TABLE OF CONTENT

TABLE OF MOTIONS	. 4
Call to Order and Roll Call	. 7
Election of Officials	10
Adoption of Agenda	10
Consideration of 181st Council Meeting Verbatim Transcriptions	11
Executive Director's Report	12
Inflation Reduction Act Funding-Kelly Denit	14
Questions/Comments	19
Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking-Wendy Morrison	23
Questions/Comments	27
Approval of the Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review (SEDAR) 91 Caribbean Spiny Lobster Terms of Reference	30
Questions/Comments	33
Fishery Management Plans Amendments and Actions Updates— María López-Mercer, NOAA Fisheries	38
Questions/Comments	47
Final Action for Framework Amendment 2 to the Island-Based FMPs Updates to the Spiny Lobster Overfishing Limit, Acceptable Biological Catch, and Annual Catch Limit-Sarah Stephenson, NOAF Fisheries	A
Question/Comments	52
Review and Final Action for Amendment 2 to the Island-Based FMPs: Trawl and Net Gear and Descending Devices—María López-Mercer, NOAA Fisheries	58
Questions/Comments	68
Review Draft Amendment 3 to the Island-Based FMPs: Management Measures for Dolphin and Wahoo-Sarah Stephenson, NOAA Fisheries	3
Discussion - P.R. Dolphinfish Size Limit	93
Continue Presentation- P.R. Dolphinfish Rec. Bag Limit	94
Discussion - P.R. Dolphinfish Rec. Bag Limit	95
Continue Presentation - P.R. Wahoo Size Limit 1	.01
Discussion - P.R. Wahoo Size limit 1	02
Continue Presentation - P.R. Wahoo Rec. Bag Limit 1	.13
Discussion - P.R. Wahoo Rec. Bag Limit	13
Continue Presentation - STX & STT/STJ	114

Discussion - STX & STT/STJ Wahoo Size Limits	116
Continue Presentation - STX, STT/STJ Wahoo Rec. Bag Limit	119
Discussion - STX, STT/STJ Wahoo Rec. Bag Limit	119
Southeast Fishery Science Center Updates-Kevin McCarthy, NOAA	
Fisheries	124
Questions/Comments	
SSC Report-Vance Vicente, Chair	139
Questions/Comments	143
Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Technical Advisory Panel Report-Sennai Habtes, Chair	148
Questions/Comments	153
Highly Migratory Species Atlantic Actions Update—Ann Williamson NOAA Fisheries	
Question/Comments	160
Update on Western Central Atlantic Dolphinfish Fishery-Wessley Merten	-
Questions/Comments	171
District Advisory Panel Reports	174
Puerto Rico—Nelson Crespo, Chair	174
Questions/Comments	176
St. Thomas, U.S.V.I.—Julian Magras, Chair	177
St. Croix, U.S.V.I.—Gerson Martinez, Chair	177
Outreach and Education Report- Alida Ortiz, Chair	178
Questions/Comments	183
Big Fish Campaign Update—Ana Salceda	186
Lionfish Market Presentation on National/International Project	s-
Phil Karp	
Questions/Comments	205
Puerto Rico Activities on Lionfish Marketing-Jannette Ramos, S Grant Puerto Rico	
Questions/Comments	208
CFMC Liaison Officers Reports	209
St. Thomas/St. John, U.S.V.I.— Nicole Greaux	209
Questions/Comments	212
St. Croix, U.S.V.I.—Liandry De La Cruz	213

Questions/Comments	216
Puerto Rico-Wilson Santiago	217
Questions/Comments	219
NOAA Fisheries' Equity and Environmental Justice (EEJ) Strated Update-NOAA Fisheries	
Questions/Comments	221
Protected Resources Updates on the Island-Based Fishery Management Plans Biological Opinion and Endangered Species Act Rules- Jennifer Lee, NOAA Fisheries	
Questions/Comments	228
Grammanik Bank and MCD Present Regulations for the Protection Spawning Aggregations of Nassau Grouper and Other Species	
Saint Thomas Fishermen's Association Statement - Ruth Gomez	241
Questions/Comments	244
Enforcement Reports	253
Puerto Rico DNER	253
U.S.V.I. DPNR	254
U.S. Coast Guard	255
NOAA Fisheries Office of Law Enforcement	255
Other Business	259
Public Commonts	265

TABLE OF MOTIONS

- <u>Page 33</u>: Move to approve the terms of reference and proceed with the schedule presented for spiny lobster (SEDAR 91) for all islands. Motion by Vanessa Ramírez and seconded by Jean-Pierre Oriol. The motion carried on page 34.
- <u>Page 44</u>: Motion to move forward with the queen triggerfish amendment to the Puerto Rico FMP. Motion by Vanessa Ramírez and seconded by Jean-Pierre Oriol. <u>The motion carried on page 45</u>.
- <u>Page 51</u>: The Council moves to approve Framework Amendment 2, Update the Overfishing Limit, Acceptable Biological Catch, and Annual Catch Limit for spiny lobster to the Puerto Rico, Saint Croix, Saint Thomas/Saint John Fishery Management Plans with Alternative 3 selected as the preferred alternative for each action, and submit the amendment to the Secretary of Commerce for approval. Motion by James Kreglo and seconded by Jean-Pierre Oriol. The motion carried on page 52.
- <u>Page 53</u>: The Council moves to allow staff to make editorial non-substantive changes to Framework Amendment 2. Any changes will be reviewed by the Council Chair. Motion by Jean-Pierre Oriol and seconded by James Kreglo. The motion carried on page 54.
- <u>Page 54</u>: The Council moves to deem the regulations presented by staff as necessary and appropriate for implementing Framework Amendment 2 and to give the Council Chair, the authority to deem any modifications made to the proposed rule as necessary and appropriate for implementing Framework Amendment 2. Motion by Jean-Pierre Oriol and seconded by James Kreglo. <u>The motion carried</u> on page 54.
- <u>Page 81</u>: Move to allow the staff to make changes to Sub-alternative 2b of Actions 2(b) and 3(b) for Saint Croix and the Saint Thomas/Saint John, respectively, as discussed by the Council staff. Motion by Jean-Pierre Oriol and seconded by James Kreglo. The motion carried on page 81.
- <u>Page 86</u>: Move to allow staff to make changes to Sub-alternative 2b of Action 1(b) for Puerto Rico as discussed by the Council. Motion by Vanessa Ramírez and seconded by James Kreglo. <u>The motion carried</u> on page 86.
- <u>Page 98</u>: Puerto Rico Dolphinfish Size Limit, Action 1a. Move to select Alternative 3: Establish a 24-inch fork length minimum size limit for the commercial and recreational harvest of dolphinfish in federal waters around Puerto Rico. Motion by Vanessa Ramírez

and seconded by James Kreglo. The motion carried on page 98.

<u>Page 98</u>: Puerto Rico Dolphinfish Recreational Bag Limit, Action 1b. Move to select Alternative 3: Establish a recreational bag limit in federal waters around Puerto Rico for 5 dolphinfish per person per day, not to exceed 15 dolphinfish per vessel per day, whichever is less. Motion by Vanessa Ramírez and seconded by James Kreglo. The motion carried on page 99.

<u>Page 108</u>: Puerto Rico Wahoo Size Limits, Action 2a. Move for Alternative 2: Establish a 32-inch fork length minimum size limit for commercial and recreational harvest of wahoo in federal waters around Puerto Rico. Motion by Vanessa Ramírez and seconded by Jean-Pierre Oriol. The motion carried on page 110.

<u>Page 112</u>: Wahoo Recreational Bag Limit, Action 2b. Move for Alternative 2: Establish a recreational bag limit in federal waters around Puerto Rico of five wahoo per person per day, not to exceed 10 wahoo per vessel per day, whichever is less. Motion by Vanessa Ramírez and seconded by Jean-Pierre Oriol. <u>The motion carried on page 113</u>.

Page 115: Size Limits for Wahoo in Saint Croix, Action 4a, and Saint Thomas/Saint John, Action 6a. Move for Alternative 2: Establish 32-inch fork length minimum size limit for the commercial and recreational harvest of wahoo in the federal waters around Saint Croix, Saint Thomas/Saint John. Motion by Jack MCGovern and seconded by Jean-Pierre Oriol. The motion carried on page 117.

Page 120: Recreational Bag Limit for Wahoo in Saint Croix, Action 4b, and Saint Thomas/Saint John, Action 6b. Move for Alternative 3: Established recreational bag limit in federal waters around Saint Croix, Saint Thomas/Saint John of 2 wahoo per person per day, not to exceed 10 wahoo per vessel per day, whichever is less. Motion By James Kreglo and seconded by Vanessa Ramírez. The motion carried on page 122.

<u>Page 144</u>: Move to direct staff to begin an amendment to reclassify rainbow runner from a reef fish species to a pelagic species under the Puerto Rico FMP. Motion By James Kreglo and seconded by Vanessa Ramírez. The motion carried on page 146.

<u>Page 249</u>: Move to direct staff to develop white paper to address the points make in the letter presented by the Saint Thomas Fishermen's Association. Motion by James Kreglo seconded by Jack McGovern. The motion carried on page 250.

Page 265: Move to direct staff to develop a white paper to address

issues requested for Nassau grouper (and others) in the Bajo de Sico area. Motion by Vanessa Ramírez seconded by James Kreglo. $\underline{\text{The}}$ motion carried on page 265.

1	CARIBBEAN FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2	182 ND REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING
3	HYBRID MEETING
4	EMBASSY SUITES HOTEL
5	CAROLINA, PUERTO RICO
6	
7	AUGUST 15-16, 2023
8	
9	The Caribbean Fishery Management Council convened on Tuesday
10	morning, August 15, 2023, and was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by
11	Chairman Carlos Farchette.
12	onariman oarios raronocco.
13	Call to Order and Roll Call
14	Outi to order and norr outi
15	CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, good morning. We're going to call
16	this Council meeting to order, the 182 nd Caribbean Fisheries
17	Management Council meeting is called to order. It's 9:03 AM on
18	August 15 th , 2023. We'll do a roll call. I'm going to start with
19	Cristina on my left.
20	Clistina on my lett.
21	CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Good morning. Cristina Olán, Council
22	staff.
23	Stall.
24	LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Buenos días. Liajay Rivera García, Council
25	
26	staff.
	VENTE MCCADEUX. Cood manning Marin Macanthu Couthagat Eighann
27	KEVIN MCCARTHY: Good morning. Kevin McCarthy, Southeast Fishery
28	Science Center.
29	TEAN DIEDDE I ODIOI: Cood monning Joon Diegos Oniol II C Wingin
30 31	JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Good morning. Jean Pierre Oriel, U.S. Virgin
32	Islands.
33	CARLOG HARGHERME. Cond Bouchotte Mico Chair Council
	CARLOS FARCHETTE: Carl Farchette, Vice-Chair Council.
34	MICHEL & DOIÓN. Miguel Delán Council Chaff
35	MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Miguel Rolón, Council Staff.
36	
37	DIANA T. MARTINO: Diana Martino, Council Staff.
38	THE MECONIED TO A MECONIED TO A
39	JACK MCGOVERN: Jack McGovern, NOAA Fisheries.
40	
41	KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Kate Zamboni, NOAA's Office of General
42	Counsel.
43	
	VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Vanessa Ramírez, Council Member, Commercial
45	Fisherman, Puerto Rico.
46	

ROBERTO SABATER: Roberto Sabater, possible Nominee and sports

47

48

fisherman in Puerto Rico.

```
1 2
```

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Good morning. María López, NOAA Fisheries.

3 4

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Buenos días. Graciela García-Moliner, Council Staff.

5

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

7 8 9

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

10 11

12 **JULIAN MAGRAS:** Julian Magras, DAP chair, Saint Thomas/Saint John.

13

14 GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Gerson Martínez, DAP chair, Saint Croix.

15

16 MIGUEL BORGES: Miguel Borges, NOAA Office of Law Enforcement.

17

18 MANNY ANTONARAS: Good morning. Manny Antonaras, NOAA Office of 19 Law Enforcement.

20

21 **ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR:** Buenos Dias. Alida Ortiz, Outreach and 22 Education and Technical Advisory Panel.

2324

VANCE VICENTE: Good morning. Vance Vicente, Scientific and Statistical Committee.

2526

27 HOWARD FORBES: Good morning. Howard Forbes, DPNR Enforcement.

28

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Good morning. Nicole Angeli, DPNR Fish and Wildlife.

31

32 **LIANDRY A. DE LA CRUZ:** Buenas. Liandry De La Cruz, port sampler, 33 DPNR DFW.

34

NICOLE GREAUX: Good morning. Nicole Greaux, Fisheries Liaison for Saint Thomas/Saint John.

37

38 RUTH GOMEZ: Ruth Gomez, Saint Thomas Fishermen's Association.

39

40 KATHERINE GODWIN: Good morning. Katherine Godwin, CIMAS.

41

42 DAVID BEHRINGER: David Behringer, CIMAS.

43

44 RACHEL ECKLEY: Hi, good morning. Rachel Eckley, Southeast 45 Fisheries Science Center.

- 47 WILSON SANTIAGO: Good morning. Wilson Santiago, Puerto Rico
- 48 Fishery Liaison.

1 2

REFIK ORHUN: Good morning. Rafiq Orhun, Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: ¿Cristina, puedes leer los nombres de las personas que están en zoom?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: People in Zoom: Georgina Bustamante, Guillermo Cordero, Aurea Rodríguez-Santiago, Cindy Grace-McCaskey, Dwame, Jesús Rivera Hernández, Kelly Denit, Laura Cimo, Martha Prada, Morgan Corey, Noemí Peña, Rachel O'Malley, Ricardo López.

13 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mr. Chair?

15 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Miguel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, for the record, Ricardo López has a family issue with COVID. That's the reason why he's participating virtually, but he will be able to vote.

I would like to take this opportunity to introduce Mr. Roberto Sabater. Roberto Sabater has been selected by the Secretary of Commerce effective September 16th. So, we now invite him to be at the table so he can be familiarized with the Council process and everything. And Mr. Roberto Sabater has been a recreational fisherman for a long time. Can you say something about yourself, your profession and where you live?

Roberto, el botoncito.

ROBERTO SABATER: Ah, el botón. I graduated from Colegio Mayaguez as a civil engineer. Spent two years in active duty in the army from 66 to 69. I joined Bird Construction as a project engineer and as a partner. I was president of the American General Contractors, director of two schools, president of the My Park, President of various condominiums. And right now, I'm retired for the past 13 years. Thank you.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you, Roberto. I believe that Roberto will be an asset to the Council representing the recreational sector from now on. He'll be serving after September 16th and, as you know, that's a requirement for new Council members. So, welcome to the Caribbean Fisheries Management Council.

 ROBERTO SABATER: Oh, excuse me, I forgot. I'm a member of the Club Nautico de San Juan, Puerto Rico, Cangrejos Yacht Club in Puerto Rico, and the Puerto Rico Light Tackle Anchorage, which I'm treasurer.

1 2

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you.

MIGOEL A. ROLON. THANK YOU.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, next on the agenda, we have the election of officials.

Election of Officials

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: So, I'd like to make a motion. I'd like to move. I'd like to nominate Carlos Farchette to serve as Chair and Vanessa Ramírez to serve as Vice-Chair for the Council. I so move.

13 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Anybody--

15 JACK MCGOVERN: Second. Jack McGovern.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yes, with Robert's Rules, for nomination you don't need a second, but that's better getting every second from the RA. Everybody in favor say aye.

The reason I'm running this is because the Coast Guard is not here. Vanessa, would you like to sit next to our Chair? And welcome, this is the first woman as Chair of the Council for a long time.

Don't we want to have a round of applause for Vanessa? [applause]

Now for Carlos, we know this guy for a long time, so. So, go ahead, Carlos.

Adoption of Agenda

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, thanks everyone for the vote of confidence. Next on the agenda is the adoption of the agenda and we have a couple changes. At 9:30 we'll have a presentation by Kelly Denit regarding the IRA (Inflation Reduction Act.) Right after her presentation, we'll have Wendy Morrison from ANPR, she'll be discussing National Standard 4, 8, and 9 and possible changes. Graciela?

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, Mr. Chair, we also have a request from Dr. Sennai Habtes to see, if he doesn't make it today, to move his presentation on the EBFM TAB for tomorrow.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, we'll make a note of that. Also, on that same subject James Kreglo, Council Member for the Saint Thomas District, is on his way here right now. His flight was canceled yesterday, but he should be here within the hour.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Dejame decir algo about flights.

4 5

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Talking about flight before I forget. The next Council meeting will be on December 4 and 7. Those are the two travel days. I'd encourage everybody to start making your airplane reservations. It's a nightmare. And Diana and I, the last time we spent six hours there, Julian lost a flight and now we have [inaudible]. So, I encourage everybody planning to attend the Council meeting to start making your reservations, now, as soon as possible. To give you an idea, Christmas time is the heaviest season. One of the airlines have three planes and when Diana and I took one, the other two were out of service. So, to give you an idea. And if you hate little planes, try to make your reservation on a big one as soon as possible. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Miguel. So, we need a motion to accept the changes to the agenda. Jack?

JACK MCGOVERN: Actually, I have two corrections to the minutes on page-- Oh, I'm sorry. I second

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: All in favor, say aye.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Motion for agenda?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, no, no.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Motion to adopt the amended agenda.

JACK MCGOVERN: Second.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Hold on a second. Cristina, dile a Ricardo que 35 tiene que votar.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: All in favor say aye. So now we go to the--

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes. Good morning. I'm here. I'm in favor.

39 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. Thank you, Ricardo.

Consideration of 181st Council Meeting Verbatim Transcriptions

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay, So, now we're moving forward to the consideration of the 181st Council meeting for bait and transcriptions. Jack. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Two corrections to the minutes on page 87. María López says the action name is to modify because we named the action. "We don't know what curse you guys are going." I think she means to say "course." And then again, on

page 100 María López is discussing on line nine, descending devices, and she says, it states, "it's basically requiring that old fishers have descending devices on board," and I think she means, it should say "all," not "old."

Thank you.

8 So, thank you for that, Jack. I have those same corrections on my notes. And I'd like to add a couple more.

Page 31, where Sarah was describing the difference between ACL and ACTs. line 29, delete the word bunny. When she was referring to "stock pelagic, reef fish, bunny, lobster." So, delete "bunny." Page 69, line 27, where Kreglo was talking about his lobster experience. He put, "I live lobster." I think that should be, "I dive lobster."

And then, page 71, line 20, change "Sun Croix" to "Saint Croix."

And I have Jack's, and then I have one more. Oh, down in page 141.

Where Abdiel Connelly used the word sea, he meant S E A for sea,
and that both lines 33 and 34 have S E E, So, we want to change
that. Delete S E E and put S E A on both lines. Thank you.

So, if no one else has any corrections on the verbatim minutes, we'll win a motion to accept the verbatim minutes as corrected.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: So, move.

JACK MCGOVERN: Jack McGovern, second.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: It's moved by Jean-Pierre Oriol and seconded by Jack McGovern. Any nays? Abstentions? All in favor say aye.

GROUP: Aye.

Executive Director's Report

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none, motion carries.

So, following that on the agenda is Executive Director's report, Miguel Rolón.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Also, for the record, please identify yourself. So, when you talk— I'm guilty of not identifying myself. So, I'm Miguel Rolón, for the record.

48 Today we have two presentations during my report. Before that, I

want to mention that the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission is going to meet in September and our chairman now is going to represent the Council. As I said, I myself will be virtually participating. It will be held in Barbados.

The CFMC has been an active participant on all the WECAFC projects since the beginning of the 80s. When the Council was created in 1976, we found that promoting Pan-Caribbean Management is one of the main goals of the Council because many of the species that we have here are shared by all the other countries. And also, upstream we have actions that may jeopardize, or may affect, not jeopardize, but may affect the species that we manage in our area. So, it is important that we continue working with WECAFC.

The NOAA Fisheries participates by attending the meetings, working with the working groups. The point of contact for the Southeast Region is María López. And then, in the case of the Office of International Trade and Commerce, NOAA Fisheries, we have Laura Cimo and others that participate depending on the topics that we discuss.

We will have Marine Special Planning. We have two workshops for data gathering. Graciela, do you have the dates? The one in Marine Special Planning.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, the dates. There are going to be two meetings. One in Saint Croix, and one in Puerto Rico. So, it's August 28th and 29th in Saint Croix. And August 31st and September 1st in Puerto Rico at the Buccaneer and at the Isla Verde Marriott Courtyard. Here. So, it's a full day the first day, half a day on the second.

 It's a meeting by invitation by the MSP group but it has been announced and we're looking forward to receiving information on data that are missing, data gaps that have been identified for Marine Spatial Planning. Thank you.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you, Graciela. We were asked for the people to be included there were fishers, so the three chairs will be participating in those meetings.

The other announcement is that we have, the highly migratory species, as you know, they have an event today. It is a public meeting. And it is suspected that many people can attend.

Tomorrow, in the evening, Ana Salceda is going to meet with some key fishers and the Council members have been invited to discuss the Big Fish campaign. She will have a presentation tomorrow and

you will see what we have been doing with the Big Fish campaign. That campaign is an international effort to promote conservation 2 3 of marine species that aggregate to spawn. Snappers, grouper, 4 etcetera.

5 6

> 7 8

> 9

10

It's an activity under the WECAFC, the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission, with the participation of the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism, the CRFM, OSPESCA, who is an organization that encompasses Central America countries, and, of course, the United States, in this case, the Council and the U.S. Caribbean.

11 12 13

14

15

16 17 Mr. Chairman, I have a minute to kill until 9:30, but I believe, if you're ready and Kelly's ready we can have that presentation now. Kelly Denit is the director of the Sustainable Fisheries Office at National Marine Fisheries Service NOAA Fisheries in Washington. She graciously accepted to have this presentation in front of the Council. She gave this at the CCC this past spring.

18 19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

The Presentation is related to the funds that have been approved by the president to combat the inflation. So, it's something that we should be mindful of. The actual spending of the money will be coordinated with the National Marine Fisheries Service, NOAA Fisheries. The Executive Director will have a meeting on August 22 to continue these efforts. In the case of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, Graciela and I are supposed to work together with the V.I. to work on this effort.

27 28 29

So, Mr. Chairman, can you allow Kelly to do the presentation?

30 31

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Miquel. So, are we ready for Kelly?

32 33

Inflation Reduction Act Funding-Kelly Denit

34 35

I'm here, Chair. I'm ready to begin if you can pull KELLY DENIT: those slides up there, in the room, for everyone.

36 37 38

Okay, great. Good morning. Thank you for that introduction, Miguel. This morning, I'm going to talk with you about the Inflation Reduction Act funding that's been made available to NOAA Fisheries.

40 41 42

43

44 45

46

47

39

There are three buckets of funding. NOAA Fisheries has equities in all three. The first is the Coastal Communities and Climate Resilience. The second is related to Forecasting. And the third is related to our facilities. Also, please let me know if I start going too quickly for the interpretation. I will try to make sure that I speak slowly, so there's opportunity for that. Okay, great.

48 Thank you. 1 2

Okay, So, our main focus is on bucket one, the Coastal Communities and Climate Resilience.

So, please go ahead to the next slide.

What I will do this morning is walk you through the breakdown of all of those funds, so you have a sense of how it's distributed across the different areas within the National Marine Fisheries Service. And then, I'll spend a little specific time on the funding for the Regional Fishery Management Councils.

So, first let me step through overall, NOAA received 3.3 billion dollars. Approximately 1.2 of that is coming to NOAA Fisheries for work. And you see the boxes along the bottom there. The one with the arrows pointed to it is the Climate Ready Fisheries, which is where we'll spend most of our time this morning in the presentation, talking through the components of that specifically. But there is also funding specific to tribal priorities, that's the yellow box. Funding for habitat restoration and conservation, which is the green box. The purple box is our facility's needs, specifically in the mid-Atlantic and Northwest. And then there's Arctic research and some funding to facilitate permitting and reviews with respect to various energy related projects.

So go ahead to the next slide and we're going to dig in on that dark blue box, the 349 million.

Okay, I apologize that there's a lot of acronyms here on this slide, but we'll start on the upper left. So, this is our essential data acquisitions and advanced technologies, which is focused on our improvements to our stock assessment enterprise. And I'll talk some more about that in our next slide. The next box down is the Climate Ecosystem and Fisheries Initiative with \$40 million. The next one is our modernizing data, which is another \$40 million. So, that's about 200 million directed towards improving our scientific enterprise and helping make adjustments to be more climate ready with respect to our scientific work. The next three areas, Red Snapper, North Atlantic Right Whale, which is the NARW on the upper right and Pacific Salmon are species or stock specific efforts that the agency identified as key priorities that we wanted to focus some funding towards.

And then finally, we have the bucket with all the arrows there that is specific to the Regional Fishery Management Councils at 20 million. and then we have funding in that very last bucket specific to our overhead.

You can go ahead to the next slide.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: We need a second. We're having a technical difficulty with the video. Sorry to interrupt. Thanks.

KELLY DENIT: No problem. If you'd like, Chair, I can go ahead without the slides while they're continuing to get those brought up.

Excellent. Ready?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Yes, we are ready. Thank you.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Go ahead, Kelly. We're ready.

KELLY DENIT: Okay. Please go to the next slide.

So, on the next slide we're going to-- I'm going to talk a little bit about the specifics of the Essential Data Acquisition and The Advanced Technologies. There we go. Perfect. Thank you.

So, the focus of this funding, which is \$105 million is supporting our efforts to expand and modernize stock assessments. We recognize that as the climate is changing across the country, we're going to need to be able to expand our survey coverage in the coming years in order to manage our fisheries and protected species.

So, this funding is focused in looking at our ability to continue to have ship-based surveys, but also look at the application and use of advanced technologies in order to increase our ability and improve our ability for coverage in areas where we might not otherwise be able to get to with ship-based examples. And so, here we're talking specifically about potential opportunities to use camera technology or survey coverage to get into areas that we currently can't, but where fish may be moving. And that includes our protected species as well.

With respect to the bucket on the upper right, are Modernizing Data. As we all know electronic technology is everywhere and the agency needs to invest in our ability to not only take advantage of that technology, but also make our data more accessible both internally and externally. So, this funding will be focused on establishing clear data standards, moving more of our systems to cloud based technologies in order to facilitate that access which connects to those bottom two bullets of enabling open science and looking at an operating model that is more modernized than what we have currently.

And then, this final bucket is the Climate Ecosystems and Fisheries Initiative which hopefully you have heard about and is a cross wide NOAA effort to advance our ocean ecosystem prediction capabilities. So, the focus here is to try to take many of the more global ocean modeling and bring it down to the scales both in time and space that are useful for fisheries managers. And we recognize that that will look very different across our different regions because of the data availability in each region but the point is to try to get towards more ability to forecast and provide projections on potential climate impacts to both our fisheries and protected species.

4 5

Go ahead to the next slide.

So, here we have some species-specific examples. I won't spend a ton of time here, since I don't think we're going to see any Pacific Salmon showing up in the Caribbean, despite climate change. So, North Atlantic Right Whale, the focus here is on modeling and monitoring and also two main threats to that species, special strikes, and also gear, fishery gear interactions. And so, trying to move towards ropeless gear.

 With respect to red snapper, the main focus is threefold. One, investing in the data infrastructure to support the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission as the clearinghouse for our recreational data. And then also, to improve our estimates of fishing effort, recreational fishing effort in particular, in the Gulf of Mexico, as well as investing in improving our estimates of recreational discards. And then, finally for Pacific salmon the focus is on our ability to scientifically evaluate our habitat restoration and reintroduction strategies and how we can help facilitate and make sure we're investing our funding in those two areas to support salmon in the best way possible.

Go ahead to the next slide.

So, I'd be happy, Chair, to take questions on that first part or if you prefer, I can go right into the specifics of the Council funding and then take all the questions at the end. Let me know your preference.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So yeah, we would prefer that you finish and then we'll ask questions later.

KELLY DENIT: Okay, thank you, Chair. Okay, go ahead to the next slide. And go ahead to the next slide.

So, now I'll dig into the details of the \$20 million for the

Regional Fishery Management Councils. The focus here is on the two goals that are highlighted with those hollow bullets.

The focus is on fishery management and governance and achieving those two goals, which are the implementation of fishery management measures necessary to advance climate ready fisheries, and also the development and advancement of climate related fisheries management planning and implementation, in particular in support of underserved communities.

So, these goals are fairly broad because we recognize that each Council has very different fisheries and very different potential impacts from climate on said fisheries and fishing communities.

Go ahead to the next slide.

So, we tried to identify some very broad priorities that we will fund with this IRA money. They are listed here, and these are currently up for discussion and input and feedback from the Regional Fishery Management Councils. The Council Executive Directors, as Miguel noted, have provided some initial feedback. The point here is, again, to provide some broad priorities that allow each Council to focus on the areas that are most relevant to their fisheries and fishing communities.

So, examples here talk about operationalizing our fishery climate vulnerability assessments and other scientific products such as ecosystem status reports, moving forward with recommendations from climate scenario planning, efforts that have been undertaken, implementing management changes to address climate vulnerability. And then the last two, implementing measures that increase responsiveness of allocations or other management measures to climate impacts. So, here we are talking more about focusing on opportunities to streamline our processes to make our ability to react to changes more quick. And then finally, the last bullet is targeted at investments in planning for climate change. Some Councils have not had an opportunity to dig into what are the potential impacts to their fisheries and fishing communities. And so, there's the possibility to use some of these funds to facilitate workshops or engagements in that regard.

Go ahead to the next slide.

So, overall, our plan it to create specific grants for each regional fishery management Council and each Council will provide proposals to the agency for our review. The focus on our criteria- Yeah, you're good. You're on the right slide. --is to make sure that any projects that are put forward by the Councils, one, are

able to be completely implemented or in the final phases of approval by 2027. The reason for that is the Inflation Reduction Act funds have an end date. We cannot provide funds beyond FY '26, the federal fiscal year '26. And the other main point is that actions that we implement using the IRA funds have to be able to be sustained with no additional funding after the IRA funds. So, we will need to, this is essentially a pulse of funding, we will need to be able to continue whatever it is that we invest in, recognizing that we'll be back to our baseline funding.

So, we've identified some areas that we will give high priority to, and those are actions that leverage existing tools such as ecosystem status reports or other products that are being produced by the agency already, actions that will be completed within three years, and any cross-Council projects and initiatives where that is relevant. That may not be relevant for all of the Council areas.

Go ahead to the next slide. And there's just two more slides here.

So, the process is focused on establishing specific grants for each Council, and we are in the process of getting that kicked off. As Miguel noted, we have a meeting with the Council Executive Directors next week to discuss the specific mechanics of that. And then our plan in out years is to run a proposal process where the Councils, we'll put forward the key projects that they want to prioritize for this funding and the agency will review those to ensure that we have the capacity to match that since we are key partners with the Councils in getting any projects fully implemented. And then go ahead to the last slide, which is essentially just a recap of what I've noted.

So, we currently will be refining our priorities and criteria based on feedback from the Councils. Our next steps, here in the fall, will be to get those IRA specific grants to each Council established. And then later, here in 2023, we will initiate that proposal process so that the Councils can submit those and then complete our review and selection process here by hopefully early 2024 so each of the Councils can have the funding to begin executing their work. And with all that I'd be happy to take any questions, Mr. Chair.

Questions/Comments

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Kelly, we couldn't hear you at the end. I think that you said any questions. Is that correct?

KELLY DENIT: Correct.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Thank you, Kelly. The floor is open for questions if any. Okay. Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Good morning. Julian Magras, for the record. After looking at this, I think this is very important and what's being proposed here. What I think is a very important aspect of all of what's going on is to make sure that we include the fishers in this process. This is due to the fact that we're seeing the different changes with climate change hands on, and we have seen where things have changed but it has not changed drastically.

What we're seeing is more like it's changed from one month to another month and I think with the information that we're collecting, which is very important to how we fish and move forward, it would be very good to include us in this process so that we don't think something is—let's use an example of going into extinction or being overfished or something, but it has decided to do a different cycle in a different area. And I think that's very important to have this information for each one of the different sectors: Puerto Rico, Saint Croix, Saint Thomas, Saint John, moving forward, so when we sit to the table to make decisions, we could understand what's going on in each one of the fisheries pertaining to the climate change. Thank you.

KELLY DENIT: Yeah, thank you. It broke up just a little bit there at the end. But I certainly hear your point with respect to using some of these funds to directly engage with our fishing communities and get their input on what they are seeing on the water and what the potential impacts are.

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Kelly, we are not hearing you. We are not hearing you completely. Maybe you can turn off your camera and use more of your bandwidth for audio instead of video.

KELLY DENIT: Is that better?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Jean-Pierre.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jean-Pierre Oriol. So, I guess this question is for Miguel and Council staff. So, according to the schedule, it says the request for proposals is going to open up soon and then you're going to discuss the proposals in October, which is about six to eight weeks. How is the Council coming up with the preliminary list of projects and those types of things?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. All the eight Councils are really working on that, and we have a list of possible alternatives. Actually,

going back to what Julian mentioned, Graciela and I have been discussing— I tell you; this will include biological component and socio economical component. The socio economical component, that's where we want the fishers in. Because many of the things that are happening now, the people who receive the impact, the people who have the experience out there, are the fishers. So, any proposal that we have, we intend to include the science, the socioeconomic science, economic science, and the biological science. And of course, included in that will be representation of the fishers. Actually, the proposal that we might be working together will depend on whatever we discuss, there was 22.

4 5

Like Kelly is saying, the important, those high priorities include the tools that we have for fishery management and the ecosystem. So, what we need to do before September 30 is to have a list of topics that we want to address. Once we have that accepted, and if they copy, because they're still working on how they are really going to distribute this funding. If they're going to adopt this system that they have for habitat, like Graciela is very familiar with, and myself, then it would be a matter to submit a proposal to National Marine Fisheries Service. They are the one who approves the proposal. Once they approve the proposal, then we go ahead with it.

So, by the December meeting, we should have a list of those proposals, who's going to do what and when and where. And we have to finish by 2027. So, it's kind of interesting that some of the actions, the activities that we have might have a continuity but there's no money after '27 for that continuation. So, the Chairman of one Council raised that point and he was literally confused about it. So, I believe and the Councilors, the eight Councilors, are working with the fisheries, NOAA fisheries, to make sure, number one, that we use the funding according to the IRA and number two, that we do it on time.

 For this Council, we already have a person who worked with us as PI for other activities, so she might be able to work with us. And we may need to even have an assistant for Angie for the accountability of this funding. If you look at the-- remember the minimum amount of money for the proposal would be 300K. \$300,000. So, depending on how much they appropriate to us, to the eight Councils, and they have a formula that will do that, we will be able then to say, "okay, these are the things that we can do." And then, we need to look at what the SSC have recommended in research priorities in the past, and the TAP for the ecosystem.

Once we have those two elements, then we can present to the NOAA fisheries, these are the items that we would like to include in

the possible proposals and then we report back to you. We may need to have, probably, a virtual meeting with the voting members of the Council and the Chairs of the groups when we have something to present to you. This way you will know where we are with this and we can receive the comments, especially what Julian mentioned, so we have a solid proposal for the use of this funding.

4 5

We would like to, as much as possible, use the local folks from universities and agencies. So, we will do the work, but also, we will enhance the capacity of the agencies and the scientists in this area rather than bringing, you know, Mr. Jemison from outside and we don't want to do that.

Any other comment or question for Kelly now that she's here?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Kelly Denit wrote in the chat, "To clarify, in October, we will discuss the process, not the proposals themselves. The proposals will be submitted by the end of 2023. And to the first question, engagement with the fishing community or activities that can be supported with this funding.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Any other comment?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any more questions for Kelly? Hearing none.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Kelly, we would like to thank you for your time and patience. Sorry for the issues with the electronics. We're fishing on that. We're looking forward to talking to you a little bit further between here and October to finish the process. And for that, we are really, really grateful for your time to address the Council today.

KELLY DENIT: My pleasure. Thank you So, much, Miguel and Mr. Chair. Gracias a todos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Kelly. So, next on the agenda is Wendy Morrison.

WENDY E. MORRISON: Good morning. Can you hear me okay?

41 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yep.

WENDY E. MORRISON: Awesome. Would you like me to leave my camera off, given some of the challenges you're having right now with the internet?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay.

WENDY E. MORRISON: Okay. And then are you going to pull up the presentation, or shall I?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I'm going to check with Cristina here.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Hi Wendy. We're going to make you co-host So, you can share your presentation from your side. Thank you.

WENDY E. MORRISON: Okay, good. Because I don't see where the share button is, so I'm glad.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Wendy, we made you co-host so you should be able to share your screen. Down there is a green button that says, "share screen." Perfect.

WENDY E. MORRISON: Okay, let me put it in. Does that work?

18 CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Yes, but we are looking at the PowerPoint version, not the full screen mode.

WENDY E. MORRISON: So, you have the full screen. Awesome. I will go ahead and—

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: No, we don't have the full screen. We don't see the full screen. You can do the full screen, and in case you have some problems, we have your presentation here also.

WENDY E. MORRISON: Okay, stop sharing. Let me try it again. Is that better?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Yes.

Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking-Wendy Morrison

WENDY E. MORRISON: Awesome.

Okay. So, thank you. I really appreciate you putting me on the schedule today. What I'm going to talk about is, we have out an advance notice of proposed rulemaking. We are considering if we want to update our guidelines for National Standards 4, 8, and 9. So, I'll walk you through a little bit of what we're thinking right now.

So, the objective of this project is to determine if updates to the guidelines are needed, and we are focusing just on three of the National Standards right now. So, national standards four, eight, and nine.

A little background. I'm sure you know this, but Magnuson-Stevens Act is our main law for fisheries management, and there are 10 National Standards within that law that all fishery measures must agree to, must follow. And NOAA has been given the task of writing guidelines on how we implement those National Standards. And so, those are the guidelines we're talking about today. So, right now we are going out and we're soliciting public input on the current guidelines and areas that may benefit from revisions.

4 5

So, a little background on the three National Standards we're considering. The first one is National Standard four. And the shorthand for this is allocations. So, this is dealing with any fishery management measures that choose and give out allocations, and what it says is "allocations shall be fair and equitable; should promote conservation; and do not result in excessive shares." The second one, is National Standard 8, and this one considers impacts to communities. So, you can see I've highlighted the shorthand for each of these. The National Standard 8 says that "we must provide for sustained participation; minimize adverse economic impacts to the extent practicable to communities." The final one is National Standard 9, which is dealing with bycatch. And it says, "we need to minimize bycatch and bycatch mortality to the extent practicable."

So, the advanced notice of proposed rulemaking, we identify two current challenges that we are going to pay attention to and determine if, due to these challenges, we need to make some updates to the guidelines. The first one is related to climate change. The second one is related to promoting equity and environmental justice.

 Okay. So, I'm now going to go into each of these. The interactions of the National Standards and those two issues, one at a time. The first one is National Standard 4, which is on allocation and how it interacts with some of the challenges we've had with climate. So, as you know changing ocean conditions are affecting the location and the productivity of fish stocks. I just heard some of the discussion with Kelly Denit. And so, your fishermen are seeing some of these changes on the water. So, this does affect our ability to manage those stocks. Those changes also can cause social, economic and other impacts to the fisheries and the fishing dependent communities.

And so, we want to look at these climate issues and determine if there's updates to the guidelines needed. So, we're asking, specifically, for input on whether we need to look at approaches for balancing access for the historical users, for any marginalized individuals who may have been excluded historically and for new

users. We do have from 2016, an allocation policy related to any allocation that exists in regulations needs to identify a trigger in the Caribbean. There aren't any allocations that require a trigger so that's less relevant to your Council. And then we're also asking if there's types of documentation, analyses or alternative approaches that could be considered for allocations.

When you're looking at National Standard eight, which is the standard related to communities or National Standard nine, which deals with bycatch, same climate issues, changes in distribution and and productivity of the stocks does affect, you know, the communities and bycatch. So, we're asking for if we need to update our guidelines to improve the ability of communities to adapt to the shifting stocks and shifting productivities or do we need to update our guidelines to better account for when target stocks bycatch interact? Especially when it's with protected resources.

Okay. Moving on to challenges related to equity and environmental justice. Under National Standard four, which is again the allocation National Standard. We're asking for similar to what we said under climate change but approaches to improve the consideration of underserved and underrepresented communities previously excluded entrants or new entrants. And then the same question about, are there documentation or analyses that you think are needed that would improve the allocation process?

So, under National Standard Eight, which is the one for communities, and the intersection with equity and environmental justice, we have a couple of slides on this. The current National Standard Eight guidelines have a definition of fishing community and we're considering if we need to update that definition within our guidelines. So, the current definition defines "community" as place based. And we're wondering if we want to extend that definition to allow communities to be not place based, but instead, maybe communities of interest. So, are there advantages to allowing communities to be defined on interest that is not focused on a place?

With that same definition the National Standard Eight deals with dependence of communities and engagement of communities in fishing. And we're pondering if we want to update that definition to shift the balance between dependence and engagement. Our thoughts here are as the stocks shift their distributions or adjust their productivities, the communities that are dependent on historical stocks may do better if they are less dependent on some of those stocks as those stocks, you know, move or change. And so, maybe we want to focus more on engagement in fishing in general. And so, we're putting these ideas out there and want to hear from

you and if you have any thoughts on this aspect.

1 2 3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

And finally, this is my final slide on National Standard Eight with EEJ. Again, we're really trying to understand how to balance the requirements of sustained participation of fishing communities, but also understand that at some point we're going to need new entrance. We need to look at these underserved, underrepresented communities, maybe people who were excluded in the past and communities with high levels of social or climate vulnerabilities. So, are there revisions to the guidelines that would would improve our ability to do this?

111213

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So, we also have been looking at bycatch and equity environmental There are some challenges and some other Management Councils where the shifting of stocks productivities has impacted when there's a target fishery-- A target for a stock that that stock is also bycatch in another fishery. How do we balance the needs of those two groups? And so, that's something we're looking at in the guidelines. Are there some revisions that are needed to help balance the needs of if a stock is target and bycatch in different fisheries. Especially if a community is underserved.

222324

25

2627

2829

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

And then finally, we have two other challenges we mentioned in the ANPR that are outside of climate and EEJ issues. And so, the first one is National Standard Nine. It requires us to minimize bycatch to the extent practicable. And so, we want to mention that practicability standard. We would like to assert that the current discussion of practicability within our guidelines appropriately balances the complexities of fisheries management, given how different they are around the different regions, but we would like some input if there are some thoughts on how that discussion of practicability could be updated within the guidelines. And then, in some regions, less so in the Caribbean, there are fishery management measures that create required discarding. And so, that creates a little bit of waste if fishermen catch fish and then are required to discard them. We're looking to see if there's any revisions we could do, that would incentivize reducing that waste. So, reducing the regulatory discards.

39 40 41

42 43

44

45

46

47 48 Our timeline. So, we published, in the federal register, the advanced notice of proposed rulemaking on May 15th. We have given presentations to the Council Coordination Committee and then this is the last Council. We've given presentations to all Councils between June and August. We have given two tribal and one national webinar and the public comment period closes September 12th. We will take all this in, there's a chance that we will look at all the comments and decide that the current guidelines are great, are

sufficient and no changes are needed, but we also may decide that some changes might be a good idea. If so, we will begin drafting a proposed rule in the fall of 2023.

Okay, that's it. I'm happy to take questions as needed.

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Wendy. I have María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you, Wendy, for the presentation. This is María López with NOAA fisheries SERO. I just want to ask you, if people are able, people that do not speak English, are they able to provide comments on this proposed item in Spanish or any other language, if you know that.

WENDY E. MORRISON: Yes! That's a great question. If they want to provide a comment, we will find a translation. So, yes, we would love comments in Spanish or any other language. In office we have a translator that can translate Spanish but if we need to go elsewhere, we can find a way. Yes. I would love any comments.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you. And we're available, too, in our office to provide assistance with any comments that come from the Caribbean region. If you guys have any questions on that, feel free to contact me and SERO or Sarah Stephenson as well. Thank you, Wendy.

WENDY E. MORRISON: Perfect, thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Any more questions for Wendy? Or comments?

Vance?

VANCE VICENTE: Yes Vance Vicente, SSC. What's ANPR?

WENDY E. MORRISON: It's Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. So, it's very similar to when, if you have a regulation and you do a scoping, when you go out and say, are there issues? What are the challenges? what do we need to potentially fix? So, it's a step before we put out a proposed rule. So, we're just kind of going out and doing scoping.

VANCE VICENTE: Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: No more questions. I see no other hands. Miguel?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No. Just to ask Wendy. Wendy, thank you for the presentation. What are the next steps? What is expected to happen following this? You know, the next steps for the Councils and for the National Marine Fisheries Service.

WENDY E. MORRISON: Good question. Thank you. As I noted, this is a scoping and so when we compile all the comments that we receive, we will look at that and decide if a next step is necessary. We may look at the comments and decide that we do not need to update our guidelines, and therefore we would probably just send out an email and just say we're good and then no changes would be made.

If we decide that there are changes to the guidelines that may be a good idea, we would put together a proposed rule and then we would put that out again for public comment and we would come back to the Council and say, "Here's our proposed rule." We would give you a presentation and give you the chance to provide us with input on any proposed changes before we would actually implement them.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Thank you, Wendy. Because one of the topics that she addresses is the definition of community, fishing community. Saint Croix had been appointed or declared a fishing community a long time ago. If we change this to expand it to a fishing group, we don't know whether that would be good or bad for the proposals that you receive on your fishing community and the consideration of your fishing community about NGOs, etc.

So, and there are other things regarding what she presented that the group may be interested in. If you have any questions, as María said, we can help you question and answer. So, during the scoping process, you will be able to have a better grasp of what is intended to be done. So, you don't have to wait until the proposed regulation is in place to react to it.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Miguel.

WENDY E. MORRISON: Was there-- I'm sorry. Was there a question in there? I would love your thoughts on whether changes to the definition of fishing community could be harmful. So, any thoughts you have on that would be very welcome.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Well, I discussed this a long time ago when we were working on this. For some communities when you are place based, let's take the example of Saint Croix, and then also you have communities that are affected by the EEJ now, there are some considerations that people that put together proposal and agencies that give the money take into consideration whether this is a fishing community or not. Because the definition of the fishing

community carries many other attributes that are important for those proposals.

For example, one time I was working with a proposal to look at the socio-economy of the Puerto Rico fisheries. Puerto Rico, at that time, was not declared a fishing community. The lady told me, "You know, that would be something that the local government could do." See if we can apply for a definition of Puerto Rico as a fishing community definition, but then the administration changed and that was the end of it.

I remember that Saint Croix is still a fishing community in some level, some consideration. So, I don't know whether eliminating the place-based fishing community will be having any effect on future projects, future considerations of the area. Another part of the coin is that if you call all the commercial fishers, the fishing community of the U.S. Caribbean, then you may be able to have a better response from agencies and donors and NGOs to work on particular species, particular project, particular issues regarding the socio-economy of the commercial fisheries and/or recreational fisheries of the U.S. Caribbean.

So, that's all, Wendy, that's what we wanted to do because in this case most people don't know what we're talking about when we talk about National Standards unless you are touched by one of them. And this is a very good opportunity then for the people to present their inputs, give their input on everything, but they need to be aware of what is it. And we have Dr. Alida Ortiz here. She's the Chair of the OEAP, our advisory body for outreach and education. So, if you think that we could put together a fact sheet outlining what is the purpose of this scoping, spell out the acronyms for Vance and other people like me that don't know what we were talking about before, it will be good to have that in Spanish and English. So, we may be able to offer you our social network to get more information, to get more comments for the purpose of what you're doing on these scoping meetings. If you think that that's something that will help, we are willing to help you with that.

WENDY E. MORRISON: That sounds great. I would appreciate that. Yes, please.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. So, we will be in touch with you, Alida and myself, and see if we can put something together, especially Alida, so we can convey the message to the fishing community of the U.S. Caribbean and the agencies.

WENDY E. MORRISON: Great.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Thank you so much, Wendy. Anyone else? Any other comments for Wendy? Okay. Hearing none, I'm going to move forward on the agenda. Approval of the Southeast Data Assessment and Review for the Caribbean Spiny Lobster Terms of Reference. That's María. Oh, Kevin. Sorry. Kevin.

WENDY E. MORRISON: All right. Thank you!

Approval of the Southeast Data, Assessment, and Review (SEDAR) 91 Caribbean Spiny Lobster Terms of Reference

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I'm Kevin McCarthy. I'm with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. I'm going to present to you an overview of the terms of reference for SEDAR 91, which will be spiny lobster.

So, SEDAR, for those of you who have been through the process, but don't really know what that acronym means, is the Southeast Data Assessment and Review. So, it is a process. This is SEDAR 91. I think I started on SEDAR 4. Every time I do one of these, I learn something new, and it always has a surprise or two. That doesn't mean it's a bad thing.

Next slide, please.

So just some milestones that we need to think about. This process is really in three steps. So, there'll be a data workshop, which will be in person. There'll be an assessment workshop, which will be a series of webinars. And there'll be a review workshop, which again will be in person. Just a couple of important marks that we need to hit. So, workshop appointments will be finalized at your meeting next April. So, I'll need to be working with Council staff and with Julie Neer at SEDAR to get those appointments made. There are appointments that SEDAR pays for, there are appointments that the Science Center pays for, those are usually Science Center staff. And the Council can appoint people and pay for them to attend. These are public meetings, so people can go on their own dime if they so choose. But we certainly have workshop appointments for people that are expected to be active participants and add information to the process.

So, we'll then have a data scoping call in June. We just had one for SEDAR 84. And basically, that's a a webinar where we discuss those data sets that are available. We don't get into the gory details, but we do want to be made available of potential data sets. There are some data submission deadlines in September and October of next year. The data workshop, right now, is penciled in for November of 2024. There are some assessment webinars from

January to April. And then, the review workshop is scheduled for August. So, it's a long process. We've got to have time for the analysts to do their jobs. But these workshops in particular are when we get a lot of input from all of the stakeholders involved in the process.

So, next slide, please.

So, these are the terms of reference. There are terms of reference for each of those steps, the data step, the assessment step, and the review step. The SSC has already approved these. We can spend as long or as little amount of time as the Council would like. I will spare you from my reading each of these slides, but I'll try and summarize them.

So, in this case, these are the terms of reference for the data workshop. Basically, the idea behind the data workshop is to review those data sets that are available as inputs or potential inputs to the stock assessment models. So, they include things like the commercial and recreational landings and discards, if we've got them, length and age composition data, life history and other ecological information, indices of abundance, those are things like catch per unit effort series. We will want to include data through at least 2022. Recommendations for future research are also provided at these data workshops.

We're looking for specific guidance there for how we can make this better in the future and there's a report that's prepared. So, I will keep going unless you all have specific questions on any one of these slides.

So, next slide please.

 So, we've got another set of terms of reference for the assessment workshop. These are a little more detailed and technical. Again, the terms of reference provide guidance for how the process will work, and the kinds of things we're trying to achieve at each step of the process. So, in the assessment workshop, we're essentially trying to develop and apply assessment tools that are compatible with the available data. So, if we don't have data to do a particular kind of approach in assessment model, we may have data that support a different kind of approach. So, that's really what we're trying to figure out leading up to and during this assessment workshop.

And then, there's some things that we're trying to focus on that are centered around uncertainty. We want to understand how much uncertainty is there in the data inputs? How much uncertainty is

there within the model? How can we quantify that? And what does it mean for the results?

Next slide.

And then, there are some series of acronyms that we have to get numbers for. Things like Maximum Fishing Mortality Threshold or MFMT. Maximum Sustainable Yield or a proxy for that. Minimum Stock Size Threshold. These are all metrics that we're trying to estimate with this stock assessment procedure. There may be an alternative. If we can't get to these numbers, there is another alternative approach that we might use. So, these again are guidance for what we're trying to achieve during the stock assessment process. And these are all the things that we need to get to. This is the kind of management advice information that we're trying to get to.

Next slide.

And then again, another set of metrics and management advice to supply to the SSC and to you all. A lot of that stuff at the bottom there where you see an F, what we're talking about with F, that's fishing mortality. So, what is the impact of the fishery on the population? So, there's a series of F's that we're trying to get to, particularly if the stock is overfished.

Next slide.

And then there are some reports that are produced at the end of the assessment workshop as well. And we're looking, again, at research recommendations for the future. We always want to-- part of the process is to make the next assessment better and so we can identify gaps in our data and in our analyses that we could improve upon next time.

Next slide.

 And then we've got a series of guidance or terms of reference for the review workshop. And so, typically the review workshop involves some members of the SSC as well as independent reviewers who come in. Center for Independent Experts. They're hired to come in and serve as impartial reviewers. And so, these terms of reference really guide that review. So, they're asking these kinds of questions. Are data decisions that were made in the data workshop and the assessment workshop, did they make sense? Where they the right decision? Do we understand the data uncertainties? And how are they handled within the modeling framework? Were the methods used scientifically sound? Do the assessment models, do they make sense? Were they configured properly? Were they used consistently

with standard practices? Those kinds of of questions will be the consideration of this review panel.

Next slide.

And then, can the results be used to inform management? That's really sort of the most basic question, isn't it? So, that's something that this review panel will consider. Are we completely off the mark during this process or does it make sense, and can the results be used to develop annual catch recommendations?

I'm just going to give you a moment to sort of scan these things. Like I said, I don't want to read them to you, but I don't want to dwell on them too long either, unless you have questions. Again, the SSC has already given their okay to these, so it's really up to you all to give the final approval.

Next slide.

And again, as with every step the review workshop can make research recommendations. They can provide guidance on areas to improve the data or the modeling approaches. They can provide recommendations on possible ways to improve the entire process. Maybe the way the SEDAR process is working isn't the best fit for this particular kind of data and the kinds of things we need to be doing here in the region. And of course, they provide a summary of their conclusions and recommendations.

Next slide.

Oh, I think that's it. So, any questions? I know that was quick and there were a lot of words and a lot of concepts on all of those, but I'm happy to take any questions or backup and review anything you'd like to see again.

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Kevin. Miguel?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Kevin, do you need any motion from the Council to accept what you just presented?

KEVIN MCCARTHY: I think so, yes. I think we need to make that.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Jack?

JACK MCGOVERN: Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chair. Just one question. I assume this applies to all three island-based FMPs and we wind up

with separate A, B, C Resulting from it. Just like previously.

4 5

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Correct. So, yeah, there'll be three assessments. They'll all have the same terms of reference. These are pretty general and pretty standard. There's nothing that is specifically applicable to one island versus the other. But we'll have three assessments.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Julian?

JULIAN MAGRAS: Julian Magras, for the record. So, the question, Kevin, the Caribbean has experienced multiple major events, natural disasters, COVID, that impact fishing landings related to data collection. Can a statement about evaluating those to ensure they are accounted for in indices?

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Thanks, Julian. Yeah, we'll definitely want to understand that. So, a big part of having the fishers and other members of the community as part of this process and being especially at the data workshop. The data workshop is where we really get into the data to understand what are the patterns we're seeing, what may have driven them. And so, the input from the fishers with their experiences day in and day out is really important. So, that's a really important part of that process. And those kinds of decisions are made—— All the decisions that are made during the SEDAR process are a consensus decision, especially during the data phase. So, we'll make those kinds of decisions about how to approach those very questions during that process.

JULIAN MAGRAS: One more question. Julian, again, for the record. Also, I had this other question that I don't know if it applies to this. If studies that have been done and fishers feel they were not done correctly, like studies done in the U.S.V.I. Let's say we're talking about lobsters and we feel like the study was not carried out correctly and we can prove that the results are not the results that would have come out if it was done correctly, does that information get excluded or does that study get excluded from the overall picture that we're looking at when we're looking at all the data or it's just that that note will be made that fishers feel that that study was done incorrectly? How would that work?

KEVIN MCCARTHY: So, all of the data sets that would go into the assessment are critically reviewed. So, there's nothing sacred. Nothing's going to absolutely go in. Everything gets reviewed, so that would be part of that review process. And then the group itself sees the pros and cons and makes a decision. So, I can't say at this time what would go in, what wouldn't go in, but

everything would be reviewed.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Thank you very much.

CARLOS FARCHETTE:

Graciela?

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, Kevin, one of the issues that is always raised is the gap that we have in the recreational landings and that applies, specifically, to the invertebrates. So, spiny lobster in this case. That's something that I just want the Council to be aware of because it's going to be-- I don't think we'll have any new data from the recreational sector in 2024.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Right. Thanks, Graciela. Yeah, we likely won't--We certainly won't have a time series, but what we may have a snapshot between now and then as to the magnitude of recreational landings versus commercial landings. And again, it won't be a lot of data, but it may inform a little bit. The tricky part, of course, is what did that look like 20 years ago? Was it relatively the same? Was it not? So, again, this is a conversation during this whole process that what do we do about these data gaps? Whether it's recreational or, you know, subsistence fishing in the case of some species, maybe not lobster, maybe so. You know, how do we, how do we account for that? Is that caught up in the uncertainty part or what exactly? So, it's part of the process. But yeah, that's a conversation that we've got to have.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I'll have Vanessa.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, the last thing is that we do quite a bit of outreach in terms of gathering or getting people to collaborate with this process. And in that case, you know, the recreational sector would be the one that would be least represented in most cases. So, we're starting the process now and making that call for data from the recreational sector.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Right. And that's exactly why you and I and others need to work on those, the people who get appointed to be part of the process, especially in the data part. Because we so often need to have that kind of anecdotal reporting where we are missing survey data.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mr. Chairman, just to inform Kevin. I just got word from Puerto Rico that they are about to finish the data set for recreational and they are going to write you an email regarding the information, what type of information and when that could be available.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: That's great news. Yeah. And we've been working with Grisel on some of that. Yeah.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I think I have Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez, for the record. Kevin, thank you for the presentation. Some of the questions that I had, Graciela clarified already, but especially with the workshops and the research that is made in the spiny lobster, it's always a big issue in the commercial sector.

We know that is one of the most species that we catch and from my experience during the past year of research, the participation of the divers has been practically lost because, usually, the people that we receive are focused on traps or are focused in other areas that are not in the area where the biggest catch is made, like the West and the East Coast.

So just to be sure and for the record. Please, try to, when the people you select to make this research and especially when the workshop starts, that we have that participation from the sectors and the areas in Puerto Rico. I think it's the same also for the islands. Thanks.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Yeah, thank you. Yeah. And we're going to call you to get some names of who needs to be involved. Because I don't know them, but you do, right? And so, that's a big part of the process. That's why I put that first, finalizing the appointees in next April. Because between now and then we've got to identify the people and then we've got to get them to be willing to participate.

So, that's the other part of it, right? We can identify some of these folks and then we have to convince them that it is in their best interest to be part of the process. Because we absolutely have to have all the sectors that we can get. We'd have to have them represented so that we're not misunderstanding they're part of the fishery, right? We need to get the information from them so that we're characterizing it well.

One of the big things that we didn't have last time for the stock assessment was an index of abundance. That will probably come from the fishery itself and that's a tricky kind of analysis to do if you don't understand the fishery because you'll see patterns that have nothing to do with abundance but have everything to do with the way the fishery works. If we don't understand that, we're going to misinterpret it so it's critical that they're involved. So, thanks for that comment.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Vance.

4 5

VANCE VICENTE: Recently, the Department of Natural Resources and Environment reported that there are 85,000 vessels registered in Puerto Rico, out of which maybe, what, 2,000 are commercial, the rest are recreational. That just points out a very serious menace to the marine environment in various ways, not only fisheries wise, but recreational party waste, like has been reported in the newspaper. That's my comment.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Vance. So, we're going to put up a motion. I can't read that up there. I don't know what that—Should I just read this out? Yeah.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: To present the motion to approve the terms of reference and proceed with the SEDAR 91 for spiny lobster for all islands.

19 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: ¿Vanessa, esa es tu moción?

21 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Second?

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Second.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, the motion reads, "Motion to approve the terms of reference and proceed with the schedule presented for spiny lobster (SEDAR 91) for all islands. Motion by Vanessa and seconded by Jean-Pierre Oriol."

All in favor say "aye."

GROUP: Aye.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none, motion carries.

39 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Well, Ricardo-- Cristina, preguntale a Ricardo.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes, I agree. Ricardo Lopez, for the record. 42 I agree.

44 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes. Okay, thank you, Ricardo.

Okay. We're going to go for a quick break, but I'm requesting that everybody just take a short four to five minutes because we're lagging a little behind. Thank you. (Whereupon a brief recess was taken.)

1 2

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. breaks over. Okay. let's take our seats. We've got to get started. We're getting short on time here. You ready? Okay. It's open. Okay. So, one second.

So, continuing with the agenda, we have María López with the Fisheries Management Plan Amendments and Actions Updates.

Fishery Management Plans Amendments and Actions Updates— María López-Mercer, NOAA Fisheries

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is María López with NOAA Fisheries Southeast Regional Office. I'm going to be discussing the status of the amendments to the Island Based Fisheries Management Plans. We're waiting for the presentation to be shown on the screen.

So, in the meantime. These are the slides that we normally present at the beginning of each meeting where we give the Council an update on all of the actions that the Council is currently discussing and some of the pending items so that the Council can decide how to move forward and prioritize actions.

It's not that one. The amendments. Okay the presentation is going to be set soon, but in the meantime, I don't think we need this slide for this.

So, we all know that since October 13, 2022, we are operating under the Puerto Rico FMP, the Saint Croix FMP, and the Saint Thomas and Saint John FMP. For the benefit of our new Council member these are the management plans that we are operating under to manage fisheries in the federal waters of Puerto Rico, Saint Thomas/Saint John, and Saint Croix. This replaces the previous management plans, which were the reef fish, spiny lobster, queen conch, and corals in associated plants and invertebrates.

Okay, next slide, please. Thank you, Cristina.

Okay, So, that was the first item on the table. The second item on the table is Framework Amendment 1 to the Island-Based FMPs. This is the Spiny Lobster Reference Points; this is the first one. It became effective on April 15, 2023, and this one was based on updates from SEDAR 57 Spiny Lobster Assessment. I'm just mentioning this to let you know that this was our first amendment that became effective, Amendment to the Island-Based FMPs, and it had new

reference points for Spiny Lobster.

4 5

Other amendments that we are going to be discussing today, and that are currently under review, is the Amendment 1 to the Island-Based FMPs, which is the buoy gear definition and use. As you can recall, this is the amendment that would prohibit buoy gear use for the recreational sector and would allow up to 25 hooks on the buoy gear for the commercial fishers.

The final rule for this amendment published on July 20, 2023, those numbers that are in there are the reference for the final rule, so you can find it in the federal register if you're interested in reading it. Now the regulations for this, for the buoy gear amendment, are going to become effective on August 21, 2023. This means that once these regulations are effective, buoy gear is going to be prohibited for use by the recreational sector and then fishers that are engaging in the buoy gear fishery, commercial fishers, are going to be able to continue to be allowed up to 25 hooks on the buoy gear.

The next item that we are going to be currently discussing is Amendment 2 to the Island-Based FMPs, trawl net gear and descending devices. This is the amendment that will modify the use of all trawl gear in the EEZ, in the Exclusive Economic Zone of all three islands, prohibit the use of gillnets or modify the use of gillnets, I may say, trammel nets, purse seines, in the EEZ, and require that descending devices are available and ready for use when fishing for reef fish in the exclusive economic zone.

Now, as you recall back in April, in the meeting in April, the Council finalized the selection of preferred alternatives for all the actions that were included. However, the interdisciplinary planning team that has been developing this amendment would like the Council to clarify some items with respect to the gillnet action before moving forward with final action for this item. So, that means that the final action after this is all discussed later this morning may be postponed to December 2023.

The next amendment that we're going to be discussing today is the Framework Amendment 2, also to all the island-based FMPs. This is the update on the overfishing limit, the ABC, and the ACL for spiny lobster. This is based on the 2022 update assessment to the SEDAR 57 spiny lobster assessment. It will provide new ACLs for lobster under each FMP. This amendment was already discussed during the April meeting, and at this meeting, the Council can decide to take final action to approve this amendment to be submitted to the Secretary of Commerce for the development of the regulations. This is also an amendment that we're going to be discussing this

morning.

4 5

The other amendment that we're going to be discussing today is Amendment 3 to each one of the Island-Based FMPs. And this one is the one that will deal with new management measures for dolphin and wahoo in all three islands. This amendment will establish recreational bag limits and size limits for all fishing for dolphin and wahoo stocks in all three islands.

During the last Council meeting, the Council reviewed the document and chose preferred alternatives for some of the actions related to the U.S. Virgin Islands. At this meeting, the Council would be reviewing and if that is the desire of the Council, choose preferred for Puerto Rico, for the actions that are specific to Puerto Rico. Also, there are some of the actions in the U.S. Virgin Islands that still need some discussion and the Council can decide to revisit those actions or if they would like to take preferred alternatives at this time. So, this is an amendment that is still under development, and we are going to be discussing this this afternoon.

Next page.

Okay. So, all of the actions that are on this slide, this is almost my last slide, are actions that are not currently being developed as an amendment. Okay. These are actions that the Council has discussed that they wanted to discuss and put into consideration for creating an amendment in the future or have a little bit more discussion. So, I'm going to go through each one of them and at the end, I'm going to go back to three of those actions that the Council may need to make some decisions before we move forward.

There's an action to develop a federal permit system for the EEZ for the U.S. Virgin Islands and for Puerto Rico. This would evaluate general permits, limited permits, or any other actions that the Council would like to take. We will be discussing this at the December 2023 Council meeting instead of during this meeting. So, we're requesting the Council and staff to be able to discuss that instead in December.

 The idea at that time is that we will provide a presentation and we will engage in the discussion so that the Council can provide guidance as to whether they want to move forward with the development of a federal permit system, because as you know, this is a complex action and the more guidance the Council can provide to staff in terms of what they would like to see happening with this permit system, the better it will be so we can focus on it. So, I would encourage everybody to think a little bit about that.

1 2

4 5

Another action that we have the Council has had some interest in the past is a Trap Reduction Plan for U.S. Virgin Island. There's no updates from this one at this point. This one is the one that would evaluate compatibility with U.S.V.I. trap reduction program. We will continue having conversations with our U.S.V.I. government partners to see where and when they would like to move forward with something and if and we'll bring back some updates to the Council at that time.

Another action is the timing of seasonal area closures for the Red Hind Grouper in the Puerto Rico EEZ. This is an action that the Council discussed some time ago regarding a potential shift in the timing of the seasonal area closures for the red hind grouper in Western Puerto Rico. At this point, we're still gathering information. There was a meeting with some of the scientists where we were able to collect some additional information for this action and there's some research that is ongoing. So, the request will probably be for the Council to wait until all of this information is available to bring it back to the table.

I would like to see if Graciela has anything that she would like to say regarding this.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: The Council participates in the coral reef conservation program grants. One of the grants that is ongoing right now, specifically deals with Abrir La Sierra and the comparison of technologies to determine the population or the stock of red hinds in one of the sites and to evaluate the different methodology to determine whether it's two red hinds that make noise, or if it's a hundred of them that make noise.

The reason for that is because the acoustics have given us quite a bit of information regarding the presence of individuals at the spawning sites, but we still don't know how many. So, currently, we are on the second year of that comparison, and the third year we'll move that comparison to Lang Bank. So, in the next two years we'll have information on the abundance of the red hind at these spawning sites in two of the protected areas, one in Puerto Rico, the other one in Saint Croix and a determination of which methodology to apply to all of the other MPAs that the Council has in the EEZ. So having said that, the red hind is being discussed, but the data will not come in until the next year and a half, two years.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you, Graciela. Okay, So, I think with that said, I mean, unless the Council has anything else to comment on that red hind, I think it should be something that perhaps the

guidance to staff could be, just to wait a little bit until that information is available. If you all agree.

There's another action that has to do with the red hind, but this time it's the seasonal closures in the Saint Croix EEZ. The Lang Bank seasonal closure. This was a request that was made to the Council to evaluate modifying the Lang Bank closure during the three months that it's closed to allow fishing for pelagic species during the closure and other species, because right now during the closure, there's no fishing.

So, the Council tasked staff to move forward with this action and then staff is planning to bring an options paper to the December 23, 2023, meeting to scope a little bit more about this. The Council could, if there was a need to, bring a little bit more information for this, it would be advisable to have a District Advisory Panel meeting for Saint Croix to gather that information, but I would leave that to the discretion of the Council. So, that's something that can be discussed too.

There are two more actions. This is about the rainbow runner and specifically for Puerto Rico. Right now, the rainbow runner is classified as a reef fish in the Puerto Rico FMP, but in reality, and based on testimony from fishers, recreational fishers mostly, this is caught as a pelagic species. So, there was a request that was brought from the District Advisory Panel of Puerto Rico requesting the Council to reconsider reclassifying the rainbow runner as a pelagic species. So, this item was reviewed by the SSC at their last meeting that was in May, and they will be providing recommendations at this meeting with this regard. I think for this one, we can wait until the SSC gives their recommendation and their rationale and then the Council will need to decide if they want to move forward with an amendment to make this change. So, we can talk about that once the SSC provides their recommendation.

The last item is the 2023 accountability measure discussion. This was a discussion that we had at the past meeting regarding stocks that may continue to exceed their ACLs due to enhanced reporting because there have been changes. Obviously, when we move from the old FMPs to the new FMPs and then there was changes in the way that the stocks were grouped. So, there will be stocks that they exceed their ACL, however, it was determined by the Science Center that it was due to the enhanced reporting. So, to prevent this from continuing to occur in the future the Council needs to take action to revise those stocks so the ACLs can be revisited.

So, the Council will be tasking the SSC with looking into this. So, there's a need for further guidance. At this time, what we

would probably like to request is that the Council, perhaps commits into tasking the SSC at a not too late meeting. Obviously, there's an agenda that the SSC has and somethings that they need to be done as well. So just to set it up as a priority and just to set a date as to when the SSC should be discussing this.

Okay, last slide.

So, I went into this right now. So, 2023 Mr. Chair I think at this point, because this is the only time that we're going to be discussing these things during this meeting, perhaps this is a good opportunity if you think it's okay to see if you would like to send this to the SSC at some point.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah. You're talking about the AM discussion?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: I'm talking about-- I'm sorry, the 2023 AM Discussion. The first one.

So, just to rephrase. Do you think the Council is interested in sending this to the SSC for further guidance and do you think this is something that can be completed within a certain timeframe? Graciela, we may need to look at you too. Or maybe bounce this here too, if this is something that could be taken care of perhaps during the next couple of meetings.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Graciela?

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, actually this would be the involvement of the Science Center in terms of allowing for new data to be considered as not being detrimental to the fishers. So, the conversation needs to happen between the Science Center and the SSC in terms of when do we stop considering new data as new data. So, I think that we should put that in the agenda for the SSC, but we need to sit down and make sure that the presentations are provided to the SSC to make that determination.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Kevin?

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Yeah, Graciela, that's a great idea. In terms of the new data, I mean, this applies to the SEDAR process as well. At some point, you have to go with what you have, right? You can always revisit in the future as new data comes in. I mean, that's sort of the way science works. But if you wait until all the data are in, you'll never make a decision about anything. Now, this is not a comment about this issue in particular, just more in general, that sometimes you have to go with the best available information at the time because next year there may be something new at which

time you can revisit. But if you continue to wait on everything, we'd never get a stock assessment done, for example.

So, the information that you have is likely better than what you use to make the decision five years ago, or 10 years ago. So, I would caution that inactivity, waiting for the ultimate data set, you're going to wait a long time because there'll always be an improvement. But I agree with you on your earlier point about the Science Center working with the SSC.

 GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, one of the issues really has to do with the changes in the reporting methodology that we keep asking the fishers to do. So, that's one of the things that I'm hoping that I have leveled off and we are on the right track. Because that would really deal directly with enhanced reporting.

And secondly, the surveys that are taking place, [inaudible] and the like will have a lot of information provided to the SSC regarding whether it's enhanced reporting, what we're seeing, or if it's really the population that is being reflected in those fishery independent surveys. So, this conversation needs to happen. The Council will have to provide a letter or a memo to the Science Center in the direction that we're trying to figure out when enhanced reporting is done, and this is the data that we have, and this is what we have to use in order to change or to determine that we have overrun the ACLs.

But again, it's a collaborative effort between the Science Center and the Regional Office and the Council, etcetera.

Kevin?

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Yeah. And, Graciela, as you know and maybe as everybody in the room knows, if there is an overage, there's usually a request to the Science Center to investigate that very issue. It's a difficult question. Sometimes it's straightforward, but not always. It can be very difficult. So, as with any data collection program, when you have changes in methodology, you really have to understand how that impacts your data time series.

So, it's very true that as the forms change it changes the pattern in the data and it may not mean that there are fewer fish or more fish, there's better or not as good reporting depending upon the impact of how fishers or fishery independent surveys are run. You know, when you expand it, things change.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, I have Ricardo on a chat there, but I would prefer him to come on audio.

1 2

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Let me say something for the record too. Those people who are via Zoom the record of your intervention will be the audio, not the chat. So, Cristina, you can tell Ricardo, if he's available, so he can talk.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Thanks for the opportunity and for considering me. Ricardo López, for the record. Yes, when we talk about the red hind, I would like to emphasize that I know there are some difficulties in order to use the Lunar calendar, but I still prefer that way. I would like to study, if it's possible, that possibility of using the Lunar calendar in the regulations for the red hind and maybe others, instead of the Gregorian calendar. Recognizing that it could be difficult for law enforcement and for the regulation itself. Thanks for the opportunity.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Ricardo. Before I go to Julian, I want to recognize Council Member James Kreglo and mark him as present for the record and also for our previous motion he was absent. So, I want to mark him as absent in the previous motion before the break. Thanks.

Julian?

JULIAN MAGRAS: As it pertains here to the process that we've been working on for the queen triggerfish for the Saint Thomas/Saint John District. I know there was a lot of discussion on the sizes of the fish that the fishermen were harvesting, and they were not seeing the smallest sizes. I just wanted to put here, in the record so when the SSC looks at it again. I provided Virginia Shervette with those small ones that I retained last month for her to get the life history and that information.

I was able to bring in, I think it was 24 or 25 of the small ones. We don't like to bring them in because, you know, that's our future. But because they were not seeing that in the assessment, I myself collected those individuals and brought them in so she could do the life history on those species.

 So, hopefully, I know Kevin said we can't continue to get new information but I know that was one of the big issues and question at our SSC meeting since we didn't have any of that information. So, at least we'll have that small amount that can be provided to that assessment since it's not completed as yet. Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Kevin?

 KEVIN MCCARTHY: Just to be clear, Julian, we always want new information. We just can't always delay a decision until we have all that we will ever have. Because we'll never have all we'll ever have. I think we're in agreement.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Nelson Crespo.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm curious. Maybe Daniel Matos or Ricardo can answer this question. Eh, what is the status between the new data collection, electronic reporting versus the trip ticket, the paper one? What is the percentage? Did the electronic data reporting increase or is more or less, you know, level 50/50? Because I know that's to improve the data collection.

DANIEL MATOS CARABALLO: The answer for this question is, right now, the paper trip ticket is around 60% of the data collection, and the e-reporting, the electronic trip ticket, is 40%. So, it's increasing the electronic reporting. Thank you for the question.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Daniel. I still want to María to go back to your request about the SSC. I don't--

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: For this one, for the-- you know, because we're talking about different topics here. So, just real quick. Back to the '23 AM Discussion. I think everybody has the guidance that they need. I mean, there's going to be a request for information and then the Southeast Regional Office will work with the Science Center and the Council to gather all the information that is needed to pursue this.

So, I think at the next Council meeting, we can probably make a decision as to, if this is ready for SSC review or something like that. So, I just have one more topic. It is queen triggerfish, the reference points. Here in the presentation it says "SSC will report," but it's not really the SSC, it's the Science Center. I apologize for that.

So, when Kevin is giving his presentation, he will touch on the SEDAR 80, the Queen Triggerfish Assessment. As you all know, Puerto Rico has been completed, this was something that was discussed, I'm going to say like two or three meetings ago, where you all made some decisions regarding the— In the 180th meeting this was discussed. And then, in U.S. Virgin Islands the stock assessment was still not completed. So, it's very possible that during this Council meeting, because Puerto Rico is completed the Council could task staff to begin developing an amendment to implement this for Puerto Rico.

 So, this definitely, we can bring this conversation once Kevin is discussing that. Just to be aware that this is something that the staff will be prepared to work in, because the information is already there. And then, for the U.S. Virgin Islands, once that's ready, then that will be brought back to the Council to report on the outcomes. And correct me if I'm wrong, Kevin, but I think that's what the plan is. And then, at that time, the Council can decide to move forward with amending the plan so this can be implemented but right now it's just Puerto Rico.

4 5

Okay, So, this is all I have. Are there any questions? and if not, we can start discussing the amendments and the actions but I'm open for questions.

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Miguel and then Vance.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay, thank you Mr. Chairman. The easiest one to get out of the way would be, following Kevin and María's intervention, Puerto Rico's amendment we can move it forward. You can have a motion to move that forward so we get the ball rolling on that one.

The other consideration that we have is to allow Graciela, María, and Kevin to put together the question that we need for the SSC to answer. So, if anything, then the chair will work with Graciela to put together that meeting for anything that you need from that. But at this time, Mr. Chairman, probably a motion that will be in order for the Puerto Rican Amendment to move forward.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay Vance.

VANCE VICENTE: Yeah, real quickly, because I'm going to be discussing this in my presentation this afternoon. Nelson, one of our research priorities is to specifically, statistically and scientifically, compare the landing data reported electronically versus the written form. So, that's one of our research priorities.

And second, regarding the rainbow runner. I remember that you requested in the last meeting for me to include it as part of the discussion, even though it wasn't in the agenda. And as you may remember, we did discuss it. The Southeast Fishery Science Center person, I can't remember her name, I'm sorry, she said that she had to look back into this pelagic versus benthic reef behavior of the rainbow runner. But from what I remember, I think that she agreed that it was more pelagic than benthic reef associated. I don't know. Do you remember Nelson? That's as far as I--

1 2

NELSON CRESPO: I thought that the SSC said to move forward to move the rainbow runner to a pelagic species.

VANCE VICENTE: Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, we need to do a motion here. So, we want to put up a screen for a motion. Do you need language?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you for the help with the language. I present a motion to move forward with the queen triggerfish amendment to the IBFMP for Puerto Rico.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: We need a second.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Second.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, we have a motion by Vanessa to move forward with the queen triggerfish amendment to the IBFMP for Puerto Rico. Seconded by J.P. Oriol.

Discussion, sorry. Jack?

JACK MCGOVERN: Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chair. just want to, you know, the Council discussed that assessment back in December. They have an ABC recommendation from the SSC. I think what was discussed there that we needed to update was the ABC OFL and the ACLs and that there may also be a need to update the accountability measures in that amendment as well. And, you know, the IPT will have recommendations for the Council and maybe other things that they want us to look at as well. So, I just want to have that on the record.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Katherine?

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: In the motion, it's not necessary to refer to the island-based FMP for Puerto Rico. When we're dealing with just one of the FMPs, we can just call it the Puerto Rico FMP.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes, I accept the language.

44 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Does the seconder agree with that change?

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Yes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any further discussion? So, we'll take it to a

vote. So, all in favor say "aye."

GROUP: Aye.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Ricardo, I didn't hear you. Did he say it?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: He's writing to me that he agrees with the motion and he's having problems with the audio.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. As long as he agrees. Any nays? Any abstentions? Motion carries.

Now we have Next on the agenda, final action for Framework Amendment 2 to the island-based FMP's update to the spiny lobster overfishing limit, acceptable biological catch and annual catch limits by Sarah Stephenson.

Final Action for Framework Amendment 2 to the Island-Based FMPs:
Updates to the Spiny Lobster Overfishing Limit, Acceptable
Biological Catch, and Annual Catch Limit—Sarah Stephenson, NOAA
Fisheries

SARAH STEPHENSON: Hi, this is Sarah Stephenson. Can you hear me okay?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Okay. Thank you, Cristina, for driving. I'm going to give a quick update on Framework Amendment 2, which is going to update the overfishing limit, acceptable biological catch, and annual catch limit for each island for spiny lobster. And that was based on the 2022 update assessment that was done for the 2019, SEDAR 57 Spiny Lobster Stock Assessments. And there was a stock assessment for each island. So, the update updated each island's values.

Next slide, please.

So, at the last meeting that we had, the Council selected preferred alternatives for each island, which set the ACL for spiny lobster equal to 95 percent of the acceptable biological catch that was recommended by the Council's SSC, stemming from that 2022 update. So, the final draft of the amendment was prepared between the April meeting and now and is ready for your review and final action at this meeting. If you approve the amendment as is, you could submit the amendment for review by the Secretary of Commerce and then we would begin the rulemaking process.

1
2 Next slide. Thank you.

So, Framework Amendment 2, which is available in the briefing book for this meeting, would update those three values for spiny lobster for each island. It is based on best scientific information available because it's based on that 2022 update assessment to the stock assessment. And then if approved, the updated ACLs would be implemented for the next fishing year, the 2024 fishing year. And here, in this table, are the comparison of the ACL. If we take no action, which is that second column, and then the ACLs that are resulting from the preferred alternatives in framework amendment. So, you can see how they change.

Next slide.

So, the amendment, as it is part of what was developed between April and August was a full kind of analysis of the effects. So, biological/ecological effects, the social/economic-- That should say economic, not ecological again. Apologies. --and analyzed each island's change individually.

So, for both Saint Croix and Saint Thomas/Saint John, the ACLs will actually increase from what the baseline is, to what the proposed new ACLs are. So, for those effects, you might have short term negative effects, from more lobster being removed, but long-term positive effects from managing to the maximum sustainable yield. Because that's what the stock assessments do, they want to get us at that MSY level.

On the social economic analysis, you would have short-term positive effects from increased revenues and fishing opportunities. And then, long-term positive effects from sustainably managing the stock. And you'll see that double asterisk there, those benefits would really only be applicable if fishermen do take advantage of the increased fishing opportunities and harvest to that new higher ACL. If they choose to continue harvesting at the rate that they're at, then there likely wouldn't be any positive or negative changes to the fishers.

 So, for Puerto Rico, which the ACL decreases slightly from the baseline to the proposed ones for your biological/ecological effects, you're going to have short term positive effects from decreased removals, meaning they wouldn't be able to take as many lobsters.

Sorry, my computer just crashed. Hopefully you didn't lose me.

So, decrease in ACL, biological/ecological. But that decrease removal is really only applicable if they're fishing in federal waters because these ACLs are only applicable in federal waters. it doesn't govern state waters. So, but they would also have long term positive effects from managing to the MSY.

For the social/economic, you would have short term negative effects from not being able to harvest as much lobster and the decrease in fishing opportunities. Again, that's specific to where they fish, state versus federal waters. But there would be long term positive effects from sustainably managing the stock.

Next slide.

And then as part of the briefing book, we also submitted the regulatory text, which is kind of a preview of what the regulations are going to look like online. And so, just in case you wanted to see it, the draft regulatory text will state, for Puerto Rico, which is part 622.440, the ACL is 357,629 pounds, round weight, and it has a conversion in kilograms. And then Saint Croix, the ACL is 137,254. And then for Saint Thomas/Saint John the ACL is 133,207.

So, that's what the regulatory text is. There's a header which is applicable to each of those parts. So, the header does say spiny lobster. So, even though these statements don't say spiny lobster, it's clear that those ACLs are applicable to lobster.

And I believe -- Next slide. I believe that's it. Oh, no, there's next steps. Next slide, please. Sorry, I'm seeing--

Okay, So, next steps. So, you can, if you approve the framework as it is, you can submit that today for secretarial review and that would be by motion. There is a section of the amendment that isn't completed or wasn't completed at the time. The amendment was submitted to the briefing book, and it was just missing some costs associated with preparing the amendment. We've since received those from the economist, but they will just need to be updated from what's the version that's in the briefing book. So, in light of that and any other minor editorial changes that might be found in doing a final kind of review of the amendment, you could allow the chair to approve any editorial changes made to the amendment and that would be another motion to do so.

And then, if you do make those motions, NMFS would begin rulemaking. There would be a proposed rule that would include opportunity for the public to comment. And then, the final rule would likely be completed sometime in early 2024, and that's when

those new regulations, the new ACLs would be effective.

And next slide. With that, I'll take any questions if you have any.

Question/Comments

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Not a question, but, Cristina, can you go back to the next steps? Okay, Sarah, for the next step, Council submits framework amendment 2 for secretarial review. So, that would be the motion at this time during this day?

SARAH STEPHENSON: Right. So, I believe the motion would say something along the lines of that the Council approves the framework amendment 2 to you know, each of the FMPs. The Puerto Rico FMP, the Saint Croix FMP and the Saint Thomas/Saint John FMP with alternative 3 selected. So, that's stating that you would like to set the ACL at 95 percent of the ABC and then you submit the amendment to the Secretary of Commerce for approval.

So that would kind of, it's a long motion, but it would be something along that that encompasses, you've seen the amendment, you agree with the preferred alternative that was selected and you're ready to the secretary. So, that would be kind of the language you would want for that course.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Sarah, can we have use your abilities with the chat and you can write that language in the chat so we can put it on the screen?

SARAH STEPHENSON: Sure. I can work with-- Is it Cristina? I can work with Cristina.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yes. So, we have a chance to start the motion.

Mr. Chairman, while we write the motion, does anybody have a question regarding the presentation of Sarah at this time?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Vanessa?

 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: I have a question, in the case of Puerto Rico, about the numbers. If we already know that for the past two years, we have gotten closures because of the best data available and we already know that the data is increasing, we also know that we have more fishermen now and that these numbers are going up, why is the data and the ACL going down?

SARAH STEPHENSON: So, thank you Vanessa for that question. The

numbers are kind of resultant directly from the update assessment. And so, this wasn't a full SEDAR assessment with new data streams and new information like what you just suggested, it was just strictly an update based on the data that was used in that original one. So, it's kind of limited in what it can consider in my opinion-- And sorry, this is just my opinion, so if the Science Center wants to weigh in with additional information, I would love that. But it was just a straight, kind of like, let's take the numbers that were used for the SEDAR and let's refresh them with more recent years of data, but not necessarily new types, information like what you just suggested about, you know, we have more fissures and that kind of information.

So that information, what you just suggested or explained would be used in the next full SEDAR assessment for spiny lobster, which is what we were just discussing earlier with the terms of reference. So, for now even though it's still considered best scientific information because it was an update to an assessment, like I said, it can only handle what was put into it. And so, we are aware that we had an accountability measure triggered and applied for last year for lobster. And a lot of that is as I mentioned in the presentation—

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Sarah, we are not hearing you. Do you hear us?

SARAH STEPHENSON: Oh, sorry. I can hear you. You can't hear me? No. Um.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Sarah, do you hear us now?

SARAH STEPHENSON: I can hear you. Can you hear me?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Yes.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Okay, okay. I see that they can hear me. Sorry about that. Did you hear any of my, kind of, response or none of it?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: We heard a little bit.

SARAH STEPHENSON: A little bit. Okay. So, Vanessa, from what you did hear, does that answer your question or no? Would you like me to keep explaining?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Well, I just want to ask you if there's any possibility that we stay, in the case of Puerto Rico, with no action?

1

SARAH STEPHENSON: I don't believe so, because this is based on an update to a stock assessment. And so, we're required to kind of, when new information like that comes in that's been deemed best scientific information, we're required to use it.

read it for the record. "Motion to approve the Framework Amendment

2: Update the Overfishing Limit, Acceptable Biological Catch and

Annual Catch Limit for spiny lobster." Is that correct? Or do we

that real quick. Okay. Sorry, I wasn't doing two things at once,

so when I started talking, my hands stopped typing. So, I just

dropped it in the chat, Cristina, hopefully you can see it. And

it's just really to kind of add to that statement that it's to

each of the FMPs with the alternative three selected as the

preferred and to submit it to the Secretary of Commerce for

Thank you.

SARAH STEPHENSON: So, you could probably just copy all of that and put it right after the word spiny lobster. And then, just put

"to." After lobster, put the word "to" T O. And then, the rest of

it should just read okay. And that kind of just cements all of the

actions and alternatives as they were presented in the framework

record. I think you could add to that, that the Council moves to

Did you get that, Cristina?

So, Sarah, the language for the motion I will

I'm going to add something to the tail end of

Sarah, could you write your comment to

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jack McGovern, for the

Okay, thanks.

Yes. Okay.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Okay, thank you.

need to add something else?

approval. So, it's just kind of--

the one that says presentations?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ:

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ:

SARAH STEPHENSON:

CARLOS FARCHETTE:

CARLOS FARCHETTE:

JACK MCGOVERN:

6

7

VANESSA RAMÍREZ:

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN:

SARAH STEPHENSON:

8

9

10

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

CARLOS FARCHETTE:

and the Council's intent for those.

Jack.

Council moves -- up on top, right? In the

approve framework amendment 2 and then the rest of that text.

54

```
1 beginning, Jack? In the beginning, right? Yeah.
```

James, do you want to read that out? As a motion?

JAMES R. KREGLO: James Kreglo, for the record. The Council moves to approve Framework Amendment 2, Update the Overfishing Limit, Acceptable Biological Catch, and Annual Catch Limit for spiny lobster to the Puerto Rico, Saint Croix, Saint Thomas/Saint John Fishery Management Plans with Alternative 3 selected as the preferred alternative for each action, and submit the amendment to the Secretary of Commerce for approval.

13 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Need a second?

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Second.

17 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any discussion? Okay, all in favor say "aye."

GROUP: Aye.

21 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any nays?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: No.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any abstentions. Okay. So, we have five "yes" and one "no." No, four and one.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Oh, Ricardo. Right, Ricardo. I'm sorry, I didn't get Ricardo's response. What was it?

32 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: He said, "no."

34 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Oh, okay, So, two no's. Four and two.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: I'm sorry. I do not agree.

36 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Cristina, son cuatro "yes," dos "no."

38 Mr. Chairman, I suggest to do a roll call for the vote. So, you don't have any [inaudible] like this, you know.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Yeah, that'll be a little more organized.
So, I'll start with Kreglo.

44 JAMES R. KREGLO: Yes.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Yes.

48 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: No.

1 2 JACK MCG

JACK MCGOVERN: Yes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Ricardo.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: I changed my decision. Yes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

10 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Ahora son cinco y uno.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, the motion is, "The Council moves to approve Framework Amendment 2: Update the Overfishing Limit, Acceptable Biological Catch, and Annual Catch Limit for spiny lobster to the Puerto Rico, Saint Croix, and Saint Thomas/Saint John Fishery Management Plan with Alternative 3 selected as a preferred alternative for each action and submit the amendment to the Secretary of Commerce for approval."

We have five "yes" and one "no." Miguel?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, Graciela and I were talking and rather than cutting the next presentation and discussion Diana is going to check on lunch. So, we can have lunch but instead of coming back at 1:30, we propose to come back at 1 o'clock. So, we're going to lose that amount of time.

María?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: We have not finished with this action. There are still some things that need to be taken care of before we move forward. I would allow Sarah to continue.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Can she do that in 10 minutes, or can she come back at one o'clock?

37 MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Oh, yes. This is fast.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you. Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Yes. Thank you, María. It's really just to make those other two small motions to allow the Chair to review any editorial changes and then also for the Council to approve the regulatory texts.

So, I did put both of those in the chat. The first one, the Council

moves to allow staff to make editorial non substantive changes to Framework Amendment 2. Any changes will be reviewed by the Council Chair. So, that's the first motion, and then the motion to redeem the regulations. The Council moves to redeem the regulations presented as necessary and appropriate for implementing Framework Amendment 2 and to give the Council Chair the authority to deem any modifications made to the proposed rule as necessary and appropriate for implementing framework amendment 2.

So, it's very wordy, but there they have it. And so, feel free to change the language if you like. But that will help us just walk away from this meeting with everything that we know we need to do and start rulemaking for you.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, Mr. Chairman. We have the two motions on the screen and we need somebody to move it, second it and go forward with it.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: The Council move to allow staff to make editorial non-substantive changes to Framework Amendment 2. Any changes will be reviewed by the Council Chair. I So, move.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Second?

25 CARLOS FARCHETTE: We need a second.

27 JAMES R. KREGLO: Second.

29 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any discussion on that? All in favor say "aye."

GROUP: Aye.

33 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any nays?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Ricardo's vote?

37 RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes, I agree.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Ricardo. Any nays? Any abstentions? 40 Hearing none, motion carries.

42 Second one?

44 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So again, we need a mover for this one.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: The Council moves to deem the regulations presented by staff as necessary and appropriate for implementing Framework Amendment 2 and to give the Council Chair, the authority

1	to deem any modifications made to the proposed rule as necessary
2	and appropriate for implementing Framework Amendment 2.
3	
4 5	CARLOS FARCHETTE: Need a second.
6	JAMES R. KREGLO: Second.
7	DAMES K. KREGEO. Second.
8	CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, James. Any discussion? Hearing none
9	All in favor say "aye."
10	
11	GROUP: Aye.
12	
13	RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes.
14	
15 16	CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Ricardo. Any nays? Any abstention
16 17	Hearing none, motion carries.
18	MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: ¿María, ya terminamos? So, Mr. Chairman. So, i
19	you all agree, lunch is across the door, and then we can go back
20	at one o'clock to save time? You will all do that?
21	
22	CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay, yes So, we're breaking for lunch. We're
23	on recess, be back at one.
24	
25	(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on August 15, 2023.)
26 27	
28	
29	AUGUST 15, 2023
30	
31	TUESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION
32	
33	
34	CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, we're going to get started any second there
35	now, since it's six after one. Seven after one. ¿Estamos, Cristina
36	¿Estoy bien? Okay.
37	On the section to continue with the country of the Device
38 39	So, we're going to continue with the agenda. It will be the Review on Final Action for Amendment 2 to the Island-Based FMPs: Trawl
39 40	and Net Gear and Descending Device, with María.
41	and het dear and bescending bevice, with matra.
42	Review and Final Action for Amendment 2 to the Island-Based
43	FMPs: Trawl and Net Gear and Descending Devices-María López-

FMPs: Trawl and Net Gear and Descending Devices-María López-Mercer, NOAA Fisheries

44

45

46

47

48

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just to clarify, we are, as we discussed earlier this morning, at this time, we're not going to be requesting final action because there's still a couple of things that need to be addressed. But we will be discussing this amendment in full.

So, okay. So, Cristina, if you can put the presentation.

So, this is an amendment to each one of the fishery management plans. This one deals with trawl gear other types of net gear such as gillnet, trammel net, purse seines, and also the use of descending devices for reducing fish mortality. This is an amendment that you have all seen and discussed several meetings.

Next slide.

During the last Council meeting in April, the Council reviewed version number three of the amendment and selected preferred alternatives for all action. The IPT finalized the development of Amendment 2, there's a version 3.2 in the briefing book that was included in the briefing book a couple of weeks ago for your review. But the IPT is now requesting revision of actions 1B, 2B, and 3B, which is the one that deals with gillnets in all three islands, before moving forward. That table that I'm showing in here is so you can orient yourselves in terms of how the actions were organized per request of the Council.

Action 1 deals with Puerto Rico, all trawl, gillnets, trammel nets, and purse seines. As you can see, if you follow the column, Action 1(a) is trawl, Action 1(b) is gillnets, 1(c) is Trammels, and Action 1(d) is Purse seines. And there's a similar organization for Saint Croix, which is Action 2, with the sub actions being 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), and 2(d). And then, for Saint Thomas and Saint John, it's Action 3, 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), 3(d). So, most of these sub-actions are pretty much the same. And the way that the Council decided to go, in terms of deciding what was going to be the preferred alternative, is very similar among the three islands.

Action number four we didn't divide it by island like this, but the Council had the opportunity to choose something different for each one of the islands, and this one is the one that deals with the descending devices.

So, in the next slide— if you can go, please. I'm going to discuss the purpose and need first, and then in the next slide I'm going to give you just a high overview of the actions and what you chose as a preferred alternative. I don't think at this time, unless the Council wants to go revisit any one of them, I think you already had a good rationale for making the decisions on the preferred alternative. However, again, we're going to be discussing again the action for the gillnets. But before that, I just wanted to

show you the statement of the purpose and need, because we're going to need to review it a little bit to ensure that whatever we are doing complies with this purpose and need.

So, the purpose of this amendment is to prevent potential damage to habitats, including essential fish habitat, from certain gear types. Protect species associated with such habitats, as well as to promote best fishing practices and enhance the survival of released fish in the exclusive economic zones 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. And for the benefits of our new member, in all of the amendments that we have, we include a statement of a purpose and need, which is something that will guide the way that we develop our actions and the alternatives that we're using to answer that question.

Okay, next slide.

Okay. In here, this is the summary of the actions with their preferred alternative as included in the draft amendment, in the document that was included in your briefing book. For actions 1(a), 2(a), and 3(a), remember everything that has a 1 is Puerto Rico, everything that has a 2 is Saint Croix, everything with a 3 is Saint Thomas and Saint John. These actions will modify the use of trawl gear in federal waters around each one of the islands. You all chose Prefer Alternative 3 for each one of the islands, which is prohibit the use of trawl gear for all fishing in the EEZ around Puerto Rico, or Saint Croix, or Saint Thomas and Saint John. For Action 1(c), 2(c), and 3(c) -- note that I skipped (b) because it's a gillnet and we'll go through that in detail soon -- this one will modify the use of trammel nets in federal waters around Puerto Rico, San Croix, and Saint Thomas/Saint John, respectively. You chose as a preferred alternative, Alternative 2, which is to prohibit the use of trammel nets for all fishing in the EEZ around Puerto Rico, Saint Croix, or Saint Thomas and Saint John. Actions 1(d), 2(d), and 3(d) modify the use of purse seines in federal waters around Puerto Rico, Saint Croix, and Saint Thomas, and Saint John, respectively. You all--

I'm sorry, what happened? I think we're having some issues with the internet. Give us a moment. Please. There you go. Thank you.

So, I was in purse seine, So, you all chose alternative two, which is prohibit the use of purse seines for all fishing in the EEZ around each one of the islands. The rationale for all of these decisions that you made and an analysis of each one of the

alternatives is included in the document. I invite you to review the document in case you have any questions. I will be happy to answer questions about this.

The next slide, please. Can you go to the next one first, please? I think I'm missing-- Let's see. Can you go back? Two more please. I think we skipped one. Go back. Back. That one. One more. Yeah. Sorry for that. Nope. Nope. Nope. We're going too fast. The next one. This one. Okay.

Action four. So, this is the last action. I apologize for that. It's the requirements for the use of descending devices in the reef fish component of the Puerto Rico, Saint Croix in Saint Thomas/Saint John. This is the Alternative 2, that you all chose as a preferred and it is to require that a descending device be on board a commercial or recreational vessel and readily available for use while fishing for or possessing species in the reef fish component of the Puerto Rico, Saint Croix, and Saint Thomas, and Saint John. And I'm not going to go into detail because we already discussed that during our past meeting unless there are questions. but these are the definition and the requirements that you all decided to include in the definition of the descending device.

And to remind you, the descending device, this is not a requirement to use the descending device because of course the use of a descending device will depend on the condition of the fish. The requirement is for you to have a descending device, which can be easily made, you can, you can make one in your house with materials that you probably already have. The amendment also have some information and I believe that the Outreach and Education Advisory Panel has some information on how to obtain descending devices or how to prepare some descending devices too. But you should have one on board in case the fish, the reef fish, the managed reef fish that you are fishing for, want to fish for, is showing signs of barotrauma so you can return it to the water. In this sense we are trying to reduce or minimize the fishing mortality of this fish that you're returning because it's usually some sort of bycatch.

Okay, let's go to the next slide.

Okay, so, the way that we decided to do this presentation is taking this action by itself. This is the action of the gillnets. During the last time, you had already made decisions about how you wanted to see the alternatives, and you made a decision of which one you wanted to do as a preferred.

 So, as I mentioned earlier, the IPT had some questions about things that perhaps could be included in an alternative, if the Council wants, to make the alternative more clear[inaudible] easier to enforce, and also to comply with the purpose and the need of the amendment.

So, the way that I'm going to do this, I would like to go through the alternative, say what we have, the differences. And then, in the next slides, I'm going to explain what is the type of information that we need, so we can all start thinking about how we want to address this. I also have some examples of suggestions of how we can do this. And then, I'm going to separate this by island. So, I'm going to start with Saint Croix, then Saint Thomas, and then Puerto Rico. Because there are some differences. And again, this is what island-based is for, right? So, when I am discussing Saint Croix and Saint Thomas, I would like for the representatives of Puerto Rico to pay some attention to what we are discussing to see if there's any benefit of doing the things that we are discussing for the U.S. Virgin Islands for Puerto Rico.

Okay. So, let's do this. So, the Alternative 1, the way that you have it in the amendment, it says no auction, No action. 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-federally managed species in the EEZ around Puerto Rico or Saint Croix, or Saint Thomas—— Remember it's the same alternative for everybody. It's just that it's divided by island. ——and as a prohibited gear type for reef fish and spiny lobster in the EEZ around Puerto Rico or Saint Croix, or Saint Thomas/ Saint John and inside Council Seasonally Closed Areas or Council Marine Managed Areas.

This is the no action alternative. As you know, this is management as it currently exists. What we call the action alternatives are the alternatives that come after this one. In this case, Alternative 2 and then difference of alternatives. It could be another Alternative 3. But in this case, we have divided alternative 2, 2a, 2b, 2c Those are called the actions alternative, which is what is being proposed for change.

 Alternative 2 will prohibit the use of gillnets in the EEZ around Puerto Rico or Saint Croix or Saint Thomas/Saint John, and then Sub-alternative 2a will say, well, let's prohibit that for all fishing, which means that in federal waters of the EEZ around each one of these islands, there's no use of gillnets. I want to remind, remind you guys that, right now, I know that Alternative 1 is a little convoluted here, but right now there is no use of gillnets allowed for reef fish or for spiny lobster in federal waters. This

has been in place for many years.

4 5

From the managed species, the only species that can still be harvested with gillnets, in federal waters, will be the pelagic species because this pelagic species are new to management. We just recently started doing this, managing this species and that is the reason why the Council requested we address this, right? So, we can manage the species with the consistent regulations like we do for reef fish. Because, you know, looking at the effects on the populations that potentially cause bycatch to those pelagic species.

Again, this sub-alternative 2a will then prohibit the use of gillnets in all federal waters. If you prohibit the use of the gillnets, then there's no worries here about bycatch of species that are managed or on species that are undersized or juveniles, etcetera. So, that reduces that impact, biological impact.

Sub-alternative 2b is the one that the Council chose as the preferred for all three islands. It says, Prohibit the use of gillnets in the EEZ around Puerto Rico or Saint Croix or Saint Thomas and John for all fishing except for the following fish species belonging to the halfbeaks, the gar, and flyingfish. The sub-alternative 2b, for Puerto Rico, includes those three families, but also included the bigeye scad or the goggleye, which is something that Virgin Islands did not want to include in their alternative.

I will continue reading the sub-alternative 2b. A surface gillnet used in the EEZ around Puerto Rico or Saint Croix or Saint Thomas/Saint John to fish for any baitfish must be tended at all times. Mesh size must not be smaller than 0.75-inch square or 1.5-inch stretch. Must be used 20 feet or more above the bottom. This is what we currently have-- what we present, sorry --what we presented to you during the last Council meeting where you made this decision. There was a sub-alternative 2c, which is basically prohibiting the use of gillnets in the EEZ around each one of the islands for fishing for managed pelagics, federally managed pelagics.

 So, we are requesting clarification to ensure compliance with the purpose and need, authority under the Magnuson-Stevens Act for regulating non-FMP species and consistency with state regulations where applicable or needed.

Okay. Can we go to the next slide, please?

So, these are the items that we would like to address. Number one,

species that are not managed by the Council, or what we call in here non-FMP species, and how they relate to the purpose and need of Amendment 2. What this means is that you saw in sub-alternative 2b, in the text above— can you go to the previous one real quick, I want to show it so we don't get a little bit lost here.

That sub-alternative 2b, those fish species belonging to the halfbeaks, gar, and flyingfish, those are species that we do not manage. The Council doesn't manage them right now. So, this is what we call non-FMP species. So, it's important for the Council to clarify, how they want those gillnet requirements to apply to those non-FMP species and we will have some suggestions on how to address this. Because these are species that are obviously not managed by the Council, so we have to ensure that what we do with those species is for the benefit of managed species and these are action that we can actually take.

So, that's one thing. Let's go to the next one, please. I'll provide more details soon.

So basically, the second one, is that there needs to be more specification on the mesh size for the surface gillnet because we have been talking about a surface gillnet in here and some other requirements. We need to also discuss consistency of regulations with the state as needed. For example, the way that the alternative is phrased right now is the same way that very similar to what the U.S. Virgin Islands has in their regulations. So, it will be important for the Council to discuss if their interest to have consistency with these regulations or if there's any other changes that are needed.

We should probably start thinking about if there are any enforcement issues, if there are differences between what we will allow in federal waters versus what we have in state waters, obviously depending on the need, because we know that there are some fisheries that are conducted in state waters and others that are not, and therefore federal waters. We can talk about landing species and the number of fishes participating in the net fisheries, because if you remember from the last time there was testimony from the fishers that barely nobody uses gillnets in federal waters. It's very minimal, because of course this type of gillnets, surface gillnets, is mostly used for certain species of baitfish and this is a fishery that mostly occurs in state waters. So, we can talk about that and then we'll see what the landings are telling us about it.

We can clarify, what do we mean with those baitfish species if there is a need to not call them baitfish species and then just

use a different term, right? As long as we are all good with what is the purpose, what we want to accomplish with that subalternative.

Okay, the last one clarified whether there is a need to distinguish between non-FMP pelagic species and other non-FMP species, and we'll leave that one for the end.

So, let's go to the next slide.

Okay. So, for the first one. Non-FMP species and how they relate to the purpose and need of Amendment 2. These are just some guiding questions. This action includes regulations that pertain to fishing for non-managed species. And as you know, we currently allow gillnets in federal waters for the harvest of non-managed species. So basically, this action is asking to further restrict that usage. So, that's something to keep in mind. Does the action provide benefit to federally managed species? Does it comply with the purpose of reducing bycatch of target or not target species? And this is not meant for you to answer it right now, but just a little bit of thinking about the kind of information that we need.

For specifying surface gillnet mesh size and other requirements. This is something that perhaps the Council will want to get some clarification, because the way that the alternative is created right now, it says that the size of the mesh cannot be less than 0.75 or 1.5 stretch. And one of the things that the IPT was requesting was that the size of the mesh needs to be specified. It's either that specific size or is it a different size that have a minimum or a maximum so that it can be enforced, because otherwise, it will be very difficult to enforce.

For number three, consistency of regulation with states as needed. Enforcement issues. We want to ensure that the Council's intent, if that was the intent, was that Puerto Rico, Saint Croix, and Saint Thomas/Saint John have consistent gillnet regulations among them, because this is the way we kind of said it last time. Because the three islands chose the same thing, but we need to see if this is the best route. If you guys are okay with it, we'll move forward. If not, then, you know, this is a good opportunity to have more discussions.

 Okay, and then—— So, I'm just going to go to the questions. How does the Council want to specify the mesh size requirements in a way that makes it clear that it will reduce the potential for bycatch? For example, can the mesh size in sub-alternative 2b include a specific size or a minimum/max size? Which is what I just said.

1 2

4 5

 Intent. Are we wanting to be consistent? Is it okay to have a difference as long as it's enforceable? Is there a need? Because as you have said, there's some species that are caught in state water versus others that are in federal waters. Should the subalternative specify the number of surface nets allowed per boat? What will be the implication if a fishing vessel possesses a gillnet that does not meet these specifications?

Let's go to the next slide. I plan to stop at some point so we can start answering these questions and have this discussion.

This is an example from the regulations of the U.S. Virgin Islands. I took this from the commercial fishing guide. As you can see, it's very similar to what you guys already have in Sub-alternative 2b, but the difference is, when it says, in the second it says, Surface gillnets must be tended at all times, which we already have. May not be more than 1,800 feet in length as measured by the float line; we don't have that. And may not be used within 20 feet of the bottom; we do have that. Mesh size may not be smaller than 0.75-inch square or 1.5-inch stretch. Only one 18 feet bait net is permitted per boat. We do need, it will be advisable for the Council to specify, how many nets are allowed in a boat.

The more conservative you are with these regulations the better it is for the purpose and need, because we are trying to reduce bycatch of species that we manage. Restricted gill and trammel nets may not be possessed onboard vessels in Territorial waters. Again, these are the regulations, exactly as I took them from the Fisher's booklet. Okay. We don't have any restrictions, right now, set for possession, but it's advisable to include that on the text of the regulation.

Okay, next slide.

Now, I just want to give a little bit of background. None of this information is new. We have discussed this in the past, but this is important and relevant for this topic.

Net gear types reported to catch managed and non-managed reef fish and pelagic species and other non-managed species in federal and state waters around Saint Croix include gillnets, such as surface gillnets that are used with scuba, cast nets, drop nets, seine net, and beach seines. This is strictly from your commercial catch report forms and from the literature.

Federal regulations allow for the use of gillnets for the commercial harvest of non-federally managed species (for example,

ballyhoo or flying fish, pelagics) -- It doesn't specify which species, right? Because those are species we don't manage, except for the pelagics that we're managing now, but this is an example of what these gillnets are used or may be used for in the federal waters at this time. --subject to a requirement that the gear be tended at all times, and the use of gillnets is prohibited year-round for fishing for spiny lobster and federally managed reef fish.

4 5

U.S.V.I. regulations prohibit the use of gillnets in territorial waters, except for surface gillnets for the harvest of certain species of baitfish, which is what you just saw. Most of the gillnet landings reported from Saint Croix waters are from surface gillnets.

Okay, let's go to the next slide.

And this is a table that came straight from the amendment that you have in your briefing book. What this is saying is that from landings, from commercial catch report forms, over a 10-year period, the only federally managed species harvested with surface gillnets from federal waters around Saint Croix was redtail parrotfish and it was confidential data. Which means, three or less fishermen reported landing with this gear type. It was very very little. The two non-managed species shown as harvested with surface gillnets from federal waters around Saint Croix—And this, again, this is from the commercial catch report forms. —were ballyhoo and needlefish.

Landings from "unknown" waters include flyingfish and bigeye scad. "Unknown" waters means that it wasn't determined, it wasn't marked at the time that the landings were entered if this fishing occur in state or in federal waters, okay?

 Now, in terms of how many people have fished with surface gillnet in federal waters? Very, very little. We're talking about in a period of ten years, less than five fishers, and there's years that nobody has reported fishing with surface gillnets either in state or federal waters. So, what I'm trying to say in here is that the landings corroborate what you guys have been saying, that it's something that it's not very used, okay?

Okay, let's go to the next one.

 Let's go now to Saint Thomas and Saint John. Managed species reported with surface gillnets in Saint Thomas/Saint John commercial landings from 2012 through 2021 are all from state waters and include red hind, coney, yellowtailed snapper, and blue

runner. All landings are very minor, sporadic through time, and confidential, which means that less than three fishers reported. So that's information that we consider confidential. Again, super, super minimal.

Non-managed species reported with surface gillnets are all from state waters and include herrings and ballyhoo. During the 10-year period ending in 2021, the number of fishermen reporting landings with gillnets was between zero and two. This tells us that, again, that's very, very minimal.

Okay. So, let's just start this discussion. Let's go to the-- and again, Puerto Rico, we'll deal with Puerto Rico after we address U.S. Virgin Islands. Can you go to the next slide?

Okay, So, this is the current text that we have in the draft amendment. There were a few changes, nothing too major, that we did in the amendment. For example, we added surface gillnets in separate and different instances. Nothing that really changed, but this is the text that we have right now in the amendment. Okay? And again, these are the questions that we want to answer in here.

Are these species harvested from federal waters? And we're talking about this particular species. And you'll see that maybe it's not that important that we specify the species because, again, we don't manage the species, but that's the question. Is there any bycatch from this mesh size? Will this alternative minimize bycatch? Is there a need to continue to allow the use of surface gillnets for baitfish in federal waters if their use is so minimal?

And now, what do we want to address? We want to respecify the mesh size. These are our assignments so we can get out of here with something more concrete that we can bring to the IPT. We want to specify a length of the net. We want to specify the number of nets allowed per boat. For example, the U.S. Virgin Islands have one per boat. We want to clarify, what do we mean with baitfish? Okay? And we want to include possession restrictions.

Okay. So, on the next slide we have some suggested text. But before we go there, I would like to ask the Council if they want to discuss some of these questions. I think we can go back to the slide before. Like, how do we like-- Can a discussion be had so that we can answer some of these questions.

Go ahead, Miguel.

Questions/Comments

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: María, how do you pref-- because there's a lot of things in your presentation that we need Council action. Do you want to start with this one and then guide the discussion, please?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yeah, what I would like to do, what I would suggest the Council to do is to go to where it says here, "To address: re-specify mesh size, specify length of the net, specify the number of nets," etcetera. And provide a rationale of doing so. I don't think this is going to be a huge change to what we already have. It's more just to make it more clear, unless the Council feels that there's a different way of dealing with this.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, I did quite a bit of homework on this.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Good.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: And I want to start off—Before I go to these questions, I want to start off with what you had on the screen earlier, but don't bring it up, about the surface gillnets for redtail parrotfish. That's impossible. It's a reef fish. It's a bottom fish. There's no catching of redtail on the surface, with a surface gillnet.

In speaking with the fishermen that use the bait nets, specified here, the 0.75 and 1,800-foot nets, are only used in territorial waters. For catching ballyhoo, for catching jacks, which is the bigeye scad, which is a different net, and I'm going to talk a little bit about that method of fishing. Because when you fish for bigeye scad, it must be done in waters no deeper than 80 or 90 feet. It takes three to four boats. One boat carries the net because it's very large and about eight divers, because that's how they work the net. They work it with divers and they actually, the divers go down below and try and purse it to keep that ball of fish trapped. And when they get it up to the boat, they use what they call, it's a bully net, but it's a homemade bully net, where they scoop that fish out and put it onto another boat, so that boat brings in just the catch.

It's impossible for the divers to work in deep waters outside the three miles because of the currents and the depth of the water and the kind of tiger sharks that come around there when they start to hear that fish fighting in that bully net. So, it's something that really doesn't happen in territorial waters. I mean, sorry, it doesn't happen in federal waters.

Now, when it comes to mesh size. The specific mesh size for the ballyhoo net is 0.75 minimum mesh size. But there is a net that the fishers, and I'm going to let Gerson speak to that, for

flyingfish. It's the same mesh size, but it's a very small net. And it's a net that is not just deployed out in the ocean and hope that it's going to catch flyingfish. The fishers have to attract the flyingfish to the boat before they deploy the net. So, there is actually zero bycatch of other species, particularly because of the mesh size. And I think that's what I have for now.

4 5

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Carlos, thank you so much for bringing all that information. It's precisely the information that we need. And as you see, one of the questions that we have is— it's right there. It says, "If the use of surface gillnets is minimal in federal waters, is there a need to continue to allow?" In my understanding, based on what you said, there's some fishing for flyingfish that occurs in federal waters that you guys would like to continue to allow, even if it's minimal. That's kind of like what you were implying?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah. And the length of the net is very short. It's not 1,800 feet.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. So, did anybody else have any other questions or any other comments with respect to U.S. Virgin Islands?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No. What I was thinking is that Gerson has some information that you wanted to talk about. The flyingfish, the type of net that they use so we can introduce it to the record and help María with the information that she needs.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Right. So, Gerson, if you-- because you are a fisher that uses this net, if you want to add additional information. So now, after we collect information from both of the islands, we go to the next slide and if you guys want to make some changes to the language on that alternative based on what you guys are saying here, then we have that background info. Go ahead.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: The information you have about the 1,800-feet, that was all information on ballyhoo nets. Carlos and I was talking about the method. The fishery for flyingfish doesn't produce bycatch for the reason that when you're targeting flyingfish, that's the only thing you will see there. You can have pelagics that attack them, but the schools of open water fish run differently to the reef fish. The reef fish, you have everything together out there. When you're targeting flying fish, the only species that come there are them. The way we do it, and for the reason that Carlos said, that the nets are much shorter, you can use a net up to 200, maybe 300 feet if you push it. But the method I learned from José Alberto Sánchez was to shunt the fish in, put

them in a spawning mood and with such a short net, it's just retrieving, taking out the flyingfish and deploying again. And that's a constant thing that you do until you get the specific amount that you need for that.

Another thing. Don't believe that we go there every day and catch hundreds of pounds of flyingfish because that species is a funny species to catch in the way that you need the right current, you need the right temperature of water, you need the fish to be in that mood and specifically has to be calm waters. In Barbados, they do, I've seen videos of them doing it in any weather, but we've tried it and we have not been successful in catching the numbers that we need. But when the weather is right, temperature, flat weather, no birds around because they are very scared fish. Anything that goes over them, a shadow, even yourself, will scare that school away. But don't believe that we will catch thousands and thousands [inaudible] fish. It doesn't happen that way. And the most that we need is like 300 feet. You don't need more than that. One net.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you very much, Gerson. Any other comments from the U.S. Virgin Islands?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Julian?

JULIAN MAGRAS: Well, in the Saint Thomas/Saint John district, we don't fish for those species in federal waters. We are fishing for all of them in local waters except for the flyingfish. We don't have a flyingfish fishery in Saint Thomas/Saint John. It's mostly from Saint Croix.

When the fishers from the Saint Thomas/Saint John district need, they would buy them from Mr. Sánchez, for fishing. So, yes. So, what I was going to make a comment to try to make it a little easier for enforcement, was to combine the local regulations with the federal regulations on this particular issue. Because some of the questions that are asked are already answered in the Virgin Islands law. And I think, in this case, it would fit where you can have the regulations the same. The only thing that I'm hearing different, out of what we have, is the 1,800 feet is not really necessarily needed for the flyingfish.

 Now, a question to the Saint Croix guys would be, up in Lang Bank, because of the depth of the water, 30 feet and I don't know how shallow it gets there and that Lang Bank fall in shallow water, do any of the guys go there and fish in the ballyhoo with the 1,800 feet nets? Then you wouldn't want to take out the 1,800 feet because it's in federal waters where the Lang Bank is. So, that

would be the only difference. So, that's my comment. Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Gerson?

4 5

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: There are two species of ballyhoo. They are the coastal ballyhoo, which is the yellow beak, right? And then there's the one with the white tip beak, which is a much smaller one. That one you will see in open waters. But the one that we're most successful in catching is the one to the shoreline, which we don't find in the federal waters.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you. Thank you for those comments. You know, this is very helpful in, you know, thinking a little bit about the things that the Council has put in their strategic plan in terms of describing how the fisheries operate, the gear types that are used, this information that has been put on the record is very important for us to be able to accurately characterize how the fisheries operate in the islands, which I think is one of the most important aspects of managing at the island level.

Okay. Mr. Chair, you have a--

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Just one more comment on— It kind of brought back something, when I saw the list of poundage that you had up there. It's, I wouldn't say impossible, but I don't think it has ever occurred in Saint Croix that they harvested 6,000 pounds of ballyhoo in the EEZ. That just doesn't happen, only in territorial.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: And thank you for that clarification. Again, this came from the commercial landings throughout time. So, I'm hoping that— I don't have a specific year because this has been collected throughout the years, not just one specific instance. So, I see that there were no recent landings recorded, so this may be older information. However, you know, that sets the stage for more consistent reporting and it will help us greatly to characterize the fisheries that occur in federal waters versus the ones that do not occur in there.

Okay, So, my suggestion right now would be to move to the next slide which is some suggestions and examples. This one that we have right here.

And again, this is just an example, something that we can base on the conversation that we knew we were going to have today. Alternative 1 does not really change. It's what we already have. And again, what we're talking about here is not Puerto Rico. It is just Saint Croix or Saint Thomas/Saint John. In Saint Croix or Saint Thomas/Saint John, they can both choose something different

if they want. Of course, you know, the more similar they are in their regulations to what they have in state waters, and more similar among each other, I would say that the easier it will be to enforce, but that's for you guys to decide.

Now, for Alternative 2. Prohibit the use of gillnets in federal waters around— Same thing. Alternative 2a for all fishing, it doesn't change. What we're dealing right now here is Subalternative 2b. So, this is some subjective text, but we still have to change some things, okay? based on your testimony right now. For fishing for all federally managed fish species, and limit the use of gillnets in the EEZ around Saint Croix or Saint Thomas/Saint John — because that will be going in their respective section — to fish for non-federally managed fish species.

I think I made a mistake there. It should say to fish for non-federally managed species with surface gillnet that meet the following specifications and requirements: number one, mesh size of the surface gillnet must not be smaller than 0.75 inches square or 1.5-inch stretched. Number two, the surface gillnet must be used 20 feet or more above the bottom. Number three, the surface gillnet must be tended at all times. And in here, we'll probably want to add a number four, which will be the length of the net.

Now, if you see here, there's no mention of species. And again, this is because we are not managing this species. So, our suggestion, our recommendation to the Council here, is just to leave it general as non-FMP species, non-federally managed species and that will take care of that flyingfish or whatever other species that are not managed that you may or may not catch in federal waters based on how the fishery is behaving and depending on when you guys want to go out.

Okay. So, other change in here. Carlos, I think I talked to you a little bit about this. The way that this is created right now, "no smaller than 0.75 inches square or 1.5 inches stretch." It doesn't really set a limit of the net, right? So, you have a couple of options here. You can say, the net must be that one, right? Because the net that is 0.75 inches, when you stretch it is 1.5. But if you put that as a different size, one that it's 1 inch, when it stretches, it's going to be bigger and that's not what you guys want or is that what the U.S. Virgin Islands regulations have? Is that what it was supposed to—— Is that what we're supposed to infer from that? And if that's the case, then we have to have some suggested language and have to fix that. Carlos.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah, I agree with you in that 0.75 to 1.5 stretch. And that stretch, in case people don't know, that's when

the fish hit it, their head might stretch the net to that 1.5. It's not that the net stretches on its own. So, it's a 0.75 and when it hits-- Yeah. You can--

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: The net is a square, but when you put it together, it measures 1.5 from end to end.

 MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. So, my understanding is that that is the net. It's no bigger, no smaller. That's the one. Okay. So, that is clarified. Is that what the Council would like to leave in this alternative then? Okay. So, is there any way that we can put that in the text of the alternative so that it's more clear?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Any suggestions on how to do that? Or we can also do that in house too.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, we should leave here with that language so the staff can have better guidelines. So, María, si puedes ponerlo ahi.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yeah. I'll give it to Liajay. She's going to put it up so we can make changes right there.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. And in this case, does the Council — This is a U.S. Virgin Island regulation, does the Council want to have that compatible regulation equal or similar? Do you want to change any of the language that María is presenting here? That's the question they have.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Miguel, just to clarify, that is exactly the text that they have in the regulations is just that it wasn't clear. So, I think that now that it has been clarified, we write it in our text-- and of course, you know, we'll do some tweaking when we are, writing in the actual regulations. But the important thing in here is what is the Council's intent? And it has been expressed that the Council intent is to have that net to be of that specific size.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. But the other thing is, for the Council discussion, you have to decide whether you want to have compatibility or not. That's the first thing. If we all agree with that, then as María is saying, we have to express in the language that is for the federal government, exactly what you want. In this case, you are saying that 0.75 inches square or 1.5 inches stretched is the net that you want. And if you agree with that, then that's the language that you need to offer to the staff to

follow. And for that, you need to have discussion among yourself to develop the record.

JAMES R. KREGLO: I just wanted to-- I was looking at the V.I. Regulations because that's what we were discussing before. I just don't have the knowledge on nets as far as-- I know some people make their net. Some of them are made commercially by companies. What different sizes they make, for example, on the squares or how far they stretch. So, I just don't have that knowledge myself.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: That's precisely the point of why the Virgin Islands has it. If the mesh is, when you look at it, square, that would be 0.75. If you stretch it, 1.5. Some of these nets are not square. The measures are different. So, when you stretch it, you end up with something else. But here, with the language that you have, the size of the mesh has to conform with those two which are equivalent, actually. When you say, 0.75 is the same as 1.5 stretched. So, you have to make sure that that is what the Council would like to see in the EEZ. And that will make it compatible with the local government.

JAMES R. KREGLO: So, I know you were discussing now and saying that perhaps we should keep it general and not make it so specific.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: They are two different things. We're talking about the species, that you want to make it general. So, the opportunity for the fisher to fish for flyingfish and others is there. That's what María have stated several times. But now with the gear, is the question that we have. Do you want to have—For example, in the Virgin Islands booklet you have, "must not be smaller than 0.75, 1.5—" but if you want to clarify that and make it idiot proof, you drop "not be smaller than" and just say, "the mesh size of the surface gillnet must have 0.75 square or 1.5 stretched." And what María is asking is, what is the language that you would like to see in your regulation?

Remember, you may adopt compatible regulations at the end, but the language might be different a little bit. Once you have to conform with the regulations applicable to federal government the way that we write the regulations and the other one with the Virgin Islands, the way that they do it. The main point is that the goals and objectives are the same. You want to protect the species, you want to keep the gear they use. Those are the questions that you need to answer. So, with this language, if you agree, then the discussion will go around at that point.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Commissioner.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: I mean, but what I'm hearing is that the exception that we have, like looking at the existing local regulation, the territorial regulation, the exception that we have in there is for non-FMP species. Right? And we're talking about the specificity for non-FMP species. So, the preferred alternative should just say that no gillnet for FMP managed species. That gives you compatibility with the local regulation because the local regulation is what's dealing with the exception for this local species. And so, the easiest way to do it is just to adopt the language that simply states that they get no use of the gillnet on non-FMP managed species.

4 5

I think it's pretty cut and dry that we're being compatible, especially with the fact that the exception is something that is not related to the federal waters.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Yes, absolutely. This is María, NOAA fisheries. So, what we're trying to do here is not necessarily that we're trying to be compatible. We're trying to have something that works for federal waters, but it happens to be compatible, which is a plus, right? So, that's why the text doesn't have to be the same.

Now, based on the testimony here and what we have discussed before. That mesh size that it's included in here right now is what is being used to catch this species. So, from my understanding is that we don't need anything else other than that. What we're trying to get here is a little bit more clarification in terms of how it is expressed so that it's not confused. But I think it's clear that what this means is that that 0.75-inch squares and the 1.5 stretch, is exactly the same thing, right? And it's, you know, one or the other because as you said, it could be a square mesh that will be 0.75 or it would be a stretch, because not all of them, as you said, are square, that will be the minimum size that you could use. So, I mean, we don't have to super figure out how to put it in the in the text right now, but as long as the intent of the Council is clear, that makes this exactly the same as you have in your regulations, which will make it consistent.

So, I think. We can move forward to the next item that— Can you put it again? The one that you were fixing. If you guys are okay with that, then we can move to the length and specify other things that you guys already have included in the U.S.V.I. regulations, it's already in the text, but we have to tweak it a little bit so that it is a little bit more consistent and easier for us to put in our regulations and for enforcement.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Maria, let me clarify something. Those

regulations are compatible. Compatible doesn't mean identical and that's what María is saying, you know. We achieved the same thing, not identical, but we understand that what the Council would like to see are regulations that are compatible with the local government regulations that address the same issue. And for that, we need to hear from you that that's what you want. You don't need a motion at this time, but just instruct the staff that this is the intent of the Council, to keep their language so María can go ahead with the presentation.

4 5

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: I understand that we don't have to be identical in the conversation. My point is that by the specificity that we're going with here, if you go back to the list of María's questions, from the first couple of slides, like defining what baitfish is, doing all of those things. If you're going to include that language in there, and it seems that you have to have more clarifiers for that. And so, by not having the language, then the specificity, like, not having the specificity in there, then you don't have to also find what those clarifiers are, going back to those points that were being made. And again, it's still compatible.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I have a question about that first sentence, because I don't understand where it says, "For fishing for all federally managed species, and limit the use of gillnets." Aren't we saying that you can't fish for managed species with gillnets, right?

 MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: No. So, this is another way of just phrasing the same thing that you had before, that's a little bit more specific. So, it's basically saying the use of gillnets, all gillnets, no difference between surface or the other ones, is going to be prohibited for fishing for anything that it's managed.

Remember, it's already prohibited for reef fish. It's already prohibited for lobster. This will basically cover the pelagic species. I mean, we can also say for pelagic species, but I think this is like, what's the point? it closed any loopholes. Like, remember we have spoken in the past that if something is not listed as an authorized gear type, somebody can come and petition to the Council the use of that gear type. So, these are kind of like things that we do want to close in here. Okay?

And then we will limit the use of the gillnets in the EEZ to fish only for those non-federally managed species with this specific net. Which is the same thing that you guys have. The only difference is that you guys have some species listed in there, because these are species that you mostly catch in state waters,

and I don't think that makes a huge difference or not. Because non-FMP species can be any of those, because we're not really managing those. Okay?

So, the important thing here, is that you do not catch species that are managed. So, no pelagics that are managed, no reef fish, no lobster just return that, although it's already in there, but then you can use only this specific kind of gillnet to fish— if you're going to use a gillnet, it has to be a surface gillnet with those specific construction requirements.

I think Kate has a little bit more clarification.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Chair, I agree with you. Sometimes it's hard to read these sub-alternatives because you have to go back to the beginning of alternative 2 where it says, "prohibit the use of gillnets in federal waters around" whatever island group, and then you go into "for fishing."

All right, so, it's sometimes when we focus on those subalternatives, we forget that there's that beginning part of the sentence that says, "gillnets is prohibited for" and--

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, for federal waters, we want to be able to allow the fishers to get flyingfish. So, we can put a number four in there for the use of—

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: So what we're suggesting right now is that we don't have to get into any specific of this non-FMP species because we don't manage it. If we would be managing flyingfish, then absolutely, that would be something different, right? But you know, our role in here is to deal with managed species. So, by adding in their non-FMP species, I think we have that covered. So, my suggestion will be now to go to the rest.

 We can clarify, number one, the mesh size of the surface gillnets must be that specific size. And then, the surface gillnet must be used 20 feet or more above the bottom. I mean, we can also use text that could be, don't anchor it to the bottom or something like that but if you guys are okay with 20 feet, then we can just leave it as that. Recognizing, obviously, this is federal waters, but there are areas that are pretty shallow. Right? But what is the most important thing? It's the same. It would be either anchoring, as long as it's not anchored to the bottom, I think it's pretty good. We can add that to the alternative 2, if you want to be a little bit more specific.

48 Then number three, it "must be tended at all times." Super

important. Then we can add a number four Liajay, if you may. We can add-- Well, the U.S. Virgin Islands have one net per fisher, per boat. So, we can add that to the alternative. If you can add that in there and then we'll tweak it a little bit.

 I wouldn't worry too much about the specific wording of the alternative at this point, because we do have other actions that we want to discuss. As long as the Council's intent is clear of what you want to do, we'll bring it back to the IPT and we can clean it a little bit more. But it's very important for you to tell us, we only want one allow per boat and then what is the length, which is the next question we have.

You all said that this is a net that it's smaller based on my understanding. You know, it's a net that perhaps go 50 feet, 100 feet. What is the maximum that is reasonable to use? I mean, of course, we can say 700 feet just in case, but is that real? Is that realistic? Because what we are hearing here is that you will probably be fishing or want to pursue flyingfish, which we do not manage, in federal waters, and that this net that you're allowing in here would allow you to do that.

So, what is the length that we need to add to this regulation that is going to be fine for you to use it for whatever you want, that it's not 1,800 feet because that's not what it's used in federal waters.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: María, What will happen if you drop the maximum length?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: I'm sorry, what did you say?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Could they drop the maximum length? Leave it open? Is that advisable or not.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: During the last meeting, you decided that you didn't want to add a length of the net at that time, because that will depend on the size of the boat, etcetera. But you have brought new information to this meeting saying that you may want to put a length. I think, in terms of enforcement and in terms, also, for the fisher to be able to tend this net all the time, we think it's important for them to have a length of the net. And for enforcement, I would think they will want to know how much you were allowed to fish with.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, the question to the Council is very clear, what is the length that would be most appropriate.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I'm going to go but -- I thought you said two.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Wait, wait, wait. You have to get it in the record?

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Gerson Martínez for the record. We used to do it 800 feet, I think 600 feet should be more than enough to do a decent catch.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Let me ask something. Are you talking about flyingfish or are you talking about -- Okay.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Flyingfish.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Guys, we need to finish the meeting today. So, do you think that we can recommend the staff to write 600 feet there? Okay. Done. Six hundred feet. Sold to Gerson Martínez for six hundred feet!

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: I'm just struggling. I hear you. I'm just struggling a little bit to understand how exactly we are-- So, if this is something that we do not manage and one of the purposes is that we're trying to have this in here to reduce the potential for bycatch, etcetera and we're not just talking about fish, we're also talking about sea turtles and things like that. Is that something that-- and this is for the record. If we do 600 feet, you told us earlier that there's no bycatch on this net. For the record.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: You are confusing a net that only the height is not hundreds of feet. The height can be from two feet to six feet high. I'm just covering the basis, for instance, for the future, if anybody wants to use a 600 feet net, I think that's more than enough, but for me, the experience that I have, I don't need that length. I can do it 150. But for other guys that don't know how to do it.

I was trained by Mr. Sanchez and a lot of guys know him. He's one of the greatest fishermen in Saint Croix and he taught me everything he knows. So, I know the techniques of how to bring that fish and be successful in catching. As I said before, don't believe that we're using a tuna wrangler net that has a mile deep and one mile long. No. We are not using that. We have 20-to-25-foot boats. We are not fishing in those big vessels. Thank you.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you so much for that information. That's very good for the record.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: This is Kate Zamboni. Just to clarify, because we've been talking about Saint Croix, Saint Thomas/Saint John kind of together here, I just asked the Council to clarify if the recommendation of 600 feet applies to both FMPs or only Saint Croix?

JULIAN MAGRAS: Yes, 600 feet would go for Saint Thomas/Saint John also if they decide to have that fishery.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay, noted. We are going to include that as part of this alternative and then we will bring it back to the IPT because, of course, it needs to be reanalyzed because there are changes. Okay? So, one other thing that I wanted to add to this is that we will suggest adding something regarding possession the same way that the U.S. Virgin Islands has. For example, if you are possessing of a gillnet and you have a species for which the gillnet is prohibited, for example, a reef fish or a spiny lobster, then that means that it will create a rebuttable presumption of a violation. So, that's the same thing is in the regulations. Kind of like the same thing that we have in the regulations for the U.S. Virgin Islands, where it says, if you have a gillnet that is not the gillnet that is specified in the regulations there's a presumption of violation.

I'm going to leave Kate explain this one a little bit better and I believe, Carlos, that Gerson also has a comment, but I'll leave you guys.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: You know what María just said? Our regulations currently say, if you're in possession of a gillnet and a species for which a gillnet is not allowed to be used, it creates this rebuttable presumption. One of the benefits of providing some of these specifications is that it creates this opportunity where we could word that differently to say, "if you gillnet that is not in compliance with specifications," so that the possession of a surface gillnet that meets all these requirements would not create that rebuttable presumption, but a different kind of gillnet would.

 And I think that, I know Jean-Pierre just left, but he was asking that question about, is it really necessary to have these specifications? And that might be one of the benefits of including it. Then you could say that the possession of a gillnet that meets your requirements does not create this rebuttable presumption of a violation, but a different gillnet would.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Gerson?

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: You have me scratching my head now. You guys are accustomed to doing regulations on fisheries that do one specific type of fishing. In the Virgin Islands we can have the gear for every type of fishing that you can imagine. We go out for lobster, and we see a school of dolphin, we go after them. If we see conch, we go after them when it's in season. If we are catching lobster and fish— There is no way that a regulation for a specific species that you practice in the States, it's going to work down here. You have to understand that we do multispecies. If you look at our CCRs, you can have from [inaudible] to conchs to lobster to fish a couple mahi—mahi and tuna. Because we are so close to the drop off that we can do everything in one day.

4 5

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you for that comment. I think in this case, we're just talking about the gillnets. I mean, the gillnet is something that is prohibited. Gillnets. We're not talking about surface gillnet. Gillnets are prohibited in state waters. The U.S. Virgin Island fishers do not have gillnets other than the surface gillnets. So, the way that we will phrase this, it will be compatible or consistent, not compatible, consistent, with the present restrictions that you have in federal waters. I mean, that doesn't mean that you cannot fish for other species. Right?

So, we'll have to be-- Kate, I'm looking at you right now. We'll have to probably-- We know the Council's intent and I think this will be something that we can work with our regulations branch and see what will be the best way of phrasing this. I don't know, Kate, if you agree with that.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Yes, I agree.

 MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you. Okay. So, one more thing. Remember that I asked you if in the text of the regulations it said "must be used 20 feet or more above the bottom" or did you guys want to change that for "unattached to the bottom" or just say "20 feet from the bottom and unattached" or something like that. You guys want to change it? What would you suggest you want to do?

We don't have to come up with a specific text as long as we have the intention.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I think we'll stick with language.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: You want to stick with this language? Okay. All right. So, I think at this point, what we can do is we can make a motion for the U.S. Virgin Islands that says, because we still have to do some tweaking, a motion that will basically say that the Council would make changes to sub-alternative 2b as

discussed in the forum and I think that will cover it. Do you have that text Liajay?

2 3 4

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Um, before that. ¿Cristina, tú tienes algún comentario de Ricardo que puedas leer? Es que hay problemas con el audio.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: And there's also, remember that we're going to do Puerto Rico real quick after this one.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: We have several comments written by Ricardo López in the chat. First one, "In territorial waters of Puerto Rico, the use of nets in conjunction with diving equipment (Scuba) is prohibited, except with written authorization from the secretary for the capture of lionfish under the particular provisions of the regulation."

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Cristina. Sorry. It's just if they have any comment regarding U.S. Virgin Islands because then we are going to talk about Puerto Rico.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: No, no. I'm reading what he wrote in the chat.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. So, that's okay. Nothing for the U.S. Virgin Islands at this time?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: No. the things that he wrote are related to Puerto Rico.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. Thank you.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Mr. Chair, I will be discussing Puerto Rico soon and I have all of that. So, is it okay if we wait for that one and then— So, we have a question in here with regards to the 20 feet. There are some areas in federal waters where you may have less than the 20 feet, right? Are you guys still okay with that? Or is it better just to say, "unattached to the bottom"?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah, the only area in Saint Croix is Lang Bank, so. Gerson?

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: The shallowest you will find, 8 miles away from 44 Saint Croix, in Lang Bank is about 48 feet deep.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: I mean, much of the EEZ area is still uncharted in terms of the habitats and the rugosity of the seamounts. Even when they're about 200 feet in deep water or 300

feet or 400 feet, you can have coral structures coming up all of a sudden. So, you know, we were talking about the 20 feet and wondering, not knowing exactly what we have in the EEZ, and this is all dealing with the EEZ, this is not the territorial waters, is 20 feet enough to be off the bottom?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Gerson?

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: The way this method is used for flying fish, is not like in the shoreline. In the shoreline, you surround the school, and you pull the two ends together and then you pull them. Everything that gets in there gets dragged in. The way we do the flyingfish is drifting. So, that is going to be a straight line and the nets, as I said before, they're no deeper than eight feet. We don't have those big deep nets like the tuna wranglers guys do. We just have little nets.

If we are in Lang Bank and we are at 48 feet, we still have 40 feet of clearance. Thank you.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. So, this is the motion that we kind of put together. So, if you want to use it or change it or whatever at this point. And with the understanding that Saint Thomas agreed to have the same thing.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, we need somebody to read the and motion to make the motion.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: I move that the Council allows the staff to make changes to Sub-alternative 2b of actions 2b and 3b for Saint Croix and the Saint Thomas/Saint John, respectively, as discussed by Council staff. I so move.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: We need a second.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Second.

42 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any discussion? So, all in favor say "aye."

44 GROUP: Aye.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Ricardo?

48 RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: I agree. Thank you.

1 2

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Any nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none, motion carries.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you so much, U.S. Virgin Islands. This was a little painful, but everything is on the record, and this helps a lot. Okay?

All right, So, I'm going to try to be very quick, but give the same amount of love to Puerto Rico for this same action. Okay, So, can we go back to the to the presentation?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I have to say it was not painful at all. I think it was fun.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: This is very interesting stuff, and it's always a good opportunity to learn from our fishers and how they are conducting their fisheries.

Okay, So, can you go one up, please? More. That. Ahí. Okay, gracias.

Okay. So, in Puerto Rico, and I know that this is where Ricardo was going with his comments in the chat. In Puerto Rico, the fishery uses bottom and surface gillnet and trammel nets consisting of a trammel with three net cloths, which we're not dealing with this right now, but we did during the past meeting. The regulations allow the use of gillnets and trammel nets, except in inner waters and river mouth, and they prohibit the use of gillnets and trammel nets in conjunction with diving equipment. Only for lionfish is authorized.

Gillnets and trammel nets cannot have a mesh size greater than six inches as measured from knot to knot of extension. This is obviously a difference, but here we're talking about gillnets. Gillnet, gillnets, not surface gillnets.

And then for trammel nets, the outer cloths may not have a mesh size larger than six inches. Trammel nets used for bait fishing may not be more than a 0.25-inch. I didn't see any additional information regarding surface gillnets used for bait fish.

Okay, next slide.

The use of gillnets for the commercial harvests of federally managed and non-federally managed pelagic, which is the same as U.S. Virgin Islands, is considered to be minimal due to the depth and distance from the coast of the location of the federal waters.

In the U.S. Virgin Islands, we have 3 nautical miles to 200. In Puerto Rico, it's even farther away, 9 nautical miles. Although gillnets and trammel nets are specifically prohibited for harvesting reef fish and spiny lobster in federal waters, there are some landings reported of reef fish species and spiny lobster with these gears from federal waters. As you know, they are allowed to be used in state waters, but there are some landings reported in federal water with that net. The trammel nets and gillnets are allowed, they're widely used in Puerto Rico state waters.

4 5

Let's go to the next slide, please. I'm just going to show landings right now. And you have already seen this before. Can you go to the next slide? Right here.

Okay, So, from 2014 to 2019, which is the most recent and complete landings at the time this amendment was drafted, this is all from the amendment, 127 fishermen reported landings using gillnets or trammel nets in all waters. That means state and federal waters and unknown waters. From 2014 to 2019, an average of 16 fishermen reported using gillnets for managed and non-managed species in federal waters around Puerto Rico, and an average of five fishermen reported using trammel nets in federal waters.

Okay, so, as you can see over there this is the information. Most of the landings are with gillnets. It doesn't specify if these are surface gillnets or gillnets. I mean, they're allowed in state waters. But what we see is that most of these landings comes from state waters.

Let's go to the next one. Now let's see some of the species. I don't think that that's the one. That one.

Okay. So, the top Council-managed finfish species reported with gillnets from federal water from 2014 through 2019 include King and cero mackerels, parrotfish (unspecified), which didn't say which species it was, and lane snapper. Note that the total landings reported from federal waters only represent a small percentage of the total landings from state waters. And remember here, we're not making a distinction of surface gillnets versus gillnets, so let's assume that the king and zero mackerels and those other species were harvested with regular gillnets, which have a different mesh size.

Next one.

The top non-managed finfish species reported from 2014 to 2019 include ballyhoo, bar jack, mullet, herring, and mojarras. And of course, this is saying federal waters, and it could be like the

same issue that we have discussed before that some of them is like they were really harvested in federal waters because of the depth, right? But this is what the landing is saying. I just wanted to point out what are the species that are showing under landings.

Next slide.

Okay. So, let's get to work, Puerto Rico. Let's do the same thing that we did before. This is the text that you had. Our suggestion will be the same species. I always think that the most important question in here is number three, gillnets use appears to be minimal in federal waters and gillnets are allowed in state waters. Is there a need to continue to allow the use of surface gillnets for this species, this non-managed species, in federal waters? And if the regulation is implemented, given that there are different mesh sizes for gillnet in state waters, how difficult would this be to enforce? So, I think these are the two biggest issues that we have encountered with Puerto Rico.

So, I would say that— Let's go to the next slide and we can go to the text which is— this is exactly the same thing that we did for the U.S. Virgin Islands.

The text that you have on sub-alternative 2b is the one that instead of doing all of those species, we can just say non-federally managed fish and then have those specifications. So, this is the time where we would like to hear what Puerto Rico has to say in terms of the size of the mesh. Are they okay using this size? Are they still wanting to pursue this alternative of allowing the use of surface gillnets in federal waters, given all the information that I just provided. Provide a length, provide a depth.

Now remember, this is what you had from before. You chose to basically do the same thing that the U.S. Virgin Islands does. And if this works, then perfectly fine. But if it doesn't, we need a rationale for making changes. Okay, thank you.

I'm not done, but at least now I think this is the time for discussion.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Nelson?

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelson Crespo, for the record. I think we should go for the same thing as the Virgin Islands did. We should leave it open for the species not under management and use the same size, the 0.75 and 1.5 stretch mesh. Because right now I don't know nobody, but I know of people

interested in developing the flyingfish fishery and they are talking very seriously about that and we cannot close that door.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I'd like to address Ricardo's comments.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: I think they're wanting to hear from Ricardo. I don't know if you guys heard us. I don't know, Ricardo, if you want to read it or you want to comment, or you want us to read it in here.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Okay. Ricardo López wrote in the chat, "Fact: By regulation 7949 article 14.9, in the territorial waters of Puerto Rico, bait fishing trammel nets may not have more than a quarter of an inch opening from knot to knot.

And the other comment says, "Fact: By regulation, in the territorial waters of Puerto Rico, only the length for the trawl nets it is stipulated that it may not exceed 175 fathoms, equivalent to 320 meters or 1,050 feet long."

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: I think-- Yeah, go ahead, sorry, Carlos.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm asking for a permit to talk.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Oh, yes. Go ahead. Sorry. Go ahead.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Okay. Thank you. Ricardo López for the record. What I just shared was only facts. They were only facts for the colleagues of the U.S.V.I. so they can know what we have in our regulation. That was the only purpose. Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Ricardo. I have Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez for the record. Just to comment, as Nelson said before, we have already had this discussion, and we think we should move on with the subalternative that we have already discussed in past meetings. Gillnets is not my expertise area, but from what I have talked with the fishermen, usually they are in the state's water, and maybe only one or two and they use it for the ballyhoo. Thanks.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. But, Mr. Chairman, we need from the Council, and this is something María mentioned before. We have in the EEZ, are you happy with the language? And Nelson said that they would like to see the same language that they have in the Virgin Islands for Puerto Rico. So that's the question. If you really want to have that, then the staff can go ahead and address

it for Puerto Rico.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you, Miguel, for that. Okay, So, I think based on what we have heard maybe a motion that has the same text that we have for the U.S. Virgin Islands, we can put it in there, as discussed in the-- So, I think, Liajay, you can just take the same motion and just change that it's Action 1(b) for Puerto Rico as discussed by the Council, and for the record with the same specifications that were set for the U.S. Virgin Islands. I think that will take care of it.

Not that one. That shouldn't be there. It should be just the first part. "Motion to allow staff to make changes to Sub-alternative 2b." In this case, "Motion to allow staff to make changes to Sub-alternative 2b of Action 1(b), as discussed by the Council." And that will take care of this based on the record that you guys have provided.

I do have one more question but go ahead with the motion. And I think that will finish.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Cristina, can you make it bigger so that Carlos can read it for the record.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay, So, we need someone to move on this.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: ¿María, Está bien el 'language' o le falta un 3b o algo así? ¿Eso está bien para Puerto Rico así? Okay.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: So, move for motion to allow staff to make changes to Sub-alternative 2b of Action 1(b) for Puerto Rico as discussed by the Council.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: We need a second.

36 JAMES R. KREGLO: Second.

38 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any further discussion? Hearing none, we'll take it to a vote. All in favor say-- Oh, we have a--

41 CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Ricardo López.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes, I would like to give an opportunity to Daniel to express about this issue, please.

- DANIEL MATOS CARABALLO: Just a little comment. I think in Puerto Rico, the use of gillnets and trammel nets on federal waters, you
- 48 know, is almost zero. It's very, very, very low. That's all my

comment. Thank you.

1 2

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay, back to the vote. All in favor say "aye."

GROUP: Aye.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Thank you, Ricardo. Any nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none, motion carries.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Thank you very much. I think we can be done with this for now. So, now we have instructions for staff to make changes to the amendment. We will be discussing and bringing back the changes and analysis, as needed, for the upcoming meeting and hopefully we'll be able to have final action on this one. But thank you very much for a great discussion.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you María. So, next on the agenda is the science and Scientific and Statistical Committee, Vance Vicente. One second.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Excuse me, Mr. Chair, because we're a little behind unless there is a change in the agenda, we still have two amendments to discuss. It's going to be a fun afternoon. Before more fun with the SSC report. So, we have a Review of Draft Amendment 3 to the Island-Based FMPs. It's just one more, sorry, one more amendment. And this is by Sarah Stephenson, Dolphin and Wahoo.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Before Vance. Alright, I just skipped over that. All right. So, we're going to go to Review of Draft Amendment 3 to the Island-Based FMPs: Management Measures for Dolphin and Wahoo. Sarah Stephenson.

Review Draft Amendment 3 to the Island-Based FMPs: Management Measures for Dolphin and Wahoo-Sarah Stephenson, NOAA Fisheries

SARAH STEPHENSON: Thank you. Can you still hear me okay?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yes.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Okay, I'll try to be brief and quick.

Next slide, please.

At the April meeting the Council requested that we add the size limits and recreational bag limits for dolphin and wahoo for the Puerto Rico FMP to the amendment that was previously drafted, which just had management measures for Saint Croix and Saint Thomas and Saint John. I see that you're fixing it. I'm going to just keep chatting cause it's just background information. So, we did add those in at the April meeting, the Council did select a 24-inch fork length size limit for dolphin as the preferred alternative, and that was just for Saint Croix and Saint Thomas and Saint John.

You did also select a 40-inch fork length size limit for wahoo as the preferred alternative for Saint Croix and Saint Thomas and Saint John. And then, you selected a recreational bag limit for dolphin of 10 dolphin per person per day, not to exceed 32 dolphin per person, or per vessel per day, whichever is less. And that was the preferred alternative for both Saint Croix and Saint Thomas and Saint John. That alternative would be consistent with the U.S.V.I. regulations. I'm on slide two, whenever you get there.

Then lastly, the Council did modify alternative three of the wahoo recreational bag limit that you changed the numbers to two wahoo per person per day not to exceed 10. You did not, at that time, select a preferred alternative for the wahoo bag limit so that's on our to do list for today.

Next slide, please.

The purpose and need statement was revised somewhat to include the Puerto Rico FMP. So, you'll see there that the purpose statement is now amending all three fishery management plans. And then, the need statement was also slightly modified. And so, the need for this amendment is to develop conservation and management measures for dolphin and wahoo to ensure that undersized individuals have adequate time to mature and reproduce and to take a precautionary approach to management to protect against overfishing for resources with limited management structure.

And basically, what that means is, that for the recreational sector, we weren't able to establish ACLs for the U.S.V.I., because we didn't have recreational data, and we were able to establish them for Puerto Rico but now we don't have the actual recreational landings to mount to measure towards those ACL. So, there's kind of a gap there. So, that's what that second part of that statement means.

Next slide, please.

So, I'm going to take this in chunks by chunks. So, we'll start with dolphin in Puerto Rico. And these are the same alternatives that you saw for the U.S.V.I. Islands because it's based on biology. So, your no action is don't establish a size limit. Your alternative 2 is establish a 20-inch fork length size limit. And

this is for all fishing in federal waters and for dolphin. And then, alternative 3 is establish a 24-inch fork length size limit, for both sectors in federal waters.

And the rationale here is in this orange color. It's the same rationale that we used for the U.S.V.I., but I just wanted to put it here to review to make sure that the rationale for Puerto Rico would be the same rationale for what you selected as the preferred in Saint Croix and Saint Thomas/Saint John. So, these are your three alternatives.

Next slide, please.

Our analysis, our data analysts in house, as part of the development of this amendment when we added Puerto Rico to it, they went and looked at landings information for both sectors, since we did have both sector data involved. And so, here is a distribution of the size limits from the commercial sector, and the bar graph on the kind of left part of it, with the equivalent and change in landings for the alternatives proposed in this amendment.

So, that means if you selected Alternative 2, the 20-inch fork length, you could see there on the bar graph, it was maybe about 3 percent of the lengths that were measured. This data is from the trip intercept program. About 3 percent of those lengths were 20 inches or smaller. So, that equates to less than 1 percent in landings. So, the little chart on the right, the table, is telling you what the change in landings would be based on those size limits. And then the graph on the left, is showing you what the distribution of those lengths caught. And this was over for the last five years for Puerto Rico, 2017 to 2021.

So, that's just going to— you're going to see the same kind of structure for the other islands. And all of this information was included in the amendment, which is in the briefing book. So, if you wanted to look into it. And the appendix has the full explanation of how these analyses were conducted and the data used, in case you want to get into that a little bit deeper.

So, next slide, please.

Here's a similar layout, but for the recreational information. So, this data came from the MRIP, basically. The precursor to MRIP. Those links you can see, you know, it's kind of spread from 12 up to 70, but the majority are right around 26 inches. So, they did a similar kind of estimation of, if you select the 20-inch fork length, about how much of that recreational harvest would be

impacted? It would be a 1.3 reduction. Or if you pick the larger size limit, that will equate to almost a 15 percent reduction in the harvest for the recreational sector.

Now again this data, kind of the last full year of landings information that we have for the recreational sector, was in 2016. So, we don't have anything more recent than that, but based on that time series here, this is what your changes would be.

Next slide.

And I built in little slides to stop to see if anybody had any questions. As I said, I'm going to chunk it so we can either continue moving or you could stop and discuss dolphin size limits for Puerto Rico right now. If you would like to select a preferred alternative, I can remind you again what the ones selected for the U.S.V.I. were, or we could continue on and you could do it all at the end, but I thought since there's so much information to kind of interpret, it might be easier to kind of chunk it. So, it's up to the Council.

Discussion - P.R. Dolphinfish Size Limit

SARAH STEPHENSON: Just to remind you-- yes, thank you. You already did select the preferred alternatives for Saint Croix and Saint Thomas/Saint John. You are welcome to change that preferred if you would like to, but for the dolphin size limit, you selected the larger size to make sure that 100 percent of the females that were spawning capable did actually have time to spawn. So, that was your reasoning, your rationale for picking that larger size limit for Saint Croix and Saint Thomas/Saint John.

So, you can discuss if you'd like to do something similar for Puerto Rico or something different, or even if there's a different number that you would like us to consider. So, that's the discussion that you can have now for Puerto Rico.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay, Vanessa.

 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think we already have this discussion also in the past meetings and especially for the commercial and recreational sector in Puerto Rico, as we know, we don't have enough recent data that is available for the science,

but we, that work every day in the area, we know that we have to take care of this specifically with the mahi. I think that the 24, which is as Virgin Island, the size that we should have. Thanks.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Crespo.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelson Crespo for the record. I agree with Vanessa. We should go with the same size of Virgin Island, especially because a 24-inch mahi has no commercial value in the market. So, that causes a negative impact in the market because restaurant don't want to use that fish and when the fisherman brings it, what are they going to do? Sometimes they use it for their houses or for bait also. We should give a break to those fish. 24 inches is okay.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay, Sarah. You can go ahead.

Continue Presentation- P.R. Dolphinfish Rec. Bag Limit

SARAH STEPHENSON: Okay, Thank you for that. Next slide, please.

So, now we're moving on to the dolphin recreational bag limit. These numbers are actually going to be slightly different than what we saw for the U.S.V.I., and that's because we wanted Alternative 2 to be compatible with the Puerto Rico regulations as opposed to compatible with the U.S.V.I regulations.

So, you'll see that the Alternative 1 is the no action, that we would not establish a recreational bag limit for dolphin in federal waters. Alternative 2, would establish a recreational bag limit of 10 dolphin per person per day; not to exceed 30 dolphin per vessel per day, whichever is less. And that's the one that would be compatible with the current Puerto Rico regulations.

And then, Alternative 3 is a little bit more conservative. It would establish a recreational bag limit in federal waters of five dolphin per person per day, or 15 per vessel per day, whichever is less. And again, the rationale here is in the orange color because I want to make sure that it captures your intent. So, establishing these recreational bag limits would be the precautionary approach to management to protect against overfishing of dolphins since there's no recreational data available at this time. And of course, since we don't have the data to measure those ACLs that were established.

So, the next slide has some of the analysis.

So, again, this is data from the Marine Recreational Fisheries

Statistics Survey from 2000 to 2017. It shows you the number of dolphins harvested per recreational trip in the left-hand graph and then what that would equal if you selected the two action alternatives, what change in harvest that would reflect.

So, if you picked the 10 per person/30 per vessel alternative, that would be a reduction of about 3 percent for the recreational fishers. And then, if you pick the more conservative one of 5 per person/15 per vessel, it would be about 15 percent less dolphin that they would be catching. So, that's kind of the analysis.

And again, that's all explained further in the amendment, if you'd like to dig into that a little bit deeper. And so, with that now, if you'd like, you can go ahead and discuss what might be your preferred intent for dolphin recreational bag limits.

So, next slide is just asking for the discussion.

Discussion - P.R. Dolphinfish Rec. Bag Limit

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, Puerto Rico. Vanessa?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez for the record. In this case, for the discussion, specifically knowing that the recreational data is not available and the only data that we have is the one that came from the tournament, and of course, what we see every day in the area, in the fishing area, I think, or I will suggest that Alternative 3 should be the best in this case. Because 15 dolphin per vessel per day for a recreational is enough fish to have in their freezer or to give it to friends and neighbors.

What we have seen during the past years is that the legal catch of the recreational is making a direct competition with the commercial sector. We've also seen that the recreational prefer the smaller Mahi because it's better to handle for them and it's a little fillet. This is causing that the dolphin can get to the point that the sustainability will be overfishes. So, I will suggest Alternative 3.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: I Have a curious question to the enforcement here. Would that be enforceable? How can you tell whether the fish was caught in the EEZ versus in the area of jurisdiction of Puerto Rico and whether they violate Alternative 3 or Alternative 2, if we have two different quotas.

MIGUEL BORGES: Well, we prefer the regulations to be compatible. Always. It will be more enforceable. To your question, if it's

enforceable or not, it would definitely be a lot more difficult if we would go with Alternative 3.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mr. Chairman, my point is that I personally don't care one way or the other. But when we were discussing this, I was in the Natural Resources Department when we were discussing this.

I would like to hear also from Roberto Sabater. He's not a Council member, but he's a member of the public. So, do you have any experience with the dolphin/wahoo and what are your thoughts on the group of fishers, recreational fisher regarding the present quota that we have and the possibility of reducing that quota from 5 to 15 in the EEZ?

ROBERTO SABATER: Right now, I believe with the present quota of up to 30 per boat, there is no problem. The problem will be if we combine Alternative number three, with the 24-inch fork length, then you create a problem to the recreational. Because normally the recreational will go for the small fish, which is not for commercial. So, you should allow him to have the 10, but if you bring him to the 24-inch with the alternative of only five dolphins, Alternative 3 with only five dolphins, you're restraining him because he won't be able to catch them. You know, if you combine both of them, it will hurt the recreational. Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Crespo.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I agree with Vanessa that Alternative 3 should be the one selected as a preferred alternative.

JACK MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I guess my question is for Ricardo and if there's any thought about changing the state regulations or making them compatible with what this Council does after we went forward with this and implemented this.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Ricardo.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Permit to talk, please.

42 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Go ahead, Ricardo. ¿Nos escuchas, Ricardo?

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes. Yeah, I can hear you.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. Go ahead.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: The alternative that was discussed with the

Sub-Secretary, with the knowledge of the Secretary and the Auxiliar Secretary of DNR, is for Alternative number three. In 2020 personnel from DNR, including personal experts in recreational fisheries, were reviewing the Regulation 7949 and the recommendation was very, very similar to alternative number three. So, I agree with Vanessa and Nelson that alternative number three will be the choice that I would like to approve.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: The question from Ricardo is, how willing is the local government to follow suit and have compatible regulation with the federal if we adopt number three? Do you think that that's something doable?

Yeah, go ahead Ricardo.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes, I understand that and the plan for the Bureau was to revise the regulation as soon as possible. I believe that if alternative number three is selected, it will be easier once we review the regulation for a new one.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Miquel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. Just to explain to Roberto Sabater. What we're doing here is preparing a document that will go to public hearings. We will have a chance to hear from all sectors. So, what we're doing, at this time today, is picking the preferred alternative so when we go to public hearings, we show the slate of alternative, the ones that were not adopted and the preferred one of the Council. When we come back from public hearings, that might change or not.

There are two issues here. One, number three is more in favor of the conservation of the resort by 11% and the other one is compatibility because I personally believe if you don't have a compatible regulation with this one. Right now, we don't have that much of enforcement within the area of jurisdiction of Puerto Rico, let alone if you don't have compatibility with them.

 So, the Council can then have a rationale, as we were discussing today on the record, that number three is more in tune with the responsibilities of the Council. But then, you also mentioned that number three in combination with the minimum size of 24, creates some problems. So, all that had to be included in the record and we may include it also in the discussion. The written discussion.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Roberto.

ROBERTO SABATER: There is another part. You know, if you have a

55-foot boat and you're going to go out there to fish and you can only catch 15 dolphins instead of 30 for your friends and everything, you have to look at the social economic part. A lot of people are going to lose their jobs because people are not going to go out fishing anymore as much as they would do at the same time. So, you have to think of that part too.

4 5

I mean, if you have a little boat, it doesn't matter if you got 15 or 30 because usually the guy with the little boat will sell it. Let's admit it, most of the sportsmen will sell fish too, which is a problem we have. But a person with a big boat who invites some friends and everything to catch fish, he doesn't want to find a place and only be able to catch 15. Especially if those 15 go below 24 inches, what is he going to do? I mean, you're going to shoot down the tourist and the recreational fisherman that go for dolphin. That's my opinion.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Julian?

JULIAN MAGRAS: I have to support my counterpart here with alternative three. The reason why, this is recreational. You're going off a recreational trip. If recreational is considered charter, the charter vessel owner has already been paid before he gets out on that boat and his catch is illegal to sell. So, what they're harvesting, and they're allowed to keep it for personal consumption.

We must take into consideration the bigger picture, which is our commercial fishermen. We're trying to protect this species so everyone can enjoy it and we don't overrun the ACLs. So, a smaller bag limit and not to exceed 15 fish per vessel per day, I think it's a good justification in order to keep a healthy fishery for everyone to be able to use it. That's my opinion. Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any further discussion? Hearing none, we'll move. I guess we have to select something, right?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, Sarah needs your preferred alternative.

SARAH STEPHENSON: So, yeah. So, we're done with Puerto Rico Dolphins. So, if you could for both the size limit and this recreational bag limit, if you could just, real quick, do a motion to say which alternative you select as preferred.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, you could select the preferred alternative at this Council meeting. You could also leave it for

the public and hear from them what they would like the Council to do. So, either or, I mean--

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, Graciela, excuse me. That's not how it works. You select preferred alternative, you go to the public, and if they shoot you, fine, you select another preferred alternative. But you cannot go to the public with a blank statement unless it's a scoping meeting.

So here, we need to have a preferred alternative so they can draft the document. And what I'm hearing now is you have a preferred alternative for the number three, regarding the size and— I mean, regarding the bag limit, and whatever the number 24 inches that you have. That doesn't mean that you will end up with those regulations—— I mean, with regulations with those management measures. It all depends on the process at the end.

The other thing is, we talk a lot about recreational fishery without the data, but we have interviewed a lot of people about recreational fishery. And in the case of the dolphin, this is more of an allocation issue than a conservation issue. Whatever you do here and the U.S. Virgin Islands, is not going to affect the dolphin unless the other Councils, the other institutions, the other countries, do a similar thing to protect that. We're talking about [inaudible], because the one that comes from the North, esos son otros veinte pesos.

So, Sarah needs to hear from you, what is the preferred alternative so she can write it and she can continue with the development of the document.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: You have something in the chat? I can't read that.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: We have two comments from Yamitza Rodríguez.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Cristina.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Digame.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: The chat is not considered part of the record unless it is the audio. So, either she speaks, or you read it for the record. If she's there, she can--

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: She's there. Yamitza, do you hear us and do you have audio to speak?

YAMITZA RODRÍGUEZ: Sure

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Okay, thank you.

4 5

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mr. Chairman, can you give her time so she can talk?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Sure.

YAMITZA RODRÍGUEZ: I just wanted to add that even though there are no current federal quota for recreationally caught dolphinfish, at least in the tournaments that we monitor, most anglers tend to comply with the 30-fish quota. Also, we would like to add that we are seeing many undersized dolphinfishes in these events. Even though, in Puerto Rico, there are some fishing clubs that have established their own rules requiring minimum weight for landed fish, this has not stopped anglers from bringing fish that weigh less than the regulations that the tournament established.

We try to educate them because we're seeing fish that are less than a pound in the tournament and there was even a category a few years ago for the smallest fish. That was eliminated, but fishermen keep on bringing more than the allowable quota and it's very difficult for us, in these events and out of tournaments, to monitor this activity. I just wanted to add that.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. So, we need a motion.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Yes, please. A motion for the size limit, if you would, and then a motion for the recreational bag limit. And I believe from the discussion both of the ones that you identified were Alternative 3. So, the 24-inch size limit was Alternative 3 and the 5 and 15. Thank you.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: So, moved for the Puerto Rico Dolphin size limit, Action 1a. Motion to select Alternative 3. Establish a 24-inch fork length minimum size limit for the commercial or recreational harvest of dolphin in federal waters around Puerto Rico.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Second.

42 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any further discussion on size limit? Yeah.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, it's just a minor thing that Diana just reminded me. It's dolphinfish, we are not working with the mammals. So, thank you, Diana. Es una sola palabra. Junto.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, the first motion is Dolphinfish Size

Limit- Action 1a, Alternative 3. Establish at 24-inch fork length minimum size limit for the or recreational-- Should it be "and recreational"? --harvest of dolphinfish in federal waters around Puerto Rico. Motion by Vanessa, second by Kreglo.

Any further discussion? Hearing none, all in favor say "aye."

GROUP: Aye.

10 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any nays?

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: I agree.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Ricardo agrees. Okay. Thank you, Ricardo. Any nays, any abstentions? Hearing none, motion carries.

The next dolphinfish recreational bag limit.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez for the record to present the dolphin recreational bag limit - Action 1b, as alternative 3. Establish a recreational bag limit in federal waters around Puerto Rico for 5 dolphinfish per person per day, not to exceed 15 dolphinfish per vessel per day, whichever is less.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: A second?

JAMES R. KREGLO: Second.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any further discussion on bag limits, for dolphinfish? All righty. So, the motion is, Alternative 3: Establish a recreational bag limit in federal waters around Puerto Rico of 5 dolphinfish per person per day, not to exceed 15 dolphinfish per vessel per day, whichever is less. Motion by Vanessa, seconded by Kreglo.

All in favor say "aye."

GROUP: Aye.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any nays? Ricardo. Okay, thank you, Ricardo. 41 any nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none, motion carries.

So, Sarah.

Continue Presentation - P.R. Wahoo Size Limit

SARAH STEPHENSON: Yes. Thank you. So, next will be the same kind of structure, but for wahoo. So, once the presentation gets back

up, you'll see the wahoo size limits that are proposed for Puerto Rico. These are the same size limits that were used for the Saint Croix and Saint Thomas and Saint John. Again, it's because they're based on the biology of the fish.

And so, you'll see that the no action is, do not establish a size limit for wahoo. Alternative 2 is to establish a 32-inch fork length minimum and that's for both commercial and recreational fishing in federal waters. And then, Alternative 3 is to establish the 40-inch fork length minimum size limit for all fishing in federal waters. And again, that rationale for this action would be to ensure that undersized individuals have time to mature and reproduce. So, those are your alternatives.

The next slide kind of shows that breakdown of the analysis.

So, there weren't as many wahoo lengths, but you can still see that the majority of the fish caught by the commercial sector, were under 32 inches. But how that translates to the commercial poundage is over in that table on the right. So, if you selected the 32-inch fork length, that would be about 12 percent reduction in landings. And then, if you selected the 40-inch fork length, that would be almost a 40 percent reduction in landings. So, this one is a little bit more of an impact based on the size limits that were selected.

And then just real quick, next slide shows the same information but for the recreational sector. So, we'll look at that and then we can have discussion on the wahoo lengths.

So, you can see the distribution of sizes that were collected, and this again is from the recreational fisheries statistics survey. And then, and how that would have an impact on the amount of recreational harvest. So, almost 33 percent if you select the smaller size limit, but then almost 76 percent impact to the recreational anglers, if you pick the 40-inch. So, this one is a little bit more of an impact.

Just for reference, I believe for the U.S.V.I., the two islands, the 40-inch was selected. But, as I mentioned before, in light of this new information, the landings information, you may want to, or you can, if you'd like, revisit that preferred alternative.

So, now the next slide is just the prompt for discussion for wahoo. The wahoo size limit.

Discussion - P.R. Wahoo Size limit

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah, can you bring back that screen for the size limit on Wahoo? So, for Puerto Rico, Vanessa.

2 3 4

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: As we already discussed for the Virgin Islands, I suggest Alternative 3 to be the one also for Puerto Rico.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Nelson.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Same as Vanessa, I suggest Alternative 3. Small fish may have no commercial value for us. And if you give the opportunity for that fish to grow, at the end of the road, everyone's going to have more benefits. So, Alternative 3 should be the best.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Roberto Sabater, do you have a comment on the wahoo size?

ROBERTO SABATER: Yes. I have a comment. Maybe the small fish doesn't have any commercial value, but it has a lot of recreational value. So, I don't think that we should go to forty. Forty is a big fish, and mostly you catch a small fish, which is what recreational people want. You know, light tackle, you catch them in 20-pound test line, or maybe thirty at the most, and you have a lot of fun. But that way, you go to forty, and then you will be catching a lot less, and you won't be searching them over at the Bajo de Patillas, or the Grappler Bank, or any place like that, because it won't be any fun anymore. You know, 40-inch is a big fish for us. It's not what we searched for.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, I guess we need to come up with a motion preferred alternative.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Excuse me. The whole idea for the development on the record is that if you have 32 and 40, and the biological concern is not the main thing and you can adopt 30, 38, or whatever, 40 and with the analysis that was presented, you are doubling the percentage of the fish that you'll be saving, for lack of a better word, with the 40.

 But remember, you also have to take into consideration the socioeconomics. The problem that we have here is that we don't have the darn data from Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands. Actually, the Virgin Islands is way ahead with recreational fisheries than Puerto Rico. The socioeconomical data that we need for recreational is lacking. That will come up in the public hearings and so forth. But at this time, with the element of judgment that you have at this time, we need to hear from the Council, which issue you preferred alternative.

1 2

4 5

And remember, I'll repeat it again. The preferred alternative doesn't mean it will be at the end of the process the one that is going to be chosen at the end but we need to provide the staff with some indication as to where you want to go with this. That's all.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Jack.

JACK MCGOVERN: I remember at the last Council meeting, there was a lot of discussion about release mortality and whether to go with a 40-inch fish or a smaller fish. Maybe, I'm wondering if Sarah knows if there's any information on the release mortality of the fish. It would help inform us.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to make a comment. Of course, I'm in the commercial sector where we have a nice marina in my area and from what I have seen the difference about the dolphin between the wahoo sector, in recreational, that the recreational prefer the bigger wahoo. Especially from the data that we have from tournaments and the charters. The way that they manage also that fish is different.

I don't know if Yamitza who is in the chat, maybe she could give more information about the wahoo that they have seen during the past year. I think that the wahoo, at least from my experience in what I see in the sector, for recreational, that size is most of what I see, in both, commercial and recreational in the west side.

YAMITZA RODRÍGUEZ: Just to answer Vanessa's question. At least in the past few years, that comes up to my memories, we have seen an increase in interest in different areas in wahoo fishing, recreationally, and creating new events for targeting the species. And to our surprise, because from our previous data, we saw smaller size wahoo in the West Coast, but in the past few, I could say three years, we have seen bigger landed fish. And there are, I think, at least three new species from areas that are targeting wahoo in the East Coast, recreationally and creating events for this. And they're landing bigger size fish than what we have seen previously.

 Even though the wahoo is not as important for recreational fishing anglers as dolphinfish, it's because of the difference in capturing them, it's more difficult, etcetera, there are still anglers that prefer to go out fishing for wahoo. We have seen bigger fish in the past three years in tournaments.

1 2

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Sure. I'll make a comment here because I know that when it comes to the Virgin Islands and wahoo, I want to revisit that size limit of 40 inches. I did some homework on this talking to recreational fishers.

Their concern is that if a fish has already matured enough to lay eggs at least once, which happens, according to literature, 50 percent of a 32-inch wahoo has matured, they say that when they're out fishing— I have to read what this guy told me. He says, "when we use a wahoo bomb, which is a ballyhoo and a skirt, sometimes a small wahoo, 32-inch wahoo, will swallow the whole thing. Then they have to cut the wire and release this fish and it probably causes more of a mortality issue than they would a live release, a live discard.

So, that's one of their biggest concerns on going to a 40-inch. They said it's too big. I know that Nicole is out in a meeting right now, but I think that I did hear her say at one time that the, I'm not sure she was talking about the wahoo size, but she said it was too big also, but I got to verify that with her first. I'm not really sure if that's what she was referring to. But I think they had concerns with the 40-inch and I want to revisit that and get some science from either SSC or someone that knows more about the maturity of a wahoo and the size of maturity.

Vance?

VANCE VICENTE: Well, examining the Caribbean Fishery Life History Compilation—

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Mic is not on.

VANCE VICENTE: Oh, I'm sorry. At least in the Caribbean Fishery Life History Compilation, which was created by Adams and Adyan Ríos, there's no information on the wahoo. We do have a lot of information on other pelagics, but— Nope. So, if I'm wrong, I mean, if the Center has information that I don't have available, but yeah, there's no biological information.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Roberto?

ROBERTO SABATER: I hear the word here that all the data is based on tournaments. Tournaments for wahoo are not too many of them, but a lot of people go out every day, on certain days, and during certain seasons to catch wahoo. 40-inch is a big fish. We consider that a big fish. For a normal recreational guy to go out there and to not be able to collect something small is-- you're destroying

the sportsman. You have to be able to let— as a matter of fact, I think 32 is big too. That's a big fish. And 40, I wish I could catch 40-inch ones all the time I go out there.

I'm happy without with a 30-inch tarpon. But a 40-inch wahoo is an experience. A 30-inch wahoo is an experience. But you're talking only about tournaments, tournaments, tournaments. A lot of people fish here every day, not in tournament. Tournament, few, few people fish tournaments now, because it's getting to be too expensive.

And so, they go out there every day and a 40-inch is big, a 32-inch is big too. So, I think you should give a chance to the guy to find a smaller number or something like that. I know we need to protect our species, but at the same time that guy that goes out every day or every two days or every Saturday when work allows him, he should be able to catch something. If he had to throw away a 40-inch fish, I would cry. Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez for the record. Roberto, as you said, we don't have enough data about the wahoo and counting also what Carlos says, I think that maybe we should be able to take alternative number two between the time that we have more information, but I want to know if this can cause any situation for the enforcement that they already are for the Virgin Island for 40.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Cristina, puedes poner las alternativas de wahoo, por favor.

So, for the record, Alternative number 2 establishes a 32-inch fork length. Is that what you're referring to, Vanessa?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes, to have a happy medium between recreational and commercial sector. If 32 is going to have a percentage of maturity in the wahoo, and we are able to get that one in the meantime while we have more information from the recreational sector or the scientists about the maturity and the length.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: And will be for prefer alternative. To make it clear.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Graciela and then the chat.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Ricardo López requested turn to speak.

2 3

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, que Ricardo va primero. Dile a Ricardo que hable.

4 5

6

7 8

1

Thanks for the opportunity again. I would RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: like alternative number three. It's completely compatible with U.S.V.I. and it's what we talked in 2020 when we were revising the regulations. So, that's what I prefer and that is what the Sub-Secretary agreed with me. Thanks.

9 10 11

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Graciela.

12 13

14 15

16

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, you do have a study by the DNER in which it was reported that 25 percent of the females are mature when they reach 32 inches in length. So, 40 inches would most likely approximate the 100 percent maturity schedule. It's on page 15.

17 18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

Yeah. Graciela, I have a report here from the MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Gulf and Caribbean Research and they have assessed a maturity of 50% of the maturity of the females at 40 inches. Actually, they offer this in millimeters, 1,015 which is roughly 40 inches. And then combined with what Graciela is mentioning, you have 24 at 32. So, we have information. We don't have specifics about the landings by recreational fishery, but biological information is there, with what Graciela mentioned and what we have here on the record.

26 27 28

29 30

31

32

33

34

And then also Sarah's analysis, you have the table, you have the percentages, you're reducing with the different sizes that you have. So, you have to-- and again, this is-- Anyway, the Council has to decide what to do with the motion, or not the motion, but what Vanessa mentioned, that happy medium to get better information would be alternative two. Ricardo preferred Alternative 3. So, you have to decide which one you believe. And we're talking about Puerto Rico only, at this time.

35 36 37

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I have Vanessa.

38 39

40 41

42 43 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Oh, yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez for the record. It's just basic, in the information that we have now and considering that the recreational sector in Puerto Rico doesn't have enough data to be aware of what they are really catching, only data that we have is for tournaments and what we see in the field. So that's why I suggest alternative two until we have better data available or new information.

45 46

44

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Kreglo, and then Julian.

JAMES R. KREGLO: The first thing is, Miguel taught me when I got on the Council, was that we're supposed to make decisions to protect the resource, the species, and, of course, we want to be able to have maximum sustained yield at some point. And so, number one what I learned was to be able to allow these species to at least have one opportunity to reproduce.

4 5

Now, Carlos and I had a discussion about a week or so ago, and I looked up a 32-inch wahoo. And if you can look up on the internet, that's. That's about a six and a half to maybe a seven-pound fish.

Now, I've been catching wahoo for a couple of decades or so. I've caught a lot of wahoos. I can tell you most of the wahoo I've personally caught have been between 20 and 65 pounds. I've never caught a monster 90 pounds or so, but I don't think I've ever caught a seven-pound wahoo. I mean, I've just never caught one that tiny. Maybe a 12-pound wahoo, but I can't ever remember. So, you know, a 32-inch wahoo is a small wahoo. A 40-inch wahoo and give it one chance to reproduce and get more of those wahoos out there, that's my concern.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: We have Marcos Hanke in the chat, and he wrote, "It is easy for compliance to allow wahoo smaller than 40-inches total length. Use the rationale of the biology to determine the month size and the importance of this species for recreational

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Did you guys understand what he said?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: No.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Marcos are you there?

MARCOS HANKE: Yes, I'm here. Thank you for the opportunity. Hello, everyone. Can you hear me?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Citizen Marcos, can you explain what you put in the chat, please? [laughter]

MARCOS HANKE: Yes. Can you hear me? Yes. Thank you, everyone. Hello to everybody in the room. I think we need to use the biology not to go over and trying to think that everybody is looking for 40- and 50-inch wahoo, that will be guided by the gear you use. The majority of the wahoo caught are on the smaller size than 40 inches. We're going to be releasing a lot of fish with a low survival rate and that will hurt the recreational fishing a lot.

On the other hand of the story, if six-and-a-half-pound wahoo is a very small wahoo, with the gears that we use, they don't target

those small fish. But if the biology allowed them to be caught at 32 inches, I don't think we need to go beyond that, considering the high mortality after release of the wahoo.

I totally agree with alternative number two for other reasons too as stated by Carlos Farchette and others. Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Marcos. Julian?

JULIAN MAGRAS: Just a suggestion and I think it goes across the board for U.S.V.I. and for Puerto Rico. Even though that in the U.S.V.I. we already chose the 40-inch size limit. Listening to all the discussion and everything that's going on, this is a suggestion I want to throw there for everybody to think about and see if it makes sense. By looking at the landings of both recreational and commercial here for Puerto Rico and the size limits and everything, it's showing that 32-inch or just a little bit above 32-inch is the main catch of the wahoo. If we decide to go to the 40-inch, which we didn't have this information to look at it the last time, we can see a high mortality or not. We don't know about that mortality number.

So, I would make the suggestion that I think that the way we go is with the 32-inch but manage it through the bag limits. So, instead of having a high bag limit, have a smaller bag limit until both Puerto Rico and the U.S.V.I. can collect at least three years of solid data from these species, and then you can revisit it and see if the rules that you have put in place are they working or are they not working?

I think it would get away from a lot of everybody saying, "Well, this, that--" 32, and control it through the bag limits. That's just a suggestion from me as a fisherman looking at it. Thank you.

JACK MCGOVERN: I guess another suggestion. You're not necessarily locked into having a 32-inch size limit and a 40-inch size limit. You could have another alternative that's somewhere between that and that might satisfy the rec sector and the commercial sector more. Kate just showed me in the amendment that a lot of the fish that are released, wahoo that are released, in Puerto Rico are around 36 inches, it says in there. So, maybe somewhere in between could be another alternative to consider.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay Crespo.

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelson Crespo for the record. I hear what Julian says and I think we should go that way, with a bag limit. We can work with that. We can go with the 32.

1 2

4 5

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, Mr. Chairman, we have a couple of alternatives. The one presented to you, 32, plus the bag limit. Both Nelson and Julian are talking about it. Jack believes that probably we can go in between. Maybe 36, 34. So, Sarah will need to have a preferred alternative from you at this time.

Remember, I keep saying the same thing. The preferred alternative doesn't mean that that will be the one that you'll have in the regulation, but it'll give you an idea how it goes. The other thing I was going to mention is that we have three island-based FMPs. For those species that are place based, that's a new phrase. They mostly occur in Saint Croix, like the parrotfish. The other in Puerto Rico, like the others. Maybe we can have separate regulation, but in this case, the wahoo goes all around. So, maybe you would like to have the same regulation for the federal water surrounding the three areas. It will be up to you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Gerson?

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Just speaking back on Mr. Julian Magras' comment. I, first and foremost, agree with what Mr. Julian said on the 32-inch and the bag limits reduced. That's all I have to say.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Um. So, we're going to-- there's a lot of discussion here. Katherine?

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Just so you know what your choices are. If the Council is not ready to select a preferred at this time, that is a choice that can be made. If you want to pursue and select alternatives, those are not locked into stone. You can change those later based on additional information or public comments that you entertain later on.

I just want to make sure you're aware of that. That if the Council is not ready to select preferred for the wahoo size limit, you are not required to do that right now. You can come back to it at another time. But if you do want to make a selection now, that can also be changed later.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, the thing is how fast do you want to go, Mr. Chairman. If you want to delay this a little bit further, probably then you will come with the same issues. So, what is the pleasure of the Council?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez for the

record. I would like to move with Alternative 2, if it's okay with the rest. Because of the discussion that we already had and the expertise of the recreational that also contributed on the chat and Roberto here, I think that alternative number two will be the preferred for now until we have more available data for the recreational sector.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Somebody want to second that?

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Second.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Some kind of discussion.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: For the record to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, the motion would be to adopt Alternative 2 as a preferred alternative regarding the size limit of the wahoo.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: For Puerto Rico.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Exactly. For Puerto Rico. We have it on the screen. Make sure that— Vanessa, is that language agreeable with your intent?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Okay. Motion for Puerto Rico for the Wahoo Size Limits, Action 2a. Move for Alternative 2: Establish a 32-inch fork length minimum size limit for commercial and recreational harvest of wahoo in federal waters around Puerto Rico. Yes.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any further discussion? Jack and then Vance.

JACK MCGOVERN: I just want to reiterate what Kate said. We can select a preferred here but then even when we come down to the time to take final action on the amendment, the Council could change the preferred because all the analysis would be in the in the amendment at that point.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Do you want to instruct the staff to look at 30, 34, 32?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Sure.

42 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Sure, because you're not going to it.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: You have a motion pending. You should resolve what's going to happen in that motion before you talk about other options.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, all in favor and the whole thing.

1 2

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, Vance on discussion.

VANCE VICENTE: I'm just going to make a comment. I think that until we have enough data on the length at maturity, the size at maturity, K, the rate at which the growth curve of the wahoo approaches L-infinity. If we don't have that data for the Caribbean, I know we have it for the Gulf of Mexico and elsewhere, but I believe that we should have that information before making any final decision. That's just my comment.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: What happens if we never have that information? Never.

15 VANCE VICENTE: I don't know.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Vance.

Okay, So, the motion is "Alternative 2: Establish a 32-inch fork length minimum size limit for commercial and recreational harvest of wahoo in federal waters around Puerto Rico. Seconded by Commissioner Oriol.

All in favor say "aye."

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Aye.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Aye.

30 CARLOS FARCHETTE: any nays? Oh, Ricardo?

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes, thanks for the opportunity. Ricardo 33 López for the record. I oppose.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Any nays? Okay, nays, Ricard. Okay, any abstention?

JAMES R. KREGLO: Abstain. Okay. So, we have one abstain, one no, and that leaves four yeas. Motion carries, four to two.

Okay. Alrighty, we have to take a quick break. So, about ten minutes? Ten minutes is good. Take a little break.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. We're going to get started again. So, while I'm here talking, let me request from all the Council. Folks, because we won't be able to finish the agenda for today, we will

start tomorrow at 8:30 in the morning. Thank you very much.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, what else do we need to do, Sarah? We need to get to the next one?

Continue Presentation - P.R. Wahoo Rec. Bag Limit

 SARAH STEPHENSON: Yeah. So, we just finished wahoo size limits, So, there will be wahoo bag limits for Puerto Rico and then for Saint Thomas/Saint John and Saint Croix. And then all the prefers would be identified. So, yeah. So, here's the recreational bag limits for Puerto Rico.

So, Alternative 1 is to do nothing. Alternative 2 is to establish a five wahoo per person or ten wahoo per vessel per day. And that would be compatible with the current Puerto Rico regulations. Or Alternative 3, which is a little bit more conservative. Establishes a two wahoo per person, six wahoo per vessel per day, whichever is less, in federal waters around Puerto Rico.

And there again you can see the rationale. for why we're doing this is because there's no recreational data available at this time.

And then the next slide has the analysis that was done for this bag limit action. If you would, next slide. You can see that the majority of the recreational anglers from 2000 to 2017 caught one wahoo a day. And on the right-hand side you can see what those bag limit alternatives would relate to in the amount of harvest that would be reduced for the recreational sector.

So, with that, the next slide is just to prompt for discussion for the recreational bag limit for wahoo.

Discussion - P.R. Wahoo Rec. Bag Limit

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Can we go to the alternative? There, Mr. Chairman, similar to the discussion of dolphinfish, here you have the same issues, regulations, enforcement, etcetera, etcetera. So, we have to break at five o'clock sharp because we have public hearings in the afternoon and then tomorrow, we will continue with the agenda. So, at this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear from you regarding your preferred alternative for the bag limits.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez for the record. Well, counting on this, I suggest Alternative 2 because we

know the lack of enforcement that we have in the landings; it is the best way to maintain a compatibility with Puerto Rico regulation in the case of the wahoo. Also, because of the size, to maintain also with the recreational and commercial. I think that five wahoo per person per day, not exceeding the ten wahoo per vessel. Yes.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, the motion is for the Council to adopt Alternative 2 regarding the Puerto Rico wahoo recreational bag limit on action 2b. We need a second.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: We need to put it up on the screen.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Well, yeah. But while they put it on the screen, do we have a second?

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: I second.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mr. Chairman, can you read it for the record, 20 please?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah. For Wahoo Recreational Bag Limit, Action 2b. Alternative 2: Establish a recreational bag limit in federal waters around Puerto Rico of five wahoo per person per day, not to exceed 10 wahoo per vessel per day, whichever is less. Motion by Vanessa, seconded by Oriol.

Any further discussion? Hearing none, we're going to go for a vote. All in favor say "aye."

GROUP: Aye.

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: I agree.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Ricardo. Any nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none, motion carries.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. Next, Sarah.

Continue Presentation - STX & STT/STJ

SARAH STEPHENSON: Okay. When we get back to the presentation, the next slide is just showing you for Saint Croix, which is Action 3a and Saint Thomas Saint John, Action 5a, the preferred alternative that you selected for the size limit for dolphin, which was 24-inches minimum size limit in federal waters. So, that's just a reminder, you don't have to do anything. There are some graphs to show you that same kind of information that was done. It was part

1 of the amendment that was prepared.

3 So, sorry, it's not this slide, it's next, I think two forward. 4 Oh, keep going. So yeah.

So, here's the alternatives for the size limit. The next two slides show you what that analysis prepared. The impacts of those alternatives. So, next slide.

For the commercial data that we had, you could see a 4 percent or a 5 percent reduction in landings, depending on which size you picked, and this is for Saint Croix. Next slide.

There is no recreational data so this is the commercial data for Saint Thomas/Saint John, and you can see that the two sizes picked would have a less than 1 percent reduction in landings based on those two size limits. The next slide.

Recreational bag limits. You already selected a preferred alternative for both Saint Croix and Saint Thomas/Saint John of 10 dolphin per person per day, 32 per vessel per day, whichever is less. And that was to be compatible with the U.S.V.I. regulations.

Next slide is just prompting for discussion and that's just if you wanted to revisit any of those selections, if not, we can keep moving.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Sorry, what's the last part? If we keep them, that's it, we continue?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah, I think we're good with that. But we want to revisit the wahoo.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Yeah. So, wahoo is up next. So, next slide.

Here are the size limits that were proposed for wahoo for Saint Croix and Saint Thomas/Saint John. You did already select a preferred size of 40 inches in federal waters around both islands.

And then the next slide, I believe, has some analysis for you to look at. Although, it's just for Saint Croix because there were only 21 lengths available for Saint Croix and there are only 17 lengths available for Saint Thomas. The Saint Thomas is in the little description on the right side. So, all 17 Wahoo samples were above 40 inches in fork length and the sizes range from 42 to 56 with an average of 54.

So, the two graphs, the graphs and the table, show you the Saint

Croix information broken out. If you do the 32-inch, it would be about a 2 percent reduction in landings. And then, if you did the 40-inch, that equates to about a 45%.

So, the next slide is just prompting for discussion again. So, sorry, it should have been discussion. Do you want to discuss or revisit size limits?

Discussion - STX & STT/STJ Wahoo Size Limits

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Right. So, based on our previous discussion with Puerto Rico, and I think that the V.I. and Puerto Rico all agreed to change the preferred to the 32. I need someone to make that motion if they prefer.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Cristina, can you put the alternative for the wahoo?

Yeah, here the question is whether you like to change your preferred to any of the other two. Meaning, Alternative 2 or not. Do you want to keep it at 40?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Well, I think that we did agree. I mean, both V.I. and Puerto Rico did agree with the change to Alternative 2. So, all we need is a motion for that. And then discussion. Jack?

JACK MCGOVERN: So, moved.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Can you pull up on the screen? We need a second.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, the motion is to switch the preferred alternative from number three to number two.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: So, I'll second it to have the discussion.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: For Size Fimits for Wahoo, Saint Croix, Saint Thomas/Saint John would be Alternative 2. Establish 32-inch fork length minimum size limit for the commercial and recreational harvest of wahoo in the federal waters around Saint Croix, Saint Thomas/Saint John. So, you can change the "or" to "and." Moved by Jack McGovern, seconded by J. P. Oriol.

Open for discussion. Okay. Commissioner?

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Yeah. So, it's my understanding that we voted on something at the last meeting with the numbers, supported by whatever information was presented. And then, my understanding of what we're doing is creating what it is that will go out to

public notice for public comment.

My thing is, I haven't really seen anything that supports why we're reversing the decision, at least today, from whatever it is was discussed in the meeting in April. That took place in April/May. So, what is prompting the change in the number is my question.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. The question is—Anyway, we are changing it because we spent about an hour discussing this with Puerto Rico. The same holds true for the Virgin Islands. You know, recreational sector is saying that 40 is too big, 32 is agreeable.

32 ensure that at least 25 percent to 30 percent of the females are spawned. 40 ensure, well, not ensure, but it is estimated in the North Gulf paper that 40 will be 50 percent of the females will have spawned at least once.

So, you can keep the preferred alternative you have here if you consider nothing has changed for the U.S. Virgin Islands to do it, or you can switch and go back to what Puerto Rico decided.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Right. So, you know, further in that line, right? So, again, not having been here at the last meeting, but something was presented at the last meeting that would-- because the way I understood it took place is that the original motion was for 32 and it went up to 40.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Correct.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: And so, there was some information that was presented at the last meeting that supported the number going up to the 40-inch fork length.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Do you want me to speak bluntly? The reason we changed it is because now we have recreational fishers who know what they're doing. The last time we didn't have those two.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Say that again for me.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: We have information on the socio-economy that we didn't have very clear before. Until Roberto and Marcos spoke, you guys were pushing for 40. So, the socio-economy also plays a role here. For example, in this case Julian offered 32 plus the bag limit, a combination of those two, until we have further information. So, those are the only element of judgment that we have on the record.

So again, for the U.S. Virgin Islands, if you consider that you

should stick to the 40, as your preferred alternatives, so be it. If you want to change it because of what happened in the discussion today, you might do so. So, either way, you have both, you have the biological concerns addressed, 25, 50 percent. You also have an analysis by Sarah, what percentage is reduced by the different sizes.

4 5

And then, I guess it was Vanessa saying, "I vote for this one because in three years I want to have more information." So, if we can change it, we'll change it, but at least you will go to the public with a preferred alternative, collect more information, etcetera, etcetera. Does that address your concern?

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: Yes. Thank you.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Vanessa.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez for the record. Also, just to recall what Carlos brought to the table about him talking with some fishermen between the time from April to now and the high mortality of this ones once they get the bait inside. So, if we now have this information, and know that with the 32 it could be a good number until we have more data for the recreational that's why Puerto Rico moved to the 32, and that's why I will support also the 32 for Virgin Islands.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any more discussion? Okay, Miquel.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, for the record and for the future, what the commissioner asked is the kind of discussion that we need for the record, why we are changing from one to the other. Especially for the new Council member, don't feel—— I mean, anybody can say whatever they need to say so we can develop the record. The more arguments we have in the record, pro and con, the better for the development of any management plan. So, I guess that we are doing good, Mr. Chairman.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, we'll take it to a vote. All in favor say "aye."

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Aye.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any nays?

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: I abstain.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Oh, okay.

JAMES R. KREGLO: No.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, we have one "abstain," one "no," four "yeas." Motion carries.

Continue Presentation - STX, STT/STJ Wahoo Rec. Bag Limit

SARAH STEPHENSON: This is Sarah again. Okay, So, that just leaves one more action and that's the Recreational Bag Limits for Wahoo in Saint Croix and Saint Thomas and Saint John. You looked at this last time, but you didn't make a decision. You did ask us to change = the numbers in Alternative 3.

So, the Alternative 1 is the no action. We would not establish a bag limit for wahoo in federal waters around either island. Alternative 2 would establish four per person or 20 per vessel per day, whichever is less. And that would be compatible with the U.S.V.I. regulations. And then, Alternative 3 was changed to two wahoo per person or 10 wahoo per vessel per day, whichever is less. I don't believe there was any analysis for this one to show. So. we can just go right to discussion if you have any. And the reason why there's no analysis is because we didn't have any recreational data for the U.S.V.I.

Discussion - STX, STT/STJ Wahoo Rec. Bag Limit

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, the question is similar to before. You want to do the compatible one with the regulations for the U.S. Virgin Islands? or number three? what is the pleasure of the Council?

JAMES R. KREGLO: In the discussion last time, I think Julian brought up the point about the bag limits and all that, but the other thing we were looking at in the discussion was that we said it was to be comparable with U.S.V.I. regulations, but those regulations had not gone into place yet. Not until August of next year. That was a whole discussion there.

So, we were afraid to make our own regulations because they haven't gone into effect yet and that would give the V.I. a chance to go in with the federal regulations. We were looking really at Alternative 3, from what I recall from the last meeting. That's my comment.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Well, Mr. Kreglo just said so. Since, like I said earlier, going with a smaller size of the fish, we should go with

a smaller size and control it with the bag limits until we have gathered enough information through the new recreational program that's supposed to be coming up.

So, I would suggest that we go with Alternative 3 to protect this migratory species, the wahoo, protected until we have enough information, and we could revisit it after that information is collected. So, I would like to see Alternative 3 for the Saint Thomas/Saint John District. It's up to you for Saint Croix.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mr. Chairman, for the record then, is it compatible to be with the U.S. Virgin Islands for the second one? You still don't have that in the books, is it been planned? Is just addressing James' question.

JEAN-PIERRE L. ORIOL: No, the regulations themselves haven't gone into effect, but they have in fact been passed. So, it's kind of like that grace period to get people in line with the regulations that were passed. So, the thing is, is that the difference between the local and the federal one is we don't deal with dolphinfish and wahoo separately, but here we are. There's a total number per vessel that is inside the regulation.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, what does the Council want to do?

ROBERTO SABATER: It's just-- I'm showing my ignorance now. How do you get from 4 wahoo per person to 20. Do you normally fish 5 people in a boat? Because we only fish 3, maximum 4. And then you go from 2 wahoos to 10. So, that means you're fishing 5 people, and you normally have three people. So really, what you're talking is maximum of six and a maximum of 12, not 20. I mean, I don't know how those numbers came about, but in reality, you never fish more than four people in a boat in recreational, you know, five is--

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Unless it's a charter boat.

ROBERTO SABATER: Unless it's a charter boat, which I don't know. A charter normally, well, they do three, four and five, but then you have to pay extra.

But recreational, we only fish three, maybe four. So, I don't see how you get to the 20 if you're only fishing four people. You get only to 16, maximum. So, I don't follow the reasoning in those numbers.

MARCOS HANKE: Yeah. Thank you very much. I want to highlight, due to historical discussion, the importance of compatibility between

the areas. We don't have enforcement and to keep discussing the finer details about the numbers is not as important as to be compatible to state laws that are already in place. That's the only way we can really make a change on the protection of any species, most of the time.

And addressing the question that Roberto Sabater just mentioned, which I understand the four wahoo per person is considering, as far as I remember, the days that you're fishing in the wintertime where you have smaller wahoos to have enough wahoos to take home, but not to exceed 20 to prevent the illegal flow of those fish to the market. And that's the basic rationale behind that. I understand that it doesn't add to it the way he expressed, but that's the rationale.

I want to highlight the members to focus on the compatibility that all of you guys discuss and endorse for other species and defended so strongly before. I'm not hearing that discussion right now. Thank you.

JULIAN MAGRAS: So, Marcos brought up the issue about compatibility again. I see the compatibility issue, but we don't catch wahoo in territorial waters. If we do catch a wahoo in territorial waters, it's an incidental catch. Wahoos hang out off the shelf. All of our shelf is in federal waters in the Saint Thomas/Saint John district.

So, the compatibility there, I don't see it being a problem with us trying to reduce the amount of wahoo by going with alternative number three. I think it's a happy medium. We already said that we want to see the smaller size but to protect the species by going with the smaller size, we also need to protect the fish by a bag limit that is justifiable for these recreational fishers. How much fish do you actually need to take home? Okay?

 We the commercial guys, we have to spend our money to get out there to go catch a fish to then sell it. When these recreational guy going to catch these large quantities of fish, then they're go and illegally sell the fish back in to our market, to our customers. So that's another issue. By controlling it with a bag limit, we stand a chance, and the fish itself stands a chance to be there for future generations. That's just my comment.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, we need a motion to go somewhere with this. I know we catch whaoos in territorial water, but that's because our water is very deep, very close. So, yeah.

JAMES R. KREGLO: I'd like to make a motion to accept Alternative

3. You want me to read the whole thing or just say Alternative 3? Okay. Alternative 3: Established recreational bag limit in federal waters around Saint Croix, Saint Thomas/Saint John of 2 wahoo per person per day, not to exceed 10 wahoo per vessel per day, whichever is less.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Second.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any further discussion? Julian?

JULIAN MAGRAS: Just one more statement like it comes to my mind. You know, we went to island-based fishery management for a reason because each one of the fisheries are different. At the last Council meeting in Ponce, we had the same issue when dealing with some issues with Puerto Rico, where we came up with a decision, I say this because I'm part of this committee, where we said "when it comes to voting on these different alternatives or rules that we put in place, that we would take each one of the island-based fishery management platforms and we would vote on them separately."

Carlos just made a good point. Saint Croix, deep water is right there. You could throw a rock from the Carambola into the deep water. And that's a very good point. So, the wahoos can be caught there. But in the Saint Thomas/Saint John shelf, they can't. And that's where we all fall different. Puerto Rico have a nine-mile zone limit. We have a three-mile zone limit. So, in Puerto Rico, when they go nine miles, sure they can catch wahoo still inside the territorial waters and federal waters.

 So, that was one of the big reason for us separating out the different island based plans. So, I'm just throwing that out there. I know we're trying to make it easier by compiling the plans when we do it like this. But when we run into problems like we have right now and I saw it earlier today also, that we need to separate it out and vote separately. That's my comment. Thank you.

 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes. Thank you, Julian, for reminding me of this example. So, I want to ask if we can divide this as it is for some Saint Croix and then the other motion for Saint Thomas and Saint John, just for the record, to have them separately on the FMP and that this action continues also for the next motions that have to be done tomorrow.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: If you're going to take number three, let's say for Saint Thomas/Saint John and number two for Saint Croix, fine, you can divide it up. But if you're going to take the same for the two, there's no reason for dividing it. You as a Council have to decide what it is that you would like to do?

1 2

4 5

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Well, my concern with that is that we have fishermen on Saint Croix, and I know of at least four that do go to the North drop off of Saint Thomas and fish there. So, that would be an enforcement nightmare, coming back to Saint Croix and landing more than the 2 and 10. That's just one of my concerns. What's going to happen when a guy boarded out there and he says, "well I caught this" where you can take 20 or "I caught this" where you can only take 10. That's just my concern.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: You have a motion; you have to vote on it. Reject it or accept it?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, there's a motion on the floor. We're going to, we already seconded it. No more discussion? We're going to vote. All in favor say "aye."

GROUP: Aye.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Ricardo?

RICARDO LÓPEZ-ORTIZ: Yes, I abstain.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any nays? And any abstentions? One abstentions? I thought you said no. Okay. *Motion carries*.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: I believe that with that, Sarah, did we finish your section.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Yes, I am. My next slide was just to kind of show you the timeline of what's coming up, but you probably already know that we're going to take this back the IPT, we'll work on it. We'll try to maybe get some public input and then we'll bring it back for you to see again in December.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Jack?

JACK MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jack McGovern for the record. I was just going to mention that we need to gather information, like Vanessa said, information on release mortality, size maturity. Vance says we have information that we can glean. We need to make sure that we have that all in the amendments so each of the alternatives have good analysis. Also wondering if the Council wanted to add a third alternative for the size on the 36 inches, that could be directions to the IPTA. I don't think it necessarily has to be a motion, but after we do all that analysis, it might show that that's a good alternative.

 1 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, yo creo que terminamos. Deja que Kevin 2 McCarthy diga los next steps.

Finish this; go to McCarthy presentation. He's been waiting for the whole afternoon there.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Kevin.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: If you've got a hard stop at five, I can't be done in 20 minutes.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, we can-- Let me talk to the people here. 13 Maybe 15 minutes more.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Okay.

17 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Then the important thing is--

19 KEVIN MCCARTHY: I'm going to have to wake up the group back there.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah. But the important thing is, Mr. Chairman, we finish with this and then at the December meeting Council will review the draft amendment, etcetera, etcetera. They will have more information for you to consider at the meeting.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, Sarah?

28 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, she's done.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Uh, yes.

32 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Sarah finished already.

SARAH STEPHENSON: Yes, I'm finished. Thank you very much for the great discussion, everybody. Thanks.

37 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Sarah.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: While Kevin is awaking the people there, this is an excellent opportunity to have the branch of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center come here and have this presentation. and I asked Kevin to introduce each one of them, so you will have an opportunity to connect the face with the name. And the people who are working for the Caribbean Council at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. So, please go ahead.

Southeast Fishery Science Center Updates-Kevin McCarthy, NOAA Fisheries

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Thanks. I don't know. Cristina or Liajay going to present, I think. Perfect.

 Okay, we won't need any votes, but one decision that I'll ask for and as much discussion as you want. But I'll remind you that happy hour starts... 20 minutes ago, probably. Okay. So, thanks everybody. We'll try and keep things light and happy for the last half an hour or so.

So, this is our usual update from the Science Center. Primarily, this is the Caribbean Fisheries Branch and we're part of the Sustainable Fisheries Division. Many of you know Shannon Calay; that's my boss. She's the Division Director. Above her, in the hierarchy is John Walter, and he's been at a couple of these. And of course, Clay Porch is the Center Director. So, I'm like way down the layer cake in importance. So, the branch is coming up which is great.

I'm really excited to have everybody here, you can see the names there. We've sort of split them out. Some of them are, it's all one team in my way of thinking, and you know some of the folks. Some are CIMAS. So, that's the Cooperative Institute for Marina Atmospheric Science at the University of Miami. So, we would call them affiliates or associates. Then the other folks across the bottom are NOAA and we are trying to backfill for Nancy. As you may recall, she retired at the end of 2022. So, we're trying to backfill for her.

Next slide.

This is the team. So, if everybody can just sort of introduce yourselves. There's a little blurb next to each one and sort of the kinds of things they work on, but believe me, they do a lot more than this. They only had one line. I made them just put it in a bullet point. So, most of them do a heck of a lot more than the-All of them do a heck of a lot more than that. And you can see I'm the least important name up there.

 DAVID BEHRINGER: Hi everyone, I'm David Behringer, a research associate at CIMAS. Primarily, at the moment, I'm working on fishery dependent survey design and data analysis. At the moment, primarily been focused on U.S. Virgin Islands but working with some Puerto Rico data as well.

RACHEL ECKLEY: Hi everyone, I'm Rachel Eckley. I'm also with the Cooperative Institute at the University of Miami. I am sort of facilitating and organizing the strategic planning project, which

many of you have been part of. I've also compiled the research inventory of federally funded projects in the Caribbean region. I act as a CIMAS liaison between the Science Center and the Cooperative Institute employees. And I help Kevin with planning the Caribbean Seminar Series. So, as a side note, if any of you are interested in presenting at the Caribbean Seminar Series, reach out to Kevin or myself and we'll get you on the schedule.

4 5

KEVIN MCCARTHY: In fact, I'll go one step further. We'll be actively recruiting you. So, you'll know when to run and hide if you see me walking up to you with a clipboard or something to have you sign up.

KATHERINE GODWIN: Hi guys, I'm Katherine Godwin. I'm a research associate at CIMAS. I do data analysis on a couple different projects. Right now, focusing on TIP data.

STEPHANIE MARTÍNEZ RIVERA: Hola, I'm Stephanie Martínez Rivera. I work with all of the data in the Caribbean. So, I do data analysis and provision. A little bit of data management. Developing and research of programs in our code and also in charge of data requests and I have a life history project.

REFIK ORHUN: Hi, my name is Refik Orhun. I've worked for 12 years as data analyst for the statistics division, now with the Caribbean division. Before that I've run for about 13 years two different marine fish hatcheries. I do, besides data analysis, life history, fisheries ecology, fisheries oceanography, and again, my passion, marine aquaculture.

ADYAN RÍOS: Hi everyone, my name is Adyan Ríos. I work on the stock assessments as well as research related to our models. I also participate on the Outreach and Education Panel for the Council and participate in the MREP education program. I also do workflow automation in order to take some of the modeling processes and make them as easy to reuse and share as possible.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Thanks, everybody. So, I'm Kevin McCarthy. I'm the Branch Chief of the Caribbean Fisheries Branch. I don't do science anymore very much. I used to do that but now I worry about keeping everybody funded and logistics stuff and all that other non-science, less than fun stuff.

We're going to keep going. Next slide. And I think Rachel's got a couple of slides she's going to talk you through.

RACHEL ECKLEY: All right, this is Rachel again, for the record. So, I want to give you guys a little brief overview of some of the

outcomes of the strategic planning workshop that occurred at the end of May, here in San Juan. Over at the Verdanza Hotel right next door. A lot of people in this room have participated, as well as people in the virtual room, so I wanted to say quickly thank you to everyone who's participated and thank you to everyone who lent support to all of the participants while they were away.

4 5

So, the workshop included 35 people that got together in a room to talk about ways that we can improve regional data limitations to inform stock assessment in EBFM of Puerto Rico, Saint Thomas, Saint John, and Saint Croix. You'll see on the bottom all of the logos of the participating agencies and organizations and while one of our goals was to ensure that we had someone from every organization there, our other main goal was to make sure that we had diversity of expertise and given some of the discussions during the workshop, I think we really achieved that.

We got into some really great discussions, some at length. We stayed on topic the whole time, which was awesome. And it was a very successful workshop.

Check my notes, make sure I don't forget anything. Okay, we can go to the next slide. I have my notes on a napkin here.

Okay. So, the next two slides are going to be talking about the pre work, which was the values, the mission, and the vision statement, which really just guide us moving forward. So, our values that we came to are these five here on the screen. And this, like I said, guides us moving forward. It sort of explains all of our efforts moving forward regarding the projects that we work on.

So, our values were integrity, reproducibility, transparency, and communication of data. Innovation through adaptive management and continuous improvement. Respect and trust in data and partnerships. Collaboration and cooperation in the collection and dissemination of data. And diversity and inclusivity of data sources, data input, communities, and stakeholder ideas.

The next slide, please.

So, the mission statement was, why are we here? Why are we doing this? And what we came up with was: to develop and continuously improve collaborative data collection programs to support stock assessment and implementation of EBFM, integrating the region's inherent cultural and ecological diversity for the benefit of the U.S. Caribbean. Now the vision statement was our desired future state of where we wanted to be once all the strategic planning work was completed and what we came up with was: to have effective,

efficient, and innovative continuous data collection processes and partnerships to inform on progress towards fisheries and ecosystem management objectives in the U.S. Caribbean.

Next slide, please.

And my last slide here is the breakthrough objectives and the ongoing projects in working groups. So, the breakthrough objectives are the four with the filled in bullets. And then the indented bullets are the individual projects that we're working on. So, we came up with four of the breakthrough objectives, big picture ideas that we want to do accomplish within the next five years and that is: to expand the toolbox to inform fisheries management. Reduce gaps in data sets to inform management. Improve communication of knowledge to better engage stakeholders and fishery management processes. And establish funding governance structures that are equitable for fishers, contractors, agencies, and islands and allow for the collection of necessary data to inform fisheries management.

Now, each of the breakthrough objectives has one project that we're working on now that we'll hopefully complete in the next year. And then, the reduced gaps in data set used to inform management, that one has five individual projects centered around some of the main data types, which are fishery independent, fishery dependent, life history, socioeconomic, and habitat and environmental data. Now we've already started working on these. Six of the eight there have had their first meetings. The other two are scheduled for this Friday, actually. We already starting to make improvements, well, not necessarily improve anything at the moment, but we are working on accomplishing these projects. Like I said, they'll be completed in about a year, and then we'll start phase two of it. Each group will have a different project and ultimately, we'll reach our five year objectives.

I'm currently working on a more formal report of this workshop, but the Council, on their website in the briefing book, has the English version of the fact sheet that has all of the main points from it, and then the Spanish version will be uploaded very soon. I'm going to get that to the Council as soon as I receive it. And that is all I had to talk about for the strategic planning workshop.

 KEVIN MCCARTHY: Thanks, Rachel. So, I would just remind the group here that these are not necessarily Science Center objectives. These were objectives that were brought and were agreed upon and developed by that entire group. So, those 10 or so different agencies, the 35 people in the room that were participating. So

we're going to work to achieve this in partnership across all of that group.

So, this is a plug for your 20 million bucks. You might want to keep some of these in mind. I know you've got your own strategic plan and all of that, but this was certainly a group effort in every sense of the word.

So, I think the next one is Stephanie.

STEPHANIE MARTÍNEZ RIVERA: I'm just going to give you a quick update of one of the life history projects that we have in the branch. So, we have a CRP life history project ongoing in Puerto Rico. We have funding until December 2024 and we are hoping to expand to U.S.V.I. We're doing this with collaboration with HJR Reefscaping. We have two observers. We are also collaborating with Noemí Peña in DNER laboratory where one of the observers does the dissections. And we're also collaborating with another NOAA affiliate, Kate Overly, that she also has another life history survey. It is a fishery dependent sampling of the West Coast of Puerto Rico. And we are trying to fill in the gaps in the sample size for federally managed reef fish. Thank you.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: So, one thing that I would add, just because we've got some initials up there. CRP is Cooperative Research Program. So, this directly involves commercial fishers being involved in this project. And we do that through HJR. They've got the insurance and the observers that they can put on the commercial vessels. So, it's very, very much a collaborative project between NOAA, local contractors and local fishers.

And I think maybe the next one is me. So, port sampling projects, as many of you're aware, these are collaborative with the local agencies. So, with DFW in the U.S. Virgin Islands, we've got a survey for commercial and rec in the recreational sector. So, if people went out fishing, we want to sample them. And we've completed what we're calling an effort survey. So, basically, this is a look at patterns of where boats are coming in, what times of day, what days of the week, and in what locations so that we can then develop a survey design based on that information. So, that initial step has been completed, and some pilot projects will be starting up very soon.

We've still got ongoing commercial port sampling in Puerto Rico. As we've discussed in many meetings in the past this went on for about 17 months uninterrupted after the hurricanes. But we noticed from that initial survey that there were aspects of the fishery that didn't get sampled very well, just either-- So, in Vieques we

didn't have a lot of sampling out there, so we've got samplers out there now. The deep-water snapper sector was not sampled terribly well, through no fault of the survey, these are the things you learn as you develop surveys, what you're doing well, and the parts that you're missing. The same with Yellowtail, just due to the nature of that fishery. So, we're got some additional money out there, and they're directing sampling at those sectors.

We're also in a supporting role working with DRNA in the recreational survey. That's Grisel's work. We've helped with supplying tablets, computers, and software for the samplers, some training of those samplers and we're getting them some sampling stations so that they can hopefully keep the sampling going really quickly.

Next slide.

We've also got a couple of fishery independent and fishery dependent sampling projects. So, these are out on the water. So again, these are cooperative programs with Puerto Rico commercial fishers. The first is a fishery independent lobster trap survey. So, by that I mean, we're developing a survey where it's not necessarily where the fishers would go, but where the sampling design would take it. Because fishers are very good at knowing where to go to fish, because you want to keep a good catch rate, right? But we also need to know where fishing isn't so good. So, that, hence the fishery independent side of that.

 What we were trying to do is to sample lobsters that after another molt or two, they will be big enough to be caught by the fishery. So, we're calling that a recruit index that we're trying to build. It's not the larvae coming in. It's the just of sublegal-size lobsters. So, in doing that, we can get things like catch rates and size composition of the catch and we need both of those components. So, it achieves a lot in a single project. It also tells us what the gear selectivity is. We can talk about that some other time, but that's a really important component in the stock assessment modeling.

 We've also got a fishery dependent survey, which is very similar to the fishery independent, but we have the fishers go wherever they want to go. So, we're not telling them where to go and set traps. They're doing their fishing as they normally would, but we've got, through a contractor, a video set up so that when the trap comes on board, they can stick the lobsters underneath this video rig and we can get size information from that, as well as catch rates. And it will inform the same sorts of things like the trap selectivity. It can serve as a recruit index. It could do a

lot of the same stuff, but it's a slightly different approach because it's wherever the fishers want to go fish.

We're also seeking additional funding, as always, and when we get that, we want to expand these surveys into the Virgin Islands. We started in Puerto Rico because we had, this began several years ago, we were set out to do it, basically. There were local contractors that could get observers out on the water for us. And I think now we've got a better shot at doing that in the Virgin Islands. So, once we get some more money, we'll move the projects over there as well.

Next slide. Which, I'm not sure who was going to do the TIP work.

ADYAN RÍOS: This one is me.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Okay, thanks.

ADYAN RÍOS: Yep. So, we have a project funded through the Fisheries Information Systems, FIS, at NOAA to work on TIP extraction and automation. TIP is the Trip Interview Program. And this is the data collected by our port samplers. So, like, Wilson, Liandry, Daniel. We have over 40 years of length comp information in this data set and it's a critical resource for all of our stock assessments. So, some of the elements of the project are noted here. Katherine, myself, and Molly Stevens are contacts for this project and we're trying to make these TIP data more readily available for upcoming assessments and needs for our fisheries management and our stock assessment process.

The first one noted here is just standardizing our QA and QC. So, our quality assurance and quality control. Sometimes we do this on a species-by-species basis and so we want to take that to be more assigned to the entire database and make working with this a little easier. We're also doing a historical review to make sure that these many years of data are ready for the analyses that we want to do with them. And so, that's a little summary about the TIP automation project.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: So, I would add that this is one of the less glamorous jobs, but it's incredibly important, because these are these data drive so much of the stock assessment answer. And to not have them correct, or as correct as can be, presents real problems for the analysis. So, this doesn't get a lot of press. It's not as cool as going out on boats, but it's really critical.

So, I think the next one is me, again. So, one of the other people that I was hoping to bring down, but she had a conflict in her

schedule, is Kim Johnson. She is not in our branch, but she works with us a lot. She's in the Fisheries Statistics Division, so she deals a lot with data, including the electronic reporting, or the ShellCatch data as it's sometimes called in Puerto Rico. So, this is electronic reporting by commercial fishers.

Right now, we're trying to overcome some data supply issues. So, the data are stored in the vendor's Shellcatches cloud-based database. Unfortunately, we don't necessarily, at the Science Center, we don't have direct access to that, so it's very hard to merge that with the existing CCL data, so everything that was reported on the paper forms. So, it sounds like it would be simple to fix, turns out it's not. There's a lot of accessibility and data compatibility issues that need to be resolved, and Daniel Matos can tell you all about this, because he's been key in getting this resolved, along with the ShellCatch folks and people at, where we're eventually going to put it, which is in ACCSP. So, this is a group that stores all kinds of data, all kinds of fisheries data for NOAA.

So, as I mentioned, DRNA, ShellCatch, ACCSP, and Science Center staff have been working to resolve this data transfer. They've made great progress. Still got a couple of technical obstacles to overcome, but they're getting really close. And so, once the data can be moved directly from the ShellCatch cloud-based database to ACCSP, then we can get it at the Science Center, merge it simply with the CCL data. And then we've got the complete landings and effort database for Puerto Rico. So, they're making great progress, but there's still a bit of work to be done.

Next slide.

ADYAN RÍOS: So, three years ago, we embarked on creating a compilation of management regulations into a data set. And through that process we created a system to house that data set called the Online Data Set Manager. And so, the management history was one of the pilot projects within that system. But now that we have that system, we're also able to build other data sets that are useful for our needs.

 A second one to note is the Morphometrics Project. So, this project is taking the morphometrics conversions that are reported across all of the SEDAR reports and consolidating into one accessible location that's searchable. And we also have the Caribbean Research Inventory in this online database manager that Rachel referred to earlier.

There's a lot that's already been done, but there's a lot of work

that's ongoing. So, for the Management History Project, there's still some processing of developing the views that will be available and that's taking place before it will be presented to each of the Councils. The Morphometrics Project is also looking to expand that project to not only house that information, but also provide advice on like how to compare those analyses and identify the best equation depending on the needs of that equation. And the Caribbean research inventory is in the stage of testing and preparing for public access.

4 5

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Thanks. Next slide, which I think is me again. There we go. Perfect.

So, we talked some about SEDAR 91 earlier, but there's a lot of stock assessments that are either ongoing or soon to happen. So, again, let's go through the SEDAR process. The Southeast Data Assessment and Review, which you saw earlier today, can be very lengthy. We're working to tighten up that schedule a little bit, because I think we can do it, here in the Caribbean.

So, SEDAR 80 is still ongoing, and this is where I need some help from you all. We're hoping to get it wrapped up at the December 2023 SSC meeting, but in order to do that, we need to arrange for another SSC meeting between now and then. Because we've reached a point where we want to get a little input from the SSC, receive a little guidance. So, if we can have an SSC meeting, it can be virtual if need be. We probably may need, well, we can talk about how long that needs to be, but certainly, no more than a day, maybe less, but we need some input on a couple of decisions. So, if we can get that in, well, we need at least a month because you have to notice it in the Federal Register. But in another six weeks or so, that would be terrific.

We've already moved forward with the, the Puerto Rico assessment, which is complete. So, that was great to see. We've got SEDAR 84 coming up. There's a bit of a delay in that, because SEDAR had trouble booking hotels that would fall within per diem in October. So, it looks like that in person data workshop's going to happen the end of January of next year. We've got then SEDAR 91, which is spiny lobster. We talked about that earlier today.

 And then, in 2025 you all ended up recommending hogfish and red hind. That came out of our data triage work, what data are available for stock assessments. So, all of these we have-- well, we've done spiny lobster. We feel pretty good about at least having a good shot at getting a good assessment out of all the other species as well as spiny lobster. So, hogfish and red hind, which will probably begin sometime next fall, maybe into the winter. It

depends on how SEDAR 84 goes, if we have to shuffle schedules around because of the late start there.

Next slide.

So, we're not the only folks that are working in the Caribbean who are with the Science Center. So, you'll recognize some of these names, but there are-- Adyan works a lot with outreach both in MREP and with the Council's outreach efforts. We've got NOAA fishery staff who are on the SSC and have been great additions to that committee. We've got folks working on E.E.J. There are new surveys that are coming out with conch. Jennifer Doerr is heading that up. She's at our Galveston lab.

The NCRMP survey, which is the diver survey, has been ongoing for years and years and years, and that includes some people from the University of Miami, Jerry Ault as well as Science Center staff and CIMAS. Jeremiah Blondeau is CIMAS, Jay Grove is NOAA, but she's in a different group that has Caribbean in the name. She's in the Atlantic and Caribbean reef fish group. There's a deep-water snapper survey which is going on in Puerto Rico. That's another survey we would like to move over into the Virgin Islands as well. She uses cameras and hook and line to do their survey. It's also a cooperative project, so those gears are deployed off of commercial vessels. Kate Overly is in another group that has Caribbean in the name and that's the Gulf and Caribbean Reef Fish Branch of the Science Center.

There are folks involved in SEAMAP-C. There's life history work. Data management. I talked about Kim a little earlier and database development. Yanet is great. It's great to have her. She's really, really good at what she does. So, it's great to have her involved more in the Caribbean. And these are, except for Jerry, these are all folks who are directly associated with the Science Center. So, there are certainly other people who are doing life history work in the Caribbean. I don't mean to claim that we're the only ones doing it. These are just folks who are directly associated with the Science Center.

Next slide.

 ADYAN RÍOS: We just also wanted to congratulate recent awardees of the Saltonstall-Kennedy. So, the S-K grant. That's a yearly competition to promote development and marketing of U.S. fisheries. And in the Caribbean, the three projects have received close to \$900,000. It's great to see projects being awarded this in our region, because that means that more projects are applying for this in the region. If you have ideas for things like

development and marketing of U.S. fisheries, next year's S-K is another opportunity for more applications to obtain opportunities for more research in our region.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: So, I think Graciela mentioned this a little earlier. We've got a Marine Spatial Planning Workshop that's coming up and it involves a lot of different folks. This is happening at the end of the month. There'll be two meetings. One, in Saint Croix and the other one back here in San Juan. You can see the workshop goals there. This isn't my project. So, I can't claim to speak for it, but we have the Science Center wanted to make sure that everybody was aware of it because it is a big effort. It's not just occurring in the Caribbean, it's throughout the country. Again, we've heard a couple of comments about it earlier in the day.

Next slide.

So, there you can see sort of the core data questions. The different ocean sectors that are involved, is pretty all inclusive. And then the outputs. So, comprehensive lists of available data. Leads to acquire additional data. Lists of identified and prioritized data gaps. So, they're asking a lot of the questions that we're already asking, which is nice. And since our workshop a couple of months ago for the strategic planning, when I've had conversations with people who are talking about work in the Caribbean, they're not coming up with any ideas that that group didn't already discuss, which is very nice. Very nice to know that we did a very comprehensive job in that meeting.

I think that's it. Next slide.

So, any questions? There's the team again with their contact information. I would ask that if you want to ask them to do any work, please, please add me to that request so that I know what everybody's being asked to do because I am responsible for sort of setting the priorities in their workdays.

But we certainly want to be responsive to data requests, from this group and everybody else who works with us as partners in the region. So, any questions? That's the team and that's some of what we're doing in a very brief, I think, half hour. I think we've made it in half an hour, maybe 35 minutes.

Questions/Comments

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Kevin. Thank you. Not a question but thank you. Seeing these young fellows, including the other one, young fellows

coming here, it's the first time that we have this opportunity to have this talent in the Center working for the area. And the myriad of studies that we just saw, that people are working on, is an achievement in itself. When I started, it was very, very hard to get one iota of information.

The other thing is, you mentioned jokingly, but I took it seriously, because I already have your name in our list, Graciela and I. Whenever we put together this list of possible studies under the 20 million famous money, the number one priority is to look at the tools that we have, the gaps that we have. You identify two of them. We need to move to the Virgin Islands to replicate what we are doing here. So, that will be one priority. Move some of the things that we have here that conform with the goals and objectives of the monies, the IRA, and then—

But enough said. We are going to thank you again, and everybody there you introduced, each one of them. But the one in the last is our family now Adyan Ríos has been working with us for some time now, and I'm glad to see all this young talent working with us here.

So, we are going to knock on your door, probably between here and December 31st this year, because Graciela and I have to work together. So here, I believe that the Council advanced that list of things that we can do. Number one, are things that are already blessed by NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, we have to reinvent the wheel, and that's one of the things that we need. And all of the information that you are gathering are germane to the ecosystem, management plans. So, I believe that we have a good chance of having some of these activities continue moving for the next three years at least. So, thank you again, and thank all of you. [applause]

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Thanks Miguel, and thanks everybody. No, I look forward to working with you. Thank you.

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, thank you all very much for hanging in with us here. I want to thank the translator William Cordero for the overtime work he's putting in. And we'll recess until tomorrow at 8:30 so we can catch up on the agenda. We'll start off with the SSC report and then Sennai with the EBFM Technical Advisory.

Thank you. I don't drink, but you all are welcome to hit the happy hour.

(Whereupon the meeting recessed on August 15, 2023.)

AUGUST 16, 2023 WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION CARLOS FARCHETTE: Good morning, everyone. We're going to start about one minute. Okay. Good morning, everyone. Continuation of the 182nd Caribbean Council meeting held in San Juan, Puerto Rico at the Embassy Suite on August 16, 2023. I'm going to start with a roll call. I'll start with Graciela. GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Graciela García-Moliner, Council Staff. Buenos Dias. MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: María López, NOAA Fisheries. ROBERTO SABATER: Roberto Sabater. 2.5 KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Kate Zamboni, NOAA's Office of General Counsel. JACK MCGOVERN: Jack McGovern, NOAA Fisheries. CARLOS FARCHETTE: Carlos Farchette, Chair. VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Vanessa Ramírez, Vice Chair. JAMES R. KREGLO: James Kreglo, Council Member. Saint Thomas, V.I. KEVIN MCCARTHY: Kevin McCarthy, Southeast Fisheries Science Center. LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Buenos días. Liajay Rivera García, Council Staff. CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Buenos días. Cristina Olán, Council Staff. SENNAI HABTES: Sennai Habtes, V.I. DPNR, Division of Fish and Wildlife. NELSON CRESPO: Good morning, everyone. Nelson Crepo, DAP Chair,

Puerto Rico.

```
1 2
```

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

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Good morning, all. Gerson Martínez, DAP Chair, 6 Saint Croix.

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

11 HOWARD FORBES: Good morning. Howard Forbes, DPNR Enforcement,
12 Saint Croix.

14 VANCE VICENTE: Good morning. Vance Vicente, SSC.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Buenos días. Alida Ortiz, Outreach and 17 Education Advisory Panel.

19 MANNY ANTONARAS: Good morning. Manny Antonez, NOAA's Office of 20 Law Enforcement.

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

RACHEL ECKLEY: Rachel Eckley, Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

REFIK ORHUN: Refik Orhun, Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

DAVID BEHRINGER: David Behringer, Southeast Fisheries Science 29 Center.

KATHERINE GODWIN: Katherine Godwin, Southeast Fisheries Science 32 Center.

NICOLE GREAUX: Good morning. Nicole Greaux, Saint Thomas Fisheries Liaison.

LIANDRY A. DE LA CRUZ: Good morning. Liandry De La Cruz, Port 38 Sampler, Fisheries Liaison, DPNR Division of Fish and Wildlife.

ANN B. WILLIAMSON: Hi, Ann Williamson, NOAA Fisheries Atlantic 41 Highly Migratory Species, Management Division.

CARRIE SOLTANOFF: Carrie Soltanoff, HMS Management Division.

RUTH GOMEZ: Good morning. Ruth Gomez, Saint Thomas Fishermen's Association.

48 WILSON SANTIAGO: Wilson Santiago, Puerto Rico Fisheries Liaison.

1 2

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

DANIEL MATOS CARABALLO: Daniel Matos Caraballo, Puerto Rico Department of Natural and Environmental Resources.

DIANA T. MARTINO: Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay, thank you.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Carlos, I'm going to read the names of the people that are in Zoom.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Cristina.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Okay. Sarah Stephenson, Miguel Rolón, Rachel O'Malley, Jack McGovern, Cindy Grace, Laura Cimo, Virginia Shervette, Martha Prada, D.W.A.M.E., Kate Zamboni, Guy DuBeck, FSCR CORP.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Cristina. So, before I begin with the agenda, I want to thank everyone for yesterday's excellent participation and discussion with Net gear Amendments and the dolphinfish/wahoo discussions. I think that went well. It took a lot of time, but it was necessary. And I particularly want to thank María and Sarah for all the hard work they did in putting these documents together for us. So, thank you very much.

All righty in continuation of what we missed out yesterday on the agenda, it'll be the Science and Statistical Committee with Vance Vicente.

SSC Report-Vance Vicente, Chair

 VANCE VICENTE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will present a summary of a five-day meeting that we had. The Scientific and Statistical Committee together with the Ecosystem-Based Fishery Team. Do you have the first slide? Second slide.

The meeting, as I said, it was a joint meeting between the SSC and the EBFM TAP members. The EBFM TAP members are Alida Ortiz, Juan Cruz-Motta, Kevin McCarthy, Orian Tzadik, Sennai Habtes, Stacey Williams, Tarsila Seara, And Dr. Edwin Cruz-Rivera. The SSC members during the May 1st to May 5th meeting was Jorge García, Richard Appeldoorn, Juan Cruz-Motta, Todd Gedamke, Erik Williams, Michelle Schärer, Vance Vicente, Walter Keithly, Tarsila Seara, and Jason Cope.

These two teams got together, and we asked our questions. Where are we going? We agreed that is a very complex topic that we were going to be discussing. But complexity should not scare us. We have already overcome some complexities. For example, we were able to develop the Island-Based Fishery Management Plans and there's a final rule for this, which was effective on October 13th of 2022. That was complicated, but now it gets more complicated because now

we're trying to get ready for ecosystem-based fisheries management for those three Island-Based Fishery Plans.

4 5

The first two days the EBFM TAP members worked together in the same room with the SSC. Kindly, Sennai Habtes was the chairman during those two days because the main topic was ecosystem-based fishery management. So, there were two presentations, one by Sennai Habtes, New Fisheries Ecosystem Plan Draft Outline, and a second, Orian Tzadik reporting on the Technical Writing Consultants for FEP Development Outline.

During that first day, the SSC was told that the mission of the EBFM TAP is to promote ecosystem-based approaches to ensure a healthy, resilient, and productive marine ecosystem and the fisheries resources dependent on such ecosystem within the context of the particularities of the fisheries resources. That's the mission, and it's very compatible with the definition of the National Ocean Council from the White House. Which defines ecosystem-based management as an integrated approach to resource management that considers the entire ecosystem, including humans and the elements that are integral to ecosystem functions. EBM is informed by science to conserve and protect our cultural and natural heritage by sustaining diverse, productive, resilient ecosystems and the services they provide, thereby promoting the long-term health, security, and well-being of our Nation. Let's digest that.

Several topics were brought up and discussed informally, such as the Lenfest Loop Ecosystem Optimum Yield, Optimum Social Goal, new memberships, the status of conceptual models, a finalized approved outline, strategic and operational objectives and many other topics.

The second day was a very full day, very complicated day. We had nine presentations. And again, this second day was taken care of by both teams in the same room. Sarah Gaichas presented on Using Ecosystem Information in the Stock Assessment and Advice Process. Juan Cruz-Motta, or J.J., Progress Towards Informing an Ecosystem Based Approach for Fisheries Management in the Caribbean. Advan Ríos spoke on the Ecosystem Status Report: Ecosystem Indicators.

Tauna Rankin gave a presentation on a Risk Assessment Update. María López-Mercer gave us an update on the Island-Based Fishery Management Plan. Juan Cruz-Motta presented to us the SEAMAP Caribbean Gold Copy Update. Martha Prada presented to us the Caribbean Fishery Management Council Geographic Information System Tarsila Seara spoke to us on Community Vulnerability Indicators. And Kevin McCarthy presented to us the Southeast Fisheries Science Center Data Triage Work.

Several topics were discussed. Define uncertainty, Species and Sector Level Risk Elements, Ecosystem Overfishing Indicators, Natural Mortality, Ecological Risk Assessment, Performance Metrics, and Reference Points. And many other topics, including one was that was added to the agenda, which consisted of determining whether the rainbow runner is a benthic reef fish or is a pelagic fish.

During May 3 and 5, the team separated. We were in separate rooms to essentially develop what are our research priorities and I believe that the EBFM TAP decided also to form subcommittees to discuss the different aspects of the ecosystem-based management plan. So, one, there was an overview of SSC research priorities. Continuation on SEDAR 80 U.S.V.I. Queen Triggerfish by Adyan Ríos. And then we discussed with Kevin the Spiny Lobster Terms of References, which we adopted, which we accepted. And again, between May 3 and 5, the EBFM TAP were in a separate room discussing their own internal matters, forming committees, and developing their research priorities.

Finally, on May 5th, 2023, the SSC finalized the Scientific and Statistic Committee Research Priorities with ranking. So, the research priorities were evaluated by the committee as a one, lower priority, two, middle priority, and three, a high priority project.

So, I'm going to, next slide.

The research priorities are the following. One, we decided that it's critical to improve our landings data based on Puerto Rico port landings study, for Puerto Rico to develop statistics-based methods to improve port sampling, improve expansion factor estimation and application, improve collection of length composition data. Do the above, the same, for U.S.V.I. upon completion of the U.S.V.I. port sampling study. Improve landing data collection via digital tools. And evaluate digital formats for reporting and validating versus paper reporting.

Second, we also consider a high priority, the collection of biological data for life history population parameters. Again, we

ranked this as a high priority. One, to improve biological data collection via digital tools, timely prioritization of collection by species using for example, the IBFMPs, Island Based Fishery Management Plan and SEDAR publications. Review and formalize stock prioritization process.

Third, we gave a very high priority to improve and do research on effort estimation. Again, we ranked this as a high priority. Develop alternate methods for estimating efforts.

Next, we also highly prioritize the preparation for (h)(2) flexibilities, okay? For example, simulations to test alternate ACLs for (h)(2) flexibilities; how to incorporate uncertainty into defining ABCs from OFLs; and collect life history information.

We also consider as a high priority to continue and develop some monitoring and surveys. For example, monitoring program of the fish populations in closed fishing areas; cooperative fisheries-based surveys; train and delegate to fishers' fisheries monitoring activities. And this, I believe, is very critical.

Next there was a three plus high on socio economic data for management. Periodic systematic collection of data to provide a baseline and comparative basis for social impact assessment; research to assess and integrate local ecological knowledge into decision making; determine the economic values of fisheries that can be used in assessing benefits and cost of alternative management measures.

Next. We also ranked-- I don't know what number we finally agreed on, but ecosystem-based fisheries management mapping. Develop habitat maps from existing NOS multibeam/lidar data. EBFM assessing regulatory impacts. Evaluate the effectiveness and impacts of closed areas; to evaluate the closed season relative to the spawning season; review status of spawning aggregations within those closed fishing areas.

Then regarding the status of species. One, status of the species subject to seasonally closed areas to protect spawning aggregations. That got a three. Status of species subject to seasonal closures in the EEZ only and in the EEZ and territorial waters. For example, the queen conch, deepwater snapper, mutton snapper, lane snapper, grouper unit 4, yellowfin grouper, tiger grouper, etcetera.

Also, we recommend determining what the status of species are within the no take areas, such as the Hind Bank, no take areas in the EEZ, and within the state waters, such as the monuments in the

U.S.V.I., Saint Thomas, and Saint Croix, EEMP in Saint Croix. And in Puerto Rico, the Northeast Corridor, Tres Palm Reserve, Luis Peña Reserve, Condado Lagoon Reserve, Isla Verde Marine Reserve, and others where fishing is prohibited year-round.

Next status of the fish population is subject to year-round harvest prohibition, for example, the nassau grouper in the U.S. Caribbean. That was given a one, but I believe it should be hired. Status of the parrotfish species for which harvest is prohibited in the EEZ only (i.e., midnight parrotfish, blue parrotfish, rainbow parrotfish.)

And next, the status of the queen conch, Lobatus gigas, population, a prohibited species in the EEZ of the subzones of Saint Thomas/Saint John, and Puerto Rico. We also recommend research on sifts, consequences of shifts, in fishing practices. Shifts in fishing practices owing to implementation of regulations, for example, gear changes from nets and traps.

Gear changes resulting in changes to the species caught, the relative numbers of these species, size selectivity of the species being targeted, and our ability to manage. Also shifts in fishing grounds. Status of species. We also recommend conducting research on the status of the yellowtail snapper, Ocyurus chrysurus, population. For example, the EEZ size limit is, 12 inches total length. Puerto Rico has a size limit of 10.5 inches fork length. There is no size limit in the U.S.V.I. Also, we recommend research to determine the status of queen conch populations in Saint Croix given the current management regime which allows harvest of queen conch in the Saint Croix EEZ, Lang Bank. Status of the spiny lobsters and queen conch populations, both have catch restriction, but there is no information on the compliance of the recreational sector.

That's the list of research priorities by the, by the SSC. And then the next slide, that's the end of the presentation. So, any questions, any comments?

More details about the meeting are included in the presentations given, which all of you have available. So, if you need any specific information on any of the topics that I presented, you can pick up the proper presentation that was given on that topic. So, that's it.

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Vance. Graciela?

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, Mr. Chair, the SSC will be preparing a final research priority document to be distributed to everyone. The idea of this document is to have it in the forefront so that whenever there is an RFP that comes out, etcetera, we already have a plan of where to move.

In addition to that, it should be consonant with the strategic plan of the CFMC, and we have provided that information also or will be providing that information to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and the regional office for any monies that come up to fulfill any of these RFPs. In addition to that, it's a public document that can be provided to any scientist or any group of collaborative people who might be interested in doing Cooperative Research Program, Coral Program. I mean, there are quite a bit of funding opportunities.

The limiting factor that we've come across is the availability of people, local groups, to do a lot of the work. So, you know, one of the main issues that we need to think about is capacity building for the region. So, having said that, that's not one of the issues that we discuss, but it's really in everyone's mind. So, how the Council can move forward in terms of capacity building for the region, it's a question that we have, and we need to address at some point. Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Graciela. Any more questions for Vance? Jack?

VANCE VICENTE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

JACK MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Jack McGovern for the record. Vance, I was wondering if the SSC discussed rainbow runner and had recommendations for the Council on rainbow runner?

VANCE VICENTE: Yes, I believe that was in the second slide as other topics. Yes, we discussed that. Nelson Crespo brought it up to the SSC for discussion and I recall that there was a Southeast Fisheries Science Center scientist there who agreed that the species is pelagic and not reef. And then I think that we went on a vote on that, and I think that we did vote and we were in favor to accept the change from benthic reef fish to pelagic. Thank you, Julian.

JACK MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, I think there was discussion at the previous meeting about developing an amendment to make rainbow runner a pelagic species and I don't know if the Council wants to make that motion now and give direction to staff or just give direction to staff without a motion to begin an

amendment for Rainbow Runner.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah, I think that's a good idea. Anyone of the members want to make that motion?

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

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah, you want some language on the board?

10 JAMES R. KREGLO: That would help. Mhm.

12 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Or I can say that, essentially, we're just saying that we recommend that Rainbow Runner become a pelagic species for the Council and for our research.

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: James, could you repeat it again and out 19 loud so I can type it in properly? Thank you.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Oh, I don't think I can, but I'll try. I move 22 that Rainbow Runner is designated as a pelagic species. Oh, I'm 23 sorry.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Hang on a second, Kreglo. You want to have Jack get that language because I think we've got to direct staff to do that.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Yeah. Why don't we do that? Okay.

JACK MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think it should be that the Council directs staff to begin an amendment to change rainbow runner from a reef fish species to a pelagic species.

35 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Yeah, María.

37 MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Just real quick, can I suggest to reclassify 38 instead of change?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Jack's agreeing with that. I would like to add the U.S.V.I. to that because we have rainbow runners. So, maybe all three FMPs.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Okay, this addresses the issue of each island having a separate list of species that are under management.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay, so we have the language of Kreglo. You want to go ahead and read that motion?

JAMES R. KREGLO: Direct the staff to begin an amendment to reclassify Rainbow Runner from a reef fish species to a pelagic species under the Puerto Rico FMP.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: We need a second.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Second.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay, let me read the motion here. Direct staff to begin an amendment to reclassify rainbow runner from a reef fish species to a pelagic species under the Puerto Rico FMP. Motion by Kreglo, seconded by Vanessa. Open for the discussion.

ROBERTO SABATER: I have a question. When you move it to be a pelagic, that means that we fall into the permit that you have to get from NOAA because then it will become a pelagic, right? Right now it's not a pelagic, so it doesn't fall under the permit that you have to buy each year. So, if a person fishes one from shore, because you can't get them from shore, he will be violating that law, right? If he doesn't have a permit for the boat.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: No, Graciela's and María are about to fix that.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Okay. So, the rainbow runner is a species that is managed by the Council. It's classified as a reef fish. It was determined that it should have been classified as a pelagic species because the way that the species behaves it's not really like a reef fish. So, this type of pelagic species is not managed by highly migratory species. It's not a highly migratory species. It's managed by us, so there's not really a permit to fish for them.

The only difference that will happen here is that, right now, for the recreational harvest of reef fish species that are managed by the Council, there is a recreational bag limit. So, if the rainbow runner is moved from the category of the reef fish to the pelagic species that are managed by the Council, that recreational bag limit will not apply to that pelagic, which was the point that was brought by the District Advisory Panels in Puerto Rico when they realized that the rainbow runner was classified after that.

So now, once this species is moved from the reef fish to a pelagic species group, right? There's going to be other things that apply and eventually other regulations. But right now, we have an annual catch limit that limits the amount of the fish that you can catch in federal waters, but there's not really other regulations such as the bag limits, etcetera, that would apply to that fish.

That doesn't mean that nothing will be recommended in the future, but right now that will be the only thing. Okay?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: María, does it make any difference to add coastal pelagic to the species or just leave it as is?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: So, we don't really use the coastal term for our pelagics. But the difference will be like, for example, if there's species that you could classify, and maybe the people from HMS can correct me, that they classified them more as pelagic species, is different than what we have. HMS have their own highly migratory species such as the billfishes, etcetera. They have their own separate regulations and they're not under the purview of the Council.

So, when we started managing species that we consider pelagics, it's basically what we call the coastal pelagics because of the distance from the coast. But, in our case, we just decided to leave the coastal out. It wouldn't be a big deal, but I understand it will be confusing. We should start thinking about, when we say pelagics, we're talking about these species that are more associated to what we call the coast, right?

So, in Puerto Rico, we have, I believe it's nine species that we manage, pelagic species. And I will be happy to provide you with the list, so you can familiarize with it. I know it's a lot of information. And then in the Virgin Islands, they only manage, for this pelagic species, the dolphin and the wahoo but we do have other species other than the dolphin and the wahoo included in this as well.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any further discussion? All right, we'll take it to a vote. I'm hearing none. Everybody in favor say "aye."

GROUP: Aye.

38 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any nays?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Carlos, let me check if Ricardo López is on Zoom. No, he is not.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: For the record, Daniel Matos is the second delegate for Puerto Rico and Ricardo is sick. So, he's going to sit at the table representing Puerto Rico.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, all in favor. Okay, no nays, no abstentions, motion carries.

Before I go to the next agenda item, I want to go back to the roll call and mark Commissioner Oriol and Miguel Rolón as present. Just to make sure they're on the record.

So, the next topic on the agenda is Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Technical Advisory Panel Report by Sennai Habtes.

Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management Technical Advisory Panel Report-Sennai Habtes, Chair

SENNAI HABTES: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and good morning to all. I want to take a moment to thank everyone, and the Council in particular, for continuing their support of ecosystems-based fisheries management in the U.S. Caribbean. I appreciate the chance to provide an update on some of the processes and things that are ongoing with the Technical Advisory Panel that was convened by the Council.

Next slide, Cristina.

So just as a reminder the purpose of the EBFM TAP is to provide the Council ongoing scientific advice on ecosystem-based fisheries management for fishery management decisions, including recommendations for habitat status, social and economic impacts of management measures and ecosystem-based impacts or stressors on the sustainability of fishing practices. Now I know that's complicated and long charter, but what that actually comes out to mean is that the purpose for this Technical Advisory Panel is to develop a fisheries ecosystem plan or an FEP. This is a framework by which the Council can maintain marine ecosystems and the fisheries resources dependent upon those ecosystems.

 In addition, as part of the processes for the EBFM TAP, we are developing a community of practice. That means a group of practitioners in the U.S. Caribbean that continue to provide the Council with the infrastructure capacity and needs to implement EBFM within the U.S. Caribbean. So, that is just a little review of what we are trying to do and now I'll move on to some of the updates and explain where we are. I won't bore you with a lot of the details that I usually give in these updates on the history and background of the EBFM TAP, but I will just move on to updates and let you know where we are in the process.

So, as Vance mentioned, we had a joint SSC and EBFM TAP meeting from May $1^{\rm st}$ to the $5^{\rm th}$ of this year. Some of the notable presentations included some of the social vulnerability and

perceptions that has been part of the Lenfest project, which are a partner on the EBFM TAP and two of the PIs, Tarsila Seara and J.J. Cruz-Motta sit as members of the EBFM TAP. And so, they provided us with some of the results on stakeholder perceptions of environmental and climate change in the U.S. Caribbean and community and social vulnerability indicators in the U.S. Caribbean. In addition, Sarah Gaichas from the NOAA Northeast Fisheries Science Council came in and provided us a little overview of some of the ways EBFM is used in the stock assessment and advice process in the Northeast. That was useful to both the EBFM TAP members as well as the SSC members to see how we can develop a roadmap for EBFM use in the Caribbean as we are kind of just at the beginning of the process for developing it.

13 14 15

16

17

18

19

20

2122

23

2425

26

27

28

29

30

31

2

4 5

6

7

9

10

1112

The rest of the meeting was used to develop a path forward for all of the working groups, which are kind of listed up at the top right and I will go into some more detail on those a little further. So, don't try and strain your eyes reading those. But we have a conceptual model melding group and ecosystems indicator group, a risk assessment group, a data repository working group, and a drafting FEP working group. And so, since that meeting, we've had two meetings of the conceptual model indicators and risk assessment groups to continue the work towards drafting the FEP. In addition, a technical writer was contracted to do some of the draft formation of the FEP that we can provide to the Council. And in addition, Tauna Rankin, with the help of the Council staff and EBFM members, was able to get internal NOAA Fisheries funding to continue the work on developing a risk assessment for the U.S. Caribbean to evaluate the drivers from both the Lenfest work as well as the ecosystem status report developed from NOAA to quantitative indicators from those for use in risk assessment for the U.S. Caribbean.

32 33 34

Next slide.

35 36

37

38

39

40 41

42 43

44 45 So, in addition, we submitted research priorities based on the EBFM needs and priorities to the SSC for evaluation into their research needs and priorities for the Council. The ones that were submitted included: developing species and habitat climate vulnerability indices for the U.S. Caribbean: EBFM reference— I'm not going to read them fully. I'll just kind of highlight them and you guys can read them off the screen, and if people have further questions on the sub points or those, just please come find me during a break. So, development of EBFM reference points; increased— sorry, there's feedback. I'm going to just wait until that's gone.

46 47 48

Good? Alright. Increased research on bycatch and discards for the

U.S. Caribbean; reference points and measures for ecosystem restoration and capacity for mariculture; ecological sustainability and management of herbivores on ecosystems and identifying important indicators used in that; quantifying the positive and negative effects of sargassum; developing research quides for strategies in adaptive fisheries management; socioeconomic factors to design surveys for data collection on social impact assessments. And as Graciela mentioned after Vance's presentation, both the SSC agreed that these should be set as specific actionable priorities that can be integrated into RFPs directed for the use of the research in the U.S. Caribbean. And the Council should identify a clear structure or process to help influence and provide the present and clear needs for research funding within the Caribbean on a regular basis to both partners in the region, federal funders, and NGOs and others that do work based on ecosystems-based fisheries management and all fisheries management within the U.S. Caribbean.

17 18 19

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

1415

16

Next slide.

20 21

22

23

2425

2627

28

So, as I mentioned, we're using Technical Writers. We were able to get some funding left over from annual funding for the PEW Charitable Trust, which was used to hire a Technical Writer, Katharine Tzadik. She is developing the intro, the interface between fisheries and ecosystems management, the environmental setting, and conceptual models' management framework for the FEP. Those sections have all been drafted by the Technical Writer and are currently in review by members of the EBFM TAP for further review of all membership within the TAP.

293031

32

33

3435

36

And then in addition to that, we will have a final product to be used at the discretion of the EBFM TAP to kind of coalesce the rest of the working group information into a final FEP. And we are working with the funding from Sustainable Fisheries that was developed by Tauna to get another contractor to help with the writing process particularly to do the risk assessment that can be used within the EBFM TAP.

37 38 39

Next slide.

40 41

42 43

44 45

46

47

48

And so, as I mentioned, we have five working groups. The conceptual model melding, that's led by Tarsila Seara at the University of New Haven. It also includes JJ, Cruz, Orian Tzadik, Sarah Stephenson, Tauna Rankin, myself, Liajay Rivera and Stacey Williams. That group is to do the indicator and gaps, create a model framework and appendix of conceptual models, and comparative model analysis. And develop indicator rankings from the conceptual model. The work from that has been done throughout the Lenfest

project that J.J. and Tarsila are the PIs on. All of that information from all conceptual models has been completed and summarized and is now being used in putting into the draft FEP. That working group has met twice since the meeting and has identified the framework that they want to put in.

The only aspect of the conceptual models that has not been completed was the final list of indicators as that is waiting on determining what's available from the ecosystem status report. And that will be done in the next working group below which is the ecosystem indicators working group. Those members include Orian Tzadik, J. J.-- I'm not going to continue with the names. They're on the slide. You guys can see them. You guys know who they are. That group has not yet met. We have individual partners meeting to develop kind of a framework that can go into the draft FEP and identifying the information from the ecosystem status report that is available for us to use as that has not been completed as yet.

The Risk Assessment Working Group that is led by Tauna Rankin has met twice and they are currently coming up with the specific risk assessment model that they wish to provide for the FEP draft. And they are currently going through about seven different models that we've identified as maybe feasible for the U.S. Caribbean and trying to figure out which is the best one to use.

The data repository group, which I lead has not met as yet because we are trying to identify what the needs are once the FEP is drafted. What will come out of that, is a prescription or recommendation to the Council for the type of infrastructure that is necessary to sustain continued EBFM work. And the drafting of the FEP will be done by the technical writers, myself, my Co-Chair Orian Tzadik, and Council staff, including Liajay and Graciela.

Next slide.

Alright. So, what we have done. These are the tasks that have been completed by the Conceptual Models Group. They've done all conceptual models for the different stakeholder groups. We've tested those models and combined them into a melded model to identify the indicators, the gaps in terms of data that's available, and the model framework that seems to fit best amongst all of the conceptual models. This has identified a lot of gaps related to socioeconomic information within the U.S. Caribbean that can be used within ecosystems-based fisheries management. In addition, with a comparative analysis within and among model types, they've come up with a list of indicators and they're currently going through the process to rank them and identify which of those indicators are best recommended for EBFM use within the U.S.

Caribbean.

1 2

Next slide.

As I mentioned, the Ecosystems Indicator Group has not met. We have individual people that have worked on all of these indicators based on the Lenfest group and the ESR report that NOAA was doing, talking and identifying which data and indicators are available for use in the draft FEP. We have summarized the process that was used both in the Ecosystem Status Report and the Lenfest project in the draft FEP and are using that as the framework to continue writing it up. And hopefully we'll have the list of all indicators that we identified for use in ecosystems research going forward by the end of the year.

Next slide.

As I mentioned, Tauna has received internal funding to continue developing the risk assessment. And this was the change in the task and goal based on that additional funding. And basically, we're trying to develop the framework or process, the best risk assessment that can be used in conjunction with ecosystems-based research by the Council to define measurable and quantifiable indicators, identify thresholds, and assess or evaluate the strategic objectives needed within the management process for EBFM to do the best precautionary approach for using that in the U.S. Caribbean.

Next slide.

Finally, probably the biggest need that we have is the infrastructure. Developing an FEP without having the process, the structure, the computing capacity, the personnel, to do ecosystems-based fisheries management effectively in the U.S. Caribbean is meaningless. It will simply be, and I have mentioned this point many times and I will continue to mention it every time I am reporting to you. Without having these things in place and a process to do it, having the report is just another group of paperwork that will sit on a shelf. If we do not do the work, find the money, and build up the capacity to make it useful for management, it is meaningless.

 So, the data repository and infrastructure needs will be included in the FEP. It will be a prescription or recommendation to the Council for how we can develop the policies and infrastructure necessary for the U.S. Caribbean. As I've mentioned before, we are developing a community of practice. There are some people in the U.S. Caribbean and outside of the U.S. Caribbean that work in it

that would like to see these things happen.

4 5

As most of you know, we all have other jobs, and we all volunteer in these positions, and it is not feasible to do all of this entirely. We have to come up with a process by which we want these to be implemented, find the funding, and do it. And that has to be done at the Council level. So that is just a reminder that when these things are written into the FEP, it is a plan for you to implement.

Next slide.

All right. So, as I've mentioned, we've created a community of practice. I've mentioned the Lenfest proposal that J.J. and Tarsila are the PIs on. Bill Arnold, Mandy Karnauskas had developed another proposal in the beginning to do the Ecosystem Status Report and NOAA. And now we have another. Tauna is the PI on the NOAA Fisheries internal funding that she received to develop a risk assessment and continue the work on risk assessment in the U.S. Caribbean. So, these are complementary projects that help us build all of the stuff that's necessary for the EBFM.

Okay, next slide.

So, last but not least, where are we? We have completed a revised draft for the EBFM goals and objectives. We're in the process of, we have drafted the FEP charter and the goals, those you've seen. We've completed all the conceptual models, melded them to develop a larger report that has all the information from Lenfest. We're in the process of using those models to identify the indicators that can be used in island specific versions for the EBFM. And we are trying to draft all of those products into a draft FEP by the end of the year.

Next slide.

In addition to those things, we will develop strategic objectives and prioritize these objectives in an outline that will be presented to the Council; have operational objectives that can be used in the FEP; develop performance measures as well as a feedback mechanism; and complete and submit an FEP that will go through the SSC, drafted and developed for the Council to vote on and ratify by March or April of 2023.

So that's where we are. Those are the updates on the FEP, and I'll be happy to take any questions if you have them.

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE:

Thank you, Sennai. Do we have -- Vance?

VANCE VICENTE: Sennai, thank you and thanks for helping us during the May 1st to May 5th SSC Joint meeting with the TAP members. You were very productive. You orchestrated those two days that you were Chairman excellently. In fact, you made me look like a beginner.

8 9 10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

1 2

3

4

5 6

7

Anyhow, I brought this up before. I think that it will be useful, or it might be useful to look back into different ecosystem based studies that have been performed in Puerto Rico and maybe in the Virgin Islands. For example, past ecosystem-based studies have been, first by Odum, H.T. Odum in the rainforest. And from the rainforest down into the coast, Jobos Bay had an ecosystem-based study. What was the other one? Guayanilla Bay and several others. I had a list of them and I lost it. I can find it, but there's several other ecosystem-based studies done in the past.

18 19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28 29

30

31

And in the present, there are two major ecosystem-based programs that are active. Even though their goal is fisheries oriented, they do integrate the public, the fishermen, the fishing villages, students, universities, scientists. One of them is the U.S. Environmental, U.S. EPA Estuary Program of San Juan, San Juan Bay Estuary Program. That's been going on since 1998, I believe. I was a member of the management committee then. And it has been growing, and we even have a -- when I say we, I'm one of the editors of their journal. We published the results of the master thesis, PhD dissertations. And they integrate the public, they integrate all the stakeholders, and including they even have done some fisheriesoriented studies, such as the trip intervention, TIP kind of data, particularly in the Laguna San Jose.

32 33 34

35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42

And this program is extremely interesting because the San Juan Bay Estuary Program includes three major lagoons, San Juan Bay, San Jose Lagoon, Laguna Piñones, Laguna Torresillas, which are all essential fish habitats for many of the commercial fishes. Not only that, but they have also done a watershed study. They monitor water quality. They've been doing this for years now and they're publishing every month. They give you an update of what they've been doing. So, looking into that to see what they have come up with for the last 15 years or so to see how that could be useful in helping us develop the EBFM approach.

43 44 45

46

47

48

The other program -- and this is funded by the U.S. EPA. The other program is the Jobos Bay Estuarine Research Program, which is funded by NOAA. That's been going on also for about 20 years now. And they also integrate the community, the fishers, students,

scientists. And they have also come up with significant amount of information on water quality and distribution of sea grasses, coral reefs and you mentioned it.

So, it might be good to see if you can contact the scientists there— I can give you the name and the address and the phone number and so can García —to see if they can provide you with an analysis and a conclusion of what their efforts have contributed significantly to society, to everything. So, that's my advice. Thank you.

SENNAI HABTES: Thanks, Vance. Yeah, I would say go ahead and pass along the contacts and any of the documents for manuscripts, for theses, or dissertations that you have. I'm sure some of that we've already incorporated into the state of the ecosystem section in the draft FEP, but it can't hurt to look at it again.

I would also say, you know, these are important programs that have done ecosystems-based management. What we are trying to develop, though, is like, looking at the U.S. Caribbean as a whole and how we can use existing tools to implement those into the fisheries management framework that we currently use. And so, yes, there are some aspects from those programs that can be incorporated, but we were looking at this holistically, across all of the regions, to make sure that we can do that.

 And so, you know, that is one of the issues that we are running into, is that there is a lack of that kind of data collected systematically across the U.S. Caribbean that makes it difficult to find ways to implement that into fisheries management. There's some, and those are the indicators that we've summarized and recommend for use. And there is not a need to move directly into EBFM at the fullest level that you can do. There are different ranges that we can do. And so, for us, I think it is to identify what is feasible and possible, now, to integrate into the existing fisheries framework that we have currently being used in the Caribbean.

VANCE VICENTE: Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Vance. Thank you, Sennai. So, we're going to make a little change to the agenda here with Nelson's indulgence. We're going to move you back a little bit because we have to get something done here first. Thank you, Nelson.

So, next on the agenda is Highly Migratory Species Atlantic Actions Update—Ann Williamson, NOAA Fisheries.

Highly Migratory Species Atlantic Actions Update—Ann Williamson, NOAA Fisheries

CARRIE SOLTANOFF: Good morning. I'm Carrie Soltanoff. I know it said Ann Williamson on the agenda. Ann is here with me. I'm going to be giving the presentation. We're here from the Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Management Division to give an update on a few of our current actions.

So, we have one proposed action, which is Amendment 15 to our FMP on Spatial Management and Electronic Monitoring. And then we have two actions that are in the scoping phase, Amendment 16 to the FMP on Shark Quotas and Management, which is a scoping document. And then, electronic reporting, which is an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking or ANPR.

So first to go over the proposed action on spatial management. So, Amendment 15, the proposed rule was published in May and the comment period is open through mid-September. There is a web address here to get to that homepage which has our draft environmental impact statement, the proposed rule, a story map, and a lot of other helpful information.

There are two broad components to this action. The first is spatial management which is considering modifications, data collection, and assessment for four spatial management areas that are shown in this figure on the right. The Mid Atlantic Shark bottom longline closed area in red and then three pelagic longline closed area, Charleston Bump in green, East Florida Coast in gray, and DeSoto Canyon in blue. Another component is pelagic longline electronic monitoring or EM cost allocation, which is considering shifting pelagic longline EM sampling costs from the agency to the industry.

So, looking at the spatial management component. We have four preferred alternative packages, one for each of the areas that I mentioned. These include modification of the area based on bycatch risk. So, that is looking at modification to the spatial extent of the areas and or the timing of when those areas are in place. Looking at bycatch risk appropriate data collection programs and looking at future evaluation timing of the areas. So, these four maps show the four areas. The black lines show the current extent of the areas. The red areas are our preferred alternatives for restricted areas where bottom longlining for the mid-Atlantic and pelagic longline for the other three areas would be restricted, either all year or during certain parts of the year.

And in these red areas for the three pelagic longline restricted

areas, the preferred alternative would be to allow data collection via exempted fishing permit. And in the yellow areas that you can see for the Charleston Bump and East Florida Coast Pelagic Long Line areas, these would be monitoring areas that would allow data collection via monitoring, which would include effort caps, expanded VMS reporting, and EM review or data collection via EFP. And for all of these areas we'd be looking at future evaluations happening when three years of data are available and finalized and or triggered evaluation based on certain events.

4 5

For the electronic monitoring portion of this area, our preferred Alternative F2, is transfer of EM sampling cost to industry. And this is based on NOAA Fisheries cost allocation policy. So, industry would pay 100 percent of sampling costs. And that shift would be phased in over the course of three years. And there are four components to this alternative. Vendor requirements, vessel requirements, vessel monitoring plans, and modification of EM spatial temporal requirements.

I'll get into a little more detail on those on the next slide. So, here there would be EM vendors that would apply to be approved by NOAA fisheries. The EM vendors would be responsible for installing and maintaining EM equipment assisting vessel owners with their vessel monitoring plans, reviewing 10 percent of sets, etcetera. The vessel owner requirements would include coordinating with the vendor to provide the EM services, ensuring EM equipment is functioning properly, working with the vendor to develop the vessel monitoring plan, declaring intention to fish in EM, data review areas via VMS, and continue reporting bluefin catch after each set. And those vessels monitoring plan requirements are shown in the middle box here. And then the vendor would provide quarterly reports and metadata to NOAA fisheries with information from video review. So, that covers Amendment 15.

Now moving on to our scoping phase actions. The first one is Amendment 16 on shark quotas and management. And looking at some background for Amendment 16. Amendment 14 to our FMP was released in January of this year. Amendment 14 established a new framework to use to implement acceptable biological catch, or ABCs, and annual catch limits, or ACLs, for Atlantic shark fisheries. Operational changes as a result of Amendment 14 are being considered in Amendment 16, as well as potentially in future rulemakings. Another related piece of background is the Shark Fishery Review or SHARE document that HMS finalized in March of this year. This document examines a variety of factors affecting the shark fishery, including commercial and recreational shark fisheries, conservation and management, and shark depredation. And identifies areas of success, concerns, and potential modifications

to regulations and management measures in the future. And so, some of these Areas are being considered in Amendment 16.

There are a couple external factors that impact the shark fishery. One of those is that in 2022, CITES listed bonnethead sharks, which is currently effective, and also listed all remaining Carcharhinidae species which will become effective in November of this year. And so, those species will all be listed on Appendix 2, which requires additional permitting for export and for introduction from high seas. In addition, the Shark Fin Sales Elimination Act became law in December, and this act bans all possession and sale of shark fins in the United States.

Going into some detail of what's in Amendment 16's scoping document this document was published in May and the comment period is open through 18th, which is Friday. And consistent with Amendment 14 and scientific advice, the purpose of Amendment 16 is to establish ABCs and ACLs for non-prohibited shark species. To optimize the ability for the commercial and recreational shark fisheries to harvest quotas to the extent practicable. To increase management flexibility to react to additional factors impacting the fisheries and account for changes in the distribution of harvest among sectors.

 So, Amendment 16 really looks at everything to do with the shark fishery. This is a description of some of the management options that are included in the scoping document. The first topic is establishing ACLs for stocks under various tiers. So, these are the tiers of the ABC control rule, which are ranked depending on the stock assessment. So, examples in the scoping document include Atlantic Blacktip, which is tier one, which is a stock assessment that is data rich. Another example is Bull Sharks, which are tier four, meaning there's no accepted stock assessment. And then another example is Sandbar Sharks, which are on a rebuilding plan so they're outside of that tier structure.

 Another set of options have to do with management group structure. So, options include status quo, creating groups for assessed versus unassessed stocks, creating groups for stocks caught together. The next group of options have to do with regional and sub regional splits in the quotas. So, it considers Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico split, considers the blacknose Atlantic boundary. And here we're also considering options to split out a Caribbean shark quota from where it's currently included as part of the Gulf of Mexico.

The next set is exempted fishing permit or EFP quotas including changes to the shark research fishery. Commercial retention limits, which includes revising or removing limits depending on species and permit. And recreational retention and size limits, which again, looks at revising or removing limits depending on the species.

3 4 5

6

7

9

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

To quickly go through one of the examples that I mentioned, the Atlantic blacktip, this is a Tier 1 stock, and this example looks at including all prior years of data and looking at an HMS risk policy of 70%, which is one of the options for the percentage of an HMS risk policy. So, here, going through the calculations to go from the OFL to the ACLs and quotas, you can see that the OFL coming from the stock assessment is 422.3, and then looking at the ABC control rule, including the 70 percent HMS risk policy, we get an ABC. Then we apply a management buffer to get the ACL, and that split between the commercial sector and then recreational sector. So, the recreational sector ACL, in this example is 50,180 sharks. And then the commercial sector ACL, the commercial dead discards are taken off of that to get to a commercial quota in this example of 136.3 metric tons dressed weight. And so, comparing this example to current harvest levels, both of these quotas would be above current harvest levels. Commercial harvest is currently 38 percent of this example quota. commercial landings are currently 89 percent of the recreational ACL.

232425

2627

28

29

30

31

32

33 34 Moving to the next, the last action that I'm going to cover today that's electronic reporting. And here we have released an advance notice of proposed rulemaking, which is again, looking at a variety of different issues and options related to HMS electronic reporting. This ANPR was published in May and the comment period is open through Friday. The purpose of this action is to streamline and modernize logbook reporting. Expand logbook reporting to for hire and commercial vessel owners via electronic logbooks. Collect additional vessel and dealer information for fishery management. Incentivize HMS reporting compliance. Offer an electronic reporting platform for HMS EFP program permit holders.

35 36 37

38

39

40 41

42 43

44

45

46

47 48 And here we're really looking across all of our fisheries to look at ways to modernize and improve reporting. So, there's potential changes to vessel reporting across all commercial fisheries, charter head boat and angling permit holders. We're also looking at changes to dealer reporting and EFP program reporting. And so, this action would work towards one stop reporting or the submission of a single electronic report that could satisfy overlapping requirements. Ιt considers various reporting options entities, commercial and recreational including requirements and looking at timing requirements for submitting reports. And the options in the NPR for reporting requirements take into account current requirements across regions and permit

types. So, for example, looking at which species would be required to be reported, whether it would be some HMS, all HMS, all species that are caught. Looking at which trips would be reporting whether it's only trips where there's catch or all trips with effort. And then looking at timing, so how many days someone would have to complete and submit their reports?

4 5

Moving to summarize our request for public comment. So, as I mentioned, Amendment 16 on sharks and the electronic reporting ANPR, those comment periods are open through Friday. And Amendment 15 on spatial management is open through September. And here you can find the web pages for these respective actions.

Looking at some of the remaining public webinars and hearings for Amendment 15, there will be a public webinar tomorrow afternoon. And there will be an in person hearing in Panama City, Florida on August 29th. For Amendment 16 on sharks, we're going to have a public hearing in this room at 5:30 today. So, anyone is welcome and encouraged to stay for that meeting, and it's also open to any members of the public. And so, we'll go into more details about Amendment 16 this evening.

And then finally some contact information. If you have any questions on these actions our branch chief for the Regulations Branch is Karyl Brewster-Geisz. And here you can see the contacts for the leads for these various actions. So, I'm happy to take any questions.

Ouestion/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Any questions for Ann? Vanessa?

 VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes, thank you for that excellent presentation. Just about the public meeting that you're going to have today. Was this shared with the commercial sector in Puerto Rico, this information?

CARRIE SOLTANOFF: Yeah, we shared the information on our HMS email list, yeah.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Okay.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Cristina, did we ever publish the bulletin announcing the hearing today in our social network or any other place?

Okay. Anyway, the other thing is, Cristina, can you send the presentation to everybody? Because I have the contacts. And it's

also available on our webpage.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: webpage and also in ISSUU.

ÍNEZ: The presentation is available on the TSSUU.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, but send it to the voting Council members via email, please. But the rest of the group, you can look at it at the webpage of the Council, and you will be able then to have the information that was presented today.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes, thank you. This will be a question for Daniel. Do you have the number of how many commercial fishermen are active in the sharks, right now in Puerto Rico?

DANIEL MATOS CARABALLO: What I know about the shark's fishery in Puerto Rico is mostly incidental. Probably over 90 percent of the catch are incidental. When they are fishing deep-water snapper, or they are fishing with the gillnets many times they catch sharks. So, I don't have a number of people that only fish shark around Puerto Rico. I don't know that.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, Vanessa, to that question. The other problem that we are having is that some people report directly to the HMS, whether they are incidental, but at least I know three people, fishers of shark, they don't report a pound and they sell the shark as 'pincho de pollo,' 'pincho de' anything but shark.

DANIEL MATOS CARABALLO: Yeah, thank you. We know there are a few of them, but most of the catches are incidental. Yeah, there are people, Miguel. That's right. Thank you. Thank you, Vanessa.

CARRIE SOLTANOFF: Yeah, I just wanted to add, at least from the perspective of those who hold HMS permits, we have a commercial Caribbean small boat permit that allows retention of some sharks, and there are currently around 27 of those permits issued here.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I've got a question on that. Those 27 permits, do you know who's for U.S.V.I.? How many for Puerto Rico?

CARRIE SOLTANOFF: I don't off the top of my head, but we can look into that.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Alright, thanks. Graciela?

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, a question on the research aspect of things. We've been told that there are more sharks in near and shallower areas around Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, is there any type of reporting that people can do to let you know what's

happening, what the species, what the depth, you know, why are we getting these smaller sharks all over the place. Probably popping grounds that we need to identify and things like that. Is there anything on that? Especially with sharks.

CARRIE SOLTANOFF: Yeah, I don't know off the top of my head what research, I do know that there is research going on that here, but I don't know exactly the details off the top of my head, but we can get back to you on that.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you I want to go touch a little bit about this Caribbean small world permit, but I know [inaudible]. Some people are interested, however, you can't have an HMS and have a Caribbean small boat permit and that's been one of the things, that they don't want to give up their HMS permits to get that other, because I think now you can get a lot more swordfish than before with a Caribbean small boat permit and that's become kind of an issue, but we'll talk about that some other time. Thanks. Any more questions for Ann? Hearing none. Thank you so much.

Next, we're going to go to Wessley Merten on the WECAFC Dolphinfish Fishery.

Update on Western Central Atlantic Dolphinfish Fishery-Wessley Merten

WESSLEY MERTEN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Can you hear me? Very well.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Wes, I'm hearing you. I will make you a co-host so you can share your screen.

WESSLEY MERTEN: Excellent. It still says disabled on my end. Oh, here we go. Okay. Can you see the presentation view?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yes.

 WESSLEY MERTEN: Excellent. All right. So, I'll get started. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen, colleagues and friends. So, our last talk with regards to dolphinfish to the Council was on December 8th, 2021. So, about 20 months ago. So, today's talk is to serve as an update to that presentation. But the last time we did present to the Council with regards to our FAD specific work was actually 15 months ago. And so, today I'll be incorporating information collected through our tagging program and through our FAD research program.

And so, just as a refresher, you know, our tagging program is known

as the Dolphinfish Research Program. And it's an international tagging program designed to collect movement, life history, and population trend data on the species. And so, this program actually began as a state funded study in South Carolina back in 2002. It went to the private sector in 2006, and we are now in our 21st year. As of today, we've had 34,589 fish tagged, 804 recaptured. We've had 84 satellite tags deployed. 81 on dolphinfish and 3 on wahoo, and we've had 12 papers published.

4 5

So, looking at the FAD research component. So, there's been 41 FADs deployed off the North Coast of Puerto Rico. Currently, there are 23 active FADs. As of the end of 2022, we've logged 2,225 trip reports. And throughout the Caribbean Basin, we've had 1,106 dolphinfish tag and release at FADs. Of those 41 FADs, 24 have been surface, 17 have been subsurface. Actually, as of the end of July, we have 2,779 trips logged. And that is a current number as of today for the number of fish tagged at FADs.

So, Puerto Rico Department of Natural and Environmental Resources, they've sponsored 31 satellite tags through this work. 27 on dolphinfish, 3 on wahoo, and 1 on silky shark. We've had 26 acoustic tag deployments. 16 on dolphinfish, 5 on yellowfin tuna, 3 on wahoo, 1 on blackfin tuna, and 1 on a silky shark. Throughout our history of our program, for our FAD research, we've had 51 vessels involved in our catch and effort volunteer initiative. We've published one paper, we have one in review, and one in prep.

And so, I present this information just to provide you with the origin of the data that we present during our talks to the Council and for our talk today. So, the objective today is to provide a comprehensive update of specific data collected through the DRP in the U.S. Caribbean Sea and the broader Caribbean Sea Basin.

And so, I'll be presenting three case studies. The first is catch and effort off San Juan over the last 15 months. And another part of this case study will be commercial catch trends for dolphinfish in D.R. and areas to the West. And then we'll look at dolphinfish movements in the Caribbean Sea with an emphasis on the Dominican Republic. And lastly, end with a brief case study on dolphinfish growth.

And so, looking at catch and effort off San Juan over the last 15 months. So, this is actually an animation, a rolling animation, just to nail down the point that, you know, we collect daily data from volunteer charter boats and recreational anglers. And so, obviously, on the left part of the screen here, you see the, the rosters of that effort depicting where these boats are fishing you know, during the different months and during the different time

periods that we're logging this data. It varies around the island by season for our participating boats, but by and large, most effort is off of Arecibo and off of San Juan, that's where we have the most participation. And then, I also included on this graphic, just the number of trips logged per month, and then the cumulative number of trips logged over the last 15 months.

4 5

And so, by the end of this time period, over the last 15 months, we've actually logged 830 trips. And the average number of trips per month is 59 trips. From those trips, we have 94 percent landings reporting rating from our boats, which is decent. And 89 percent of the trips are charter boats, with 11 percent being private recreational anglers.

Now here's another animation of the catch from those trips. And so, this is just a rolling animation that goes month by month. I just like to point you to the green pie, which is dolphinfish, and the yellow pie, which is yellowfin tuna, which constitute the two major landed species from those trips. Obviously, it shows, just like with the effort data, you could break this down by different temporal periodicities, look at it on a daily basis, weekly, monthly, seasonally, but by and large, throughout this time period the majority of fish landed from these outings is dolphinfish. And so, over the last 15 months 54 percent of catch or 1,289 dolphinfishes were landed by the boats we monitor. 22.97%, so almost 23 percent was yellowfin tuna. Followed by blackfin tuna, skipjack tuna, and wahoo, which are the top five species.

So, obviously you could break this down by seasonal trends, and so we've done this here in this slide. So, June to August is categorized as summer. September to November being fall. December to February being winter. March to May spring and then back, you know, June to present being summer again. And so, obviously you can break this down and look at just dolphinfish over this time period and look at how it may or may not dominate the catch. Last summer it actually wasn't the majority of the catch it shared with yellowfin tuna, a good portion of the catch. But as you head towards winter, dolphinfish does start to dominate the catch, up to 78 percent during winter and spring months off San Juan. And so, obviously these data are helpful in looking at the seasonality of the pulse of dolphinfish along the North Coast of Puerto Rico.

But then we're also categorizing this as whether the fish are being caught by the FADs or away from the FADs and the size range of those fish being landed. And so, last summer, catch was FAD dominated. The size range was small fish on up to 20-pound fish. During fall, actually, it's non-FAD dominated. And this could be indicative of that annual pulse of fish coming through, beginning

in the fall off the North Coast of Puerto Rico. And actually, 30 percent of that non-FAD dominated catch is small fish. So, you know, fish less than 10 pounds being caught at the sargassum lines offshore.

As the season progresses, you know, the catch becomes FAD dominated again during winter, but we have a higher dominance of the catch being in the 11-to-20-pound range. And so, this could be indicative of larger fish following those smaller fish in that annual movement of biomass of dolphinfish off the North Coast. We also have a greater percentage of fish 30 pounds or greater being landed during the winter months. During spring, you've got FAD dominated catch, but it's actually an equal percent of the small and the medium sized fish at the FADs versus away from the FADs. However, at the FADs, you have a greater amount of large fish being caught at those FADs.

And so, the FADs are holding large fish longer, providing increased opportunities for these boats to capture larger individuals during spring. And then I'd just like to mention that this past June, just two months ago, and July, have been extremely slow off of San Juan. From June through July, only 61 dolphinfishes were caught, and that's, you know, looking at about 80 or 90 trips. And the majority are less than 10 pounds.

And so, in terms of size at catch frequency for the monitored recreational vessels. The small size class does dominate the catch with a greater number of small fish actually caught away from the FADs. And so, like I mentioned earlier, this is likely due to the fall catch success as a new annual pulse of fish comes through. But with the exception of that size class, you know, FAD catch for all other size classes is higher at the FADs. One thing obviously we do recognize here is the need to bend that smaller size class into two-pound bins, which will allow us to garner a better understanding of the size breakdown for the smallest size class. So, that's something we're doing to improve our data collection.

 In terms of dolphinfish landed per trip and the frequency of that. And so, here this basically shows the number of dolphinfishes landed per trip. And this is looking at, you know, 722 angler trips over the last 15 months. And 96 percent of the trips were with dolphinfish landings less than 15 fish per trip. And actually, the majority of the trips are anywhere from 1 to 3 fish landed per trip. And so, one thing that is interesting in the last 15 months is we've had a 66 percent of total trips landed with zero dolphinfish. And so, this shows that fishing hasn't been that stellar. And then looking at NOAA's data presented yesterday, you know, this is 930 trips over an 18-year time period which shares

some similarities with our data being that the highest incidence of catch here is for small landings per trip. But one thing that is missed in this NOAA data is the incidence of the anglers being skunked when they go offshore.

And so, pardon my jargon here, but it does stink to go offshore and not catch any dolphin. So, the take home message here is, you know, we have to bring back abundance for this species. And we were pleased to see the direction the Council took yesterday with regards to the minimum size and vessel limit preferred alternatives for this species to bring back abundance.

And so, now on to the second portion of this first case study, looking at commercial catch in D.R. and areas to the West. And so, we recently had a commercial angler South of D.R. recapture one of our dolphinfishes. And so, I requested from that angler to share with me their catch, their landings over this past summer. And so, this is actually the last 16 trips this angler's made South of D.R. And the average for dolphinfish per outing was 416 pounds per outing, with a maximum of 670 pounds landed per outing and a minimum of 40. Over the last 16 outings from one boat, this is 5,430 pounds of dolphinfish being reported to us from this angler. And then, there is small dolphinfish represented in this catch. Now it would be interesting to see the size frequency among the South Coast D.R. dolphinfish fishery.

And so, this first image does represent the smallest catch we recorded. The dolphinfishes are in that cooler. Then, we counted at least eight individuals in that cooler. And so, the point being with this part of this case study is that small catch is represented in this catch. And so, we hope that the preferred alternatives and the actions being taken by the Caribbean Fishery Management Council are measures that can be considered and adopted by nearby nations and other nations throughout the Caribbean Sea. Especially at locations with FAD dominated catch, which in the case of what I'm presenting here. Most of these fish is being caught at FADs South of D.R.

We also recently learned that the FAO is funding a Fish4ACP project in D.R. to improve the supply chain for the Southern D.R. dolphinfish fishery. And so, we were provided with this infographic, and we also had a meeting with two project scientists where we learned that there are an estimated 2,369 dorado anglers in D.R. and that the catch in D.R. amounts to about 610 tons of dolphin per year. So, if you break that down by angler, that volume by angler, that breaks down to about 0.25 tons per angler or 551 pounds per angler annually. And so, over the last 16 trips for one angler, we found that that angler is catching 416 pounds per trip.

And so, the statistics go on to say that currently 36 percent of the volume is estimated, which means obviously the amount of landings in D.R. is likely higher. But the question is, you know, how much higher?

And so, you know, with the, the D.R. dolphinfish fishery and the commercial directed fishery, there's high uncertainty with the amount of volume production within that EEZ. Through our participation with WECAFC and the FAD working group, we've also learned that over the past 20 years, there's been some significant advances in the artisanal fleet in Haiti, with a lot of boats getting motors and getting better boats and getting FADs. And so, we wonder, what's the volume production within Haiti? Currently, there's no landings reported for Haiti and there's actually no landings for all of these nations here in black. And so, that represents eight EEZs in the Western part of the Caribbean Sea where we have no recorded FAO dolphinfish landings for this species.

Now these other red nations here, Mexico and the Cayman Islands, also represent high uncertainty. Back in 2007, Mexico reported 230 metric tons of annual volume production within the Caribbean WCA EEZ. The following year in 2008, it went down to two and it's remained at two metric tons per year. But all of us know that there are massive resorts within the Yucatan area that are likely feeding their guests dolphinfish.

And going back to the Fish4ACP project in D.R., the volume has increased three-fold over the last 20 years in D.R. Likely, due to the fact that more resorts are there, and they need to feed their guests dolphinfish and whatnot. So, take home message here being that there's, you know, a lot of uncertainty with the condition of the international fisheries for dolphinfish within this region. Last year we did publish a paper on this topic and I do urge you to seek out additional information there to look at the trends that we depicted in our publication.

And so, there's significant data gaps that we need to rectify to really understand the status of this population throughout the Western Central Atlantic.

I'm not going to summarize this case study. I included this for the briefing book, but I'm going to move to the next case study, which is movements in the Caribbean Sea. And so, here, there is one specific point I wanted to get to through these slides. So, here we go.

 So, first off, we've had 24 fish that have been tagged along the East Coast, recaptured in the Caribbean Sea and the tropical Atlantic. Obviously establishing the connectivity with the U.S. East Coast dolphinfish fishery and the broader Caribbean Sea fisheries. We published a paper back in 2016 that looked at the specifics of this. Data that we haven't included in that publication would be a more specific look at movements to the tropical Atlantic, which are depicted here. And so, 33 percent of those international movements have been to the tropical Atlantic, with 58 percent being to the tropical Atlantic and the Northern Leeward Islands, which highlights the fishing activity along this portion of this region.

4 5

So, our data collection is increasing throughout the Caribbean Sea. The last time I spoke, we actually had a lower percentage of releases within the Caribbean Sea relative to our database. We've had 352 fish tagged over the last 20 months in the Caribbean Sea and throughout other parts of the region. And so, our data collection is increasing, and we're getting more reports of fish being tagged at FADs and recaptured at FADs. And so, the Xs here represent where fish were tagged or recaptured at FADs throughout the Caribbean Sea, with 36.7 percent of our total Caribbean Sea tagging database represented as fish tagged at FADs.

When you break this down, when you break all fish tagged down by the size class there's 27 percent are less than 20 inches fork length, and actually 63.8 percent are less than 24 inches fork length. And so, again, these are volunteer anglers that are throwing back fish with tags in them which shows support for the preferred alternative being pushed forward for your Amendment 3 to the Pelagic FMP. And so, obviously, there's support across the basin for the preferred alternatives that you guys are pushing forward through your FMP.

As of today, we have 67 conventional recaptures throughout the Caribbean Sea. This has increased 16 recoveries since the last time we spoke. We have 17 satellite tag movements with 28 total deployments. Most of our deployments are focused on that South Coast off Puerto Rico to garner a glimpse into what this species is doing throughout the broader Caribbean Basin.

 And so, this leads me to closer to the point that I want to make through this movement segment. And so, this is actually a 44-inch cow that we tagged and released in March of 2022. And this fish, this is the most probable track for this fish. It was tagged and released South of Cabo Rojo, and this is the most probable track for the species or for the individual. It moved up into the Mona Passage and it remained in the Mona Passage for about two weeks

before it moved to the West, and it was recaptured at a FAD South of Barona, Dominican Republic. And so, this is actually the second satellite tag over the last couple years that have been recovered South of the Dominican Republic. We've deployed 12 tags. So, in total, 2 of 12 have been recovered.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Wes, we are not hearing you.

WESSLEY MERTEN: Can you hear me now?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Yes, thank you.

WESSLEY MERTEN: Okay, don't know what happened there. Where did I lose you?

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Right there in the explanation of the captures, recaptures in the Southern part of Dominican Republic.

WESSLEY MERTEN: Got it, got it, okay.

So, our satellite tagging database is showing high fishing pressure off Southern D.R. But our conventional tagging database is showing the opposite. It's showing high fishing pressure off the North Coast. And so, our conventional tagging database shows that the Northern D.R. fishery as having a higher pressure. Yet in recent meetings with the Dominican Republic Fish4ACP project leaders, they were actually unaware of the magnitude of this Northern fishery. And so, the D.R. fishery is really the major focus for the Dominican Republic dolphinfish fishery.

And so, I'll just go on to show a couple more slides with relation to this. And so, one recreational fishing team has tagged 146 fish off Punta Cana, generally, over the last two years. And of those, 12 have been recovered or, you know, an 8.2 percent recovery rate. And so, this recapture rate is higher than the highest recapture rate for our other top tagging teams within the Florida Keys. The Killin' Time II tagging team and the Wam-Jam tagging team. And so, this leads me to my point, which I was actually unaware that the South Coast D.R. fishery was the major fishery in D.R. according to our conventional tagging data. I thought it was high all around the island.

And so, it could be that the North Coast D.R. dolphinfish fishery is a major source of underestimated landings. And we wonder if the North Coast fishery is even being estimated at all in the D.R.'s volume, given the fact that the Fish4ACP project officials were unaware of the fishery on the North Coast and mainly focused data collection improvements on the South Coast fishery. And so, I

included here a summary of that. I'm not going to get into this. But I will say that tagging data are helpful in showcasing different trends than the catch data reported earlier.

And then furthermore, again, we would just like to reiterate here that there is an increase in FAD use, an increase in large episodic sargassum events throughout the Caribbean Sea over the last several years, which does raise the need for increased protection for juvenile and sub adult dolphinfish. And so, this figure depicts fishing activity collected by a recreational angler off Southwestern Guadalupe, who is also tagging fish with our program. This angler has tagged 517 fish and 121 outings. With the average fish released at 21 inches fork length. Showing support for the preferred alternative for a minimum size that the Council is moving forward with for the release of small fish in this part of the Caribbean.

And so, lastly, on to growth. Just to nail down this measure of protecting small immature fish. With data collected through our tagging program, we are modeling the growth of dolphinfish tagged and recaptured using а polynomial regression. These preliminary results, but unique results of growth for fish that extend beyond juvenile stage up to the second-year class. And so, currently we have 245 examples of growth for fish at liberty up to 561 days. So, with this model, which is still under development, with the intercept and the daily growth rate you can plug in days at liberty, and it'll predict the total growth. And so, what this model predicts is that the total growth for a dolphinfish in a year is 23.42 inches. That breaks down to a daily growth rate of 0.06 inches, or a weekly growth rate of about 0.44 inches. And this is likely an underestimate.

And so, we're breaking this down between males and females to look at sex specific growth rates and one action that is needed is that we do need more taggers to note the sex of the fish when they are tagged. Nonetheless, our growth work shows nearly a linear growth rate early in life. So, very fast, which starts to level off and slow as the fish age. So, in other words, you know, if we let the small ones go there, we're going to be able to watch them grow.

And so, bravo to the Council for supporting the effort to have small immature fish remain in the water longer with a 24-inch minimum size being the preferred alternative. And so, we hope this positive management measure for this stock is extended throughout the Caribbean Sea and in the Gulf of Mexico and along the U.S. East Coast to bring back abundance for the WCA stock.

And so, I'm not going to go through all the different issues facing

the WCA stock that I've outlined in this talk. They're included here for the briefing book. I forgot that this slide was animated. Apologize for that and I'll just move on to questions.

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Wesley. Any questions for-- Kevin?

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Thanks for the really great presentation. Lots of information there. So, I have a lot of questions, but I'll try and keep it to just a couple. I guess the first one is, and maybe you mentioned it and I missed it, do you have any estimates of release mortality?

WESSLEY MERTEN: So, we are collecting release mortality data. I have not analyzed it for the Caribbean Basin. We did publish a paper with some folks at a North Carolina State University, which does show high discard mortality. That paper was published back in 2019. Our database in the Caribbean has grown since then.

But to answer your question, for specifics, for the Caribbean Basin, no, I haven't done the analysis. But one point I'd like to mention to your question is that we do need to promote the use of non-offset circle hooks for fishing for dolphinfish. So, that more fish are lip hooked and less fish are gut hooked. And it really boils down to a question of ethical angling. And to me it's a more of a beautiful catch when your fish comes in hooked in the lip rather than basically dead hooked in the gut bleeding and whatnot. So, your point about fishing mortality is taken. And one key thing we could do, management wise, is promote the use of non-offset circle hooks for anglers.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Right. And one other quick question, if I may. In the first part of your talk, you mentioned a high rate of zero catches. How do you determine what is a true zero? So, is the expectation that anything, any vessel in your group that goes offshore has a chance of catching a dolphin on any given trip? Or is there some sub-setting of the data to get at those zeros?

WESSLEY MERTEN: Yeah. So basically, we do an interview after each trip and we ask, you know, what the angler caught and landed during that trip. And so, they'll report to us the number of landed dolphinfishes, yellowfin tuna, skipjack, wahoo, whatever it be. But over the last 15 months, we've had a very high incidence of days when these boats get skunked. Now there is one issue with that, that some of these boats are charter boats, and so there are clients on board that perhaps get sick and call the trip short. And so, we can look into that too, because we do categorize the

trips as the ones that are cut short. You can also look at the duration of the trip to see those boats go out quick and then they come back. And so, it's likely that— it's not necessarily in all cases the skill of the boat, but in some cases it could be the customer requesting the trip be ended and then obviously they're not out there longer, which might result in catch.

4 5

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Right, yeah. Yeah, that—— I mean, I guess that would be fairly easy to weed those out, I suppose, if you've got that information.

 WESSLEY MERTEN: But to that end, there is a private recreational angler we monitor off Arecibo, and he has a high incidence of zero catch. And he's a seasoned angler. And so, I have seen that he's gotten skunked a lot. Some will say that "Oh, maybe he's getting older, and his skills are not as good or his eyes aren't as good." And I've actually heard that from some folks.

So, obviously there's a lot of different variables involved, but the last 15 months we've seen a higher incidence of zero reported catch.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Right. And with the, with the expectation that those trips were actually targeting dolphin among other things, and they just got skunked.

WESSLEY MERTEN: Exactly. Yes. And so, we do categorize vessels that switch to deep drop fishing as nearshore. And so, what I'm reporting on is the offshore trolling activity. And generally, these recreational charter boats are using the same kind of trolling techniques. There is a case where when they're targeting blue marlin, they'll pull more [Kona?] baits, but you still can get big dolphin hitting [Kona?] baits. So, by and large, we feel it is representative of the offshore dolphinfish fishery but there are some customer situations and skill situations to consider.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Right. Thanks.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Graciela?

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Hola, Wes. Graciela here. I have three questions for you. One, are the anglers taking any notes on water quality, transparency, turbidity, anything that is related to the to the quality of the water? Two, are you already collaborating with the U.S. Virgin Islands and the connection between U.S.V.I. and Puerto Rico? And three, any comments or do you have any data on the catches of these pelagics, the dolphin, the wahoo, etcetera, from MPAs, especially the ones out in the EEZ? Thanks.

4 5

WESSLEY MERTEN: Okay, So, I heard your first two. The last one, I didn't get what you said there. So, the marine protected areas, Bajo de Sico, Tourmaline, Abrir la Sierra, the Hind Bank, the Grammanik Bank, Lang Bank, and the Mutton Snapper area of Saint Croix. All these protected areas. Any information that you have on the presence or the catch of dolphin in these areas.

WESSLEY MERTEN: Okay. So, for your first question with water quality. No, we're not collecting water quality specific data. There will be times when the anglers will report sargassum, but not necessarily turbidity data. Now, one aspect of our FAD research though is that we have submerged cameras on the FADs, which we're seeing are actually very useful for looking at turbidity. Which could be then looked at relative to remote sensing data. And I think what you're getting towards is like, you know, the incidents of green water, which could push pelagics out of the area and affect you know, fishing success. So, through our fishery independent research with FADs, we are getting water quality, but in our surveys, we're not generally capturing it with the anglers.

For the connection with the U.S.V.I.'s. I've had numerous discussions with Sennai and Nicole, and I used to participate with another fishery biologist there years ago. And so, I'm definitely willing and able to collaborate with them. We do have boats tagging dolphinfish in the V.I.s for us and boats out of Saint Croix and Saint Thomas. And so, yes, I'm willing and able, and I have had considerable conversations with folks over there.

In terms of catching MPAs. No, we're not, I'm not seeing any recorded catch in those locations. You know, this project started back in 2016, and so we had more participation out West, which is close to Abrir La Sierra, and all those locations, and Mona Passage, and Mona. And so, had we kept with that portion of our project, perhaps we would see anglers reporting catch there. But no, we have not seen representation of catch for the MPAs.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Cristina, you have the chat and then I got to move forward because I need Nelson to do his presentation before the break.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: We have two comments from Yamitza Rodríguez. There are many fishers targeting sharks, especially in the East Coast. There are many fishermen that are catching sharks without permits. There is a difference--

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: ¿Pero tienes algo que tenga que ver con Wes?

WESSLEY MERTEN: Yeah, I heard that question.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: ¿Que si tienes algo que tenga que ver con Wes?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: No, I'm just reading what she wrote during Wes's presentation.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: That's fine, thank you. So, now we're going to work--

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Now I noticed that it was before, thank you. Thank you for clarifying.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, thank you, Wes, for your presentation.

WESSLEY MERTEN: Thank you all for your time and for the opportunity.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: All righty. Nelson, DAP report, Puerto Rico.

District Advisory Panel Reports Puerto Rico-Nelson Crespo, Chair

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Nelson Crsepo, for the record. Good morning, everyone. On July 18th, at our Advisory Panel meeting, we talk about various topics such as how to improve data collection, the implementation plan of equity and environmental justice, and status of marine reserve areas in Puerto Rico, among other matters.

About how to improve data collection, these were the most important, the most relevant comments and recommendations. It is necessary to create a mechanism for the fishing community to provide reliable data that is considered when evaluating a fishery. We all know that the results we currently have are not in tune with the reality of our fisheries.

 The distrust that exists in the fishing sector with the scientific community is not a secret and it is necessary to increase the participation of fishermen when evaluating the fisheries and there must be feedback with the results of these collaborations. Most of the time, the fishermen do not find out the results of these investigations and this contributes to mistrust. You need to do something different to get different results.

The Caribbean Branch should be the leader in facilitating new data collection participatory forms and to be fair to the science and the fishing community, we ask to the Science Center for a balance

to place numerical data on facts that could increase the opportunity to fish, in the same way that the collection of data that potentially closes a fishery is facilitated.

Although outreach is very important, there is a structural problem and for some time there has been a claim to do things in a new way including the industry. To get the messages and priorities of the fisheries sector with numbers, the DAP should have an active participation deciding one or two scientific research priorities for each budget cycle. It is necessary to develop workshops with the DNER, the P.R. Fisheries Research Lab, the Science Center and the CFMC on how to improve data collection, including the fishing sector.

You must have information on hand such as flyers explaining more about the data collection process. We ask this Council and NOAA Fisheries to evaluate, when it's necessary, the possibility of expanding the 3 years before establishing a regulation. It is necessary to expand the collection of data with dealers, restaurants, etcetera to include an assessment of the resource.

To evaluate alternatives for data collection, we suggest the creation of a committee that includes members of the DAP, Science Center, PR DNER Lab, and the team of scientists from this Council. We should meet after this meeting.

Regarding EEJ, it is necessary to develop a research scheme that responds to the needs of the fishing sector. Each study that is carried out must have the experience of the fishers from the beginning and it is necessary to train the fishers to create a scientific bank of fishers.

It is necessary that the fishers have a fair compensation when working in the studies. At present, this payment does not compensate for the time that the fishers dedicate to participate in them and for this reason they do not show much interest. It is very important to reach out to fishing communities to strengthen their resilience and open communication with the agencies in charge of distributing funds. It is needed to have effective contact with the industry. The use of community leaders and entities that bring information to all sectors to achieve an impact on all fishing communities would be very effective.

It would be helpful to have some liaison staff that could provide guidance in the process of writing proposals so that fishing communities can participate.

Regarding the marine protected areas. The community in general

only knows that these areas are protected but they have no idea what status they are in. We suggest evaluating these marine protected areas with the most effective frequency possible and bringing these results to all fishing sectors.

there is great concern if Regarding the Tourmaline Bank, aggregations of Red Hind are currently occurring. This is because in an article published by Dr. Rowell where Dr. Schärer and Dr. Appeldoorn, among others, appear as co-authors, he says that in data from visual censuses of groupers in Abrir la Sierra, the density values are reported between 0.5 to 3.3 individuals per 100 square meters versus in a study carried out by Dr. Reni García at the Tourmaline Bank. They found a density of 0.073 to 0.074 individuals per 100 square meters. This reflects a 10 times higher density of Red Hind in Abrir la Sierra than in the Tourmaline Bank. Although Dr. García's study does not suggest that Red Hind aggregations do not exist in the Tourmaline Bank, there may be a possibility that they are not occurring, which was the main reason for protecting this area.

In other business. We briefly discussed the continued absences of our non-voting members. And we are very pleased that the DNER representation is back. I would like to know, and I wish they would've been here today, if the U.S. Coast Guard is interested in maintaining their presence on our panel, which we feel is very important. This concludes my report.

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Crespo. Any questions for Crespo? Jack?

JACK MCGOVERN: Thank you, Nelson and thank you, Mr. Chairman. Jack McGovern, for the record. That's a very good report, Nelson, a lot of good information in there. I was wondering if you could share a written report with the Council so that we could look at it more closely.

NELSON CRESPO: Sure.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Kevin.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Kevin McCarthy, Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Thanks, Nelson. Great report. And a lot of great points and we look forward to working with you all and continue the good work that we can all do together. Thank you.

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Alright, thank you. I just caught onto a text that we need a break desperately, so take a break real quick.

St. Thomas, U.S.V.I.—Julian Magras, Chair St. Croix, U.S.V.I.—Gerson Martinez, Chair

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Before the break Julian and Gerson do not have report, but I wanted to give a half a minute for Julian to tell us about the activity in December.

By the way, the hotel will be open August $24^{\rm th}$. And I insist, anybody going to travel to the meeting on December $5^{\rm th}$ and December $6^{\rm th}$, start making your reservation, airplane reservation, now. Julian, very quick.

JULIAN MAGRAS: Yes, Julian Magras, for the record. So, finally, since the hurricanes. The Marriott Western Hotel will be opening up, like Miguel just said, August 28th in that area. It's been delayed, but the Council will be back in the Virgin Islands. And the Saint Thomas Fisherman's Association would like to host everyone that attends the meeting with their other halves, if they come with them. We're going to host you guys at the Frenchtown Community Center where the fishermen and local chefs will be preparing a Seafood dinner for everyone. It won't be hors d'oeuvres. It will be a dinner. We will have fish. We'll have conch. We'll have lobsters will have all the good stuff.

And I am looking forward of having five of our main restaurants in the island, who have local chef from the Virgin Islands, to be preparing some of these dishes along with the fishers that will be preparing food. We will have drinks. We'll have music and I hope everyone can attend and enjoy this.

We're also working on providing a couple shuttles with taxis because it's very expensive on the island. It's not like Puerto Rico where three or four people get the same price they charge individually. So, between the group of us that will be attending the meeting and hiring a couple taxi vans to provide the transportation for free also so you guys can come out and enjoy an evening on behalf of the Saint Thomas Fisherman's Association.

So, Miguel, all I would need from you guys is, as we get closer and you have an idea who will be attending, if we can get somewhat of a number of who we'll be providing to it would be greatly appreciated. Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Julian. So, break time. 10 minutes. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, we're going to get started again, and the next item on the agenda is the Outreach and Education Report, Alida Ortiz, Chair.

Outreach and Education Report- Alida Ortiz, Chair

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Okay, good morning. So, we are going to make a very short report on what the Outreach and Education has been doing at this time, and especially the projects that we would like to present to you for approval. Next one.

As I said before, we are always going to find a strategic plan for the Council, and our concepts for working on outreach and education are the Ecosystem-Based Management, the Island-Based Fishery Management Plans for each island, the Sustainable Fish and Seafood consumption, and that is not only for the fishers, it's for the entire community, all the consumers, all the people that buy in the fisheries and the markets. And the Marine Protected Areas in Puerto Rico, Saint Thomas/Saint John, And Saint Croix. It was good to hear this morning from Nelson the need to get more information on the status of these MPAs so we are going to be working with that. Next one, please.

So, the thing that we have been doing in the past meeting, especially was working with the equity and environmental justice group to help Heather Blough and the fishers in Puerto Rico finding where they're going to do their meetings. These meetings are going to be from August 21st to the 24th in Puerto Rico, and they're going to be, one, in Manatee, that's the North Coast, and it will take the fishers and the communities of all that area; Cabo Rojo in the West, which is probably one of our largest fishing community; Ponce, South, not just Ponce, but all the small towns and the fishers group that are in that area; Ceiba, that will be in the East and that will take also the fishers from Vieques and Culebra.

The Liaison, Wilson and Jannette, who is part of the outreach and education advisory panel, are going to attend to all those meetings and we will then take the information and see how and what NOAA wants to do in equity and environmental justice. That way we can follow it completely in our outreach and education products. Wilson is going to do that.

The other Activity that we have been working with is the Marine Resources Education Program, MREP. That's a workshop that is done in Puerto Rico, and they are going to do it sometime in the U.S.

Virgin Islands. With the MREP, we have helped them with the areas they're going to work, and then the people that are going to participate as members of that workshop. I will be attending part of it in Humacao and Naguabo, but the entire group is going to meet in Fajardo from August 25th to 27th. And at the end, when we get the results from the discussions and what the fishers want from the workshop, we will bring back the information to you in the December meeting. Next, please.

There are two projects that we want to present to you for Council approval. It is this one. We mentioned it in the April meeting, and it is the illustrated catalog of the fish and invertebrate species that are included in the Island-Based Fishery Management Plans for Puerto Rico, Saint Thomas/Saint John, and Saint Croix. This was a request made by the three DAPs, the Puerto Rico, the Saint Thomas, and the Saint Croix, that they wanted to more information or probably some kind of product that they could look at it immediately with the information that is in the Island-Based Management Plans about this species, but that they will have an illustration, a short description, and then they could have that in the boat, they could have that in their fisheries schools, all that.

So, the objective is to familiarize the stakeholders, not just the fishers, both fishers and consumers, in an easy to understand language and illustrations with the important issues related to the species managed in each island. The text will be in English and Spanish. And then, before we complete the entire project, we are going to send it to the people we met with in Saint Thomas/Saint John, Ruth Gomez, Nicole and Julian, so that they can take a look at it and if they have different names for those species, if they have different information than the one we collected from the regular references, we will change it and we'll make a different one.

And then, there will be also the collaborators in Puerto Rico, Nelson Crespo, Eliso, and if you have another person that would want to look at it, we'll send it also. And also in Saint Croix, where we are sending it to Gerson, and I forgot the other person, but all the DAPs are going to look at the material before it is finished and then when it is finished, we will give it to the Council for production. Next one.

This is an example of what we're trying to do. Probably that description that you have there is too long because they will take a lot. We have around 73 species uniting all the Island-Based Fishery Management Plans, but we are going to have a very short description on the color, on the size, and on the regulations that

these species have in the island-based. And then, there will be references to go to the Island-Based Fishery Management Plan, the complete document, and the formal document, and check out those things. We will use illustrations. We are not using photographs because sometimes we have a description that is a color, but the photograph that we can find is a different color because it was taken on the water and it was taken, you know, with a different thing.

4 5

So, we have all the illustrations ready. We got those from Sea Grant and also an artist has made those that were not included in the Sea Grant material. So, as soon as we have that, probably in a draft, but a complete draft, we are also going to send it to Miguel and to Carlos, so that you can either send them to the whole Council, but that way--

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, we have selected people that we're going. We won't send it to everybody and his brother.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Okay, great.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: And then we have to double check whether the species appear in the different areas for some mutton snappers, Saint Thomas and all that. The other important part is that this was an idea that came out of the fishers, to have this. Saint Thomas's DPR group suggested the idea, Ruth Gomez and Julian and it was followed by DAP Saint Croix and Puerto Rico. Both groups all agreed to have the book.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: And I have already received some recommendations that were out and we're putting that in the text. The next one? Cristina?

Okay, another one is the calendar of 2024. We did have a problem with the calendar 2023, but calendar 2024 will be dedicated to the Island-Based Fishery Management Plans, because that calendar gets to the fishers, but also it gets to all the consumers, and we want that information available for the entire community. And then we have information on each one of the indicator species, manage species, and then we will have maps of where they are found.

Then, Puerto Rico will have January, February, March, and April. Saint Croix, May, June, July, August. Saint Thomas/Saint John, September, October, November, and December. And this must be completed by December for printing. Because the problem with the 2023 was that the material didn't get all together even though some material was there. So, now we have to collect that material that was for fisher's families that some of you people gave us

information on, and that should be probably for 2025. But the 2024 will be dedicated to Island-Based Fishery Management Plans, and it must be could be completed by September.

Next one.

The products that we are already working on, some of them are about to be finished or are finished. We have to work with fact sheets and booklets on the island-based essential topics. That will be stickers or infographic on each one of those island-based fishery management plans for each island. Then we would also like to have some kind of product on the content of the fishery ecosystem plan, because that is a topic that is mentioned all the time that is discussed in each one of these meetings of the Council. But we a have very complex text in terms of fishery ecosystem plan, and we have to put that in a language and a style that all consumers can read it.

We will be working with all the illustrations that we have already. We would like to have information for the schools. Because in many of the fishing villages that we have, we have a school near them. And then if the children, if the students, from the very beginning, recognizes the species and see the importance of that product, then it will be a different culture about the value of our fisheries.

We would be working—right now there is a school in Parguera, and even though it is probably something that we are doing not from outreach and education, since I have been for so long in Parguera. One of the schools in Parguera has been turned into a marine education secondary school. It's one of the Montessori schools. And they are working with the fishers, they are working with the community, and the curriculum will be accepted by the Department of Education. But much of it will be on fisheries, not just marine biology, but fisheries from history, from philosophy, from socioeconomics, so that they understand the, from the intermediate school, that fisheries are an important economic activity in our island. And we are doing that too. Next one.

 We have been asked to produce material for snapper/grouper deepwater fishing. That was one of the requests of the DAPs when we met with them. But for that, we are still getting the information. Something that I hear all the time, an explanation in very simple terms of a stock assessment and how a stock assessment done and what participation do the consumers and the fishers and the people who know the resource can have on it.

Understanding management terminology. We still have to go all the time to get optimum yield, ACL, ABC, and other terms. So, we should have some kind of a poster or something that you can stick on the fishery store with these abbreviations or these terms that are used constantly. Next one.

We were also asked but haven't gotten all the information on a fact sheet for Bajo de Sico and the fishery management regulations in the area. There are recommendations that I get from listening to the information that the fishers bring when they come to this meeting and it is that there should be a workshop on fishery management regulations for new DAP members, similar to the PEPCO. This information is not included directly in the PEPCO, but it should be like a different one on fishery management rules. What do they mean? Where is the impact? What is the importance of the fisher's participation in this communication about fishery management regulations? Next.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Alida? In that one we're-- Anyway, brainstorming. It's better to add a section like that at the PEPCO rather than double effort so the Council can assist. Then, make sure that the new members of the DAPs in each one of the areas participate. In case of a DAP member from Saint Thomas/Saint John, and Saint Croix, we can invite them over to come to this particular meeting, the new members.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Okay, great. And that's something that we can manage with Wilson. And the same way that I go there to the PEPCO and give information about what is the Caribbean Fishery Management Council and ecosystem-based management that, that will also take the information. So, I'll talk to Wilson about that.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: And the other thing some fishers suggested was to use the social networks, especially Facebook, with that information. So, it's a matter of getting with Cristina, yourself, and others to include that information. We should include also stock assessment because translating stock assessment from science to common language is not that easy.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: It's not that easy at all.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: To start, in Spanish, there's no word for stock in Spanish. It's 'abasto pesquero.'

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Abasto.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: If you say to a fisherman, "abasto pesquero" the fisherman will say, "¡Mas abasto pesquero seras tú! Cuidado como

me hablas." So, okay, thank you.

SOTOMAYOR:

1 2 3

ALIDA ORTIZ recommendations? Yeah, okay. Any questions,

5 6

4

Ouestions/Comments

7 8

CARLOS FARCHETTE: No, Vanessa?

9 10

11

12

13

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Alida. Vanessa Ramírez for the record. Of course, I have to thank you because you have been a great facilitator during all these months with all the activities that we have been doing in the West area. Also, Wilson and Janet that were in Viegues with the PEPCO.

14 15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

I just want to take a moment bring something to the attention of the Council. We started giving the workshop for the divers as we saw in presentation during this morning. Our fishermen, most of them are changing their kind of fishery to diving and we have a big issue with the young fishermen. Last week we lost one, 28 years and today I have one of my divers here and he just had two of the worst experiences for a diver. He got lost in June. He was seven hours out in open waters between the buoy four and six and it was very difficult to work with that rescue. I have to thank Miguel Borges. Sadly, 911 can't contact Coast Guard. Miguel was the one that helped me put that on the line, and they helped a lot with the rescue. We have an emergency plan in our area, but this is a situation that is around Puerto Rico. I know that also Virgin Island has the same.

29 30 31

32

33

34

35

36

We're taking care of our fishery, but we need to take care also about our human resource that are the fishermen, especially if we can develop a small booklet or an emergency card where they have and know the procedure when they have an accident with barotrauma or when they have their diver lost, who do they have to call first instead of waiting in those. Because when you're in open waters, each minute counts, it's a life that is right there.

37 38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

And also, I want to put for the record the situation in Puerto Rico with the medical personal that we have. The only chamber is here in San Juan. I have Abdiel right here. He got a bubble on Saturday; he went to the hospital in San Germán. They made him wait until the next day. The emergency doctor didn't even know what that was. He had to explain it. They wanted to let him go home with some pills, some Advil for the pain. And it was very difficult to make a request for the chamber to receive him. Jannette helped me a lot calling directly to the director. Once we got that done, he was transported in an ambulance to San Juan and received the treatment. In two hours, he was already in the chamber.

But the thing is most of our commercial fishermen, especially in the West side or in Vieques and Culebra, when they have to go to the chamber, many of them decide not to because they don't have the facility for transportation once they are out. For example, that's why Abdiel is here with me. I took him to the hospital and brought him giving back. Some of you had the experience last night talking to him. It's something that we need to address as a Council because it's our younger fishermen generation that we need some other fishermen getting. As we take care of our fisheries, we need to spread the word that they need more workshops for security in diving and especially also in the medical sector. We need some education that all these people that are the first responders know how to treat a diver when they come to the port. Thanks.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Actually, I had a short meeting with Jannette yesterday about that issue. So, Jannette, if you want to say anything.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Well, we are short on time for that one.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Jannette is requesting a turn to speak.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, I know. But the thing is that we have done this before. Several times. And with Sea Grant. So, probably we can talk to Chapa, the director of Sea Grant, and see if we can have that collaboration. Cristina did a video with the doctors. Actually, we have that. We can share it also with the social network.

But the issue is that, as Andy Maldonado said at one of the meetings, Andy Maldonado is one of the best commercial divers that we have in Puerto Rico. He's been fishing for a long time. Many young fishers don't care. They just go out. You know that guy has three tanks? How many tanks? The thing is that we can have five sheets and everything, but if you guys don't follow, it won't go anywhere. But this is a continuum, we have to do it.

This is the last thing. We were going to have a workshop, at the Council, in one December. The workshop was going to be given by a diver that was a teacher on how to avoid bubbles. The meeting was in December. He called me in November, and said he got himself in bubbles. So, you know, it gives you an idea of the problematics that we have. But I believe that following Vanessa, we can start the ball rolling to work on the two areas. And Jannette also told me about it. She helped on it. So, I believe between Vanessa, as

a Council member, Cristina, Alida, and Jannette, we can put something together that we can report back to the Council in December.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: Okay. That'll be great. Jannette?

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Jannette, you need to use the mic and introduce yourself for the record.

JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: Thank you. Jannette Ramos-García for the record. I already called the Colegio de Medicos y Cirujanos de Puerto Rico and asked them about how to do the continual medical education for doctors. And I already have the information, so we are going to proceed with the class.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Vance?

VANCE VICENTE: Yeah, real quickly. Alida, thanks again for all your contributions. Regarding the catalog of fishes and invertebrates, I'm going to make another suggestion to add a small section on seagrasses. Because, I mean, fishers know where they are and what they do, but they may not recognize one from the other. And this might be particularly important with the halophila. Since we have halophila stipulacea, which is an invasive species, which is also affecting the shallow benthic communities. And there are only six species. You can use the presentation I gave the last time on seagrasses, you can use the pictures and everything, whatever for it, for anything that you want.

Sorry for causing all this commotion here. I stepped on some cable here and I don't know. So, it's my fault again, again, and again.

 So, anyhow, just for the record, if you can add a small section with pictures showing the taxonomy of the sea grasses, which the fishers know they exist, but maybe they don't know what they are, you know, what species, and specifically what they do. You can use all the pictures that I sent you and I can help you, voluntarily, write something up if you need me to help. And maybe, another three pictures showing an example of a Phaeophyte, a Rhodophyta, and a Chlorophyte of what a brown algae is and maybe you can just show Sargassum, a Chlorophyte, maybe Penicillus or whichever you wish and a Rhodophyta, which you know more than anybody. Just to let them know that other plants are autotrophic, and they contribute to the productivity of the ecosystem. Thank you.

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: The only thing, Vance, is that since the island-based strictly focuses on the reef fishes, pelagics, invertebrates, then we could work with other products of the fish

communities in seagrasses or the fish communities in mangrove roots, things like that. But for this product in particular, it has to be only reef fishes and pelagics.

VANCE VICENTE: Thank you, I agree.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Thank you. So, we're going to move forward, but we're going to bump Ana Salceda ahead of the Council Fisheries Liaisons. And then the lunch hour will only be one hour, and we will be back here at one so we can catch up on some missing items, the liaisons and Kevin McCarty. So, Ana.

Big Fish Campaign Update-Ana Salceda

ANA SALCEDA: Hello. Good morning and thank you very much for opening a space for us to present the Big Fish Public Engagement Campaign. I'm going to be sharing my screen so you can see our presentation. My team, the digital team will also be participating in the meeting in a few minutes. So, let's start with I understand that there are different levels of information among these audience. So, I'm going to provide a little bit of background of these initiatives.

So, this initiative started in 2018 within the context of the WECAFC Spawning Aggregation Working Group. I came out because the group realized the importance and urgent need of putting out there all the research and information that had been gathered on fish spawning aggregations. In order to actually encourage action, we needed to reach out to the three main target audiences of this campaign.

So, as you know, our campaign is the first phase of implementation of a 10-year communication strategy that is the communication component of the regional fish spawning aggregations management plan. This is a two-year campaign in three languages, English, Spanish and French.

 We originally had a dream campaign. So, we were talking to all the target audiences, including young kids and everyone. But a reality check forced us to actually focus on three target audiences. The first is fishers, because, as you know, they are an indispensable part of the solution. Then, decision makers, which includes not only politicians and managers, but also enforcement officials. And also, the general public. As you know, there's no such a thing as a general public, so we are focused on tourists from Europe and the U.S., especially, that travel to the Caribbean and when they get here, they consume fish. And at the local level within the entire wider Caribbean, which is the geographic scope of our

campaign and our strategy, we are focused on fish buyers since they are consumers in all the countries in the region.

So, we originally focused on, when it comes to the logo, as you know, is the face of the initiative, we had focused on two original concepts that have been evolving, evolving, evolving, until reaching this point. This is the final logo of the campaign. The colors included in the palette of the campaign, which is basically the Caribbean blues, this is the bright blue, and we are also including the dark Caribbean blue, which is what you see in the letters and the little fish and a palette of yellow, orange, golden that includes that fish.

Well, the color of this fish has been an incredible battle. We have consulted with so many people that we came up with this color, which is, you see that the fish is kind of a hybrid between a grouper and a snapper because we originally had a nassau grouper but some of the group— let me insert a very important note here. This is a campaign that has been produced from the beginning and will be until the end by the Spawning Aggregation Working Group. And there's a communications subcommittee within that working group that has been contributing with time, knowledge, opinions, and constant feedback to the campaign. So, the scientists didn't like the color that we had before, which was the color that the fishers like, which was a very orangey, kind of happy color. So, we ended up with this color. As you see, dog snappers are pretty much like that underwater, and, well, I hope you like it. Because it was not easy to get here.

As part of the, of this initiative, we have produced many outreach products and communication products. One centerpiece of the campaign is a one-hour film for broadcast that was premiered on Nature/PBS last April and in the German market in last May. We have great news already about this film. It's originally in English for the international market, but we are going to produce a Spanish version of the film. Not with subtitles, but dubbed, because based on the fishers and some members of our communications subcommittee, well, for a one-hour film subtitles didn't work. So, we are working on the Spanish version to be distributed throughout the entire region and the Spanish speaking countries, of course, of the wider Caribbean.

The great news is also that we are finalists in three film festivals in Europe, in Germany, in Austria, and in Rotterdam. We are finalist in Jackson Hole. For your information, Jackson Hole in the U.S. is the most important film festival of science and natural history in the world along with Wildscreen that has accepted already our film, and we think that we could be finalists

as well. So, that is already great because that assures us an incredible distribution in Europe and the U.S. In the U.S. it was premiered by PBS and it's on several streaming platforms right now. That includes Apple and Amazon, etcetera, etcetera and it will be there for a year.

So, regarding the film, we are also submitting the film to many, actually, almost 50 film festivals in the wider Caribbean region, where our executive producers wouldn't have applied, but we are doing it because of this campaign. By the way, our executive producers are the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Nature/PBS and Red Bull Terra Matter out of Austria. In addition to this one-hour film for broadcast, we also have short films. We are producing two short films right now. One is in post-production, the other one is being produced as we speak. And we already finished two films in three languages. "Nassau Grouper Against the Clock" is focused on the situation that nassau grouper is facing. And, well, you get it from the title that it's a call to action for targeting decision makers, but it's a product that can be watched and perfectly understood by all the other target audiences.

The main messages of the campaign are-- again, I think you are familiar already with the communication strategy, that is the framework of all this, so you know the themes and subjects that we are going to be talking about. But the main, main messages are: no fishing, no sales from December to March for nassau grouper and no fishing, no sales from April to July for mutton snapper. The second film that we already produced in the three languages is "Fish Smart" and it's addressed to fishers. It's about fish spawning aggregations, the situations that we face in the entire region and it's a call to action, not only for the fishers to participate, but also explores ways for the fishers to get involved in the decision-making process, find alternative livelihoods collaboration with institutions like this one, and alternative livelihoods, but also with opportunities for capacity building and funding opportunities.

The short films that are in post-production right now, are pretty much the same idea for mutton snapper that we included for nassau grouper. "Love is in the Air" is the only short film that is addressed to a younger audience, the tourist that come from Europe and the U.S. and come to the Caribbean. So, it includes, of course, because for this campaign solutions are really important, they are part of our content. So, this short film includes many ideas for these target audiences of what they can do when they are here.

The Howard Hughes Medical Institute is also producing four adds as part of the campaign and apply to these target audiences where

they are going to be able to see a which species they can eat when they get to the Caribbean and the ones that they cannot eat because they are in season. It provides alternatives for sustainable species to consume while in the Caribbean.

We have, as part of our research for our communication strategy, we realized that radio is very important for fishers and for the general audience radio is back. So, we have a very important component of radio. We have created, produced already the Radio Kit in English. The Radio Kid in Spanish is being produced as we speak. We have incorporated fishers from Mexico. This week we are going to be producing, here in Puerto Rico, with many of the fishers that are part of this Council and work with this Council, the podcast in Spanish. So thus far we have the English version, as I said, and it includes two podcasts and two FSAs. One, for nassau grouper to promote the closed season of nassau grouper and mutton snapper at the regional level.

The podcasts. One is focused on nassau grouper. Of course, being radio, we used an audio approach. So, thanks to the constant support of Michelle Schärer and some of her colleagues. I think it's a juicy podcast to hear the love calls of the nassau grouper. And "Fish Smart" is complementary with the film that we produce, and it keeps exploring alternative for fishers during the fishing bans, right? In addition to provide information about fish spawning aggregations.

The Caribbean Fisheries Management Council has produced beautiful Posters for both species that are the flag species of the management plan, the nassau grouper and the mutton snapper. So, they are in the three languages of the campaign, including French. And thank you to Alida, Graciela, and all the people from the Caribbean Fisheries Management Council for contributing with this to the campaign as well.

 The Big Fish Hub is the digital phase of not only the campaign, but the spawning aggregation working group phase. The idea of creating a hub, as you know, Miguel and I really had great conversations about the difference between a website and a hub, right? So, a Hub is, as Miguel says, the enhanced version of a website. It's more interactive, and it's more specialized, and in fact, you are going to see the three sections for the different target audiences that we are creating, because the Hub is in a very rough draft state. It's basically a resource library as well. So, you are going to be able to find here not only the materials that we have created for this campaign, but we have been curating a collection of existing materials that were produced in the last 10 years by partners on fish spawning aggregations and the species

that aggregate to spawn. So, we have curated that collection. You will find it there, as well as all the scientific papers, popular science, management plan, regulations, and of course, all these products that are additional to the ones that we produce.

I'm going to walk you through this very, very rough draft of the hub. But just to finish this part of the presentation, we are also working with the Howard Hughes Medical Institute and PBS. They are creating additional materials for the respected platforms, more educational. The Howard Hughes Medical Institute has a section for teachers that is called biointeractive, and they are creating videos and workshops and all kinds of materials to focus on reef ecology and fish spawning aggregations for this group of students, freshman students in college and for this group of teachers that include teachers from the Caribbean, by the way. The idea is to bring the teachers in Puerto Rico closer to this group, but we already have presence of teachers from Colombia, Chile and many of the countries that are part of the wider Caribbean. So that's work in progress. But we have many years ahead of us. So, for now they are being incredible partners. They are supporting us with these additional materials.

The same goes for the educational section of the website of PBS, Nature/PBS, WNET. And they are producing more materials as we speak. We are also working with, of course, all of our partners in the region including GCFI, COBI, and many others to serve the communication purposes or needs of their respective organizations and dovetail both initiatives.

Let me show you a little bit of the hub. As I said, forget about the design, please. Let's focus on structure and main content. So, there will be a better explanation of what the Fish Initiative is. A link to learn more, so there will be a background. So, the viewers will be able to understand where this initiative comes from who are the main stakeholders and a little bit of history of the project.

We have, as you see at the bottom, we have a resource library, which is the one that I just mentioned, where you can find the collection of videos, radio production, papers, protocols, management plans, etcetera, etcetera, that could be useful for any of the target audiences of the campaign. And we have also, next to resource library, another section, because we are going to have a lot of Live events. We have put together a calendar for the first year of the campaign. Our partners are inserting their respective events and activities in their respective countries. So, the idea is to do a lot of streaming. So, as I said, this Hub is very interactive and there will be a lot of streaming and materials

that our partners will send us and keep completing.

2

4

5

7

8

9

10

1112

Speaking of life events. The campaign will be launched the second half of September. It will be launched from Belize as part of a series of special screenings of "Treasure of the Caribbean," the film for broadcast. In Belize, Guatemala, and Honduras, who are the countries were the main character of this film, which is the nassau grouper, but also the coral reef which is the set of the film. These three countries have a lot of importance for the future of this wonderful and resilient coral reef called the Cayman Crown. So, we start with a series of live events and screenings of this film for decision makers, fishers, and the community, always going to our three target audiences.

13 14 15

16

17

18

19

20

We will start in Belize, because as you know, there's a tradition and history of Belize protecting fish spawning aggregations, and we will launch the campaign. We are waiting for the decision makers in Belize, the Fisheries Department, to tell us when the event will be. We think that it could be around the 17th of September so that will be the launch date. But we are still waiting for confirmation. We will keep you posted.

212223

24

25

2627

2829

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38

39

40 41

42 43

So, let's go to policy makers. So, the first video that you see there is the one that we produce for them. We have three cuts on this. Everything that you see, including the pictures, the animations, everything, are rough cuts, right? Basically, this map is where we are going to include the information that we have been gathering on those 10 species that are going to be the focus species because we cannot include all of the species that aggregate to spawn. So, we have selected, based on the advice from our partners, these 10 species. There will be a database of the regulations, existing regulations in each country of the region. Then, there are three asks for decision makers. One, is help us complete the database and the information. Second, promote and support the enforcement of the closed season in your country and this is a series of steps. What you see there, the moving text, is a series of steps that decision makers and the rest of the stakeholders involved in enforcement should take in order to get prepared for the spawning season. Michelle Schärer, has been doing this work in Puerto Rico. Stephania Bolden and Michelle were instrumental in putting together this guide of what to do when the spawning season is approaching. And the third task for decision makers is to coordinate with your neighbors. Conservation, protection, and enforcement.

444546

47 48 So, we have started again. This is a rough, rough cut. So, you will be able to navigate and look for your country and you will have the information of the fisheries department of that country

and the enforcement office or unit or whatever it is in the different countries. This animated map that is going to be much bigger includes all of the known and confirmed aggregation sites of the different species in the wider Caribbean. The different colors respond to different species, and it will be bigger. So, it's right next to that section of work with your neighbors so that everybody knows who their neighbor is, right? But it helps with the content.

Here are also the ten things that have been chosen to focus on. Priority species let's call it. There will be a basic description. The ones that have posters, there will a link to the poster. And here we have the final link to go back to the library for more information. And of course, since we are requesting more information and data from the different countries here is the way for them to submit it. We still need to decide who is going to receive these emails, by the way.

So, this is decision makers that includes the managers, enforcement, and the policy makers. I look forward to whatever you think we are missing, big things, big content that should be there that we haven't included or we should include. And we will review this also with a group that is going to be meeting today at 6:30 to get their feedback on the hub.

So, this is the section for fishers, right? So, we have the film, and this is the main content. Training opportunities, financial support, connection with other fisher folks in the region, and the media, and more resources. So, here is a Big Fish film manual. The ten species that we mentioned before will be here, described. We will have the radio content that we have created, and we are producing right now. It will be linked to Spotify. We have created a channel for them, and it will be placed here.

Here we have alternative livelihoods. Basically, this is a section that is going to be to celebrate fishers, right? And we are working already with many different fishers and associations and groups and co-ops from Mexico and other countries to have a network of influencers, fisher influencers from the entire region that are going to be filling out this section. Here we have training resources. The same mechanism. You go to your country, and you can find the capacity building opportunities for you. The funding resources as well.

 Here we will have a story map that Michelle Schärer suggested to have, but it's so complex and sophisticated that we have decided to change what we were going to do, and we are putting together something that takes actually 20 days to be produced. So, it

basically will be about the situation in each country regarding the different species that aggregate to spawn. It will be interactive so you will be able to go to the different countries, and there, a window will pop up with the fishers that are making a difference in that place, in that country, right? And what they are doing to tackle the fisheries crisis. And there will be, contact information of these, it could be individuals, there are countries that are not as well organized as others, so there will be information of associations, co-ops, and individuals.

4 5

That's pretty much the two sections for fishers and decision makers. We are also working on the community. And as I said, this will be much different, this for the general public, tourists, and people that will come to the Caribbean. So, it will include the call to action, and all the information about the application, so they can downloaded before they take their trips.

We will have the ten different species that we discussed before. And as you see, you will be able to see the different species, the description, links to the posters. And you will be able to hear the sound that the groupers make as well as part of the descriptions. Here we have basically a billboard of what the events are going to be at that moment. So, everybody can get online and connect to it, or at least know what's going on in the region regarding fish responding aggregations.

Many ideas to help, which include volunteer and also fundraising for fishers, organizations, that really want to keep building capacity and for research as well. We will be raising money for those specific goals. Research and fishers, capacity building for fishers.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Ana, we only have a couple more minutes because we have a cutoff for lunch.

ANA SALCEDA: Okay, okay. So, that's basically it. Now we are going hear very, very briefly-- I'm a little worried that we don't have the time because this presentation should be 10 minutes and you guys will-- Isabella and Addie, need to make it very, very short. So, go ahead.

ADDIE BRIGGS: Hello, can everybody hear me?

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Yes.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Ana, we don't have 10 minutes because we have to break. We can do it after lunch at one o'clock.

ANA SALCEDA: Okay.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: So, the first thing after one o'clock, we'll do that.

ANA SALCEDA: Okay. Addie and Isabella, we will reconnect with you after lunch at 1 p. m., which is 4 p.m. for you.

ADDIE BRIGGS: Okay, cool. Sounds good.

ANA SALCEDA: Thank you. Bye bye.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: I believe that the work that Ana has done with the collaborator is exceptional. When we were discussing this, I called the Hub a glorified webpage, but it's a little bit more than that. This is probably one of the best things that we have done for the promotion of Pan-Caribbean management of the species that aggregate to spawn. The three components are management, fishers, and science and you have seen that it all will be there.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that Kevin wanted to say something before. Is it good news, before we go to lunch?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Kevin.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Sure, thank you. This is Kevin McCarthy, Southeast Fisheries Science Center. And this was something I forgot to mention yesterday in our presentation. But working with Laura and Rachel at headquarters, Laura Cimo and Rachel O'Malley at headquarters, we were able to get funding to hire a person to work in support of our efforts with WECAFC. So, essentially this will be a position that will evaluate U.S. data reporting obligations. So, as we become more and more involved with the WECAFC, there's data that is required from each nation that's a member state.

 So, we've got reporting obligations just like we do with ICAD and these other international organizations, but we haven't developed those mechanisms yet and we haven't identified all the data that are required for WECAFC reporting and we don't quite understand the WECAFC reporting system. So, this person would be hired through the Cooperative Institute just like many of the folks that are working with the Caribbean Fisheries Branch are and they would be working on that data reporting obligation and understanding that system and developing guidance for future implementation of data reporting.

So, we're looking for somebody who knows about data sets, who knows how to code in, say, R or SQL, that sort of thing. It doesn't

matter where they live. They could live down here. They could live in Colorado. They could live wherever because the Cooperative Institute doesn't care. They could be located in Miami if they so desire. Although, I got to tell you, the cost of living there is going through the roof. So, much like everywhere else, but it's especially so in Miami.

So, the job announcement has not come out yet. We'll make sure that the Council gets it. I don't quite know what they do, if they send out a job description as well as the job announcement, but we have both of those documents that have been prepared for CIMAS. And CIMAS does the logistics of the hiring. We will have a hiring panel that will interview candidates. So, that's something to look forward to, hopefully in the not-too-distant next month or so. But we'll see, and we'll let you know.

I meant to mention that yesterday so it's a great opportunity for somebody. We're probably looking at a master's level, like a new graduate, but who's got some coding skills and knows about some databases. And that's it.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Kevin. So, we're going to break for lunch. We'll be back in one hour. So, one o'clock sharp.

(Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on August 16, 2023.)

AUGUST 16, 2023

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

CARLOS FARCHETTE: We're going to get started again. So, are we see ready?

ANA SALCEDA: So, thank you for giving us a little bit more time.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Ana, no nos pasemos de los 10 minutos.

 ANA SALCEDA: Yeah, yeah, yeah. It won't. What you are going to listen to now is the digital part of the campaign. I presented the Hub, and the digital team of Big Fish is going to present pretty much the social media.

ADDIE BRIGGS: Awesome. Can everyone hear me?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yes.

4 5

 ADDIE BRIGGS: Okay, awesome. Hi, everyone. My name is Addie, and I'm really excited to be with you all today. Super honored and excited to kind of share the progress on the digital strategy. I've been the digital coordinator with Big Fish since June. And yeah, I'm just super excited. I'm going to pass it off to Isabella to introduce herself.

ISABELLA SAPORITO SANTOS: Hi, buenos días a todos. I'm Isabella Saporito Santos. I am so excited to present the work we've done so far so we can just hop right into it because I know we're short on time. So, we'll go ahead and get started.

ADDIE BRIGGS: Next slide.

So, this is just a campaign overview and kind of what we're going to be going over today. We're going to touch briefly on the Hub, even though Ana already talked about it. We're going to talk about our social media platforms and our social strategy, our newsletter, and then lastly, how we're bringing that all together through our Linktree, which is this super cool platform.

If we could go to the next slide.

So, as Ana talked about, the Big Fish Digital Hub is the absolute centerpiece of the campaign. It's where all of our resources, videos, information, calls to action are going to live across our three audiences, which are fishers, decision makers, and the community. And as Ana mentioned, it's also going to be in three different languages.

So, all of our different digital platforms really kind of serve to drive traffic to our digital Hub, because it's one of the most important parts of our campaign.

If you go to the next slide, I'll talk a little bit about social.

 So, Big Fish has launched across the following platforms. We are @BIGFISHINITIATIVE across Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, TikTok, Threads, YouTube, WhatsApp and Spotify. An important part of our social strategy is using kind of the research from our 10 years. The work that all of our partners, many of you all also contributed to with our recovering Big Fish 10-year plan and making sure that we cater content on these specific platforms to the audiences that are most active on it.

So, for example, we know that from this, from our previous research

from 2018, we know that WhatsApp is extremely important for fishers. So, that's going to be a really key part of our strategy. On the other hand, we know Twitter is going to be really important for decision makers. So, kind of a key part of how we're going to cater our content is just by slight differences in tone and wording so that our messages come across better to our different audiences.

4 5

If we could go to the next slide.

So, another key part of our social strategy is how we actually plan on generating buzz is through kind of leaning on our partner organizations and leaning on the current social media presences that our partners have. So, we are not planning on spending any money, at least in the beginning part of our campaign, on boosting our posts or doing paid social advertisements. But what we do plan on is synchronizing our posts and using resharing and stories and collaborative posts and tagging to build up our following from zero and kind of direct traffic to our social channels, which then leads traffic to our digital Hub.

We're currently working with our incredible, expansive network, many of you, our partners are here today, which we're really excited to be presenting to you all. But we're going to kind of sync up our posts and time our posts to kind of generate attention that way through our social platforms.

So, we go to the next slide.

So, in terms of the actual content that is going to live on our social channels and our digital platforms, we have lots of different content types. We have still images, we have graphics, we have video, and we have audio. We've spent the past two months kind of building out the themes and strategies from the Recovering Big Fish 10-Year Plan and we have kind of created pieces of content that are balanced in terms of the audience sections that they reach and the campaigns that they highlight.

 The campaign messages that they highlight, I'm just going to talk about a few of them. In terms of themes, obviously, FSAs are our most important theme. That's kind of the backbone of the campaign and everything-- FSA education is an extremely important part of our content. We also have ecosystem education focused on the species that aggregate to spawn, the importance of enforcement, responsible consumption, stakeholders, alternative livelihoods, connectivity, and building community. Those are kind of our themes, our subject matters, and our content.

And then our strategies, our stories of success, hope and triumph,

mathematical reasoning, beauty and wonder, critical calls to action, solutions, vicious charismatic animals, ocean stewardship, and viral content. And again, this entire digital plan is all thanks to the work that all of our partners have done over the past five years. It's kind of the culmination all the work. So, we're just really thankful to have had all that great research to kind of build the strategy off.

4 5

Another note I wanted to make about our social content is that we've ensured that all our video content features both Spanish and English which are kind of the two main languages for our campaign. So, any video content that is in Spanish will have English subtitles, and any video content that is in in English will have Spanish subtitles. I don't know if I mixed that up. And then our captions will be trilingual. So, they all have English, Spanish, and French in the captions so that we're making sure we're not isolating or alienating any audiences by not having content in their language.

So, I think that's it from me, for these slides, but I am going to pass it on to Isabella to talk a little bit about our calendar and some newsletter. So, if we could go to the next slide, that would be great.

ISABELLA SAPORITO SANTOS: Hi everyone, again. So basically, we have a calendar that's a brief outline of some of the dates we're following apart from the collaborative calendar we've created for partners, which we'll talk about shortly.

So, in August through September, we're going to begin distribution of a Big Fish weekly newsletter. This will include basically everything that's going on, the posts we have scheduled and everything we're up to and our partners are up to. And then, in mid-September, our Big Fish campaign will launch across all our digital platforms with key in person activations in Belize. In September through October Treasures of the Caribbean will be released in the Caribbean. And the first two months of social content will be centered around the general themes and strategies that Addie went over.

 And then in November, we'll be preparing for the grouper spawning season and gearing up messaging that will, you know, discuss that you can't fish or sell a grouper during this period through March. And then December through March the grouper spawning season will be at its active point, so we'll maximize the messaging during this time. And in March, as it's ramping down, we'll begin preparing for snapper spawning season, which will begin in April.

Then May through June, we'll be establishing our most active part, a snapper spawning season. And then at that time, there'll be no snapper fishing or sales messaging that we'll be sharing with our partners that they can share as well on their platforms. And in July snapper spawning season will begin. So, this is a brief outline until July. And of course, there'll be changes as things happen. But this is generally what we'll be speaking about.

4 5

If you could go to the next slide.

So, we, as Anna mentioned during her presentation, we created a partner event calendar. So, basically, we have a collaborative calendar that all of our partners can add on important dates happening in their own company and organization. That, we will try to synchronize in our posting and add to our calendar as well. That way we're including all that is going on that are happening in both the natural world and the cultural world. This will include screenings, workshops, and live events, and especially our screenings for the films and all the short films.

If we could go to the next slide. One forward, please.

So, our newsletter our newsletter is going to be a very important piece of strategy for our campaign. We're highlighting-- you know, we're trying to aim to include messaging that will be able to be shared through our partners' network. Since we're relying so much on organic strategy, our synchronized efforts will be key. So, the most important part of the newsletter is that we will include what we're posting, when we're posting it and where and how people can reshare it. We also will be giving our partners certain materials depending on their country that they can prepare for enforcement and for the season that they can also share on their platforms.

So, that's going to be a very important part of our strategy. And as we mentioned, you know, we're trying to bridge the gap of also including French in our captions and in our content because our partners have brought to intention that in the past, there's this historic French gap. And with such a regional project, we really want to focus in on bridging that gap. So, while there will be more content in English and Spanish, we're definitely trying to include French to the best of our capabilities.

And then if you go to the next slide. Two forward, please.

As Addie mentioned, we will have a Linktree that will connect everyone that follows our pages to our different platforms. So, it will connect you to our digital hub, a donation tip jar, which is an included feature on Linktree, all of our social channels and our newsletter subscription page. I think Linktree is going to be very important, and we'll be sharing that in all of our social platform's bios. The way that it functions differently from a website is that, to reiterate, it is a database for our target audiences and its six years' worth of research. It kind of narrates their needs, and each section has its own narrative. So, we're really excited to share all of this.

4 5

If you could go to the next slide.

Thank you. Gracias. Merci. Thank you, guys, so much for listening to our presentation. We're so excited to take advantage of all this amazing work that has been done by our partners over the years and be able to share it and really get people interested in the initiative. I don't know if Addie has any last words.

ADDIE BRIGGS: Yeah, you said it really well. We're really, really excited and we appreciate the time you've given us to present.

ISABELLA SAPORITO SANTOS: Yeah. Thank you all.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Okay. I'm trying to catch up here on the agenda.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: Carlos, Phil Karp is ready online. Okay. So, I'm going to move him up and then do the liaisons after that. So, Lionfish Market Presentation.

Lionfish Market Presentation on National/International Projects-Phil Karp

PHILIP KARP: Great. Well, thank you very much for-

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I don't know if I can give you that full 45 minutes though. If you can move kind of fast.

PHILIP KARP: Sure. Yeah. Thanks for the opportunity to present to the to the Council. What I'm going to be talking about today is value added products as a tool for dealing with the Atlantic lionfish invasion. I would like to share my screen.

CRISTINA OLÁN MARTÍNEZ: I made you a co-host. So, you have the permission to share your screen.

PHILIP KARP: Thank you, Cristina. Let's see. I'm actually looking for the share screen button. I'm not seeing it right now. So, maybe Cristina, if you could just launch the slides. Great.

So, like I said, I'm going to talk about value added products as a tool for management of invasive lionfish.

Next slide, please.

I think you're probably all familiar with the problem of invasive lionfish. So, I don't want to spend a lot of time on that, other than to note that this is a problem that has been becoming increasingly an issue across the wider Caribbean.

11 Next slide.

13 I think you probably have all seen this infographic from NOAA and 14 USGS that tracks the growth of the invasion over time. It's not 15 it's not showing the growth here. So, let's jump to the next 16 slide, please.

Since over the last two decades, lionfish essentially have become problematical throughout the wider Caribbean and up and down the Atlantic Sea bordering the U.S. and even as far South as the Orinoco River in Brazil.

Next slide, please.

In addition to their spread, their population densities in the Atlantic are up to 10 times those found in their native range. Next slide.

The nature of the problem is again one that I'm sure many of you are familiar with. The fact that they have no native predators that consume juveniles of commercially important fish, as well as biologically important species such as herbivores. They reproduce very rapidly, reach reproductive age at an earlier age than other mesopredators of their size, highly adaptable to a range of environments. Next slide.

This is just evidence of the degree to which they consume juveniles of native fish. Indiscriminate widely adaptable predators can reduce native fish populations by up to 90 percent in a matter of weeks. Next slide.

In terms of dealing with this problem, and this is what I want to focus on, there's broad agreement that eradication is impossible, but there's also growing evidence that with regular removals, lionfish populations can be controlled and that native fish populations will recover fairly quickly. The problem is, how do you undertake the regular removals that need to be done on a regular basis and in a financially sustainable way? You know, you

can't rely on volunteer divers and lionfish derbies and the like indefinitely.

Next slide.

 And increasingly, there's a recognition that one of the major solutions and most effective solutions is the development of markets for lionfish products. And particularly the development of a series of vertical markets that can provide sustainable approach to suppress the lionfish populations at the same time providing an alternative income source for fishing communities, particularly women and supporting native stock recovery. Next slide.

The vertical market that is probably most well-known is that of development of a commercial fishery and lionfish as a seafood item. The idea of eat them to beat them. Next slide.

This has been something that's been expanding quite a bit throughout the wider Caribbean and was given a boost about five years back when Seafood Watch listed lionfish as best choice, which that in turn gave confidence to supermarkets such as Whole Foods and Publix on the mainland U.S. to start stocking lionfish. Next slide.

The second vertical market and the one I want to focus on is lionfish jewelry and handicrafts. Next slide.

Lionfish spines, fins and tails can be dried and preserved in a variety of shapes and colors which results in an attractive material for use in jewelry and handicrafts. Next slide.

A variety of jewelry items can be produced using lionfish spines. Tails and fins can be produced to make both very high-end type jewelry products as well as sort of basic handicraft product. Next slide.

Some innovative artists are even using other parts of the fish, such as the pectoral fins or the operculum, and are making other types of products such as Christmas ornaments, or hair stylizers, hat fins and the like. Next slide.

They're also mixing lionfish fins and spines with other materials such as sea glass, feathers, coconut shell, coconut husk, bottle caps, to make some rather interesting and innovative products. Next slide.

In terms of where lionfish jewelry is being produced, this is a relatively new, I want to say, industry. Probably only about a

decade old. There are currently clusters of production in Belize, Colombia, Grenada, Saint Vincent of the Grenadines, as well as a lot of individual artists across the wider Caribbean, including at least one or two that I'm aware of in Puerto Rico. There's a dive master in Rincon. Taino divers that's involved in lionfish removals and also is producing jewelry. The Reef Environmental Education Foundation sells kits. So, a lot of people are, you know, making jewelry just for their own use. Next slide.

4 5

Another new value-added product that I won't spend a lot of time on, but which is very exciting, is lionfish leather. There's a company in Florida, Inversa, which focuses on leather from invasive species, including lionfish. And the leather that they are producing is then being used in turn for a variety of products from watch bands to wallets to even tennis shoes. These are very high-end very high-value products. Just to give you an idea, those tennis shoes sell for about \$400. The Lionfish wallet sells for about \$600. So, these are really high-end and high-value products. Going back down to the value chain, the price that this company is paying for Lionfish skins is also quite high, \$6 per skin. Next slide.

So, you know, Lionfish jewelry is cool, but how does this address the challenge of managing the lionfish invasion. And I want to give some empirical evidence from a few countries based on a study that I did with some colleagues a while back. Next slide.

What we looked at was the degree to which production of lionfish jewelry would incentivize removals. And specifically, we looked at how the sale of fins and spines by fishermen to artists would affect the landed value per fish. What we found is that this actually increased the landed value per fish by up to 40%, which is significant. The reason why this is important is that, as compared to other commercial species that the fishers who typically would remove lionfish, target lionfish are relatively small. The return from a purely seafood standpoint isn't all that high, and there's a risk of losing fishing days due to envenomation. So, fishermen weren't all that excited about targeting lionfish.

You had a lot of lionfish being removed by divers, adventure tourism, ecotourism, but as a commercial fish species there are a lot of constraints. But with the development of jewelry and leather markets, you have a value-added product and an additional source of income as fishermen are able to sell the fins and skins. To give you an idea here, you'll see the price, average selling price for fins and tails, anywhere from 25 cents per fin up to \$3 per fin for a really nice pair of pectoral fins.

As I mentioned, lionfish skins sell for \$6 per skin. So, you compare that with the average price per fish for whole fish or fillets which is, you know, around \$3 or \$4 it really makes a significant difference. Next slide.

It also has a significant impact in terms of livelihood contributions for the female artists who are involved. In most of the countries where lionfish jewelry projects have been developed, the artists who are trained are women from coastal communities most of whom previously were not involved in any kind of commercial venture. We found that from a survey of 35 artists across the region, that 82 percent indicated that production and sale of lionfish jewelry substantially or to a great deal, increase their household income. And even more so, nearly all of them reported enhanced self-worth and sense of contribution to their communities. Next slide.

And in fact, that may well be the biggest contribution that lionfish jewelry production makes in addition, of course, to supporting increased removals, which is the empowerment and new opportunities for women, acquisition of new business skills. In virtually all the cases where lionfish jewelry training has been organized, we've also provided small business skill training, everything from basic cost accounting, to marketing, to customer satisfaction and the like.

Also, this helps to increase awareness about the threat posed by invasive lionfish because jewelry artists also are trained to know about the invasion and to be able to be ambassadors in a sense for explaining the threat to the reef posed by lionfish and how it can be addressed. Next slide.

Lionfish jewelry initiatives have found to be most effective when they're included as part of an integrated lionfish management program, including commercialization of lionfish as a seafood item. You know, training and awareness raising. As I mentioned, jewelry artists are trained and become spokespersons around this. The small business skills.

An example of how the integration works. In Belize, for example, when we trained lionfish jewelry artists, at the same time there were efforts to promote awareness about lionfish to introduce it in restaurants. So, what we did is we provided earrings to servers in the restaurants who also then became spokespersons, raising awareness not only through lionfish as the seafood item, but also using the jewelry they were wearing as an entry point to talk to customers about the invasion.

Another thing that we found important is involving fishers in the fin harvesting and preservation so that they see how this aspect of selling fins and skins can raise the return per fish. And then, as I mentioned, the combined with commercialization of skins. Next slide.

So finally, I just want to reiterate to say that the development of these value-added products can have an important role in managing invasive lionfish. You know, public organizations like MPA managers, fishery and wildlife services really can't do it alone. They don't have sufficient manpower or resources to undertake all the removals that are needed. So, developing these value-added products gets commercial incentives in place to have lionfish removed on a regular basis. The development of these vertical markets not only supports the regular removals, but it also has important ancillary benefits, particularly for women.

And then finally, what I would say is that particularly in areas where there are concerns about lionfish as a seafood item due to ciguatera, even though the risk of ciguatera with lionfish is—there's some question about it, but in any event, in areas where there is concern about promoting lionfish as a seafood item, jewelry and handicrafts provide an alternative commercial use of lionfish, which can incentivize removals, even if the seafood markets aren't a possibility.

So, I'll stop with that. Thanks for your attention. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Questions/Comments

Thank you. Do we have questions? Ana.

 CARLOS FARCHETTE:

AND CALCEDA. It has been a while since we have seen the pres

 ANA SALCEDA: It has been a while since we have seen the presence of lionfish in the in the region. Have we learned anything about predators for the lionfish?

PHILIP KARP: So, I mean, there's still quite a bit of uncertainty about predators. There's a lot of anecdotal reports of groupers, particularly nassau groupers, consuming lionfish. Certainly, groupers, moray eels, sharks will all take lionfish off of a spear and they will eat lionfish that's been speared. So, lionfish have been found in the stomachs of nassau groupers and goliath groupers, but what is unclear is whether those lionfish have been speared and then left on the reef and were eaten by the groupers afterwards, or whether they actually were preyed upon.

In their native range, it's definitely clear that groupers are

consuming lionfish. Even octopus have been seen to consume baby lionfish. But in the Western Atlantic, it's still unclear. There have been studies that look at the relationship between biomass of groupers and biomass of lionfish. Some found an inverse relationship, some did not. So, it's unclear.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Alright Jannette is going to talk about Puerto Rico Activities on Lionfish.

Oh, and thank you much, Mr. Karp.

PHILIP KARP: Sure. My pleasure.

Puerto Rico Activities on Lionfish Marketing-Jannette Ramos, Sea Grant Puerto Rico

JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Jannette Ramos-García. I'm going to talk about our campaign here in Puerto Rico that is called Eat Lionfish! En Español, ¡Come Pez León!

Next slide.

Well, what have we done here in Puerto Rico? A long time ago, a proposal was submitted to the Caribbean Fisheries Management Council for the purchase of 20 zookeepers and Hawaiian slings to be given to commercial fishermen. Those were delivered through the island. But also, we trained the fishermen on how to cut the spines and how to maneuver the fish safely. We educated them so they learn how to handle injuries with the thorns, and to give the correct information to the doctors if they have to go to the fisherman. Next slide.

Also, we carry demonstrations showing what was in the stomach contents of the lions so that the public understand the danger they represent for species of commercial interest. Proxima.

We created a cookbook with recipes that are easy to reproduce at home with simple ingredients. So, if I'm going to make arepas with lionfish, and that is my recipe. I use what I have at home. It is simple, very simple recipes so you can reproduce them. Next slide.

So, in the meantime we also presented lionfish to different chefs around the island. Right now, there are over 25 restaurants selling lionfish. Lionfish in every restaurant is a hit. I have many, many more restaurants calling me, asking for lionfish for their restaurants. We offer samples of lionfish ceviche in different activities so that the consuming public knows the quality of the

meat. That's very important for us because that's the way that people knows that it is a safe meat to eat. And also, that it's very rich.

We created the Eat Lionfish Festival. It has been held three times. This year we're planning to hold it again during the month of September.

Let's wait a second. That's in a restaurant in Cabo Rojo, that one. The other one, Christina. The ceviche, that was in the Banco Popular in San Juan y la Milla de Oro. Next slide.

The Lionfish Festival is being held in Guayanilla, in the municipality of Guayanilla. We have the Hub of Michelle Schärer, Dr. Hector Ruiz, the Caribbean Fisheries Management Council, the Municipality of Guayanilla, and also commercial fishermen and other people and the community of Guayanilla, because that's held around La Playa, el sector La Playa. Next slide.

Those are different instances of the Lionfish Festival in Guayanilla. In the first picture, you can see Dr. Chelsea Harms. Under here is a chef. I don't know the name, in Spanish is 'marioneta,' in English puppet. In the middle is a puppet made by an artisan, and demonstrations. In the other Pablo. Pablo from Las Marías. Next slide.

And right now, I want to talk about what we are doing as well here. One of the efforts that has brought extraordinary fruits, came from the hand of this young artisan named, Gloria Albino Caraballo. I know her by Lola Irie. I've known her since she was a little girl. So, I spoked to her once and I asked, "Are you interested in doing jewelry with the lionfish spines?" And she was like, "Oh, of course."

Have you seen the table with the art that she brought with her? You have to go there. Also, her husband is a carver and part of his work is there as well. She is here with us today all day with her work along and with her husband who creates wood carvings. Today I want to introduce her and have her talk a little bit about her work with the lionfish spines. Just a little bit because we don't have time.

GLORIA ALBINO CARABALLO: Okay. Thank you. Well, good evening, everybody. My name is Gloria Albino. I'm from the coastal town of Cabo Rojo. So, there's a lot of beaches in my town. We are part of the beach culture. I have been working with lionfish fines since the year 2016. With this initiative of ¡Come Pez León! and my longtime friend I have been able to connect with other fishermen in my

area, so I have the fins accessible to me.

4 5

By trial and error, I have been working with it and perfecting the art. I am working right now with epoxy resin as a way of preserving the fins. I also work with other sea materials like sea urchin skeletons, sand, seashells, etcetera, a lot of things. But the lionfish is my main, like, the wow factor. And right now, I am certified with the lionfish fin as the 'renglón' the material as an artisan here in Puerto Rico and I am the only one holding that title right now. So, I'm certified by the state, working with Lionfish fins. Nice to meet you everybody. Thank you.

JANNETTE RAMOS-GARCÍA: Thank you. So, we have finished with the ¡Come Pez León!

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Jannette. Vanessa?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez for the record. I just want to say congratulations to Jannette, because I know the hard work that you have been doing also with the commercial sector and helping them with the equipment and the training. This book is very good. I hope that we could have more hard copies to spread around the fish markets in the area.

Two issues that are coming up right now with the commercial sector. One, is the price. Most of the commercial fishermen only catch the lionfish, especially in the West, if it's an order because it's paying like five dollars per pound in the fish market. Sometimes if it's directly to a restaurant, then they pay more. But, of course, especially for our divers that are deep diving it's very difficult for them to handle the zookeeper at that area. Sometimes they get pricked with spines, and for them it's a very hard way.

So, it's not that they are not haunting them. Many of them, if they see small areas with them, they just prefer to kill them and leave them in there. But yes, we have information as well, for the record, that the goliath and nassau grouper that we have in the West area, they are eating the lionfish alive. Of course, if the divers kill them, usually, the reef sharks and the sharks around come and eat the lionfish.

So, there are a couple of ways that we are working and helping with that, but we know that there's a lot of work that has to be done, especially by letting the community understand that the fish is a good fish, that we should try it. Once you try it, you will continue consuming it making it more commercial in our fish

markets. Thanks.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. All right. We're going to go back a little on the agenda to finish off the liaison reports. We have for Saint Croix, Liandry De La Cruz. Okay. Greaux first.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Nicole, are you going to do your own? No, because you can use this mic here and she can help you. This mic is for the presentation.

CFMC Liaison Officers Reports St. Thomas/St. John, U.S.V.I.- Nicole Greaux

NICOLE GREAUX: Good afternoon, everyone. I am Nicole Greaux, the Fisheries Liaison through the Division of Fish and Wildlife for Outreach and Education.

Next slide, please. Próximo, por favor. Gracias.

So, some of the fishing community activities that I have done within the last quarter are pretty important and definitely very, very meaningful. Conversations and emails with assisting fishers who sell at the Joseph Bryan Fish Market. That is one of our fish markets that are in the middle of town being able to have a readily available supply of water. Not only for sanitation, but also for the cleaning of the fish themselves. That has been something that's been an ongoing struggle. The fishermen who utilize that one particular fish market have reached out to me to try to see how we can manage to get them a readily available and a consistent supply of water.

Traveling to Saint John to return pickup forms for a fishing license and also to gather catch reports. So, the island of Saint John, unfortunately, does not have any sectors that are available to the fishermen over there on a weekly basis. So, when they hear that I'm coming over there to speak to a fisher or if I have any errands to run on behalf of, Fish and Wildlife, they usually meet me at the dock or they set up appointments with me so that I can assist them with their registration forms, bringing them back and forth with where the main offices are, because a lot of the offices like agriculture and licensing do not have the ability to do what the fishermen need in able to obtain their registration forms. So, this summer has been very busy for me within that.

 Liaising with the Office of the Administrator with Fishers, whose dry landed boats are being cited because of where they are placed. So, right now, the Virgin Islands is doing a clean-up campaign where they would like to remove anything, whether it's a boat or

a vehicle, a motorcycle, that is on what is considered the government highway system, and a lot of these fishers have their boats either on trailers or on platforms on the outside of their properties or on friends properties, and they were in danger of having these boats towed or taken to the landfill. So, when the administrator's office puts a ticket or a citation, or they call the fishers for removal of these boats, they have a short window of time before that boat is taken to the landfill. So, once it is cited and they cannot get in touch with these fishers that have these boats, they do take them away.

4 5

So, that was communication between the particular office of the administrator and the fishermen directly. And also, involving the division of enforcement with assisting the enforcement officers to please let the fishermen know, this is something that is not being done under the Division of Enforcement or the Department of Enforcement, but it's being done through the Administrator's Office because that was a main concern with a lot of the fishers.

The last thing is the Responsible Fisher Certification Program. That has been the most fun. This is something that we are doing through the Reef Responsible Program, and it is a new initiative to help fishers both recreational and commercial understand that it is not only your duty, but it's also something that you need to do is be a responsible fisher because you are contributing to the removal of these resources from the ocean and we want to make sure that whether you're recreational, commercial, you do so as responsible as possible.

Okay. Next slide, please.

Now on to the fun stuff. This is the best part of my job as a fisheries liaison is being able to interact with the public in this particular capacity. So, speaking with fishers and giving them updates on any changes or any grant availabilities or any programs that are up and coming is one of the things that I love enjoying. And I love and I enjoy doing the best. Directing fishers to things like the NOAA websites where they can find information, or the meat of information is also something that I enjoy doing.

The reef responsible presentations on how to become a responsible fisher. This is something that I did about three weeks ago. It was a request from a dive club. And right there, that is from las Islas Virgenes, "Los Peces de las Islas Virgenes de Puerto Rico" poster, which was given out to two of the members to put in their offices. So, thank you very much. It's such a beautiful poster and it was very good to utilize that poster to help them identify fish species. They also had to take a guiz. And they had information

given to them as well for reef responsible fishers and how to be able to identify good fish and fish that you might probably want to eat less of as far as recreational catch. So, I'm very proud of being able to do that.

And then something else that's very close to my heart. Next slide, please.

And this is interacting with children. So, before I start with the two groups that are off there on the left, those are projects and pictures that the kids from the summer camp and also the school group that I took out for the tour, sent to me. The far right, that is a puffer fish and it's supposed to be a snapper in a fisherman's net. And these are things that were done through our little projects and activities that we did and also talks that we had. The blue, very colorful one is when I asked them to create your own environment of an ocean habitat, one of the groups did that particular fishbowl, and those are all of the creatures that they think would be perfect to have in a reef habitat. So that was pretty cool.

At the very top left-hand side, that is the ELS class from the Lockhart Elementary School. These Children all have special needs. A lot of them are autistic, and this was mostly done for the parents than the Children. So, teaching the parents that showing the children fish, letting them have a chance to see the different shapes and sizes and also the textures of the touch pool. We utilized our Marine Park for this particular program to get the kids that are touch sensitive involved in doing things like picking up sea stars, touching the sand, being able to see the things that move in the water are not necessarily dangerous, so they won't harm you. Having them put their hands in the water while different creatures crawled across them just to get them more comfortable with being in the water and in the ocean.

A lot of these Children do like to float, and we thought that giving them a chance to view the ocean underworld would quiet their very busy, chaotic mind. And most of the Children that we took on this trip, doing so in that particular building there, really calmed and soothed them down. So, the marine environment does have an advantage to a lot of these children that were in the ELS class.

Below them is the Jane E. Tuitt school. That was a class right before summer. We did a Mangroves to Open Ocean Habitat Tour. We started out in the mangroves that were available at Coral World and then after that particular tour and program, that whole class during the summer went on a walking tour of a real-life, real-time mangrove habitat at Mandal Bay. So, it's very important to get

these children from early where they learn about the marine environment and how important not only the mangroves are, but how important their contribution to keeping them clean and healthy is as well.

Next slide, please.

The Youth Ocean Explorer Summer Camp. This is a camp that's done by scholarship funding, and it is also a camp that is done with the V.I. Epscor, VMAS, and the University of the Virgin Islands. What you're seeing here is a fishing clinic and fish ID program that I helped conduct with collaboration of the Youth Ocean Explorers Clinic. This is something that's really cool. It teaches the children not only fish ID, but also the different characteristics of the fish and how they can directly and correctly identify different fish in the same species by using just really telltale signs on gobies and blennies and the inshore snappers.

That's me doing a hook and line rigging for the kids. So, we teach them how to set up the lines, what kind of hooks to use, how to bait and cast, but then we make them identify the fish as they bring them in and whether the fish stays inshore, or does that particular fish also go out into the open ocean, which was really cool.

I would like to thank both the Council, definitely Jannette and Sea Grant and the Division of Fish and Wildlife for having materials available for me to take to this particular event. So, the children had a lot of takeaways to go with them as well as really important information from the Council, as well as from Reef Responsible.

Last slide, please. And that concludes my report. Thank you very much.

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Nicole. Any questions for Nicole? Julian?

JULIAN MAGRAS: It's not a question, but it's actually a compliment. Thank you for a great presentation and for all the hard work that you've been trying to do in the U.S.V.I., especially the Saint Thomas/Saint John district. One of the things that was very touching here is the time that you took to deal with the autistic kids. I must highlight, between myself and my association, we are very thankful for you taking the time and spending it with the kids because that's very important with their disability already, because one of them is one of my good friends son. So,

you know, really thank you and on behalf of the STFA for the hard work that you've been doing and continue to do a good job.

NICOLE GREAUX: Thank you very much, Mr. Magras.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Miguel?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Nicole. You don't have to say, but we are going to embark into a project with Nicole and Liandry regarding outreach and education following the presentation that she put together. So, Angie, you and myself, we need to talk a little bit more to use the funding for that project. It's a follow up to the outreach and education program that we have with the liaison officers for the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. So, we'll talk soon.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Liandry.

St. Croix, U.S.V.I.—Liandry De La Cruz

LIANDRY A. DE LA CRUZ: Afternoon, buenas, ladies and gentlemen. I am Liandry De La Cruz. I'm the port sampler and fisheries liaison on Saint Croix's [inaudible] Division. I'm going to give my report on the things that I've been doing. I'd like everybody to know that I haven't been here that long. I've been here for like a couple months, but I still have had the opportunity to work at a lot of events and do a lot of things, and I've learned a lot so far.

Next slide, please.

So, I'd like to start with the events and activities that I've been doing. The first thing that directly jumped into as soon as I started working was the Lionfish Derby. It was super fun, because I got to be one of the weight masters. I not only worked a lot with recreational and commercial fishers because, you know, on a day to day basis, I work mainly with commercial fishers. So, I got to meet, you know, a lot of people in our community wives, families, kids. I was placed at Altona Lagoon. I was learning most of the things that I already do on a day-to-day basis and that is taking data, and learning how to handle the fish, and etc.

The next thing was the Annual Fisher Pre-Registration meeting. I was put at the sign-up table and I got to meet a lot of them as they came in and dealing with them, whether they were English or Spanish speakers, and, you know, just personally conversing with them. It went super-fast, but it was just like, you know, they kept coming in and in. But it was super cool because I went from table to table, I floated around a couple times, and I assisted

them as they came in. I introduced myself and once they named me as their new port sampler and liaison a lot of them took it really well and they weren't afraid to come and ask me questions and talk to me and you know voice their opinions. Whatever they had to say they came, and they said it and that's basically the basis that you develop in a relationship with them.

4 5

The next thing was the Annual Fisher Registration. By then, I had done a couple port samplings, one that you can see in the picture. And so, a lot of them had already known me. But it was good because I developed an actual foundation with them because I took the time to learn about the process that they take to either get their new licenses or renew their licenses so I could basically closely tend to them even before they came in the building. Because a lot of them was elderly. A lot of them didn't know how to read or write. A lot of them didn't know how to, you know, speak English. And I tended to their needs the best I could, and they value that. They appreciate that. They take all of that into consideration.

And the next thing was the Monthly FAC Meeting that I attended to. I do my best to attend to. I do my best to learn about and take in a lot of information, but it's things that I learn. And I take in because that's how I inform the fishermen that I work with. That's how I teach myself, and that's how I continue to move forward when it comes to learning about what it means to be in fisheries.

And the last thing was personally conversing with and meeting the fishers, which I say a lot because it's really important when it comes to developing a kind of relationship with them. I'm just taking the time to get to know them and them to know me.

So, can we move to the next slide, please?

Yes. So, my current endeavors right now, the things that I'm working with presently. The first thing was reviving the Reef Responsible Program as a liaison, which was one of the first things that they introduced to me, and I found really important. But I also noticed that it was a bit stagnant over the years because of how busy we've been with other projects. But one of the biggest things for me was not only, you know, calling restaurants, calling fishermen, getting the word out there and working at different events, with the different materials that we have, but it's also about expanding our audience, well, at least for me, to our children and overall community. Because while the sole purpose was to connect those restaurants and connect those fishermen to be able to work together towards the goal of sustaining our reefs, it's about having the potential to begin educating our kids.

The reality of it is that we live on an island. This is the type of life we live, and these are the things that we have to understand. And when you implement those understandings on our education, into their hearts, their minds, they grow up and they continue forward. They talk to their parents, their families. Their kids, when they grow up, they become fishermen themselves and they continue teaching that, because they have those understandings already implemented into them.

4 5

Now the next thing was catering more to our Hispanic demographic in every way possible. That means having a translator at every event, translating the flyers, the presentations, because most of our public and most of our community, they're Spanish speakers. You know, me and all, my own dad is a person who doesn't understand English fully and you have to be able to take the time to level with them and have them understand the things we do. Because I noticed that a lot of the events that we went to, a lot of them were disinterested simply because they couldn't understand what we were saying or what we were doing. But once you took the time to explain it to them and speak in their language, you know, something as simple as that, is the things that they value the most. And all of this plays a part in building those solid relationships with them all the time.

Can we move to the next slide? Thanks.

And the last thing I want to talk about are present improvements for future successes. And these are the things that I've noticed and taken into consideration, whether by observing or hearing those who actively voice their opinions to me, whether it's out in a field or at these different events. And aside from everything to do with science and logistics we have to take into consideration that this, the fishing community in itself is a family. And it's based upon a culture and based upon traditions that we uphold. And it's a matter of taking these values, whether it's a simple three words, and being able to implement them within the dynamic of our agencies and the way that we present this service to our fishermen.

The first thing being communication. And that's being able to speak with them, not only to hear them, but to listen to them. And once we both can understand and value each other's perspectives, we could move forward to develop those solutions that we all take the time to discuss on our own, to be able to discuss it with them as well, and understand each other, and that's how we move forward into their concerns. Caring about their concerns, because at the end of the day, this is their livelihood. Their children, their families that we're affecting.

You know, here at this conference, a lot of us are fishers, have families that are fishers, are commercial or recreational and we value and essentialize those opinions, and I've seen that in the way that we discuss different issues. And doing that, that's how we basically move forward when it comes to putting those opinions and perspectives first. Because that's where we get professional experience from.

4 5

And the last thing being connection. Connection because whether it's in events or community meetings that we create or take the time to create, once we begin to understand that we have all the same goals together, to save fisheries, to save our businesses, and to work together better to be able to contribute, we could start contributing as a whole to that cause. And that's basically connecting governments and the communities as one big system.

I'd like to also mention something that was told to me yesterday by Commissioner Oriol, he's not here, but he also told me that this industry is something that's based on trust. And that's one of the things that I've taken as my responsibility as a liaison to build that trust and to continue advancing forward with the work that we're doing by connecting as much as we can with our fishing communities. Thank you for listening. That's the next slide.

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Liandry.

LIANDRY A. DE LA CRUZ: Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Julian.

JULIAN MAGRAS: I want to say welcome aboard. I loved, loved your presentation and the energy that you have put into it because Saint Croix has been lacking this for a long time. Saint Croix Fishers need someone that they trust. That's the key word. That they can communicate with, and feel comfortable with because they have a lot of catching up to do.

I hope you can continue for a very, very long time with the help of a leader and the Council. And everyone in this room, don't be afraid to call any one of us to help you. I'm here, Gerson is here, we're all here, we're all in the boat together, but I know this was long coming. Excellent presentation and keep up the good work. Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. I have Wilson Santiago.

Puerto Rico-Wilson Santiago

4 5

WILSON SANTIAGO: Yes. Hello everyone, good afternoon. Wilson Santiago for the record. I am the Puerto Rico Fisheries Liaison. I'm going to present my report of the 2023 activities and the next steps as liaison. Continue to the other.

Okay, in 2023 as a liaison, I had a participation on coordinating and bringing the Educational Program for Commercial Fishers. This year we have been in three municipalities including Vieques, Dorado, and Naguabo. Two of them are in the East Coast, and Dorado is in the North. We are going to continue coordinating more around the island.

We have been supporting Helena Antoun with the Educational Program for Recreational Fishers. We started in person this year. Weekly, with Cristina Olán, and other educational materials that they bring to me, we have a broadcast list in the in WhatsApp app. We have a broadcast list where we have like 400, maybe, contacts of commercial fishers, and recreational fishers too. So, we send weekly advertisement, educational materials, meetings, everything that is regarding the fisheries in Puerto Rico.

 We continue supporting the fisheries with issues and information via mobile and in person. In person I visited the fishing villages around the island. And this year I have been in partnership with Jannette Ramos from Sea Grant. We have been around the island visiting almost all fishing villages. Last week we were in Vieques. The only municipality that we haven't visited is Culebra, but in September there are plans to go there and give an educational program over there. On those visits, we take educational materials, like the poster from the CFMC, educational material from Sea Grant, DNER educational materials. In those visits, we just go and give all of the educational materials to the fishers and fishing communities.

We evaluate the state of fishing community, fishing villages. That is the same that I was talking about, the visits to the fishing villages. We participate in a focal group as a liaison with students from UPR in Mayagüez.

We have been in a conservatory with the fishers from Dorado Fishing Village. This conservatory was before the PEPCO program, so it was a meeting with the mayor of Dorado and the Department of Agriculture. We were there fixing issues and orienting the fishing community, recreational and commercials.

We are also in the steering committee of the MREP Puerto Rico.

That will be soon, maybe next week, I think. We have continued helping them. We participate in the Caribbean Branch Spatial Data Development Workshop. We also participate in a seaweed field that is going to be a pilot project in Parguera. So, we go to these workshops because all these topics we bring them to the fishing communities. And an educational table at the Festival del Pescado at Puerto Real Cabo Rojo with educational material from the Council and Sea Grant.

4 5

Next, please.

Okay, for the PEPCO and the PEPR program. We call it PEPR. Yeah, for recreational fishers and commercial fishers. Like I said for the commercial we attend Dorado, Naguabo and Vieques. For the recreational, the first one was in Rio Grande. And the second one was in Dorado. In Dorado we mixed the commercial and recreational fishers. We mix both presentations. Helena Antoun was with me that day. So, in the laws, regulation, federal and state, like, maybe some of them are the same, so we mix them, and we attended the recreational and commercial at Dorado. Okay.

Next one, please.

So, my next steps as a liaison. I will continue supporting Helena Antoun with the Recreational Fisher Program. Continue the PEPCO program in different municipalities. Like I said, in September I am starting to coordinate one in Culebra. That is the next municipality that we are going to attend. And with all of these workshops that I've been attending to I'm bringing new topics to create a second part of the PEPCO program.

I will continue supporting the Council, DNER, and other agencies regarding the communication with the fishing communities or their issues so we can canalize through me. So, continue educating in the process of license, statistics, reports, state laws, and federal laws to maintain the responsibility in the management agency.

Okay, So, participate in workshops for learning new topics, like I said, to bring them to the communities. We're going to have to attend more in the second part of the educational program. We will continue supporting fishers to resolve the issues with the DNER license and permits. I think maybe with my partner Daniel Matos in the statistic program, me and my partners, we are always getting calls from the fishers, so we canalize their issues through ourselves.

And bring educational materials and posters to fishing

communities. Communicate with them to know where we can do better regarding the outreach and education of fisheries communities. Whenever we go to a fishing community, we communicate with the fishers, their families, everyone that participates in all the process, so everything that they tell us, any issue, we try to help them. And if not, we find a solution for them. Okay?

4 5

Next one, please.

So, issues and concerns and participation from fishers. The queen snapper and cardinal snapper state permit, that's been an issue for a couple of years. Maybe this year that is going to get fix. Puerto Rico DNER commercial fishing license and permit. Like I said, at the statistic program and me as a liaison, we work together to help them with everything with the state license and permits. Continue our orientation in Electronic Statistic Reports, how to use it. We have made a guide for new fishers or fishers that were accustomed to file it in paper. So, they're going to change the technology in the phone with the app, so we made a guide and we always orient them how to use it.

Okay. Fishers, via feedback that they sent from the WhatsApp broadcast list are more interested in participating in meetings and bringing comments. In the WhatsApp broadcast list, every time I send them an educational material, a meeting, they always tell me, "Oh, thank you. Where is it going to be? can I--." Every time I post I get very good feedback, and I think that in the meetings like the CFMC, the DAP meeting, the OEAP meeting, we have gotten more participation of the fishers. Right now, there are some of them connected. This morning Cristina sent me the YouTube link for this meeting and right now, I was writing with one of them.

An issue we have with that right now is, I was writing with a fisher from the North and he said that in YouTube the meeting is only transmitted in English so I had to guide him via text, so I could help him connect to Zoom since in Zoom they have the translation. So, maybe later we can make something different for the Spanish speaker fishers. That will be all for me. Any questions?

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Wilson. Alida?

ALIDA ORTIZ SOTOMAYOR: I do not have a question. I just feel extremely happy. I'm very proud of the work that the liaisons are doing. That's the way we can get the information, what I learned, what you learned, to all the communities. And also, it's probably

the only way that we can get the real needs that the community has, because if we wait for the newspapers or for the what the local government is going to tell us, it doesn't work very much. I get more information from Wilson about what's going on in fisheries around Puerto Rico than what I get from the official government.

4 5

So, thank you so much. Without your help, we would not be able to do any outreach and much less education. So, I'm glad you were here.

WILSON SANTIAGO: Thank you, Alida. I want to congratulate my counterparts in the U.S.V.I. too.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Wilson. Okay. Now we're going to go to EEJ, NOAA's fishery equity and environmental justice strategy. That's María.

NOAA Fisheries' Equity and Environmental Justice (EEJ) Strategy Update—NOAA Fisheries

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Good afternoon. This is María López. This is going to be really quick so we can move on. So, this is just additional information about the efforts that are ongoing to engage communities in helping NOAA Fisheries to advance the national equity environmental justice goals and objectives through the development of the Southeast Equity and Environmental Justice Implementation Plan.

NOAA Fisheries published a public request for information in the Federal Register on July 21st. And we want to thank Cristina for her efforts to widely publicize that through social media. The comment period in that request for information will be open all the way until September 30th and I encourage everybody interested to submit their ideas and suggestions to the link that we're providing here. This is also included in your briefing books.

 We will also take verbal comments during a virtual webinar on August 29. The webinar will be conducted in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese. So, we hope to have a good turnout there and to get a lot of helpful information. So, please mark your calendars. And finally, the dates of the focus group meetings that we have been discussing are approaching soon and we're also looking forward to that opportunity to hear from community members in those smaller group forums.

As you know the purpose of the focus group meeting is to gather the participants perceptions, experiences, and expectations related to the work that NOAA Fisheries is conducting in the Caribbean region so that we can improve the delivery of the products and services that are prepared for the communities.

The Council liaisons and the Council's OEAP staff has been instrumental in helping us to identify the dates, the locations and the participants for those meetings. And we're super grateful to them and to the Council staff for the tremendous amount of help and expertise that they have dedicated to this work to date.

So, after those focus groups are completed and the public comment period closes on September $30^{\rm th}$, we will begin drafting our regional implementation plan, which is due to headquarters at by the end of this year. So, we intend to continue working with the Council through that process.

So, that's all. This is some information of how you can comment and also the virtual listening section for August 29. And then those are the days for the six focus groups that are going to be conducted next week and then in the U.S. Virgin Islands in September. These focus groups are very small aroups participants. And then as I said the final implementation plan is going to be due January. So, this is a great opportunity for everybody to comment and see how we can improve our services to our community. Thank you.

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, María. The focus group and community members, is that virtual or is that in person?

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: So, the focus groups are by invitation and they're going to be in person. Yeah. So, we're working on setting those up. We have some that are going to be happening next week and the others are going to be happening in the U.S. Virgin Islands in September.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Any questions for María on EEJ? Okay, hearing none, we're going to go to Protected Resources Update on Island-Based Fishery Management Plan Biological Opinion and Endangered Species Act Rules. Jennifer Lee.

Protected Resources Updates on the Island-Based Fishery
Management Plans Biological Opinion and Endangered Species Act
Rules- Jennifer Lee, NOAA Fisheries

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: ¿Estamos ready, Cristina?

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Jenny, can you hear us? We cannot hear you.

JENNIFER LEE: Can you hear me now?

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Okay. Can you increase the volume of your voice?

JENNIFER LEE: Is that better? Can you hear me now?

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Hi Jennifer, this is Liajay. We hear you, but you sound very far, so we are doing some audio tests on our side.

JENNIFER LEE: Okay, I'm so sorry. I'll try to have my sound up really loud. Okay, we hear you better now.

LIAJAY RIVERA GARCÍA: Oh, good. All right. Well, thank you for having me and sorry for the tech delays. I am here to present to you an overview of the island based biological opinion and incidental take statement.

JENNIFER LEE: I was going to present this in April but we ran out of time. So, thank you for having the time today and next slide.

So, just really quick, because I know not everyone has the same familiarity in terms of what is a biological opinion. It is the end product of a formal Section 7 consultation, which is a documented exchange of information on potential impacts on listed species. A biological opinion summarizes the effects of federal action on ESA listed species. It identifies the conclusion of whether or not it's likely to jeopardize or result in adverse or destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat, and it represents the opinion of NOAA Fisheries and considers technical, legal, and policy issues relative to the proposed action.

So, NOAA Fisheries has dual responsibility as both the action agency under the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the consulting agency under the ESA. And we recognize Councils have a unique role in shaping our action and the importance of sharing information on consultations with you.

In this case, technically, the Sustainable Fisheries serves as the action agency and Protected Resources as a consulting agency.

Next slide.

So, these are just the components of the biological opinion. They

are actually the components of all of our biological opinions, and it just walks through essentially like a book, the setting, you know, where it occurs and the action, the characters being, the status of the species and critical habitat. It goes through other activities in the area, then gets down into the effects of the particular action summing it all up and looking at population level effects of destruction of adverse modification. And makes a conclusion and then it moves into the incidental take statement where we specify the authorized take as well as requirements related to the consultation.

4 5

Next slide.

This document represents our opinion on the effects of approving and implementing the Puerto Rico Fishery Management Plan, the Saint Thomas and Saint John FMP and the Saint Croix FMP. It evaluates all three of those actions on threatened and endangered species and designated critical habitat.

The opinion batches the consultations together. They are all separate federal actions. However, they are related as each is derived from the former species-based plans across the Caribbean EEZ. And the types of gear and anticipated impacts are similar across FMPs. So, for consultation efficiency and comprehension we put it all together and the bio-op looks at all three plans.

Next slide.

 Here you can see just what the status of the species are that are or the action areas in this case. And it also identifies—— I've underlined the species that are likely to be adversely affected. That are analyzed more in depth in the biological opinion.

Next slide.

And here, same thing. These are the critical habitats in the action areas. And you can see that staghorn and elkhorn corals have critical habitat in the action area that may be adversely affected and so it is analyzed in depth in the consultation.

Next slide, please.

So, here in the effects from the proposed actions, this is where we look at the effects in terms of the number of individuals and associated captures and mortalities with the best available information. We anticipated adverse effects stem from capture and entanglement in fishing gear or physical impacts from that gear that could adversely affect them.

4 5

We also anticipate adverse effects from vessel activity. In that case it's specific to boat strikes on sea turtles, and then looking at anchoring effects on corals in Acropora critical habitat. Then we also consider adverse effects stemming from the harvest of herbivorous reef fish, and that pertains to the Acropora critical habitat in the ESA listed coral species only.

We estimate the number and the amount of each species that's likely to be incidentally affected or affected in the future, and then the amount of Acropora critical habitat likely to be affected. And we also evaluated effects relating to the dynamics of the herbivorous fish, algae, and coral and Acropora critical habitat.

Next slide.

Alright. So, here you can see our data limitations and sources. While the information in the biological opinion is best on the best available science and commercial information, we do acknowledge that we have lots of data limitations throughout the document. Our primary data sources, though, for estimating interactions for sea turtles focused on strandings, the number of fishing trips for our vessel strike analyses. For ESA-listed fish, we looked at 2012-2018 commercial and recreational landings records. And then for corals we evaluated the number of— it was based on the number of traps of fish and lobster in federal waters, the average size of those traps, and the percentage of those traps reported to be used in coral or hard bottom areas, and then the total area of coral cover.

Next slide.

Ultimately, we take those individual effects on everything, and we then, in the Jeopardy and Structural Adverse Modification Analyses, that's where we're looking at population level responses. There are potential population level responses to the effects of the action and whether those, when we consider it in the context of the status of the species, the baseline, cumulative effects are likely to jeopardize their continued existence in the wild or result in that destruction of adverse mod.

So, we consider the extent to which the proposed actions are likely to result in destruction or adverse modification of coral.

Next slide.

And ultimately, after reviewing all that information we did conclude that, it's our opinion that the proposed actions are not

likely to jeopardize the continued existence of all the species that we said were likely to be adversely affected. So, that's the North Atlantic DPS green sea turtle, the South Atlantic DPS green sea turtle, hawksbill sea turtles, nassau grouper, oceanic whitetip sharks, Central and Southwest Atlantic DPS of scalloped hammerhead sharks, elkhorn coral, staghorn coral, rough cactus coral, pillar coral, lobe star coral, mountainous star coral, or boulder star coral.

All those are not likely to be jeopardized or, and the bio-op says is also not likely to result in destruction of adverse modification of designate Acropora critical habitat. And I think I just said the bio-op doesn't do that. So, yeah. I, sorry, I meant the proposed actions. I'm trying to be guick here.

All right. So next, once we've made that finding, it takes us to the incidental take statement. That's the area where it specifies the amount or extent of take. Defines reasonable and prudent measures and terms of conditions for their implementation. I want to point out these are measures, so sometimes people get confused between reasonable and prudent alternatives versus measures.

Alternatives are things with only jeopardy opinions that are major changes. Measures are things we're doing to minimize the impact of that anticipated take that we've just said is not likely jeopardized.

Complying with the terms and conditions of an ITS does exempt federal agency from take prohibitions. The case of our threatened species such as giant manta rays and oceanic white sharks that don't have a take prohibition, they are still included because we still need to track the anticipated take and know when we potentially exceeded it, and we still need to minimize the impacts.

Next slide, please.

And so, this is the Incidental Take Statement. As you can see, our interactions or the number of mortalities associated with most of the species is relatively low. It's a little harder to judge when you're looking at all of the coral impacts that we can still take as in feet squared but again, relatively small areas.

next slide. Sorry, I have something covering up my screen. I'll just go on to the next one. That's okay. Yeah. Next slide please.

So, for the purpose of the ITS, again, we talked about the potential or the effects of harvest of herbivorous fish. So, we have a take proxy for that. It's not really bio biomass, it's

really relative biomass. So, we're monitoring it via the numbers of fish relative to the numbers of observed previously. And our relative biomass values, again, will be estimated using visual census data and subsequent values can be used to infer a relative increase or decrease in biomass detected via those surveys over time.

4 5

Next slide. And so, we just shared with you about the incidental take and the amount or extent. So, next we're going to move on to what the requirements are under the instant take statement. Next slide.

Okay. So, here, our first reasonable and prudent measure is to minimize sea turtle and fish take and mortality through outreach and education. So, our implementing terms and conditions has us working with you, the Council or Council staff, U.S.V.I. DPNR, and Puerto Rico DNER to develop and implement an outreach program to educate commercial and recreational fishermen on the benefits to sea turtles and fish from using circle hooks, a sea turtle release equipment, use of available fish release equipment, and then our handling protocols and guidelines. So, basically, we want to make sure that we're informing people on how to minimize impacts through proper handling and release.

Next slide.

 The second reasonable and prudent measure has to do with monitoring and assessing parrotfish in the functional grazing group biomass. So, here we're monitoring the parrotfish species and grazing groups via NOAA's coral reef conservation program, fishery independent visual census surveys on coral reefs and through the Trip Interview Program. So, all the data that we use to come up with a biological opinion, we're going to continue to use to try to monitor the impacts. And again, we'll be working with Puerto Rico DNER and the U.S.V.I. DPNR to maintain improvements to fisheries, landing reporting, particularly species-specific landings and additional bycatch data.

And then we do have a requirement to have an annual report which will, again, go over essentially that information, the biomass for parrotfish species and grazing groups and other relevant parrotfish information like length-frequency, and the percent cover of habitat strata, you know, focusing on the macroalgae and coral cover data, and the benthic communities, the TIP length-frequencies. Again, just all the things that went into to try and estimate those impacts, we need to continue to monitor.

Next slide.

2 Again, the reasonable and prudent measure three has to do with 3 4 5 6 7

monitoring frequency, magnitude and impact of incidental take. In this case these terms and conditions relate to coordinating, again, with the same groups as far as Council and Puerto Rico DNER and U.S.V.I. DPNR to ensure data collection methods are in place and collected on the number and disposition and condition of ESA listed species taken by commercial and recreational fishery components, the area of coral impacted by traps and anchors associated with the proposed action, and the commercial trap use in terms of number deployed, size, use, location, and anchoring.

11 12 13

8

9

10

1

Next slide.

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Again, same reasonable and prudent measure and more implementing terms and conditions. We're requiring ourselves to work with the island sea turtle stranding coordinators to improve collecting and reporting of sea turtle incidental, captures and stranding and reporting of that data to the Sea Turtle Stranding and Salvation Network. Next one says, "developing a proposal for conducting a survey on ESA-listed sea turtle and fish interactions similar to Lewis et al., 2007.

22 23 24

25

26 27 That was a fisherman survey in collaboration with Council P.R. DNER and U.S.V.I. DPNR. And then, annually report on the take of sea turtles associated with the proposed actions and the area of coral impacted by traps and anchors associated with the proposed actions.

28 29 30

Next slide.

31 32

33 34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

Okay. Reasonable and prudent measure four, reducing the frequency and amount of trap and vessel anchor damage to corals to the extent practicable. We know that there's already efforts underway and the bio-op just requires us to assist fishers and the U.S.V.I. government with those efforts to control effort though a trap certification program and consider whether a similar effort is appropriate and feasible in Puerto Rico. Collect information on the amount of anchoring in coral areas in federal waters, including the specific locations. And then, coordinate with the council, U.S.V.I. DPNR and Puerto Rico DNER on an outreach program to educate commercial and recreational fishers on the impacts of gear use and anchoring in coral areas.

43 44 45

46

47 48

So really, I ran through all of this very quickly, but we just wanted to give you a quick sense of the types of requirements that came out of this biological opinion. You know, the biological opinion was completed in 2020 but now that the FMPs are actually in place we thought it was important to go over this and make sure that you all were aware of the overall findings of the biological opinion as well as get a sense of the types of requirements that we have resulting from it.

And the next slide.

 This just touches on conservation measures. Oh, I'm sorry. I missed one. I skipped ahead. I left out preventing fishing on nassau grouper spawning sites during spawning periods by maintaining existing protections for nassau grouper spawning aggregations. Sorry about that. It's obviously important.

The implementing term and condition is to submit an annual report summarizing data from law enforcement on compliance with federal regs that prohibit fishing on nassau grouper spawning aggregations.

Next slide.

Okay, yeah. So, I already gave you, like I said, I sort of wrapped that up. We just wanted to not get into the weeds too much, but make sure you knew what was in there. And conservation measures are just actions to minimize or avoid effects. Those are recommendations. They're not requirements. So, I'm not going to run through those, but they're organized mainly by species group. There's 13 that have recommendations related to data improvement. So, they're basically things that, you know, we would like to see happen to improve our information and better understand.

And the next slide is just the conclusion slide. I will see if there's any questions. Like I said, if anyone wants to learn a bit more, they can always contact me too after this.

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Jennifer. Questions? Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Thank you, Jenny. I have a couple of questions. One, we saw in the table that you provided that there had been some encounters with nassau groupers in Saint Thomas. So, the source of that information would be of interest to the Council.

We also would like to provide information that we've received from fishers, for Puerto Rico specifically, that there are nassau grouper recruiting to some areas. So, this is definitely something that we need to look into. They're mostly in state waters, but again, I mean, it concerns everyone that has regulations to protect

the nassau grouper.

4 5

And the third thing has to do with the recent mortalities of urchins that are very of great concern because of their function in on the reef. So those mortalities, we know that they have been providing us with some information, but I don't know of anyone who's actually keeping track of those urchin mortalities.

JENNIFER LEE: Okay so, related to the nassau grouper all of the ESA-listed fish were all based on commercial and recreational landings records. So, we did have some information showing that some had been caught—I can look quick, and I can also follow up on the details of the specific reports. It might take me a second. I wanted to check on, could you repeat what it is that you're asking with respect to the sea urchins?

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, recruitment of nassau grouper, that is something that really needs to be assessed right now. It appears that they are recruiting to the shallower areas around Puerto Rico. But we don't have, I don't think right now we have any program in place to actually keep track of that. And that would be essential to the recovery of the nassau grouper.

JENNIFER LEE: Okay, thank you for that. So, that was information for me as opposed to more of a question.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Yeah, and the other thing had to do with the mortality of the urchins. So, that's also something that needs to be kept track of because it will have a negative impact on the reefs. So, these are things that we need to consider. They are not threatened or endangered, but they are essential to the best function of the fisheries.

JENNIFER LEE: Yes. Thank you for that comment.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Any more questions for Jennifer? Vance?

 VANCE VICENTE: Hey, Jennifer. Hi, this is Vance Vicente from the SSC. One quick question. On the incidental take statement under the column "LETHAL (Turtle/Fish, number of individuals, and coral ft^2)." If you look at the seven ESA listed scleractinia coral species, I see some numbers there and my question is how, in ft^2 square, how did you make that estimate?

That the incidental take for the next three years is going to be, let's say for example, staghorn 566 feet square. How do we know?

Just a curiosity. Thank you.

1 2

4 5

JENNIFER LEE: All right, it was based on the area we had for coral cover. I apologize. I'm not really intimate with the details of some of the analysis. I should have refreshed between now and when I was going to present this in April. So, I apologize for not being able to answer specific questions like that. I feel like I should, but I might need to follow up and provide, perhaps, through a quick email, I could answer that question but I don't want to misinform and I'm not feeling very confident in giving you an accurate answer.

VANCE VICENTE: Okay. no problem. Thank you.

No, the thing is that my concern is what the reef bottom looks like out there, in all three islands. I mean, we don't have the same coral cover due recently to the scleractinia coral tissue loss disease. I personally have measured that over 60 percent of the coral populations are gone, at least in the North Coast of Puerto Rico. Probably the Virgin Islands has some more specific data on their location, but the reefs are not the same anymore, and coral cover is not the same anymore. The number of species have varied, the proportion of species have varied significantly. So that was my concern. Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. I hav--

JENNIFER LEE: Yeah. No, no. I was just going to say thank you. And yeah, I'll definitely get right back to you. It's been a little while since I've really looked hard at this, and I just wanted to make sure that I give you a—

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, I have from two more. One with the Director Angeli and Sarah.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Thank you so much. Thank you for presenting in a very concise way the over 800-page document. It's much appreciated. One of the questions I had was in regards to the effect that this document might have on permitting through NMFS for actions like moorings, we have long recognized that anchors and anchoring are, as you said, a reasonable and prudent measure is to reduce the frequency and amount of vessel anchor damage to corals. We've long recognized that it takes us sometimes up to three years to receive permitting to install mooring fields and other actions and take other actions that may allow us to reasonably reduce the frequency of anchoring in our waters. And I was wondering if there's been conversation or how you anticipate this specific document assisting with those efforts for us to actually complete those actions.

1 2

4 5

JENNIFER LEE: This biological opinion should not have an impact on the time involved in permitting. So, our requirements are specific to working on, again, outreach education and minimizing impacts. But the biological opinion doesn't have any specific new requirements that would, sort of, you know, be an extra layer on that permitting process that you're talking about. So, I don't think the bio-op itself would have an impact on permit times, if you were concerned by that.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Thank you. No, I guess I was hoping it would be the other way, that this would assist us with those actions to reduce [crosstalk] activities.

JENNIFER LEE: I'm sorry.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Sarah?

SARAH STEPHENSON: Hi, yes. I was just going to try to help Jenny out with the answer to Vance's question because I helped with that part of it. The studies, we had some coral specific densities that were done from a study a few years ago. So, before the stony coral tissue loss kind of was a big issue. So, all of those estimates of area were put together using data from before that event occurred. So, probably the next time we need to revisit we would want to have updated coral densities to use.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you for that. Jennifer, I think you have another section.

JENNIFER LEE: Yes, thank you. Yes, you asked for an update on some of our ESA rules that have been in the works, and we actually have two recent publications that I'm just going to, again, for the sake of time, just really be brief on.

Yep, that's the presentation and I'll get mine going here in a second. My apologies. I just need one minute to-- Okay. All right sorry, next slide please. Sorry, I'm juggling. I wish I was with you all and not in my hotel on my tiny, tiny little laptop here. But I'm sorry, I had to also attend the Gulf Council meeting this week.

So, yeah. So, I'm going to be, again, brief. I'm just going to remind you what critical habitat is and then do a quick synopsis, not a summary of the green sea turtle critical habitat proposed rule and then the Caribbean coral critical habitat final rule and then I have, not in slides, but just an update on other rulemaking.

 Next slide.

4 5

So, just to be clear on what is critical habitat, especially since you're used to essential fish habitat. Under the ESA, critical habitat is defined as specific areas within the geographical area occupied by the species at the time of listing that contain physical or biological features essential to conservation of the species and that may require special management considerations or protection.

So, We are required to designate critical habitat based on the best available scientific data. And we must also consider the economic, national security, and other relevant impacts of specifying a particular area as critical habitat. The ESA requires that we designate critical habitat, to the maximum extent prudent and determinable, when a species is listed under the ESA.

And I put in a link there because we do have some great outreach materials on our website if you want to understand a little bit more about ESA critical habitat.

Next slide.

So, here you can just see the timeline of how we got to this proposed rule, which was back in April 2016. We published a final rule to list 11 green sea turtle distinct population segments as threatened or endangered. That replaced the original listing for the species. And at that time, the [inaudible] has concluded that previously designated critical habitat remained in effect for the North Atlantic DPS.

But just to explain a little further there. We actually said that, at the time, that designating new critical habitat was prudent, but not determinable. And then we went ahead and have been maintaining the already existing designated critical habitat that we had for North Atlantic DPS in this interim period.

 In 2020, early 2020, the Center for Biological Diversity, Sea Turtle Oversight Protection, and Turtle Island Restoration Network filed a complaint, alleging failure to designate critical habitat by the statutory deadline. We entered into a settlement saying that we would submit our proposed determinations both us and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on or before June 30th. And the, we just did on July 19th, 2023. We proposed Our critical habitat for all of our DPSs, and the Fish and Wildlife Service also has a rule dealing with the nesting beaches.

Okay. Next slide. Oh, it went two slides. Great. Thank you.

So, here, you can just see the life history of the green sea turtle 3 and its marine habitat needs. They all say number ones for some reason. I don't know what happened there. But the first couple stages obviously are in the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service but once they leave the nesting beaches and are done with their feeding frenzy, -- "feeding frenzy," sorry, swimming frenzy, excuse me --they enter the surface-pelagic, forage and resting. And they are for 10 years or so, in that stage at which point they move further inshore. And then, of course, we have the breeding 10 11 migrations when they, the sea turtles, both males and females, 12 move off the nesting beaches. The females, obviously, then will go 13 on to shore and nest. Then, they move back off into the near shore waters and they forage and rest and re-ovulate and then they do it again. And they can have five to seven times of -- they'll do this 15 in a nesting season. But ultimately that describes these different parts of their life history as they move through the waters.

18 19

14

16

17

1 2

4 5

6

7 8

9

If you go to the next slide, please.

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28 29 And so, here, basically we use those life history stages and looked at what features were essential to the conservation of green sea turtles DPSs, and we broke it down into categories of essential features. So, we have a reproductive essential feature that focuses on the juvenile and hatchlings in the near shore. And then we have, the migratory essential feature which is our adults. And our foraging and resting essential feature, it's broken up into those two stages, the post hatchling and juveniles. And then the juveniles, sub-adults, and adults and that's when they're in the benthic nearshore environment.

30 31 32

Next slide.

33 34

35

36

37

38

39 40

41

42

So again, with those categories we use the life history to develop the features essential. The descriptions on here are very long, but there's a few things I'll point out. For the reproductive essential feature and the migratory essential feature, as well as the benthic forging and resting features, you can see that they all are from the mean high-water line to 20 meters depth, defines the area. And for the other essential feature, the surface-pelagic foraging and resting, sargassum. basically, that's a North Atlantic DPS essential feature only. And that is not in your particular area. So, I will go into detail on that one.

43 44

Next slide.

45 46 47

48

Okay. So, this just shows the proposed marine critical habitats for the six green sea turtles. Because, again, this is for all of the DPSs. If you go to the following slide.

4 5

For the North Atlantic DPS in your area, there is Critical Habitat designated off of Puerto Rico. It's for the proposed-- it's basically all of the essential features, but the sargassums of the benthic and foraging/resting. We just laid them on top of each other because there's a lot of overlap. So, all of the maps just sort of depict the layers on top of each other so you can see where a critical habitat is.

Next slide.

On this slide you can see where the marine critical habitat proposed is for the South Atlantic DPS. And again, all the areas here are from the mean high water to 20 meters out.

Next slide.

Okay. So, we really just wanted to, again, just let you be aware and give you an introduction, but we have an actual virtual public hearing on the North Atlantic and South Atlantic DPSs coming up on August 29th from 6 to 8 p.m. So, registration is required, and I have the link there. I highly recommend you all join us for that public hearing. Public comments are, going to be accepted until October 17th, 2023. The schedule from there is that we'll review and incorporate those public comments and submit a final rule to the federal register by July 19th, 2024. And then, if you want more information the website link on the slide there has a lot of all of the background documents related to the proposal.

Okay. Next slide.

And here, just in terms of if you are evaluating what might be important information to submit to us as comments. We have specific areas that we're soliciting comment on. I have them all listed here. I won't read them to you, but you can see, essentially, it's specifics on the distribution and habitat of green sea turtles, and then it's more information about activities that potentially may affect critical habitat.

Critical habitat rules are different from ESA listing rules in that we also consider economics, so we need information related to economic, national security. Really any particular activity that may potentially be impacted. And so, again, I don't really obviously need to read that to you, but just wanted you to have it available and in a handy spot.

Next slide.

So, just in terms of what it means for fisheries. Critical habitat can confuse a lot of people. It's not a marine protected area. It doesn't directly affect citizens engaged in recreational activities such as recreational boating and fishing or limit their access. It doesn't create any new regulations or restrictions on fisheries. It really, what it does is, federal agencies, when we have critical habitat, it's another analysis within when we do biological opinions and consult. Federal agencies then need to consider their potential effects on critical habitat. So, we already consult, obviously, on our actions that may affect Green Sea turtle DPSs and for that matter on the five Caribbean coral species for which critical habitat was just finalized. That, I'll also share very briefly.

So, again, that consultation is just evaluating whether the proposed federal action would adversely affect critical habitat by considering if it occurs in the critical habitat, and if so, if it impacts any of the essential features.

Next slide.

I did want to point out that when we talk about Section 7, we're usually talking about ESA Section 7(a)2 and our consultation requirements. There is a section, Section 7(a)4, that talks about conferencing, and you may not be familiar with that. But what a conference is, it's a process where we have informal discussions between the federal agency and the service regarding the impact of an action on proposed species or proposed critical habitat and recommendations to minimize or avoid the adverse effects. So, essentially, it's like a consultation, but you're looking at a proposed species and evaluating potential impacts.

 It is actually required if an action is likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a proposed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of the proposed critical habitat. But federal agencies may also request a conference, even if it's not jeopardy on any proposed actions that may affect proposed species or proposed critical habitat. So, I bring that up to let you know that we are working to conference on our proposed species. We have a plan to conference on the green sea turtle proposed critical habitat. And really, we're just trying to get a jump on evaluating new species so that when they are listed, we're able to quickly address them.

Let's see, I guess that's all I wanted to mention there.

So, I am now going to turn over to the final critical habitat for

the five Caribbean corals. This just published only last week. It is a final rule, so it's not a proposal. Those five Caribbean corals, as you can see, are boulder star, lobed star, mountain star, pillar coral, and rough cactus are the species.

Next slide.

All right. So, here you can see this has been a long time coming. We actually listed the five Caribbean corals back in September of 2014. In 2020, we proposed critical habitat and early in 2021, that comment period closed. However, the CBD filed a lawsuit on us for failure to finalize that rule, because we had not done that as of March 27, 2023, and we entered into an agreement. And on, again, just August 8th, we did publish our final rule, and it has a 30-day effective delay. So, a month from now in September the final rule will become effective.

Next slide.

So, for green sea turtle critical habitat, you know, I said we had we had multiple essential features. For our five coral critical habitats, we have one physical and biological feature, and it's sites that support the normal function of all life stages of the corals including reproduction, recruitment, and maturation.

So, these sites are natural, consolidated hard substrate or dead coral skeleton, which is free of algae and sediment at the appropriate scale at the point of larval settlement or fragment reattachment, and the associated water column. And you can see there's several attributes to these sites that actually determine the quality of the area and influence the value of the associated feature to the conservation of the species. So, that includes the substrate with the presence of crevices and holes that provide cryptic habitat, the presence of microbial biofilms, or presence of crustose coralline algae; reef scape with no more than a thin veneer of sediment and low occupancy by fleshy and turf macroalgae; and then, marine waters with levels of temperature, aragonite saturation, nutrients, and water clarity that have been observed to support any demographic function. The last, marine waters with levels of anthropogenically introduced (from humans) chemical contaminants that do not preclude or inhibit any demographic function.

So, it is somewhat similar, although not identical to the Acropora critical habitat physical and biological feature that you're familiar with but I say that because you, again, you might be more familiar with that. And there was very little change between proposed and final of this physical and biological feature, other

than them making sure that it was clear that it was the sites that support the normal function.

Next slide.

So, you can see we have, again, it's five species. It's one unit for each species based on really the depth distribution in each geographic area that occurs. And so, resulting in 28 total units. But again, within each geographic area, units are mostly overlapping. And there is one excluded area, but outside of your region.

All right, next slide.

And here you can see the different areas. What we have here is in yellow, the Acropora Critical Habitat. We have on the map to show as a reference again, cause you're more familiar with it. So, again, there is a lot of overlap between that and our new designation. You can also see that we really didn't have any, or we did not have any changes between our proposed and final critical habitat designation.

Next slide.

This is just Navassa, same thing. There weren't any changes between proposed and final. But that is a new area we did not have Acropora Critical Habitat.

All right. And again, that was really just kind of a very quick fly through of the rule. I encourage you to look at it in more depth and reach out to me or follow up. Jen Moore is our coral expert in our region and is a great point of contact as well for information about the new coral critical habitat.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I have Nicole and then Graciela. Nicole.

NICOLE F. ANGELI: Thank you so much again for your presentation. The proposed critical habitat for both sea turtles and corals are something that's been on our radar in the U.S.V.I. for quite some time, and we've had multiple conversations before this proposed rule went out expressing our concerns with the amount of critical habitat that's proposed. I strongly recommend that folks from the public submit comments on this proposed rule.

 I say all of this being a very classically trained endangered species biologist. I think that one of the things that we don't know is how this will affect how federal funds are used in our territory and I'm very concerned about that and the Division of

Fish and Wildlife and Department of Planning and Natural Resources are very concerned about these proposed critical habitat designations. That's a comment, not a question, but thank you.

JENNIFER LEE: I appreciate that and we definitely encourage comments on the proposal.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Thank you, Jennifer. So, we're going to take a quick five-minute break.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Alrighty, we're going to get started again. We need to finish this agenda up.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Okay. Mr. Chairman. This section of the agenda responds to two communications I received. One, from a fisherman, another from a scientist. Both of them had the same idea, that the Council should consider revising the closed area that is identified as Grammanik Bank in the Marine Conservation District of Saint Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands. One reason, they believe that there are people fishing within the closed season. So, they asked maybe to consider expanding that closed season for another month into spring. Then, they also believe that the area between Grammanik and MCD, and thought that those areas should be considered for expanding the closed area.

So, I asked Graciela to put together a presentation on what is it that we have at this time, regarding regulations in the area. And then, I wanted to ask the opinion of the fishers on something that Julian and I discussed before. So, we have Graciela giving the status of the regulations, followed by Ruth Gomez, on the perspective from the Fishermen of Saint Thomas/Saint Jhons Fishermen Association.

Grammanik Bank and MCD Present Regulations for the Protection of Spawning Aggregations of Nassau Grouper and Other Species

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Thank you, Miguel. So, very quickly-- I think. Let's see.

I encourage everyone to read the comprehensive Fishery Management Plans for each of the islands, in this case the Saint Thomas/Saint John. If you don't want to read the whole document, go to Chapter 5, that has all the history of the regulations, especially Appendix C that has all of the regulations and the complete history from the first time that the Council implemented any regulations in the EEZ. I would also encourage you to read, at some point, if you're

looking for specific answers and testimony from stakeholders, the original FMPs that contain the comments that were received and the information that was provided at the time when the regulations were becoming a part of the implementation of fishery management in the EEZ.

So, very briefly, you have two areas. South of Saint Thomas, the Grammanik Bank, which is a seasonally closed area, and prohibits fishing for any species of fish. And in this case, fish means fin fish, mollusks, crustaceans, and all other forms of marine animal and plant life other than marine mammals and birds. And the reason for that description is because, in this case, the prohibition does not apply for highly migratory species. So, it's kind of something that we also need to consider.

So, HMS, it's allowed within the Grammanik Bank. That one it's closed between February 1st and April, and it was originally designated as a closed area for the protection of the spawning aggregation of the yellowfin grouper. This was brought to the attention to the Council by scientists and it was discussed and talked about and agreed upon at the end, with the collaboration of the fishers knowingly that economically it made a very big difference in terms of allowing them to fish in this area during those months. However, in addition to that, the bottom tending gear, any kind of bottom tending gear that includes pots, traps, bottom long lines, gill, and trammel nets is prohibited year-round.

In the Hind Bank, which has a different story, it was a-- Well, actually, yeah, a different story. A seasonal closure was established in 1990 and then it became a no take area in 1999. So, that's closed permanently year-round.

 So, you do have a little bit of comparison in terms of why they were established first, but the MCD was originally the Hind Bank, that's what it was known as, but it also had other spawning aggregations that were known from the area. Historically, from the 70s areas that included nassau grouper, for example. So, the areas are very different in terms of the area that it's managed. So, 41 square kilometers for the MCD, or the Hind Bank, and 1.5 square kilometers for Grammanik Bank. Close to the MCD from January to December, Grammanik Bank February, March, and April.

The nassau grouper, which is the species that mainly concerned us here today, and you've heard what Jenny had presented earlier regarding the threatened status of the nassau grouper, spawns between December and April. Other species that have been reported, and this is not a complete list, include red hind, tiger grouper,

yellowfin for the Hind Bank, yellowfin, dog and cubera snappers, and bermuda chub from the Grammanik Bank.

You already know where these two areas are. And what Miguel was talking about is that area between the Hind Bank and the Grammanik Bank. Between C and D in the in the picture that you're seeing. And the Council does have these areas designated as habitat areas of particular concern. Both the Hind Bank and the Grammanik Bank. And that is because it responds to that function between the habitat and the function that it carries for fish, in this case, the spawning aggregation.

This is a summary of the history of how they became to be. So, these all started, and this is specifically for the nassau grouper. So, the nassau grouper had a size limit back in the 1980s increased from 12 inches to 24 inches, becoming really economically extinct in the late 80s. And then the Council took action in 1990 declaring a no take for the nassau grouper in the EEZ. The no take for the local governments then became, specifically for the Virgin Islands, in 2006. Okay.

So, the Nassau Grouper has been prohibited in all of the area, from the shoreline to the 200 nautical miles in 2006. The seasonal closures that the nassau grouper had included the spawning months of January, February, and March. But then that becomes mute because now there is no take for these species.

So, I'm a visual person, so in this case we're just showing the months of the year, the specific areas that are impacted the Hind Bank and the and the Grammanik Bank post in the EEZ. The month that they are closed. Red means that there is no fishing allowed. The bottom gear, that it's completely prohibited. All of the months when nassau grouper is completely prohibited. And if you could take nassau grouper, you would be taking it during the month when the other species are being protected, the red, the black, the tiger, the yellowfin, and the yellowedged groupers. Those have a seasonal closure that it's compatible and it's the same between the territorial waters and the EEZ between February and April of every year.

In pink, you'll see the nassau grouper spawning months when it's been reporting that that takes place. So again, harvest and possession, both in the U.S.V.I. territorial waters and in the EEZ, it's prohibited year-round for the nassau grouper.

There are other regulations that impact or reduce the bycatch of a nassau grouper, and that is the animal catch limit for which all of these species that you're seeing on the screen has an ACL of zero. So, anyone who's diving for queen conch, for example, etcetera, that kind of thing, or is diving for any other of the reef fish, should not be taking nassau grouper.

The other two groups that might have an impact, and this is where the incidental catch of nassau grouper should be reported, the animals should be returned to sea, unharmed and as soon as possible. But those are the two groups that you have that have an animal catch limit that is improving because of the way that reporting is being conducted and they do have an annual catch limit. So, these are the groups that there might be some interaction with the nassau grouper.

The other regulations that protect the nassau grouper specifically are that there is no filleting at sea. You have to bring the fish intact. The other thing is that you have to release it immediately with minimum harm. So, these regulations are also supposed to protect the nassau grouper during the whole year.

You do have the recreational bag limits in place for other species that are allowed to be harvested from the EEZ, and those include other snappers and groupers. But again, all the fish that the recreational fishers bring to the boat, they have to be landed intact.

Okay? So, you have all that information in the Fishery Management Plan. The Island-Based FMP for the Saint Thomas/Saint John. You do have information, and these are the websites where you can find the commercial fishing regulations for the Virgin Islands and the NOAA website. These are all live links, and they will take you to the specific place.

So, the question is really what else can be done to protect the nassau grouper? And that's what brings us to that site between the Grammanik and the MCD.

Mr. Chair, that's all I have to say.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Thank you, Graciela. So, next would be-Okay, Ruth, go ahead.

Saint Thomas Fishermen's Association Statement - Ruth Gomez

RUTH GOMEZ: Good afternoon, everyone. Just to give you a very quick history of how we got to this statement. There was recently a scientific paper published that talked about an expansion of area and time when it came to the nassau grouper in the areas that Graciela spoke of. So, what it did was it set off the fishermen in

the Virgin Islands.

4 5

Just historically, it hasn't always been the best relationship when it comes to close areas, how they come about. Now, yesterday afternoon, Julian and I had a beautiful conversation with María. And María pretty much calmed our fears. This may be a little premature, but we're going to put it on the record anyway, because we like to get to first base before anybody.

So, we got together, the fishermen, the board of the STFA reached out to their constituents and we all met and at a very rapid pace I had six, seven, eight fishermen all very anxious and aggressively trying to get me to write down all the things they wanted me to come down here and say, so this is. This is it, this statement. okay?

Dear members of the Caribbean Fishery Management Council. The Saint Thomas Fishermen's Association is aware that there is a potential for an expansion of the area for both the Red Hind Marine Conservation District and the Grammanik Bank, South of Saint Thomas, Virgin Islands. An increase in area would include the closure of the corridor between the present closed areas. This corridor is referred to by the fishing sector as the "alleyway." The Grammanik Bank would receive an extension of time and closure.

The STFA supports the efforts to protect the nassau grouper and encourages the protection of the marine ecosystem. However, we cannot manage with blinders on. The fishery of the Saint Thomas/Saint John District is a small boat and market driven fishery. Virgin Islanders rely on the ocean as their main source of food. Seafood is the number one source of protein consumed in these islands. Managing the U.S.V.I. fishery does not fit in the "typical" management toolbox, resulting in a complex task. As we, the U.S.V.I., are rich in culture and history, it is crucial to understand that fishing is a generational craft. Fishing is not a way to make a living, it is deeply rooted in our culture.

The U.S.V.I. fishery currently is subjected to heavy handed management. Closed areas, annual catch limit, species-specific closed seasons, and size limits. Any additional loss of fishing area would have a significant effect on the fisher's ability to make a living and the people they service. Additional closure has a direct correlation to financial compensation.

 Observations of the nassau grouper spawning occurred late this season. It is important to note that the full moon occurred later in the months of December 2022 to April 2023. This occurrence may have resulted in a later than usual spawning period. Of greater

significance is this unusual lunar cycle potentially in a once in every 7-to-10-year event. The STFA recommends effort be placed into looking into the lunar cycle for the last 10 years and at least the next 5 years. There is no need to extend the closed season if future lunar cycles coincide with existing management.

It is proven that closures and no possession regulations work. Since 2015, observations of nassau grouper have increased in number and location. It has been protected by the territorial and Federal governments for over twenty years.

The question to be asked is, how much more protection will you put on a fish that no one can catch at the stake of the people of the Virgin Islands?

As a spawning season has already occurred for the 2022-2023 season, there is an opportunity for all of us to ensure that we make decisions based on data. The STFA recommends data be compiled on the following: What was the total landings recorded for the area referred to as the alleyway? How many fishers recorded landings from the alleyway?

And I want to segue to this. The map on the back-- I'm talking to María. I think we came to the conclusion that it's DPNR that holds this, right? So, this goes to Nicole, Dr. Angeli. Is there any way that we can put the closed areas on this map? Right? So, when the fishers report, because these are half mile by half mile squares, right? That would give us specific, like more data about what is actually being caught in that alleyway.

How many traps were recorded in the alleyway? I think we could get that from this as well. And at what month of the year? What data is there to substantiate that nassau grouper solely travel to and from the closed areas during the spawning aggregation via the alleyway? Increased funding for outreach and supplies. And an example of that would be descending devices. I think that we really need to focus on making sure that aboard every commercial vessel there is a descending device.

In the Outreach and Education Committee, we do our due diligence in making sure that we hold workshops, getting the fishermen to understand how to do it. Because it's like María said yesterday, if you don't do it right, you're going to kill the fish. So, all of that we can accomplish with just education and some time and effort.

Increase the funding in order to increase the survival rate of incidental capture. And this would include instructions on how to

deflate the swim bladder. Information on whether there are any new spawning aggregations discovered inside or outside of the existing closed areas. If there are new areas, have they been studied?

The STFA wants to ensure that due diligence by everyone is a priority. We look forward to engaging in conversation with the hope of finding the best solution for the nassau grouper and the people of the Virgin Islands.

And it's signed by our president, Daryl Bryan.

Questions/Comments

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Vance.

VANCE VICENTE: Ruth, I'm trying to find out if there is a recovery plan. Because for each ESA-listed species, whether threatened or in danger, there has to be a recovery plan. In other words, when will the species be delisted from the ESA species list? From what I see from NOAA Fisheries, they have a recovery outline, but there isn't a recovery plan which says, "Hey, when 50% of the population recovers." What are the, the reference point? I don't see any unless anybody listening to me from NOAA knows more than myself.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Miquel?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Vance, when we sided with the nassau grouper we were talking about one and a half generation of the animal before they opened it. This darn thing lasts for 22 years before they start spawning. So, it means that they might be able to have the one and a half, 33 years after your closure. That has changed. But this conversation took place in Saint Thomas with over a hundred fishermen present a long time ago. The same question came up.

At that time, it was a recommendation to study the nassau grouper better to figure out the actual spawning because we were using another species for nassau grouper, but at the time, we didn't have that much information.

 But since that time, everything has changed. Not everything, but a lot has changed. Now, the nassau groupers is under the ESA, so in order to get it to the ESA, we have to follow, as we all know, the regulation applicable to any species that is on the ESA. So, probably Kate can give us an idea of where are we, and what the future will bring to us.

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Right. Kate Zamboni for the record. As Vance stated, there is no recovery plan completed, but there is a

recovery outline, which is pretty standard as part of the recovery process. And that does identify priorities and sort of a process to work through it. Identifying critical habitat is often part of that. We have other statutory requirements to do it, but the outline does guide us until the recovery plan is complete. And that's available on NOAA's website if you want to look at it.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: And, the other thing is, maybe, Kate, you can expand, is that when you have a species that is overfished, then a recovery plan kicks in and this is under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, but the ESA, esos son otros veinte pesos. So, can you tell us the difference between the two?

KATHERINE M. ZAMBONI: Yes. There is a difference between a rebuilding plan under Magnuson, and a recovery plan under the endangered species. They have different goals.

So, under the Endangered Species Act, our goal is to get that species off of the list, to the point where it no longer needs the protections that it gets by being identified as a, in this case, a threatened species. So, you could have a, a stock rebuild, if you will, perhaps before it's off the ESA, or maybe not. You know, I don't know. It might be, locally there may be some ways to do that. But just so you know, yeah, the goal is just very different in terms of when you're talking about a rebuilding plan versus a recovery plan.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: The last time, Mr. Chairman, the fisherman who called me said that he's not asking for more expansion, more this and more that. He's asking for enforcement. What he's saying is the laws and regulations that protect the nassau grouper are okay, but he's seen a lot of people fishing—well, not a lot of people, but some of that he knows. —fishing for nassau grouper, filleting their fish and selling them as something else at the dock. Anyway, that's a concern.

So, what we need to hear from the Council is, taking into consideration these two comments that we received. The presentation by Ruth Gomez. The thing is, something that María said, it doesn't mean that if the Council decides to do something, the closure will be expanded, and close season will start tomorrow. You have to go through a whole process.

Probably we need more outreach and education than another club in the head of the fishers at this time. So, perhaps if we take into consideration—by the way, those are good recommendations. I like what you presented on behalf of the fishers. Maybe Alida and I can talk a little bit more about it and look at possibilities with

you, Julian.

 What else can we do to enhance, let's say, the efforts that we have for outreach and education? How can we take these recommendations and make it effective? And I believe that if we put our minds together, something good will come out of it between 2023 and 2024. Because the other thing is, my personal opinion is, if you ask a fisherman for something and he gives you the input, and then you do nothing for three or four years, don't ask him again or don't ask her again. So, I believe that this is a good momentum to move forward with some enhancement of the outreach and education efforts that we have at this time.

However, we also need to be mindful that we have to review what we have to see whether that area is enough for the protection that was intended as presented by Graciela. For example, somebody told me a long time ago, if you look at the alleyway and you have a lot of traps there, and you have a lot of people there, then you have a problem. Fishers, when we met at the Fisherman Association site, where they have the new place, it was a long time ago, almost nobody was fishing there. And actually, the fishers were the first ones who told me, Miguel, the whole area is not used by the fish that are spawned and it's only a rectangle. And later the scientists found that it was the same rectangle that the fishermen were telling me about.

And, anyway, enough said. We'd like to hear from the Council what will be the next steps, if any, regarding this area.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Jack?

JACK MCGOVERN: I think Ruth and the Saint Thomas Fishermen's Association has a lot of good suggestions here. One thing maybe the Council could do is to develop a white paper to try to gather information and answer some of these questions. And then, you know, some of this has to do with outreach and education, with the descending devices. We're about to, you know, approve the trawl amendment probably in December. And, you know, that could be a component of that amendment as well. And so, I think that's one thing that we could move forward on.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mr. Chairman, regarding the descending devices. We already received some funding and Marcos Hanke is spearing that effort. Dr. Michelle Schärer is preparing a video about the use of the descending devices, materials and assembling and everything. Once we have that, we will travel to the different places. We can have a meeting with the fishers, present the video.

 Marcos is willing to go and give a demonstration. I prefer the demonstration to be from fisher to fisher. If I go there to demonstrate something, "yeah, you're always behind the desk, we don't believe what you're saying." But if we have a fisherman telling the other fisherman, not only that, but a fisherman can also tell you how to enhance the device. Because the regulation should be flexible enough so we can use different materials to achieve the same goal, which is sending that fish back to a place where it can survive. The swim bladder is another issue because there are fishermen telling me that some of these fish, their swim bladder is going to be damaged when you punch them so they're going to die. We're going to be feeding the sharks.

So, I would propose, Mr. Chairman, that you need to answer to Jack about the white paper. But while that is happening, we should continue with the discussion for the betterment of the efforts that we have for outreach and education.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Graciela and then Julian.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: A couple of things. The Council has been working on a GIS, so we'll be able to provide you with the information. The problem is that when we've been talking about the areas that are selected, when you put the area and the species together, sometimes it gets blurred, so you don't know exactly what's coming from where. But at least we have all of the areas that were traditionally fished, so we should be able to look at that.

Martha just sent me that there are a few reports between 2018 and 2021 regarding that specific area between the Hind Bank and the Grammanik Bank. Kevin and the SSC mentioned the data mining efforts to make sure that the data are QA/QC (quality assessed and quality controlled) so that we can use all that information, which is extremely important. And then, also data mine the old reports when the nassau grouper was actually reported to be harvested in the area. So, we've done most of the PDFs from the very old reports, so we'll have all that history also available.

And finally, in terms of involving the fishers in a specific project, I mean, there are ROVs that we can use to go to the areas that used to be nassau grouper aggregation sites, for example, and perhaps do some kind of project with the fishers and scientists on board so that we can document if there are any changes in other aggregations that we didn't know about. But the FMP, the original FMP from 1985 has a couple of places that are marked by hand in that copy of the nautical chart that was used.

 So, you know, I'm keeping track of all the ideas and what we need to do. At some point, the Council also had a nassau grouper kit for the measurement, so that you could measure and write down and keep track of what was the size of the nassau grouper. So, just a few ideas. Thanks.

JULIAN MAGRAS: So, Grammanik Bank has always been a hot, hot issue for me. And the people that know me in here, know from back in 1995, I was one of the fishermen that used to fish directly on the bank during the spawning aggregation period.

We were involved with the SFA. When we put the seasonal closure. It was an emergency closure first put on the bank and then we were involved with creating the seasonal closure for this area. We were also very instrumental in getting the size of the Grammanik Bank decreased to the present size that is being managed right now due to the fact that it is one small area where these fish come to spawn on that particular bank. It goes from 150 on the North of it and it goes up to 108 right on top one small spot of 90 something feet of water. That's where the fish actually spawn but the whole area around it was protected. Of course, on the South side of the bank it's all the deep water, the shelf, the end of the shelf.

So, you know, I understand Ruth's concern of the alleyway. But those fish don't only travel through the alleyway. Those fish travel through the entire waters around the Virgin Islands. It's not that they're coming through that alleyway alone to get to the bank. The original nassau grouper spawning aggregation site is inside of the MCD. The same area where the hind's spawn. And 14 square miles of closure from 1995, completely no take, I can guarantee you that we have several spawning aggregations within those 14 square miles. Because these fish are all over, from the very shallow waters to all the way out to the shelf. All year long we see these fish.

We've seen them. They're all over more and more and more. We have seen them. So, you have the nassau group, but that's been fully protected for 17 years and federally protected for 27. What do you expect the outcome of that is going to be? You expect the stock is growing. And I think what's happening is agencies, universities, scientists, whoever is getting the money to study these species, the hind, the yellowfin grouper, the nassau grouper, they need to bring this information to the table.

 I've been saying this for years. We see money given, money given, money given on an annual basis, millions of dollars, but we don't see the reports. So, when we have the scientifical and statistical committee meeting, they don't have that data before them to be

able to do their job. They have to go and search for it and see if there's any papers out there. That information should be produced to them and produced to this Council.

So, you have the tools to do your job and the other side of it, the fishermen are not the ones taking the hit. We don't want to see no more closed areas. I think we have done a good job with creating all the seasonal closures. We have the MCD, we got the Grammanik Bank, we got the Coral Reef Monument. We had a presentation on lionfish earlier today. Do you know how many millions of lionfish are in those closed areas? Because they can't be caught. How much damage are they doing in those areas? Where those areas are supposed to protect not only the fish that are spawning, but every species of fish that live within those areas.

We only talk about the hind, we only talk about grouper unit 4, the Nassau grouper. But all of those other species that we harvest, come from within those areas. So, it's a full protection for every species. We need to— and I continue saying this at every meeting also. All of these seasonal closures are in place, not only for the groupers, lane snapper, mutton snapper, deep-water snapper, everything for 17 years and not one assessment has been done for us to know how those stocks are doing.

So, we have closures in place, and we don't know if it's actually working or they're not working. And it's clearly stated in the SFA, not all seasonal closures work. Some of them do more harm to the species than rebuilding it. And where does that come from? Bycatch. So, you got a deep-water snapper, you got the lane snappers, those are fish that when you're releasing them, a lot of times, they don't survive.

So, all I ask of this Council is that you take the recommendations that the Fisherman Association has put forward by our president and we sit down as a team, and we gather the information and see what we can get out of it. There's a lot of information. How many fishers are actually fish in that area? I know of five, including myself. Do we fish in there all year round? No, because our fish move from place to place throughout different times of the year. So, we move with our fish, but we know those times. That's one of my main areas that I fish for queen triggerfish. So, if I was to take another hit there, my income, and I'm a queen triggerfish targeter, my income is going to be slashed, big time.

So, we must be careful. We have a job to do to protect and conserve for the future generation's ecosystem, but we need to be careful how we do it. Thank you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Yeah.

4 5

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the discussion has been very good. Graciela, please take note of your recommendation so we can use it for the IRF funding, which is to look at the areas that we have closed and see what is inside. Some of these areas are Jurassic Park for lionfish.

So, anyway. I believe that you have a suggestion following all the suggestions by the group from the RA, which is to develop a white paper. For those of you who forget what a white paper is, it's just a compilation of the information that we have, what is needed, what are the gaps. So, you present that to the Council for future actions or whatever.

The other thing about studying the areas and the affected is that you always carry two sacks. Let's say that the scientists do this and all of a sudden, they say, "well, you need an area three times this area to be closed." That happened in California, by the way. So, the point is that if we follow the white paper suggestions and it is something that is not occurred tomorrow. In order to do that, it takes some time.

The staff is really up to here with a lot of work. So, we're talking about 2024. Maybe May, or in spring, we can have an update on where we are with the white paper. The outreach and education can start tomorrow. That's something that Alida and I can work on with the local fishers.

The descending devices is something that we're already working. So, once Dr. Michelle Schärer finishes the video, we can start having the meetings with the fishers in one of the areas. In the case of Saint Thomas/Saint John. We are going to rely on the Association to invite all the fishers. So, we can have those workshops there. I hope that we can do it on the first part of 2024, The first quarter we will have that.

So, what is the pleasure of the Council? Mr. Chairman

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, we need a member to motion for the development of a white paper by staff. Kreglo? Can you help us out, Jack?

JACK MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think the motion could be to direct Council to develop a white paper to address the questions-- I guess I should wait until it comes up there.

Direct staff to develop a white paper to address the points made

in the paper developed by the Saint Thomas Fishermen's Association.

 MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: While prepared the motion. Graciela suggested, that now that we are going to meetings in Saint Thomas in December, we can check whether the video that Dr. Schärer is working on will be ready. So, she said, "yes." We will try to have it ready by December, if not by May. But next year, we can have special meetings with the DAP of Saint Thomas to present that. And also, we can invite Marcos Hanke to give sort of a workshop. A little workshop on how to construct the device. We have the materials and everything and I believe that that would be a step in the right direction, rather quick, for December.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Jack?

JACK MCGOVERN: Just a point of clarification, Mr. Chair. James Kreglo made the motion.

19 CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, we need to correct that.

21 JACK MCGOVERN: But I'll second it.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, we put Kreglo as the motion maker and Jack McGovern as the seconder.

So, the motion is to direct staff to develop a white paper to address the points made in the letter presented by the Saint Thomas Fisherman's Association at the August 2023 meeting. Motion by Kreglo, seconded by Jack McGovern. All in favor say "aye."

GROUP: Aye.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none, motion carries.

JACK MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just one other thought. In this strategic plan are these reserves and I think addressing them is something that, you know, we intend to do as a Council. I was wondering if maybe we could kind of prioritize Grammanik Bank as one of the first in that strategic plan to evaluate.

VANCE VICENTE: I would beef up that statement. I mean, we know, for example, say "In the letter dated May 2023, regarding the expansion of the Grammanik Bank, we the Council, request" put some beef in it, or no?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Vance. No, you are killing Robert's rules. That's gone. That's passed. But the record that was developed is enough

for the staff to work on it. Don't worry about it.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, what were we going to do with what Jack just said about the five-year strategic plan?

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: One of the suggestions, and this is something that Graciela and I were discussing, we need to look into those reserves to see what is in it. What Jack said is that that was part of the strategic plan that the Council developed, looking at all that. So, that gives us enough support to develop a project, and hopefully it will be approved, to study, because this is something that the West Coast fishers already asked, especially for Tourmaline Bank.

So, we closed these areas, but nobody knows really what's inside. Something that Julian mentioned, there is a term that they use in the Caribbean, the parachuters. They come to the Caribbean, they study the hell out of these areas, they go back to Minnesota, and you never see the report. Because the idea that they have is just to collect information for PhDs, master's degrees, and all that. I remembered that Kevin McCarthy, some years ago, identified this issue because we have a lot of studies made with NOAA money, but nobody knew where they were. So, he started collecting them. That's why the center has a good database on studies that we have in this area.

But the point that Jack is bringing is what we need to follow. We don't need a motion for that, but I have to report to you in December, what is it that we have done with the proposed project? One of them could be a priority. On August 22, the Secretary Director will have a meeting with the NOAA people, the Washington people to discuss possible studies that we can make and that will be one of the top priorities that we have, for many reasons.

The Marine Reserve are impacted by climate change. Not only the fishes, where they go and everything, but also the substrate, the habitat, the plans that Vance mentioned this morning and we can't report back to you in December where we are with this. Then you can make decisions, better informed decision as to where we're going. But I believe that the top priority of the Council, you can have a motion for that, is to accept the status of the species under the management areas that we have closed for different reasons.

 By the way, there's a national effort, "30x30," we mentioned that before. There's a paper that is going to come out of that. One of the authors is sitting over there, Liajay Rivera. The paper will have all the information that has been accumulated around the

United States regarding area-based management. The needs for assessing what we have there, etcetera, etcetera. So, rest assure that by the December meeting, Graciela and I will have some, hopefully, good news as to the next steps to study these areas.

Alida and I will make sure that we start working with the Outreach and Education in coordination with the Saint Thomas Fisherman's Association and the Division of Fish and Wildlife because it's important that we have their cooperation. I already talked to Sennai and Angeli about this same issue, so they are on board with what we need to do.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. Thank you. So, we're going to move right along-- Oh, Graciela.

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, it's very important now that we have the marine spatial planning meetings, and I think, Julian, you're going to that one in Saint Croix, to mention all of the areas that are impacted, that have a negative impact on fisheries. For example, I think that shipping lanes are still an issue for you, coming over the shelf, etcetera, the monument areas that have a no fishing regulation associated to them and all of the other areas that are close to all fishing throughout the territory.

So, these are the things that, you know, the cables, anything that really has an impact on the habitat, that could have changed the habitat and therefore it could have changed the function of that area as you knew it, needs to be brought up during the marine spatial planning meetings.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Graciela. So, we need to move on. I need to get through the enforcement report so that I can get Michelle Schärer a chance in other business. So, we're going to start with Puerto Rico DNER.

Enforcement Reports Puerto Rico DNER

DANIEL MATOS CARABALLO: Yeah, perfect. I see better from my screen. Sorry. Ricardo López, he is excused today because he is sick, but he worked with Yamiré Pérez on this report. So, let's look at the report.

In Puerto Rico, we have some rules and laws to work with the features. Law 21, this is to penalize anyone who throws waste in public or private places. Law 147, this is for the protection, conservation, management of coral reefs. Law 278, this is the Puerto Rico's fisheries law. Law 430, this is for Navigation and

Safety Act. Regulation 4860, this is the regulation for the use, surveillance, very important to avoid some illegal constructions. Regulation 6979, this is for registration, navigation, and aquatic safety. And one of the most important of this group is the Puerto Rico's fisheries regulation 7949.

Next slide, please.

Okay. Well, from top to bottom. The first is the Law 147 for protection and conservation of coral reefs, only one intervention. Law 278, only two interventions. Regulations 7949, this is the fisheries regulations, 31 interventions. And then the others. The biggest, is Law 430, for navigation and safety with 246 interventions. The green is for this year, 2023 and the blue is from December '22 to March '23.

Okay, so, next slide, please. Okay, well, that's it.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Daniel. Any questions for Daniel? Nelson?

NELSON CRESPO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Nelson Crespo for the record. Daniel I really worry about the situation that we are having with the manatees around Puerto Rico. Last week, another manatee was found dead, and I don't know if federal enforcement and the local enforcement can do something, you know, have a plan to attack this issue because I think this is one of the years where most manatees were found dead, caused by boat impacts around the island. Adding to that is the situation is happening in the protected area with huge amount of boats celebrating parties, foam parties that are affecting the ecosystems. Are you evaluating to develop a strategy to attack these issues?

DANIEL MATOS CARABALLO: Nelson, I'll be glad to take your very important ideas and concerns to the secretary and she will answer that properly. Thank you, Nelson.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Nelson. Thank you, Daniel. We'll move forward to DPNR enforcement.

U.S.V.I. DPNR

HOWARD FORBES: Good afternoon. Howard Forbes for the record. We are pleased to announce that we have made several milestone achievements. We have acquired four rapid response jet skis outfitted for law enforcement. Two will be in each district. These skis are already in the territory. All officers have received personal watercraft training through the National Association of

Boating Safety Law Administrator and are now certified to operate.

4 5

In keeping with the initiative to expand Marine Patrol inventory, we have also acquired four new vessels, which will have two in each district also. The division will be in receivership of the vessels in late November at the end of the 2023 hurricane season.

Pending cases. The division is currently investigating two posts on Facebook regarding the sale of nassau grouper in a District of Saint Thomas. Our patrol hours, dockside boarding hours are 155. Our sea patrol hours, 135 hours. Last month, we had the fisher's registration for the 2023 through the 2024 season. A total of 259 commercial fishers have been registered and let me break it down in district. Saint Thomas, we had 118 registered commercial fishers with 16 helpers. On Saint Croix, we had 141 commercial registered fishers and also 40 helpers. And that concludes the U.S.V.I. report. Short and sweet.

U.S. Coast Guard

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Any questions for DPNR Enforcement? I see no hands. The Coast Guard isn't here, so we're going to go to NOAA Fisheries Office of Law Enforcement.

NOAA Fisheries Office of Law Enforcement

MANNY ANTONARAS: Alright. Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Manny Antonaras. I'm with NOAA's Office of Law Enforcement and with me is Miguel Borges. Miguel is the special agent for those that don't know him, new Council members, that covers Puerto Rico and U.S.V.I. Like I said-- I actually haven't introduced myself, but I'm the Assistant Director for the Southeast Division. So, we cover pretty much the same territory that SERO covers. For Puerto Rico and U.S.V.I., along with Miguel Borges, special agent, we have Alex Torero. He's not present today, but he's stationed in Saint Thomas, U.S.V.I.

So, for Caribbean updates, I'll start off here. This first thing I have to share here is a offload that we monitored for pelagic long line vessels that pull into the North side of Puerto Rico. Primarily, species we're looking at here are yellowfin tuna and some swordfish and we've conducted several of those over the quarter since the last meeting. No violations detected on those offloads.

Next slide, please.

Special Agent Borges also attended a two day Blue Marlin tournament

checking for compliance with HMS regulations. He was present on both days of the registration. He was there to answer questions on HMS regulations, and also assisting with some of the permitting and permit application process. He was also there on the second day of the tournament Puerto Rico DNER was also present there to measure any fish that were landed, and no violations detected at that particular tournament.

4 5

Next slide, please.

Just to emphasize our partnerships, we have, in the Southeast Division now, twenty-nine special agents and officers combined covering all the states on the Eastern seaboard and the Southeast, Gulf of Mexico, Puerto Rico and U.S.V.I. So, we are very limited and rely very much on our state partners, our Coast Guard partners specifically here in the Caribbean, PRDRNA, U.S.V.I. DPNR and then CBP, Aaron Marine as well. We've done some work with FDA and also with the National Park Service.

For those of you that are not aware, we do have a joint enforcement agreement with both Puerto Rico and U.S.V.I. We've got agreements with pretty much all the states in the Southeast Division, with the exception of North Carolina. We recently signed the agreement with U.S.V.I. and are happy to work towards signing the agreement for the next JA cycle as well.

Next slide, please.

 Trade monitoring. What we're doing here is, the primary focus is to protect our domestic seafood. We're doing inspections at ports for things like shrimp, crab, different fish species. And in doing so, we're looking for proper documentation, collaborating with other agencies at the ports focusing primarily on SIMP, the Seafood Import Monitoring Program.

And so, for the recent activities—— Actually, next slide, please. I've got an example of one of our inspections that was performed in Puerto Rico. This particular exam was conducted with the CBP trade team and a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Inspector. The container that we were looking at was coming from Japan that had reported as imitation crab meat.

The container was put on hold because of a discrepancy between the master bill of lading and the house bill. The master bill displayed the product was imitation crab while the other indicated the product was shark fins. After a thorough exam of the container it was determined that the product was actually crab meat and was released with no violations.

Next slide please.

 This is a joint patrol that was conducted with Puerto Rico DNER. It was a night patrol on the Northern Coast in Puerto Rico looking for possible spear fishermen that are fishing at night. Patrol was also conducted at a local boat ramp that's frequented by fishermen. This was really in response to two sea turtle carapaces that were found in the area, and it's believed that the turtles were killed and filleted for meat. No fishers were encountered on that particular patrol, but the investigations are still ongoing in that area.

Next slide, please.

Focusing more on U.S.V.I. Our officer Saint Thomas conducted maritime patrol with CBP to detect illegal foreign fishing activity in Puerto Rico and U.S.V.I. AOR. He also responded, this quarter, to a call from CBP in regard to a complaint of a vessel that was allegedly smuggling lobster. The vessel was interdicted in U.S. waters coming from B.V.I. and was in possession of lobster. The boat was directed to the National Park Service where the catch was examined, or the product was examined, and inspection revealed that the crew and vessel had all necessary permits and a couple minor infractions were documented.

Our officer also participated in a joint patrol with CBP AMO in the Red Hook area, checking vessels arriving at the ferry dock. He also responded to some violations in Sapphire Beach Marina. We have some ongoing investigations in that area as well. We also have some future joint ops planned with U.S.V.I. to conduct enforcement activities.

I believe last quarter we reported on some Saint Croix patrols in both federal and state waters. And thank you to U.S.V.I. for offering us some of their officers and patrol vessels.

Next slide, please.

 This is a follow up on an ESA investigation that was initiated by U.S.V.I. DPNR. The defendant that you see listed on the screen pled guilty to two counts and was sentenced to one year probation and a fine of 500,000. We also have a sentencing that's pending for the second defendant, which is scheduled in district court for August 31st in Saint Croix.

Next slide, please.

 I'd like to also share with the Council I did pass on a press release a month and a half ago that came out of San Juan, and it was the announcement from the U.S. Attorney's Office, Puerto Rico and in U.S.V.I. and through the Environmental Crimes Group, Department of Justice in Washington, D. C. announcing the formation of Environmental Crimes Task Force in U.S.V.I. and Puerto Rico. I was here in Puerto Rico for that announcement.

7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

2 3

4 5

6

The announcement in the document with DOJ you can see the particular attention underscoring that essentially that each of all the agencies that participated are ongoing commitments to environmental justice, which feeds into some of the stuff that we discussed earlier today. Essentially, a principle that combines the environmental protection by examining whether all people or income are receiving fair treatment and meaningful involvement with respect to development and implementation and enforcement of environmental laws.

17 18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

So, that was a very big deal for us. We're happy to announce that back in May. And as part of that task force some of you may have read in the newspapers, with respect to the Jobos Bay matter, a federal grand jury in the district of Puerto Rico returned to indictments charging Luis Enrique Rodríquez Sanchez and Pedro Luis Bonas Torres with a violation of the Clean Water Act and the Rivers and Harbors Act relating to the illegal construction and deposit of material in the wetlands and waters of the Jobos Bay National Estuarine Reserve.

27 28 29

30

31

32

33

34

35 36

37

38

39

40 41

There were various federal agencies that were involved in that investigation including the EPA, the FBI, U.S. Department of Criminal Investigation, I'm sorry, the Army CID Division, Department of Commerce, Inspector General, our office, along with Fish and Wildlife. According to the indictment approximately January of 2020 through October of '22, the two subjects knowingly discharged fill material from excavation of earth moving equipment into the wetlands and waters of the United States in violation of the Clean Water Act and they were also charged with building structures with navigable waterways of the United States without authorization of the Secretary of Army in violation of the Rivers and Harbors Act. And as a follow up to that case Miguel Borges also assisted with the arrests of two subjects involved in that case.

42 43

Next slide, please.

44 45

48

46 Just highlighting some of our outreach education, that's a major 47 component of our program. Just one example from this quarter. Miquel met with an importer who previously received an enforcement action for one of those seafood import monitoring violations I mentioned earlier. Importer requested the meeting in order to better understand the SIMP program and the meeting was held at the importer's facility with the in-house customs broker and Miguel provided the broker with the SIMP compliance guide and answered questions that both parties had.

1 2

4 5

I'll just touch on priorities. We talked about this at the last meeting. We worked on our national priorities document, and we held meetings with each of the Councils. In the Caribbean, we did hold meetings with all the DAP members as well. That report, we were waiting on NOAA Fisheries strategic plan, which is also being put together for the years for 2022 through 2025. The public comment closed for that and we will link the web story for the '22 through '25 priorities along with the annual priorities, and we'll get that out to the Council as well.

And the final slide I have is for our OLE resources. You can see that we have our priorities annual reports. We've got some IUU information as well. And then we have a link to subscribe to the NOAA Fishery Bulletin. And there's also information on the cases that have been charged by NOAA's Office of General Counsel. Cases that we referred. Some of which are cases that were referred by our state partners.

And next slide.

That concludes the report. Any questions?

30 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. Any questions for NOAA OLE? Gerson?

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Verification on the amount of the penalty. I think I heard \$500,000 or \$500?

MANNY ANTONARAS: \$500.

GERSON MARTÍNEZ: Okay. Thank you.

Other Business

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you. So, that concludes most of our meeting. Kevin, do you want to make a-- SSC.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Kevin McCarthy, Southeast Fisheries Science Center. I want to revisit the request that we've got to have an SSC meeting sometime in the next, say, six, eight weeks, so that we can work with the SSC on a couple of issues for SEDAR 80, the Virgin Islands, part of SEDAR 80 that is incomplete,

so that we can hopefully finish this up in December or the November December meeting, whenever the SSC meeting is in the early winter.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Graciela, please take note of that, so we don't forget. If the meeting is virtual, it's easier, if it's in person, we need to look for the hotel and we have to send the announcement to the Federal Raiser 30 days before.

KEVIN MCCARTHY: Right, virtual is fine for us because we'll be at the end of the year and travel becomes problematic for us. So, virtual is great.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay, to other business we have Michelle Schärer.

MICHELLE SCHÄRER-UMPIERRE: Good afternoon, my name is Michelle Scherer. Full disclosure, I am part of the SSC of this Council, but today I am here bringing my own personal opinions. The idea of presenting today is a little bit piggybacking on what Ruth and the Saint Thomas Fisherman's Association just brought forward.

I just wanted to give you an update on the Bajo de Sico which is an area managed by the Council. So, this Council is the de facto manager for various areas in the U.S. Caribbean. What I've done is I've gone through the CFMC record and brought out some important issues that I'd like to remind everybody where we are today.

So, back in 1996 was first established to protect grouper spaning aggregations. The area of Baja de Sico is 31 Km² and it was originally closed for three months. After that, in 2008, there was a letter by the Puerto Rico Department of Natural Resources because in 2007 they amended the Puerto Rico fisheries regulation to include no bottom tending gear in the territory jurisdiction waters of Bajo de Sico. But after that, there was a letter to the Council where they were looking forward to exploring a joint no take designation or any other means to protect Bajo de Sico and they were requesting ideas during the year of the reframe work.

I didn't find anything in the record responding to this, but the letter is there for everyone to look over. If we go on to 2010, that's when there was an amendment number three to the reef fish management plan where the closure should only have one E, but it was supposed to be six months. So, that's what we have up to today.

In 2012 was when we first observed Nassau Grouper aggregating to spawn at Bajo de Sico. And since then, we've been involved in research to better understand the habitat use and abundance suggested at the aggregation was vulnerable to bycatch in April.

So, sort of a little bit of what Ruth was bringing to the table, I'm also bringing to the table that, preliminarily, we have fish that are vulnerable to bycatch after the closed season ends.

Every time we finish a cycle of research or a project, we try to come to this Council and present and are available, and that's also on the record. So, if anybody hasn't seen the research, they can come back into the record, or anybody here that has my e mail can contact me, and we can clarify the results so far. But research publications take time, so we have to wait until those papers come out so that we can present them. But we're happy to clarify any doubts anybody may have.

So, in 2016, we have the listing of the nassau grouper as a threatened species in our waters. And after that, we had a biological opinion, sort of what we were talking about today, earlier, and in that time, it was cited in this document that there were regulatory mechanisms and law enforcement had not been effective in preventing fishing at the spawning aggregation site.

So, this is one of the major reasons that it was listed, was lack of compliance during the aggregations. So, this is something that is guiding us towards what we need to do, to effectively protect them when they are most vulnerable. Additionally, according to Farmer, where nassau grouper or specific regulations do exist, law enforcement in many foreign countries is less than adequate. And I'm not sure if he was counting Puerto Rico as a foreign country, but it happens here too because we still see nassau grouper in our restaurants and our fish houses.

In 2020 at the $172^{\rm nd}$ Council meeting, the Añasco Fishers Association proposed a 12-month closure to the core area. They argued that nassau grouper did not occur with deep-water snappers. And I remember after that presentation, and it's actually on the record, that a Council member said he did not agree in opening another can of worms. And since then, this action has not been discussed. Or this proposal.

During this year, we're observing in our shallow areas, just as the fishers predicted, an unprecedented amount of juvenile nassau grouper in our near shore areas. This has been seen in Rincón, Cabo Rojo, Lajas, Guanica, and Guayanilla. So, these little guys are measuring less than 20 centimeters, which indicates they were spawned this year.

So, thanks to the sacrifices of protecting spawning aggregations like the one South of Saint Thomas, which we have documented increased the spawning stock, this year we may be seeing a

settlement event that we've never seen before, thanks to those closures and those increases in nassau groupers spawning off the East Coast of Puerto Rico.

So, even though we have three different management plans, we're talking about a shared resource. Because it's very plausible that the currents are bringing these larvae to the South and Western Coast from the East Coast. So, I think all the recommendations that were in the letter of the Saint Thomas Fisherman's Association, I would actually propose that we also discuss it for Bajo de Sico.

And in my conversations with various partners that are at this table and outside of here, I just want to bring five points to your attention that have been discussed previously and that are actually contained in three publications that just came out this month that hopefully we'll have time to discuss with you thoroughly at the next Council meeting.

Number one, that the aggregation is vulnerable after the closed season ends at Bajo de Sico. Number two, that nassau grouper are residing on the top part of this bank year-round. This is a very particular case because they only use areas shallower than 90 meters. Third, fishers requested access to the deeper waters around the core area for 12 months of the year. And I was wondering if maybe with the Science Center we could look at how many fishers are reporting landings from the area of Bajo de Sico, where by the species composition or by the depths that they report, we could actually see what the impact is being during those six months of the closure, based on those catch rates.

In our conversations with enforcement staff, especially regarding the JEA, it would be simpler if there are black and white straight lines and we addressed that in the proposal of closing the closed area, the core area during 12 months. And finally, one of the limitations that we are encountering in our waters is that NOAA 4-D rule is necessary for law enforcement to be able to pursue an endangered species case in our waters.

So basically, I just wanted to bring this as a friendly reminder to this Council, as managers of this area, very important area for fisheries on the west coast if it could be added to the white paper request or maybe another one. I think we would be doing a better service to document and also respond to the sacrifice that fishers are making by not using some areas because a threatened species is there. And as we've seen in the Virgin Islands, it can work. Thank you.

 CARLOS FARCHETTE: Thank you, Michelle. Graciela?

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: Michelle, I couldn't tell from the nautical chart picture, is that all within the EEZ or is that—So, that's the shallower part of Bajo del Sico. Thanks.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, we'll have a public comment period. None. So, the request by Michelle was to include this in the white paper or should we do a separate? Any recommendations? Vanessa?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez for the record. I suggest that make this separate, because we already have the FMPs separate for each area. So, if we have to make a paper for Puerto Rico and need a motion, I will-- Please, Jack, if you can help us with the language.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: I would like to ask the people who are going to prepare this. María, is it easier—Yeah, you are the people. Would it be easier to have two or one? So, two would be preferable? Yes.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: I think-- I mean, I think what I'm understanding is this is a request for prioritization of certain things, right? So, a priority will be the area of Bajo de Sico, the priority will be the Grammanik Bank in terms of the nassau. I think that's perfectly fine. It falls within the strategic plan. You know, it put us in some agenda to get these things done. You know, there's interest.

There's a lot of cooperation, so I think we could probably pursue a separate motion to do this so we can divide the work somehow and start planning. So, that will be my recommendation. I wouldn't put them together, although the information will be together, or maybe we can decide when we sit down if this is something that can be together. But the important thing is that under the strategic plan for Puerto Rico, the objective, I think it was on section four, that is the one that talks about evaluating the seasonal closures in the seasonal areas, I mean, that will fall under it. It's under its own FMP, so it needs its own motion.

 JACK MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I agree with what María says. I think two motions would be good and two separate documents. I think we could get a team of folks working on these and then maybe come back at the December meeting after that and just give kind of a progress report of where we are and where the gaps are and where we need help.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay, thank you. So, Vanessa, a motion?

 JACK MCGOVERN: If Jack could help me with the language, please.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, we can copy the other language and you just change the place.

Rather than, we can say direct the staff to develop a white paper for Bajo de Sico to assess the status of the nassau grouper fishery and others. Y lo de "similar points" lo puedes quitar porque--

GRACIELA GARCÍA-MOLINER: So, take out "Grammanik Bank" Take that out. Nassau grouper. If we're talking about the specificity of the Nassau grouper then we should concentrate on that. So, take out "and others," please.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: No, Graciela, In the case of Puerto Rico, maybe leave "and others" just in case. It doesn't-- If with the white paper they don't find others, then that's it. Nassau grouper will be the priority and if they find another species, that's it.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: María.

MARÍA LÓPEZ-MERCER: Just a question for clarification when we are talking about the others. We know that Bajo de Sico was put together for the Red Hind, right? So, it's a Red Hind aggregation area. But in this particular case, we are requesting just to focus on the nassau in the beginning, or you want-- we're just evaluating the whole thing. It's just for clarification. The closure, the area closure.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Yeah, for the Council, we make emphasis on nassau grouper, but we want to evaluate the whole thing. That's was a recommendation by the fishers, DAP Puerto Rico, in the summer. And this is a response to the recommendation.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Michelle?

 MICHELLE SCHÄRER-UMPIERRE: Yeah, I just would say just copy the questions that Ruth presented, because if we're talking about socioeconomic impacts, we're talking about bait fish, we're talking about deep-water snappers all around. So, that's where I would think it's more useful to show everything and then see how it parses out. Thank you.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: But in the case of the motion, this is white paper and the white paper copies everything that you want. So, in order to make it quick, so the chairman won't have an attack for the time, staff to develop white paper to address the status of the Nassau grouper and others in Bajo de Sico area. Quitale lo de

"similar points."

4 5

But with the record, it is understood that the white paper writers will incorporate Ruth's presentation and Michelle's comments. And don't go away very far because we'll probably knock on your door for the white paper too. ¿Está bien? So, you need a second?

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Ok, léelo.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: The motion to direct staff to develop a white paper to address the issues requested for Nassau grouper (and others) in the Bajo del Sico area.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: I need a second.

JAMES R. KREGLO: Second.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: So, the motion is to direct staff to develop a white paper to address issues requested for nassau grouper (and others) in the Bajo del Sico area. Motion by Vanessa Ramírez, seconded by James Kreglo. All in favor say "aye."

GROUP: Aye.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Any nays? Any abstentions? Hearing none, motion carries. Anybody for public comment? Vanessa?

Public Comments

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vanessa Ramírez for the record. At this time, I will want to present a situation that the fishermen from the West side, especially in the Cabo Rojo area are having. They asked me, as part of the Association of Fishermen in Puerto Real, since we had last March, the incident where, sadly, a federal police officer died, after that, our commercial fishermen have been having a lot of situations with the federal police that was assigned to the area. It's specifically in the case when they stop the fishermen, they are stopping them as if they are already doing something wrong. So, they don't stop them like the regular enforcement of NOAA and Coast Guard that are very respectful, they just stop them and start telling them, in a bad way, to stop the boat, get out of everything, put your hands up with long guns on their face.

Also, as you know most of our commercial boats are small. Well, they are practically forcing them to put them side by side and the big boat, of course, causes damage to the small boats. They are also asking them to— they don't even ask them to present their

license, they are asking them to throw their bags so that they can search for the information and for everything that they have in their personal bags.

I think that this situation is out of control right now. I don't know where we have to address this, but it's a situation that is sadly happening, practically, weekly where we have an incident in that area. Especially with the federal agents that are from another area. I think that maybe they don't recognize the stamp of the commercial fishermen and, of course, we know that the situation was a bad issue in federal waters, but we need let them know how they can identify commercial fisherman boat and how to introduce themself. Because just imagine, you're running to your work and some police stop you and put a gun on your face just because you're driving.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: You're talking, you're talking about customs people or the immigration?

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: They are identified as federal police. They have the jackets as federal police. They don't even want to identify themselves.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Well, we had a similar situation one-time, long time ago. Sea Grant and the Council, we put together a workshop, on the West Coast, it actually was in Mayagüez, and we were talking about customs, immigrations, FURA, the Puerto Rico maritime unit, and the National Marine Fisheries Service. By the way, the National Marine Fisheries Service was innocent. It was one guy, and he knew how to behave. Miguel is also here; he knows a lot about it. So, there's very little the Council can do in these cases. Okay? the only thing we can do is put together a similar workshop.

 Very quick. At that workshop, a fisherman was intervened by this agent, customs, in a very bad manner. He was shot at. Another was intervened while he was on the road with the boat. And it became such a situation that we had this workshop. And we had Recursos Naturales, all the federal agencies, even the Coast Guard affiliated patrol was there. It was kind of interesting because the fisherman who wasn't intervened, when the boss of customs in Puerto Rico asked, "Who was that guy? I want to know who the guy was," the fisherman didn't want to say anything because the boss said if that guy was identified that night, he would be fired on the spot and the fisherman was mindful about the job of that guy. He just— and that's the guy that was shot at in Puerto Rico off of Desecheo.

So, the point is that the fishermen were not concerned with

penalizing anybody. What they wanted to do was to have a time where people could get instructed on how to intervene with the fishers. Let me tell you something else, customs, they are like God. They stop you and they stop you and if you don't stop, they can shoot at you. Migration is the same and we have a situation in the West Coast of Puerto Rico. The coast guard, they are different but it's still, you have the problem. So, if the Council wants to pursue this a little bit further, we'll have to discuss it here because again, heart attack here because of the time. We can put together something between here and December and we can come back and talk to you.

4 5

I will talk to Sea Grant and see if we can do a similar workshop. But a fisherman, for example, was stopped three times during the same day. By three different agents. One of them had a gun to his face. So, Mr. Chairman, we can do that, so.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Vanessa and then Miguel.

VANESSA RAMÍREZ: Thank you. Vanessa Ramírez for the record.

I just want to clarify that these incidents have not been with the enforcement that we usually have in here. I have the opportunity to talk to one of them in the marina and most of them are coming from the Gulf or the South Atlantic divisions. So, it's not people that is usually in this area. They just were assigned just because of the situation. They are still around sometimes, but it's only to address it the way that they are supposed to and be more respectful with our commercial fishermen. Not all of them are in drugs or, you know. Thanks.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Miquel.

MIGUEL BORGES: Vanessa, I understand what you're saying. So, trying to get to a common ground, I could volunteer to make a meeting with you and the supervisors of the unit that you're talking about. I know them, so we could sit down and talk it over. I think it's something that has to be addressed. So, I could volunteer to set up that meeting with those units, and then we could talk it over.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: That good. Do you include the Coast Guard and all those people?

MIGUEL BORGES: It could be with the Coast Guard, but the ones you're saying, it's not the Coast Guard. So, I think we could start first with the units there, because it's also, if we wait for everybody to be there, it'll take forever and nothing's going to

get done. So, I propose first to meet with the units there in Cabo Rojo. The ones she's talking about and then with Vanessa also. I'll be there too and then we could, you know, start talking.

MIGUEL A. ROLÓN: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Because that's better. So, we will wait until this happens and then we don't do anything until that happens. And the Coast Guard also asked me, anyway.

The Coast Guard stopped a fishing man in Vieques because he was fishing a strawberry grouper. They confiscated his catch, the boat and everything. He asked for one call, and he called me. He said, "Miguel, --" he used Spanish flourish words to tell me, "They stopped me, and they had this." So, I had to talk to the Coast Guard who was there, and I said, "Sir, we don't have strawberry groupers. It's red hind. You have to go to Florida to get strawberry groupers." But that guy then asked the Coast Guard big Chief, to start workshops identifying fish and we've had that since that time. The Coast Guard that often-- I used to go, but now Graciela and Marco sometimes they go. So, step in the right direction. We will wait for you.

CARLOS FARCHETTE: Okay. So, the next Council meeting will be December $5^{\rm th}$ and $6^{\rm th}$ on Saint Thomas, 2023. I want to give a special thank you to Señor Cordero in the back for his excellent job with the translation.

It's 5:17. The CFMC $182^{\rm nd}$ meeting is adjourned. Everybody, have a good trip back.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned on August 16, 2023.)