacts. If you have any question. I'm here.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Ricardo. Great format. The way you presented. It's--

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Good summary.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, it's perfect. It's based on experience. Thank you very much. We have the next presentation, unless we have questions. No? Next presentation then. U.S.V.I.

# USVI-Department of Planning and Natural Resources

4 5

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Since the last meeting, our officers have been collaborating closely with federal NOAA Law Enforcement in a special operation in the Saint Croix district related to illegal fish trap. As many of our officers are new, which is excellent, we're adding officers, this was good for training as well as collaboration between our agencies. Several new vessels are going to allow the officers to be on the water more often, which we hear loud and clear from our community.

In addition, as the allotments for the JEA to the U.S.V.I. have decreased by more than 10% for this upcoming year, we just want to state how important it has been to have a law enforcement officer in the Saint Thomas/Saint John district and because we do have island-based fisheries management plans, how critically important it could be to have a second officer in the U.S.V.I., in the Saint Croix district. Boots on the ground are worth immeasurable amounts of enforcement.

So, thank you very much. That concludes our report. Director Forbes, send his apologies, he couldn't make it.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much. US Coast Guard. We don't have a U.S. Coast Guard at this time to report. NOAA Office of Law Enforcement.

#### NOAA's Office of Law Enforcement

MATTHEW WALIA: All right, thank you. I'm Matt Walia, the compliance liaison for OLE. I'll be brief here and know we're at the end of the day. Before I get into it, I was just going to do a quick reintroduction to myself since I haven't been here before. What I primarily do is I work a lot with the Councils, all of them down here, the Caribbean, Atlantic, and the Gulf. We want to work with the fishing industry and get compliance, make sure they understand what to do, how to do it the right way. So, if you hear concerns from your fishing folks, please reach out to me, Miguel we have Alex on Saint Thomas, so don't hesitate to reach out to

 One thing I just wanted to point out to some of the discussions we had going on with possession and bag limits today, just a reminder that we do have a LE preset document that's made for recommendations to the Council when new amendments are getting proposed. Just to keep that in mind. So, it, essentially, if you can simplify, make the regs easier, get rid of loopholes, it's easier for enforcement. So, I just want to throw that out there

for compatibility considerations.

I'm going to present a couple overview-- if you can go to the next slide-- since the last meeting. So, a few things you've already heard, which I think is good, it shows our collaboration with the partners.

Is it going again? apparently, there are issues uploading where it automatically moves the slides? I do have it on a thumb drive, if that helps things. All right. Hopefully it stays.

So, the top pictures you see here, this involved the patrol in Bajo de Sico-

It looks like maybe it's not staying. It's going back. Do you want the, do you mind giving her that really quick? It's under the Caribbean folder. So, I'll talk as it goes on, just so you know, while they try to figure the glitches.

Essentially, we had a patrol on Bajo de Sico. It was in March right before it opened back up. Miguel was out there. There was a collaboration with Customs and Border Patrol. We came across a couple vessels out there that had possession of reef fish and shark. So, there was a couple citations where red hind and yellowfin, or yellowtail Snapper, were retained. And that's also where you heard from Nelson with the DAP report that rainbow runners came up. So, these boats did possess a fair number of rainbow runners. Officer discretion was used to not issue fines at the time since this seems relatively new, but as it is now, it still is a reef fish species until that's changed.

Um, couple other highlights that Miguel did as well, as we'll see as they're trying to bring it up. We did a lot of seafood inspections and seafood mislabeling. That's always been a concern we've heard in the region. It's been a slew of a couple different things. So, red hind and goliath grouper were reported as being sold at various places, whether it's a supermarket, fish trucks, fish dealers, and some of it was cleared up through import paperwork that was misrepresented. Something that was categorized as red hind ended up being graysby imported from Brazil, so that was okay.

We had something labeled as a Goliath grouper out of a food truck and that raised some alarm bells obviously and ended up being a misidentification. It was misty grouper that was being sold. And then other cases there truly are infractions, like you just heard from Puerto Rico, the infraction case of the hind that went over to DNER that they handled.

Dolphin harassment also unfortunately continues. We do get reports of that as well. We try to track down the accountability and verify those reports as well. We have a few open cases.

Next slide, hopefully.

 All right, in another aspect we focus on everywhere, divisionally, nationwide involves trade monitoring. We've been having a big focus with our officer in Saint Thomas where he's been able to go to the airport and do a lot of inspections. These are held in coordination with customs and border patrol, and he's found a slew of thing. Some are good, some are bad, some have tickets, some are open. But it involves everything you see up there, spiny lobster, mahi, tuna conch that's been imported in that he's inspecting. And similar, Miguel also was recently in Ponce and did a joint operation with FDA and CBP as well, where they went to shipper facilities trying to inspect seafood coming in as well from different various countries to look for anything.

So, we're hoping to continue those expansions and collaborations with the partners. And before you go to the next slide, I just want to highlight that graphic I have in the lower right. That's actually a graphic of lobster stocks and where they originate from. There's been a lot of talk about lobster stocks, the importance of it in the area.

If you can go to the next slide, I'll tie that in.

So, we recognize it's important. We want to protect our domestic seafood and some of the recent case highlights that we want to show these top two or recent cases that we collaborate with the Department of Justice that involved the re-export of spiny lobster from the U.S. So, it was falsely mislabeled. It was coming from Florida, product of U.S., when in actuality it wasn't. You see Aifa Seafood, it was actually of Haiti origin, which is the same stock considered as here in Puerto Rico. And the Elite Sky Company. It was Nicaragua and Belize stocks that they imported in, falsely mislabeled, re-exported back out to China.

 Aifa Seafood, pleaded guilty, and their sentencing is pending. And you see, Elite, they got assessed \$250,000 and also a five-year probation for infractions on seafood imports. So, it is something that we're looking after all over the place.

And lastly, the last collaboration we have with Department of Justice. It involved Operation Rock Bottom. It may sound familiar. This case originates with Lynn Rios, a retired agent, so it's been ongoing for a while. The last defendant was charged, he received what you see there, a \$10,000 fine, probation, community service. He cannot snorkel or scuba anywhere within the EEZ as well as aquarium within the Marine trade. He used to take recording of the marine organisms and was selling it illegally. So those are three big cases that we had out of the region recently we want to highlight.

Next slide.

And here, I just want-- I'm going to get into a second here. We just want to recognize our partnership, the need for it. You know, who we work with, how we get our job done, we usually try to focus on trainings and joint patrols.

Go to the next slide.

And the reason, after you just heard from Nicole, is at the beginning of this month, we did a big OP with DPNR and we actually shipped in a supervisor along with two officers in addition to Alex, who was stationed in Saint Thomas. We collaborate with U.S.V.I. We went out on their vessels. They took us out with their officers. We got underway. It was really successful. It was rough seas; it was like eight-foot seas. They were slamming out there, but they made it around the whole perimeter of the island. These graphics here show that we made it to both federally closed areas. Those are from the chart plotter, showing that we were in the closed area, and we did have some boardings and inspections as well.

You go to the next slide.

These are some pictures from the op. So, we came across various things such as conch pulled out of shell and federal waters. There's some pending cases and seizures going on with that. We had undersized lobster that were seen. And we also assisted the officers in territorial waters pulling traps that were more estate infractions.

So, it was really successful. We want to commend their efforts for U.S.V.I., for taking us out there, working together. It was a great success overall, making a presence, getting out there with the fishermen and getting out there. We look forward to continuing to do more of that.

Next slide.

48 And just to highlight a few outreach things that we've done as

well. The top one is from Alex. So, one thing that he's been really good, I've heard reports as well, is he's been real proactive meeting with the fishermen. There was confusion on where to fish, how to fish in the right area out on the banks for the snapper or for the grouper, apologies. And he reviewed electronics, their plotters, made sure they were fixed right with the right lats and longs on there, how to get out there. So, he made sure that during compliance, instead of issuing tickets right off the bat. We had complaints of some whale in the area. So as far as protected species, he was able to collaborate with Coast Guard and get safety messages broadcast out on vhf.

4 5

And then what you just heard from Wilson; it's been really successful. Miguel participated with a workshop that was held by Vanessa. It was really successful with fisherman reaching out of what to do, what the regulations are. So, we're looking forward to continuing on future workshops similar to that as well.

And next slide.

And some general enforcement outreach material I want to make you aware. So, a while ago we came to you, to the Council and to the DAP members on our enforcement priorities. They were put on hold until NOAA Fisheries strategic plan was released. So that went back out to public comment; it just recently closed. So as soon as this is final, we'll make sure that y'all have it. And those other links that'll be on there should be in the briefing book later. It is our annual report from 2020. It was just posted recently; they are catching up from Covid. Then we also have an IUU partnership fact sheet as well. We've done some recent work down in Central and South America. We've been working with Ecuador, Peru, and Colombia on some seafood and IUU fishing down there and training and sending our folks down there.

Next slide.

And these also just some general links for awareness. We have our main website that posts a lot of information. These reports, different things you can find on there for news. If you already haven't, I suggest the NOAA Fisheries bulletins, they're a good resource to use. And then that last link is actually from our Office of General Counsel Enforcement Section. What they do is they post case updates that we hand over to them. So, if you want to see actionable results of what's going on, they post that periodically. I encourage you to check that out. We also have a council report that we distribute out and that's also available upon request.

And I believe that's it. And I'm happy to take any questions you may have. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you very much for the presentation. Any question? Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: I just want to say once again, thank you for the support that you've been giving us in several different areas here and your teams out there. It's great to have Alex. Alex has been very, very instrumental in education. You know, I said yesterday in my report that he also attended our meeting on a last-minute notice and spend a whole day with us and was there to give advice and understand part of that process. So once again, thank you for the good work that you guys are doing and the subordinate in the U.S.V.I. Thank you.

MATTHEW WALIA: Yeah, I appreciate Julian. We may be small, but we're muddy. We're trying to get out when we can and make our interactions. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. And on the same note, because it is also true that Miguel Borges is involved on many communications and MREP participation and other activities. He is always available, very kind and very patience with the processes. We really appreciate that. That goes a long way in terms of education and to make it better.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: I just want to thank both of you and also Miguel, because he's always accessible, especially for giving that workshop that we made with Wilson, also in the Puerto Real Association and it was very productive, and I hope that we can bring this around the island. Thanks.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you.

MIGUEL BORGES: Marcos, very quick. I just want to say thank you to Vanessa and Marcos. For me, it's a pleasure each time I have the opportunity to do some workshop that provides education to all the fishermen. I think that's a critical part of our job as enforcement not only the, the cases we do, which are obviously our core, but also the education is a big part of what we do. So, I thank you for the opportunity for that, and I'm looking forward to any other programs that you might have and work for me. So, Marcos, if this is the last Council meeting with you as a Chairman, it's been a pleasure to work with you as a leader and we are very grateful and fortunate to have had a chairman of your caliber. So, thank you very much. Appreciate it.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, I really appreciate your words, especially coming from law enforcement. Thank you. Thank you, Miguel. We are ready to move along. Next presentation, which will be a virtual participant presenter, I'm sorry, Using DNA Barcoding to Identify Seafood Fraud, Natalie Báez. This is part of other business.

4 5

## Using DNA Barcoding to Identify Seafood Fraud in Puerto Rico

NATALIE M. BÁEZ RODRÍGUEZ: Hola, buenas tardes. Me escuchan. Hoy voy a estar presentando los resultados que obtuve de mi maestría a nivel de mis tesis de maestría el cual se titula El Uso de DNA Barcoding para identificar fraude pesquero en Puerto Rico.

El fraude de pescado se comete cuando el pescado es comercializado deliberadamente con el propósito de obtener algún beneficio económico. Esto puede representar un riesgo para la salud pública, ya que se han visto casos de envenenamiento, alergias y las personas se exponen a contaminantes tales como metales pesados. También se ve un riesgo para el medio ambiente, ya que se han visto casos de pesca ilegales, la sobreexplotación de especies, teniendo un riesgo de llevar especies a la extinción, y también se afecta a la cascada trófica de la cadena alimenticia.

Existen dos tipos de fraudes comunes, el cual fueron los mismos que se se observaron en mi estudio. Estos fueron la substitución y el etiquetado incorrecto. Estos dos son difíciles de detectar, ya que los pescados son preparados para filete y productos de consumo humano, pero gracias a los avances de métodos moleculares de identificación, existe una transparencia donde nos permite identificar la especie, ya sea por el DNA barcoding, que codifica un pequeño fragmento de DNA, o el Next-Generation, que se utiliza para grandes escalas y puede codificar el genoma completo. La trazabilidad de los peces es clave para combatir el fraude pesquero, hacer cumplir las normas de seguridad, garantizar los altos estándares de gestiónes pesqueras sostenible y garantizar la calidad de los puestos de los productos pesqueros, minimiza los riesgos de la salud del consumidor.

Yo estuve enfocándome en los elasmobranquios. Los elasmobranquios son las rayas y los tiburones. Estos son depredadores ápice, estos afectan directa e indirectamente todos los niveles tróficos manteniendo un balance balance en el ecosistema y un ecosistema saludable.

También estuve trabajando con los chapines. Los chapines pertenecen a la familia ostraciidae. Estos son caracterizados por tener el cuerpos cortos, cuboides y estar encerrado a un caparazón.

En Puerto Rico existen cuatro especies diferentes conocidas como el torito azul, chapín buffalo, chapín común y el chapín pintado.

Este estudio lo que buscaba era confirmar las especulaciones que habían sobre el uso de rayas como sustituto del chapín en las empanadillas y detectar la presencia de la venta de la carne de tiburón gata, ya que es una especie protegida, ya sea en productos de filete o en productos procesados, ya que en el 2020 se encontró un estudio que estaban vendiendo su carne en las pescaderías. Esto demostraría otro tipo de fraude pesquero, ya que es una especie prohibida.

Se estuvo utilizando el DNA barcoding para detectar la prevalencia del fraude pesquero en las empanadillas y la carne de tiburón. Yo estuve recolectando mis muestras a un periodo de un año. En el empanadillas, yo estuve recolectando de las restaurante, negocio local, o chinchorro, donde vendieran empanadillas de chapín. Y en el caso de las carnes de tiburón, estuve recolectando en restaurantes y en pescadería. En este mapa les muestro los lugares donde estuve recolectando mis muestras a nivel isla. El triángulo verde está representando las carnes de tiburón y el círculo rojo estaba representando donde yo estuve recolectando las empanadillas de chapín.

Como parte de mi metodología comenzaba con una extracción de DNA, yo estuve analizando tres sub-samples por cada empanadilla. Yo estuve recolectando en un total de 63 empanadilla. En el caso de las carnes de tiburón, yo analicé 100 muestra donde se componía 59 filetes, 33 empanadillas y 8 pincho. Luego, pasábamos para para el proceso de PCR, que es el trabajo molecular. En esta parte, lo que buscábamos era copiar muchas veces el DNA para enviarlo a secuenciar y así identificar a qué especie pertenecia cada una de las muestras.

 Como parte de los resultados en las empanadillas de chapín se encontraron 15 especies diferentes donde se componían cuatro especies de chapín, elasmobranquios, especies de agua dulce importada y especies marinas. En el caso de las carnes de tiburón se encontraron 9 especies diferentes donde estas estaban clasificadas cerca de amenaza vulnerable, en peligro, en peligro crítico. También se encontraron la presencia de especies de agua dulce importada y otras especies marinas.

En los resultados obtenidos en las empanadas de chapín, de 62 empanadillas, que se lograron amplificar, 8 contenían chapín y de esta 8 solamente 3 eran 100% chapín. También se detectó la presencia de raya, de hypanus americanus, que es una especie cerca de amenaza, en 7 muestras. También se detectó la presencia de dos

especies de tiburón en donde uno de ellos está protegido en el Apéndice 2 por ser una especies en peligro como es el mako de aleta corta, el marco de aleta corta. También se detectó la presencia de tiburón tigre, que es una especie cerca de amenaza. Otras especies comunes encontradas en las empanadillas son la tilapia, el striped catfish, bocourt's catfish y el queen triggerfish, que es una especie conocida localmente como peje puerco. Esta es una especie que está cerca de amenaza.

4 5

En el caso de las carnes de tiburón, en mi muestra no se detectó la presencia de tiburón gata, pero si se detectaron nueve especies de tiburón, donde 2 de ellas están protegidas bajo el Apéndice 2 como es en el caso del silky shark, por ser una especie vulnerable, y el great hammerhead, por ser una especie en crítico estado. Entre otras especies que se encontraron, también se encontró la presencia del blacktip shark, que es una especie vulnerable y una de las más comunes encontradas es el Caribbean Reef Shark, que es una especie en peligro. También se detectó la sustitución de la carne de tiburón por otras especies. En el caso de los pinchos, se encontraron el striped catfish y en las empanadillas se encontró tilapia y el robalo común.

A pesar de que la prevalencia del fraude pesquero no se había estudiado anteriormente, uno de los eventos que podrían estar causando los resultados obtenidos, ya que fue el periodo donde ellos recolectan las muestras, fue la pandemia. En el 2021 se publicó una evaluación donde se entrevistaron 139 pescadores de pequeñas escala para entender el impacto de la pandemia en Puerto Rico y se detectó una reducción de un 79% en el número de viaje. Una reducción de 71% en la disminución de precios y falta de mercado y una reducción de un 48% en las actividades operacionales por las restricciones gubernamentales.

En conclusión, este estudio provee evidencia de los diferentes tipos de fraudes pesquero en Puerto Rico, ya sea de sustitución y etiquetado incorrecto en las pescaderías y restaurantes. Es la primera vez que se brinda la evidencia científicamente del uso de raya como sustituto del chapín en empanadillas de chapín. Se detectó la presencia del tiburón de especies cerca de amenaza, vulnerables, en peligro y en peligro crítico. A pesar de que mi muestreo fue bien pequeño, porque solamente recolecté 100 muestra y no se detectó la presencia de tiburón gata, anteriormente si se había detectado.

 Que podemos hacer respecto. Promover la educación en las comunidades de pescadores, restaurantes y el público en general para que haya un mejor entendimiento del ID de los tiburones. Mejorar que las personas tengan un entendimiento de la importancia

de los elasmobranquios en nuestro ecosistema y cuáles son los riesgos de que nos podemos enfrentar cuando se sustituye una especie por otra. Mejorar el conoce conocimiento de las regulaciones, monitorear las ventas de especies protegidas como el tiburón gata. Y podríamos también considerar adoptar las regulaciones federales de tiburones en aguas locales o buscar una alternativa donde se protejan las especies que están clasificadas como cerca de amenaza, vulnerable, en peligro y en peligro crítico. Gracias por la oportunidad.

9 10 11

1

2

4 5

6

7

8

# Questions/Comments

12 13

14

MARCOS HANKE: Muchas gracias, Natalie. Excelente presentación.

15 16 17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

2627

2829

30

31 32

33 34

35

36

37

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Gracias, Natalie. No para 'discourage' pero en el 1974, cuando yo era el director de estadísticas pesqueras en Puerto Rico, se me encomendó el 'issue' de esto de las empanadillas de chapín y yo encontré-- el método que yo usaba era entrevistar a los pescadores que confiaban en mí. Por eso fue que se quedó el memo interno. 51 especies que se vendían como chapín, encontraron en las empanadillas de chapín, incluían rayas, tiburones de varias clases. Todos los peces eran marinos, no había ninguno de agua dulce. Se hizo un memorándum interno y los abogados lo que nos decían era, que, porque era imposible en aquel tiempo, en el '74, políticamente un poquito de no bien recibido de andar detrás de los pescadores y confiscarle los chapines como quería alquien y ponerle multa y hasta cárcel. Así que lo que se quedo fue, un pequeño esfuerzo de comunicación para que no le llamaran empanadilla de chapín que le llamaran empanadilla de pescado. Así era legal. En aquel tiempo no encontrábamos especies en peligro de extinción en las empanadillas, pero-- es refrescante a través de tantos años que se haya tomado esto otra vez. Y con un estudio tan bueno como este utilizando el DNA. No sé qué van a hacer Recursos Naturales o los otros, pero es algo que Puerto Rico podría tomar nota y ver si, también, con alguna campaña que se pueda usar, utilizando la misma diapositiva que tiene Natalie en el caso de las recomendaciones que surgen del estudio de ella. Gracias, Mr. Chairman.

38 39 40

41

42 43

44 45

46

47 48 MARCOS HANKE: Muchas gracias. Y hay una implicación que estoy dando pensamiento en la presentación. Realmente, la empanadilla, una vez esta echa tú puedes echar lo que sea allá adentro, 'the perfect cover', y es importante ese tipo de técnica en términos de intervención e identificación del contenido para evitar que los nassau grouper, los goliath grouper, y otras cosas que manejamos durante veda, entren al mercado de empanadilla un 'black market'. Así que la relevancia de documentar de la manera que lo hiciste, Natalie, si tiene una implicación practica muy importante.

Adelante, Ricardo.

4 5

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Natalie, gracias por excelente presentación. Ricardo López, para récord. Yo quisiera presentar una pregunta a Vanessa y a Nelson sobre si ellos piensan que hay suficientes chapines en la pesca, si se cogen suficientes chapines, como para proveer la materia prima de esas empanadilla en todo Puerto Rico.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: En cuanto a si hay chapines, hay. La diferencia está en cuanto al precio y lo que viene siendo el gasto operacional de una empanadilla hecha por raya que te puede salir a \$1.50 la libra, versus el chapín que el costo actual varía entre \$5 a \$7 la libra.

MARCOS HANKE: Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Mira, Ricardo, al igual que Vanessa, concuerdo que chapines hay. Incluso al norte de la isla, allá frente a las ruinas de Aguadilla, hay un lance que hacen chinchorro y la cantidad de chapines es impresionante, todos grande. Pero la diferencia es el precio. No todos los restaurantes están dispuestos a pagar lo que cuesta un chapín y por eso, pues, que truquean y, tú sabes, lo mezclan con otras cosas, pero chapines hay.

MARCOS HANKE: Adelante, María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Si, yo quería comentar que las rayas, particularmente las rayas, están prohibidas para ser pescadas en aguas federales. Osea, que esto es algo, obviamente, que pues, que es de conocimiento de de todo el mundo, que las empanadillas de chapín saben algo más. Yo, en realidad, yo no sé si lo que yo me he comido toda la vida es chapín o no es chapín, así que yo no sé cómo sabe un chapín, probablemente, no? Pero yo quería recordarle al público que la captura de las rayas-- 'the harvest of the rays is prohibited in federal waters' --está prohibido en las aguas federales a partir desde la implementación del plan de manejo de Puerto Rico y también en las Islas Vírgenes. Gracias.

MARCOS HANKE: Yo creo que aquí también sale a la luz la gran posibilidad de que las universidades, como la Universidad de Mayagüez, que tiene la capacidad de hacer ese tipo de estudios, análisis genéticos para identificar especie, coordine con el gobierno estatal y con el cuerpo de vigilantes hacia el futuro para poder hacer intervenciones y colectas de 'samples' y tratar de ir creando una presencia en cuanto a tratar de evitar-- Porque se saben que están chequeando si la empanadilla tiene o no tiene lo que dice. Esa información se riega y podría ser una manera de que dejen de hacerlo tanto y atajar un poco el problema. Nada,

dejo para los expertos que que manejen eso y seguimos.

La próxima presentación-

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos. Tienes a John aca.

MARCOS HANKE: John, I'm sorry, I didn't see your hand. Thank you.

JOHN WALTER, III: Yes, thank you very much for the presentation. One thing that I think that maybe might connect some of the pieces is the national seafood strategy, the marketing strategy, which is the promotion of an informed consumer base, might be part of it, which I think here we're talking about. In some cases, not necessarily a protected species, for rays yes, but for others it's just promoting that the customer knows what they're getting and that that informed consumer asks what the product is. That's, I think, a key thing for the seafood marketing, so that the customers know what they're getting and that they actually ask, which means that markets then have to keep track of that because they are going to want to actually put on the menu what they say is on the menu. I think that perhaps that's something to pay attention to as that seafood marketing strategy comes to fruition. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. María, we're going to go for the next presentation, but we just had a conversation. Can you please help him?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes. This is María López. So yesterday, when I gave the presentation at the beginning of the meeting that had all the actions that the Council was working on, there were a couple of actions that were still pending. If you recall, I mentioned that maybe the Council would like to revisit this list at the end of a Council meeting and see if we could prioritize or make some decisions regarding these two actions.

 So, in here, let's not pay attention to everything that's on the top because we already— the Amendment 3, which is the pelagic species for Puerto Rico, there's already a decision that dolphin and wahoo is going to be included in the other amendment that's for the U.S. Virgin Island. So particularly in here we want to talk about the last two items. The action is timing of seasonal area closures for the red hind grouper in the Puerto Rico EEZ. The things that are in red are the things that were still pending, that were actually discussed in the Council. And the other one, the modification of red hind seasonal closure in the Saint Croix EEZ. Again, with a couple of things pending. So, I would just like to bring that to the Council's attention for further discussion. Thank you.

1 2

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: I will suggest, about the timing on the seasonal closure for the red hind, to request the SSC to revisit and to give the expert opinion about it and to create the best scenario for the Council to discuss. I would like to hear what the rest of the Council members think.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: And remember, Marcos, not at this meeting, but the following meeting of the SSC.

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah. This is going to be the following meeting. Yes, after the Council, receives the response from the SSC. I'd like to hear from the Council members what they think. Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah. Apologies because my memory is not all that good, and I've missed some meetings here and there. We did receive a presentation about the timing of the spawning enclosures. Was that not presented to the SSC, and did they not provide guidance previously? I just— I want to make sure we're not retasking them with the same guidance.

MARCOS HANKE: There was discussion, but there was not, as my memory goes, not a formal petition to revise and to give back to the Council an opinion.

 ANDREW STRELCHECK: And then as a follow up to that. I don't think I was at the meeting when it was asked to do these informational workshops with fishers, so can someone describe what we were hoping to achieve with those, or is that something that would come later after the SSC provides a recommendation? Because I view this as a scientific issue first, and then if it translates into a management decision, we will want to talk to the fishers.

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. As far as I understand it was recommended, have to be evaluated. It would really depend on what the SSC will say. María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: I'm just trying to remember because I do remember that the first time that this was brought up was at an SSC meeting. That's what you were saying. And I'm not sure if there was like a formal recommendation. Okay.

And then, for the informational meetings. My recollection was, as to-- because, you know, some of the fishers were concerned about what was going to be the implications of this change. So, the scientists and the Council wanted to explain what it means, right? Because I believe that the proposal was to shift the time based on the lunar cycles, etcetera. So, there was a lot going on in there

that needed a little bit more information for the public. But Andy's question about, is this something that could happen after the SSC takes an opportunity to build this and make a recommendation to the Council as to whether this will be something that has merit to be considered for the Council as an action.

MARCOS HANKE: Miquel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: The last time that we discussed the issue is this, the red hind and other groupers, what we have now is December 1<sup>st</sup>, February 28<sup>th</sup>. Some of the scientists found that the grouper also spawned after February 28<sup>th</sup>. Then, when you were talking about moving the closure another month into lent, 'cuaresma' in Puerto Rico, a fisherman brought the point that they would be losing a lot of money because that's the time that they will sell most of the catches of red hind. So, that was a socioeconomic consideration versus the biological consideration.

And in the case of Saint Croix, it is similar. So, at this time, what the staff, María López is asking the office is, do you want to table this? You want to go further with this? If you table it, the present closure period will remain the same but also you can leave the door open to have more information from the SSC at the following meeting not this one and then you make a decision, this year, of how you would like to proceed.

MARCOS HANKE: I want to make a comment--

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Tienes a Vanessa también.

MARCOS HANKE: --and then I'll give you the word. I think it's appropriate, because we have a scientific opinion and presentation to the Council about advising us the need, right? It is way more proper to use the SSC, which is the body that advises us, and follow the steps and the tools that we have on hand to analyze this fully, and then, to take a decision to table or not to table. Vanessa.

 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. As Miguel says, we already discussed this, and at that moment the commercial sector and fishing sector talked about the economic issue that it will bring and also the enforcement issue because it's going to be practically 50 more days under the month of March and it's going to be hard, not only for the fishermen, but also for the enforcement. In that time, if I remember well, the studies that were presented were up to 2019, and we suggested bringing some of the new studies that were made in Isla Magueyes for the red hind and suggested to analyze that information before taking any action.

1 2

MARCOS HANKE: Which is in line with my comments. Yes.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

MARCOS HANKE: Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: So, going back to my previous comments about the SSC, my staff quickly found that back in December, the briefing book said that the SSC recommended moving forward the December 15<sup>th</sup> through March 15<sup>th</sup>, spawning aggregation closure for consideration in an amendment right. So, we have that advice already from them. I'm not sure we're going to gain anything additional other than we might have a new SSC that could reach a different decision. So, I think the decision point for us may be less about sending it to the SSC and more on whether we want to proceed with this action or not.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: That's exactly my point. If you-- because you discussed this to death the last time that you discussed it, and there was a concern by the fishers. We don't have that many of them, but people would have other faces if we had fishermen here telling you, "What is going to happen?" And also, they said, "15 days doesn't make a big dent in the biology of the species, but it makes a lot of different for us," and then you decide to table it.

So, the decision is not the SSC, the decision is of the Council. What do you want to do? Add 15 more days or keep it as this?

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah, we are not adding, I mean the discussion that time was a shift, it was not adding days. It was shifting 15 days.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, Marcos, the decision was put forward by the SSC and 15 not shifted.

MARCOS HANKE: A shift. Which was shifting 15 days.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Then the Council, is like Andy saying, you know, because I was remembering the discussion, what is the Council place, do you want to keep it as this? Or you want the staff to put together a set of the alternative, the documents that you have to look at the possibility of moving forward with this. So that means that you will include an alternative that would close the fishery 15 more days into March.

MARCOS HANKE: I'm going to give my rationale; my rationale is that there is information present based on my experience. I haven't seen on the past, before the closures and so on. Red hind, I don't

recall seeing them with eggs during December and after the closure, recently, I did see aggregations behavior on the line that, on my case, I release them anyway and it is consistent to report to protect the peak or the higher spawning moment where the fish is doing an activity to reproduce. That's number one.

Number two is that I don't recall now exactly, but there is some time after March 15 where the fishermen can fish for red hind. It's not all the month or 15 days, but like a week before 'Semana Santa' ends that's available. This is exactly to prevent cherry picking where fishermen that don't fish for red hind all the year and they are fishing red high on that moment because it's easier to catch because they are aggregated. Right? That's point number two

And the other point that I want to bring, again, to the table is that it is documented that in general there is a shift for the timing of the aggregation later in the season due to climate change and environmental changes for multiple species. Red hind, for sure, is not an exception of that and we should be responsible of that. That's my opinion, my expert opinion and I leave the floor to the rest of the Council.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, but you know, that's a good opinion but the Council had to go with more than that. You have the SSC that went through this, and I gave you the number. The other fishermen are telling you what is going to happen to them. Climate change, the darn thing reproduces six month a year, we picked this three because they're the top. And there will be changes, change in temperature, change in pressure and they will change their moves. Also, they change moves because people didn't know that these were reproducing at the time that they were, now the scientists are going back in the water and finding it.

So, if you want to move with this then the proper procedure is to ask the staff to— and that's what María is saying —to come back with maybe a section of the auction paper that will not have the opinions, that will have the SSC and they will have the data that you collected. And then remember, whatever you have here, you have to take it to public hearings because the document that is going to be prepared is really an option paper. The action comes when you complete the action paper process, you have an amendment process, and then you go into a regulation that you take to the public. So, until that happens, you don't have a new regulation amendment. But what you haven't red here is you want to move forward and in order to move forward, that's the way that the staff is presenting to you.

In other words, you don't have to take a decision now, on any of this. The decision that you need to do is whether you will allow the staff to beef up the option paper and bring back to you all the information needed.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. But this is really an issue that I, on my last stretch as Chairman, want to hear from the Council members their opinions more than this. Uh, go ahead.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: I could talk about our experience from this year on just passing March and the last year. Practically, after December 15<sup>th</sup> and January and February, yes, they were around, but next week, practically after the 4<sup>th</sup> of March, no fishermen have found them. This is something that is information that have the fish markets in the books. You can go there, we can provide that information also if you want to actualize or give a big sample, especially from the Cabo Rojo area that we have 10 fish markets in there, more than 115 fishermen active for the groupers and it's something that we can share that information to actualize those studies. But I think, and I believe that it's not necessary to move that now.

MARCOS HANKE: Andy, then Nelson.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: Yeah, so I appreciate the comments both by Marcos and Vanessa and I hear both sides of this, right? And I feel like we're kind of putting the cart before the horse in terms of a decision with all the data and information before us. It's been a long time since we've had the discussion of the science and the concerns obviously being raised about what that could mean in terms of impacts from a socioeconomic standpoint.

So, my suggestion, maybe not an options paper, we could at least bring back some of the information about the science and the seasonality of the spawning to the Council in August as kind of a refresher and that will better inform a decision of how we proceed from there. But I think it's really important when you get into situations like this where you're talking on one side about the biology and conservation of the resource and what the science is saying that you look at that and then you balance it with obviously socioeconomic considerations. That's obviously why we do these amendments and why we look at a range of alternatives and why we should decide whether or not to proceed based on that information.

MARCOS HANKE: I'm just recalling for a good analysis and discussion based on science and all the elements like Vanessa brought to the table, not just to table it because it's easier. We need to make a very honest, upfront scientific based discussion.

Nelson.

4 5

NELSON CRESPO: What I see on the red hind fishery, right now, the closure, how it is right now is working perfect. We see many individuals, big individuals, and from my experience, if the 'veda,' if you add or run 15 more days, the damage you are going to cause to the economy of the fishermen, compared to the benefit that you're going to have on the fishery, is going to be huge. Also, running the 'veda' 15 more days all that will cause is promote the illegal fishing to this fishery. I just suggest to this Council to leave it as is for the moment.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Nelson. Ricardo, then Julian.

**RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ:** Yes. I have a question. Is it possible to use calendars of the moon, you know, lunar calendars instead of Gregorian calendars to regulate the fisheries?

MARCOS HANKE: Andy.

ANDREW STRELCHECK: It's possible, but then the challenge becomes you have these shifting closures from year to year and have to make sure you educate the fishermen and they're knowledgeable about the timing and the closures. Whereas we have fixed seasons that have been known for some time and obviously are very stable. Right? And so certainly we could put into the regulations if the Council approved it, dates for the next five years that the seasons will be open or closed. Right? But we still have that education outreach opportunity that has to happen in order to make that effective.

MARCOS HANKE: Julian

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: I have a comment to Ricardo's question. Ricardo, that was discussed when we put together the reef fish FMP, I was part of it, and we discarded it for various reasons. One, just as he mentioned. The lawyers told us that we need to have more clarity. The enforcement people told us that they preferred to have fixed dates if there was something that will not jeopardize what we wanted to do to protect the spawning and that's the reason why. You don't need to discard it, but those were the rationales used for not having the moon cycle to use. Still, the moon cycles were used by scientists to figure out, before and after, how many they reproduce and have more or less a percentage as they found a big spawning time for those fishes.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Ricardo.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Thanks for the explanation, but for me, what

is challenging is that the fishermen can use the lunar calendar, but the officers cannot. That is challenging for me to accept.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: The issue is that the moon moves a lot, but the economy does not. That was the reason. When you are working with fisheries, you have to have the biology and then the economy together. That's what the law says. You have to convince the secretary that you have a strong rationale for anything that you do with an alternative.

MARCOS HANKE: Julian and then María.

JULIAN MAGRAS: I just want to support my Puerto Rico fisherman by saying that I believe it needs to stay how it is. I think something close to what Ricardo was saying is what I was going to say, but he got there before me. I think the few times that the scientists have seen it outside of the actual closed area is when that moon falls. This year it didn't happen, this year the fish was gone early because the same moon that they follow here in Puerto Rico is the same moon that they follow in the Virgin Islands. And the fish left early this year. Some years the fish might hang around a little bit longer. So, to try to chase it every time the moon is going to fall a little bit outside of what rules and regulations are in place right now, I don't think that -- it should stay how it is. I think the red hind has had enough protection over the years because our shelf is also connected to Puerto Rico. So, all of that larva, and we have done a lot of studies where we saw where the larvae end up. I think it's more than healthy and I think the rules in place should stay where they are. Thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: María.

 MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you for all the comments. I just want to remind the Council about the discussions that we had. So, back in December 2021, which we brought a paper to the Council and a presentation that evaluated all of this that we are discussing today, right? Not with the idea of making decisions. It was more like informational paper as you requested, because, you know, the same thing. It's like, what is going on? What are the possible solutions? One solution is doing nothing. One solution is using different years and etcetera with all the difficulties and advantages of doing all of that.

So, I could suggest the Council to go back to that paper as a refresher. It's in the Council's website under the December 2021 meeting. And then just to see, you know, what was discussed at that time. And then, we recall that at that time there was a lack of information about the histology of the fish to corroborate or

to support the seasonality of this fish for reproduction. So that was a request that was made during that meeting, requesting that information so that could help the Council to make a decision as to whether they wanted to move forward with this action, in any manner that they consider appropriate.

So, the suggestion of bringing some additional information to the Council in August is something that we can definitely do. However, if we don't have the information that we requested last time, then we're not going to be able to bring something that is complete for you. That's all I want to bring to the Council's attention.

MARCOS HANKE: Okay. Nobody else? We're going to recommend following your guidance, María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: All right. Thank you. We have another one. So, the last one was a request from the Saint Croix fishers to the Council, and it was to modify the red hind seasonal closure to allow fishing for pelagic species during the closure.

And what happened to that? I think there was some conversations about it, but Sarah, help me out on this one. Sorry.

SARAH STEPHENSON: After we were tasked to look into this from the Council, we met with HMS staff to discuss the implications of that, but that was as far as it got. It never came back to the Council. It never went to the SSC for consideration, so we just had internal discussions about the possibility of doing that, and HMS was supportive.

**CARLOS FARCHETTE:** I want to move forward with that because the fishermen are asking me, both commercial and recreational, what the status is. So, I would still like to move forward.

MARCOS HANKE: Sarah.

SARAH STEPHENSON: If we're going to move forward, can I just ask a clarifying question? Can you list what species you would like the fishers to be able to fish for? Right now, in Saint Croix, the pelagic species that we're managing are dolphin and wahoo, but I realize that there are other non-managed pelagic species that they may want to catch outside of HMS or-- yeah, HMS, it would be outside of HMS.

And then also, I believe, I remember hearing that some of the fishers also maybe wanted to be able to catch lionfish. So, you don't have to do it now, but if you could list the species that you know of, I think that would be helpful for development of this

document.

1 2 3

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Sure. I think what they were talking about lionfish is separate because it was a core who wanted to go into the closed areas to try and eradicate lionfish because they're protected, because the is closed for bottom fishing. So, they wanted to be able to just go specifically for that. So, that's a side thing. But when it comes to the commercial and recreational pelagics, it would be mahi, tuna, wahoo, kingfish, barracuda, and rainbow runner.

MARCOS HANKE: Just for the record. HMS Species, CFMC pelagic species, including the rainbow runner on that discussion. No? It can't be done like that?

**SARAH STEPHENSON:** I was just going to point out, rainbow runner is not a managed species for Saint Croix. But we could probably include non-managed pelagic species and list rainbow runner and some of the other ones that you listed. We can look into that.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I'll vote for that.

MARCOS HANKE: Andy.

**ANDREW STRELCHECK:** Yeah. And I'll talk to my team. I think with the rainbow runner, because we have the pelagics amendment, that might be the opportunity where we could shift the management plan from reef fish to pelagics based on the information we have.

The other thing I'll mention because of the ACL accountability measures presentation I gave yesterday; I'd recommend at least putting it on this list. It's something that we're probably not going to work on for a while, but this is always just a good reminder of things that are in the queue to work on. But we'll need to update those catch limits, obviously, as more data becomes available through these new sampling programs.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Anybody else? María, do you have everything that you need?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Sarah, do you have everything you need?

SARAH STEPHENSON: Yes, we do. So, we're good. Thank you so much.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. The next presentation is U.S.V.I. grouper guides for distribution. Evan Tuohy.

## U.S.V.I. Grouper Guides for Distribution - Evan Tuohy

**EVAN TUOHY:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to the Council for allotting this time for this brief presentation. My name is Evan Tuohy with Isla Mar Research Expeditions.

So, I'm here just to present. For the past two years now, we've been developing these grouper guides specific, originally it started with Puerto Rico. It outlines— it's basically an education and outreach component to be used specifically for fishers.

These are waterproof guides or slates that can be taken on the boat. They outline the most common grouper species that are commonly caught on the reefs here in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. But also, it takes it a step further and it outlines the species specific and seasonal regulations for each species. And then it also outlines the closed areas, primarily on the west coast of Puerto Rico, but their locations, the timing of the closures and the regulations that are allowed or not allowed within that seasonal or annual closure.

 These were developed with input from various stakeholders, members of the scientific community, members of the Council, NOAA Law Enforcement, and also fishers themselves devoted some very valuable information that was all included in these guides. And we're happy to announce, with the continued support from the Council, that they have now been adapted for the Virgin Islands as well. So, we have these guides for Saint Croix and Saint Thomas and Saint John. So, I'm basically here just to present them, but then also ask for the points of contact of who will be responsible for distributing those to the respective islands. I have, I believe about a hundred guides for each island for Saint Thomas and Saint John and Saint Croix. So, I would just like to identify those people and please come to find me at the end of the meeting. I'll be sitting right back there, and I'd be happy to pass those guides out for you.

I do have some additional guides for Puerto Rico as well, so if there's anybody who might know of anybody who can use them, Vanessa, I'd be happy to pass them off to you as well. Yep. Thank you very much to the Council for your continued support.

#### Questions/Comments

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Miguel.

MIGUEL BORGES: Yeah. I just want to say, thank you for that and that I've boarded just a few vessels and in one or two of them

they've had it on board, like on the console. So, they're using it. They said it was really good and I use it personally on my job. So, thank you, they're really good. So, thanks.

EVAN TUOHY: Excellent. Excellent. Thank you very much.

MARCOS HANKE: And Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to make a comment that we use these guides in the MREP and were very helpful for the fishermen that go there. And of course, please, I will need a lot of them. Especially for our fishermen in Cabo Rojo. We are going to be traveling to Culebra and Vieques also, and I will appreciate to have more copies of that.

EVAN TUOHY: Okay, perfect. Yeah, I have some more to give to you, so thank you very much. I also want to point out too, there is a website associated with this. It's geared to the original version, which was for the Puerto Rico guides, but we're looking to incorporate the information for the Virgin Islands as well. So, you have actually more detailed information for the Virgin Island grouper, the grouper fish, and closed areas as well for those respective islands.

MARCOS HANKE: Evan, thank you for the presentation. Some recommendation. Abdiel, from Vieques, that made the presentation to us with the video and so on with the school.

**EVAN TUOHY:** Mm-hmm.

MARCOS HANKE: I don't know if he is around.

EVAN TUOHY: Yes.

35 MARCOS HANKE: I think it'll be nice to give to him as material for the school.

38 EVAN TUOHY: Okay. Excellent.

MARCOS HANKE: That's in Vieques. And also, we are going to have 40 people on the next MREP. Right, Vanessa? Maybe give some to me or to Vanessa, 40 of those to reserve to each participant of the MREP to have it. Or you can send directly to Lauren or Courtney or any of them, we can help you out.

**EVAN TUOHY:** Okay.

48 MARCOS HANKE: And I want to state that the U.S. Coast Guard on

their information, they already integrated your information, they have access. Tomorrow I'm going to continue many, many years of supporting the Coast Guard for the fish ID exercise. I don't know if Miguel is going to be there at this time, but yes, I will I'll see you tomorrow. And please give me some to take it with me. It is always handy to give around because there are new people. It's a waterproof, they can move to and from when they board the boat with them or give-- you know, it's just a very important tool. Thank you very much.

4 5

**EVAN TUOHY:** Excellent. Yeah. Thank you very much Marcos. And for the MREP, when is the next meeting? We were at the last one and we distributed quite a few but we can be sure that there'll be more available for the next MREP meeting as well.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes. The next one in Puerto Rico is going to be in the East Coast and it's for August. Next August.

**EVAN TUOHY:** Okay.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Any other question here none, thank you very much, Evan.

EVAN TUOHY: All right, thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: And we are now in public comment, if I don't miss anything here. Anybody from the public? Nelson, on the public comment?

#### Other Business

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is a sweet and sour moment, but Marcos, you left a legacy that will last for a long time.

I'm happy for you because now you will have more time to do what you love most, educate and fishing. During all those years, you've always been open to give a hand, build bridges, and I appreciate that. I hope now, and listen to this, that you are going to have more free time, we can go out to fish together.

Marcos, thank you very much for all your support, but above all, thank you more for your friendship. [applause]

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: The same holds true from the staff. We met Marcos 18 years ago and he kept working with us and learning and more and more. I guess we are going to be calling you more than you think; you offered to assist. Whenever we have an opportunity, we would like to give that [inaudible].

So, whenever we have an opportunity vacant at the DAP Puerto Rico, we will allow you to consider accepting a position for the meeting. The DAP of Puerto Rico. Yeah, the guy died. You have to wait. And so that will mean that after Augusts  $10^{\rm th}$ , if we have a vacancy, I personally believe that the Council should consider asking you to participate.

The other thing is that you work with the HMS in your personal capacity, and also with the ICCAT subcommittee and other subcommittees and the information I got is that you can continue to participate in your capacity as a person, as an individual in those meetings. But we would also like to hear any opinion that you may have on things that you will bring from those meetings that the Council can take action on. So, for that, we are very, really grateful.

MARCOS HANKE: I am very, very honor and I feel like when I have the same strong feeling as when my dad passed away, last January, that I have to think hard and hold on, right? and to be focused because the feeling is the same, because this is part of my life, 18 years, it's part of the family and so on. And I'm very, very honored and what I enjoy the most maybe sounds super strange, is that I love to agree to disagree and to be able to overcome the discussion and to get to the common ground, to the benefit of everybody. And that's the message that I want by example and with my words. When I disagree with Miguel, when I Carlos, with Nelson, with Julian, we all have that, but they are still my friends, just with my wife, my kids, my family. And there is no difference if you have your heart on the right position.

Please keep doing what this Council especially does, which is being proactive to the fishing community, being proactive to the fishing resource but don't forget the respect and don't forget the reason you are here. We can all be way more productive like that, finding the common grounds. Thank you very much to all.

DIANA T. MARTINO: No, I just want Marcos to thank you. Not for what you did for us for yesterday's activity. Marcos provided a lot of the fish that we ate yesterday just because he wanted to. He fished it, he filleted the fish, and he gave it to me. I mean, on a Sunday or Saturday. Thank you, Marcos.

But not only for that, for just being there always when we have needed you. For caring not only about the fisheries, but about us too.

3 4 5

2

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you.

6 7

DIANA T. MARTINO: You're an amazing person.

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Thank you very much. Sorry about the kisses, the time, and everything, but this is one time of my life. I'm going to enjoy it. I don't care. Miguel-- I will go with Andy. I just want to mention that I am available in any capacity I can to help the Council if they decide for me to be part of my brothers there on the DAP, on the meetings, it'll be an honor. This is actually a better fit for me because my family asked me, "what do you do, Marcos? Are you a marine biologist?" "No, I am a fisherman." This is where I belong. And about the HMS also and we are going to facilitate and try to capacitate other people to follow and have the historical knowledge too, because it cannot depend on a single person. Andy.

20 21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

29

30

31 32

33

34

ANDREW STRELCHECK: So, everyone beat me to it because I was going to make a recommendation on another business to talk about you. Rather than roast you and tell jokes, because you're such a nice quy, I just wanted to thank you as well on behalf of NOAA Fisheries. It takes a huge commitment obviously to serve on the Council. All of you that serve on the Council. And your time is valuable. You are taken away from your family, you are taken away from your business and we are certainly indebted to you for all of the service that you provided to this Council over the years. I've only known you for a couple of years, but I've known you a lot longer than that because of what Roy said about you and all the great things you did for this Council. And so, I have immense respect for you, and I look forward to continuing to work with you going forward.

35 36 37

38

I also want to say one last thing. Of the three Councils I work with, you're the one Council Chair that doesn't give me gray hair, so I appreciate that. Thank you, Marcos. [laughter]

39 40 41

42 43

44 45

46

47

48

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Marcos, I want to add something else to that. I want to say personally thank you on behalf of Sarah and I because you have helped us so much to understand the fisheries in the Caribbean. For your availability at 7:00 PM, 10:00 PM, 6:00 AM in the morning. It's like, I don't understand, please help me and you connect me with the right people. You always have patience. You are my friend. You know, I still can't believe that you are not going to be here, but I don't think it matters because I know that

I can count on you for any questions. And I appreciate a lot and I know I talk from Sarah's side too, for being that liaison with the fishers in our office, you know. Because we have been able to, and I think we have been able to create like a really good relationship, like a trust relationship with our fishers and that makes us really, really happy and in part it's because of what you have done and the doors that you have opened. So, I want to thank you very much for that. And I'm going to miss our calls, you know, to talk about a little bit about everything. So, whomever is the next Chair we prepare because we're going to be calling. Thank you, Marcos. Un abrazo.

4 5

MARCOS HANKE: I will not change my phone. Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Well, you know, I got to get my words in there. I've been-- I grew in this Council with you for many years. I've been in the process with you. The people of the Virgin Islands, especially the fishers of the Saint Thomas/Saint John District, are very happy and pleased for all that you have done for us. You worked alongside of Tony for nine solid years, and you guys are like brothers. You guys called each other all the time to discuss. And you've been there for me in many situations, and our fishers, where you have defused issues that have could have gone the opposite way. And I want to give you my gratitude from me and my people and look forward for us to continue this relationship. I look forward to seeing you on the Puerto Rico, DAP.

And keep that phone line open because we are fishers, like you said, and we need to keep in contact because even though we have gone to Island-Based Fishery Management Plans, there's still a lot that we have in common, and we need each other's support and questions to be answered. So, thank you again for all that you have done and good luck. Enjoy the break.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. And I was looking—before you say something, Alida. I was looking to you and seeing the eyes of Alida. Edgardo is not here, right? Edgardo, Cedar, Luis Negron, Sastre and all my professors at University of Humacao, they didn't get tired. They never got tired of making us think and making us follow the curriculum, but the same time expecting us to look for things to change and to make it better. This lady that is there gave me the freedom to make a transit in Seven Seas all the way across Seven Seas with a disposable camera to collect pictures of the algae. That probably doesn't mean anything, but it means to me and to Willie, he was one of the students that was with me, the opportunity to empower and to try to do something extra, something better. And this is what Alida seeded and put on my heart. Thank you, Alida.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: I'm so proud of him. He's been one of my best students and not only student, he's like my child. Because, you know, when something didn't work at the university, it worked at home. So, I'm very, very proud and I feel so happy when I hear you and I remember saying that in Fajardo or in Guánica, "Oh, really? Great." So, best of luck.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, thank you. Think we are ready to--

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Bueno, no espérate, sorry. Marcos, de mi parte estoy bien agradecida por todo. Por todo el aprecio, el cariño, toda la guía, el conocimiento que nos has dado y nada, decirte la gracias y que estamos ahí para seguir colaborando y por la confianza y el amor. Gracias, de verdad que sí. No voy a decir más nada porque lloro.

MARCOS HANKE: Vamos pa'lante juntos.

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Yo también. No voy a decir mucho porque termino aquí llorando. Siendo recién entrada, fuiste de las primeras personas que me dio esa recibida tan cálida y lo agradezco. Rompió el hielo y específicamente contigo fue algo que pude abrirme a las demás personas aquí en el Consejo así que, de verdad, muchas gracias y gracias por las historias y que sigan contándose y que se sigan creando.

MARCOS HANKE: Gracias, Liajay. Gracias, Cristina. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Lo siento Marcos, pero te tengo que decirlo. Para mí, como primera mujer que ocupo esta silla, fue bien importante el que tú me recibieras en Santa Cruz hace cuatro años atrás. Y no tan solo eso si no las palabras que tú me has dado durante todos estos años. Te considero mi mentor y cuando sea grande quiero ser como tú. Gracias y éxito. [laughter]

MARCOS HANKE: Hay que comer mucho, sabes. Gracias, mi amor.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Let's stick with the agenda now. Public comment period. We have Julian Magras.

#### Public Comment Period

JULIAN MAGRAS: I would like to read this letter into the record. It's written to Mr. Chairman Hanke. This is correspondence to the board and members from the Saint Thomas Fisherman's Association formally requesting consideration of the nomination of Elizabeth Kadison or Dr. Virginia Shervette to fill the vacant seat of the

Scientific and Statistical Panel Committee.

There's a vacant seat of a retiree, and the Saint Thomas Fisherman Association is confident that either one of these individuals poses the education and experience needed to provide critical input for fisheries management. I have submitted a package to you yesterday and it includes the resume of both of these individuals. We are asking that the Council, when the time is right, can consider one of these individuals, which actually has a lot of information and background from work being done in the U.S. Virgin Islands. So, thank you.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you. Your recommendation and the group are very valuable. The package is already transferred to Miguel because I'm not going to be here, but the process is going to be an honest, open process in which the Council will evaluated in the future. Any more public comments. Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to make a comment on behalf of Ricardo Lugo. He can be today in the evening during the virtual meeting, but he wants to ask for some point of clarification about an information that he received past Monday in public hearing in Puerto Rico. They said— and I will translate his message—that he was given the information that all those grants that were made by funds of Fish and Wildlife in the area, cannot be used by commercial fishermen. So, he was just asking if someone in the table can give some guidance on that.

MARCOS HANKE: Who made those statements on a public hearing?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: He was in the public hearing, and it was someone from the legal department of DNER Puerto Rico.

MARCOS HANKE: It's already said. Anybody would like to make a comment? No?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: What he wants to know if someone in this room can or has the knowledge, if that's right, that the grants that are made by the funds of fish and wildlife are only for the recreational and they could be closed for the commercial fishermen? or if they are open?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: If I may. That something between the local government and the fish and wildlife, I don't know if Ricardo has better information.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes. To that question, Magaly Massanet is the person to talk to. She's in the main office of DNR; I can

provide you the telephone soon.

 MARCOS HANKE: Thank you for guiding the discussion, Ricardo. Any further comment? I don't see anybody. There's nobody on my back that wants to make a comment. Not nobody in front or on the side. We are clear. No public comment. Next meeting, Miguel?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. Diana and I talking with the Westin and for a meeting in August or December. the Westin in Saint Thomas is a former Frenchman Reef and the advised us that they are going to open after May, but we don't know yet whether they will be available for the August meeting. So, Diana and I are talking with the people in charge, and we want to start going back to the routes that we used to have. One meeting in Saint Croix, another Puerto Rican, another in Saint Thomas. So, the next two, we will try to have one of those in Saint Thomas.

The reason why we are not meeting there yet, is because of the Wi-Fi. The Westin is the only one that has a Wi-Fi that is trustful. The Windward told us that they only have five mega and it doesn't work. And yeah. So anyway, we will advise you if the meeting cannot be in Saint Thomas for August, probably will be in Puerto Rico.

MARCOS HANKE: Thank you, Miguel. Miguel, we'll get in touch with you guys with more information soon when they have the information clearer.

The meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much. See you all. If you want to look for me, I am on the water. Okay.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned on April 10, 2023.)