

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

MACKEREL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Perdido Beach Resort Orange Beach, Alabama

JANUARY 27, 2016

**VOTING MEMBERS**

- 10 Pamela Dana.....Florida
- 11 Martha Bademan (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
- 12 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- 13 Doug Boyd.....Texas
- 14 Roy Crabtree.....NMFS, SERO, St. Petersburg, Florida
- 15 Myron Fischer (designee for Randy Pausina).....Louisiana
- 16 John Sanchez.....Florida
- 17 David Walker.....Alabama

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

- 20 Kevin Anson.....Alabama
- 21 Jason Brand.....USCG
- 22 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- 23 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 24 John Greene.....Alabama
- 25 Kelly Lucas (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
- 26 Campo Matens.....Louisiana
- 27 Robin Riechers.....Texas
- 28 Greg Stunz.....Texas
- 29 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana

**STAFF**

- 32 Steven Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
- 33 Assane Diagne.....Economist
- 34 John Froeschke.....Fishery Biologist/Statistician
- 35 Doug Gregory.....Executive Director
- 36 Karen Hoak.....Administrative and Financial Assistant
- 37 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
- 38 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 39 Charlene Ponce.....Public Information Officer
- 40 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
- 41 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 42 Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Director

**OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

- 45 Bill Arant.....
- 46 Steve Branstetter.....NMFS
- 47 Mark Brown.....SAFMC
- 48 Cliff Cox.....Destin, FL

1 Dean Cox.....Santa Rosa Beach, FL  
2 Curt Erwin.....Destin, FL  
3 Martin Fisher.....FL  
4 Maurice Fitzsimmons.....Daphne, AL  
5 Traci Floyd.....MDMR, Biloxi, MS  
6 Troy Frady.....Lillian, AL  
7 Mike Gruet.....Destin, FL  
8 Chris Horton.....Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, AK  
9 Bill Jeffries.....Orange Beach, AL  
10 Bill Kelly.....FKCFA, FL  
11 David Krebs.....Destin, FL  
12 Douglas Lowe.....Fort Walton Beach, FL  
13 Bart Niquet.....Lynn Haven, FL  
14 Fred Owen.....Birmingham, AL  
15 Bonnie Ponwith.....SEFSC  
16 Tracy Redding.....Bon Secour, AL  
17 Lance Robinson.....TX  
18 Aaron Smith.....Fort Walton Beach, FL  
19 Tom Steber.....Orange Beach, AL  
20 Mike Thierry.....Dauphin Island, AL  
21 Eric Thrasher.....Destin, FL  
22 Bill Tucker.....Dunedin, FL  
23 Jason Vicars.....Summerdale, AL  
24 Gary Zurn.....Big Rock Sports

25  
26  
27

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1  
2  
3 Table of Contents.....3  
4  
5 Table of Motions.....4  
6  
7 Adoption of Agenda.....5  
8  
9 Approval of Minutes.....5  
10  
11 Public Hearing Draft for CMP Amendment 26: Changes in Allocations,  
12 Stock Boundaries, and Sale Provisions for Gulf of Mexico and  
13 Atlantic Migratory Groups of King Mackerel.....5  
14  
15 Other Business.....43  
16     Recommendations Made by the CMP Advisory Panel.....43  
17  
18 Adjournment.....48  
19  
20                                   - - -  
21

TABLE OF MOTIONS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
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

PAGE 7: Motion in Action 2-1 to select Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative. [The motion carried on page 7.](#)

PAGE 8: Motion to adopt Alternative 3 as the preferred alternative under Action 2-2. [The motion carried on page 8.](#)

PAGE 8: Motion to remove Alternative 6 from Action 2-2. [The motion carried on page 9.](#)

PAGE 9: Motion to adopt Alternative 3 the preferred alternative under Action 3. [The motion carried on page 10.](#)

PAGE 14: Motion in Action 4 that Alternative 1 be the preferred alternative. [The motion carried on page 19.](#)

PAGE 20: Motion to accept the modifications to the language in Action 5, as proposed by the South Atlantic and the IPT. [The motion carried on page 20.](#)

PAGE 29: Motion in Action 7 that the preferred alternative be Alternative 4. [The motion carried on page 30.](#)

PAGE 32: Motion to make Alternative 1, no action, the preferred alternative in Action 8. [The motion carried on page 39.](#)

PAGE 40: Motion to change the preferred alternative in Action 9 to Alternative 2. [The motion carried on page 43.](#)

PAGE 46: Motion that the council remove the prohibition on retaining the recreational king mackerel bag limit on a vessel with a commercial king mackerel permit, or a dually-permitted charter vessel, when the king mackerel commercial season is closed, but while the king mackerel recreational season is open. [The motion carried on page 46.](#)

- - -

1 The Mackerel Management Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery  
2 Management Council convened at the Perdido Beach Resort, Orange  
3 Beach, Alabama, Wednesday morning, January 27, 2016, and was called  
4 to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chairman Pamela Dana.

5  
6 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**  
7 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
8

9 **CHAIRMAN PAMELA DANA:** I would like to convene the Mackerel  
10 Management Committee, and I will start with Adoption of the Agenda,  
11 Tab C, Number 1.

12  
13 **MS. MARTHA BADEMAN:** So moved.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Do I have a second? Okay, I've got a second. Then  
16 let's move into Approval of Minutes. Has the committee had the  
17 opportunity to review the minutes, and, if so, are there any  
18 changes or can we approve the minutes as written?

19  
20 **MS. BADEMAN:** Motion to approve the minutes.

21  
22 **MR. JOHN SANCHEZ:** Second.

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We have a motion to approve and a second. The  
25 minutes are approved. All right. Let's move -- Ryan, I'm going  
26 to need your assistance here, but let's move into Item IV, which  
27 is the Public Hearing Draft for Coastal Migratory Pelagics  
28 Amendment 26, Changes in Allocation, Stock Boundaries, and Sale  
29 Provisions for the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Migratory Groups of  
30 King Mackerel. You'll find that in Tab C, Number 4. Ryan.

31  
32 **PUBLIC HEARING DRAFT CMP AMENDMENT 26 - CHANGES IN ALLOCATION,**  
33 **STOCK BOUNDARIES, AND SALE PROVISIONS FOR THE GULF OF MEXICO AND**  
34 **ATLANTIC MIGRATORY GROUPS OF KING MACKEREL**  
35

36 **MR. RYAN RINDONE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. If the committee is  
37 agreeable to it, what I would like to do is, as we move through  
38 Tab C, Number 4, to also go step-wise through the discussion in  
39 Tab C, Number 4(a), which is the CMP AP's Summary Report. We can  
40 go action-by-action for what their discussions were for each action  
41 within the document. That way, you guys have an idea of where  
42 they stood and what their sentiments were. Does anybody object to  
43 that?

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Seeing no objection --

46  
47 **MR. RINDONE:** Also, committee members, the CMP AP elected a Chair  
48 and Vice Chair this time around, since they were recently

1 repopulated, and Martin Fisher was elected as the Chair, and he's  
2 here today to answer any questions you guys might have about the  
3 AP's discussions. Tom Marvel was elected to be the Vice Chair.

4  
5 Starting with Action 1 in the document, which is on page 7, and  
6 this is to adjust the management boundary for Gulf and Atlantic  
7 groups of kingfish, the management boundaries have changed based  
8 on the results of the stock assessment, which suggested changes in  
9 the mixing zones.

10  
11 The council's current preferred alternative is Alternative 3,  
12 which would establish a single year boundary for separating the  
13 Gulf and Atlantic groups of kingfish at the Dade/Monroe County  
14 line, and it would make the Gulf Council the responsible management  
15 entity for management measures within the mixing zone throughout  
16 the Keys year-round.

17  
18 When the AP discussed this, they agreed with what the council's  
19 preferred alternative was and thought that having the Gulf Council  
20 be responsible for management throughout the Keys year-round was  
21 good for the gillnet fishery down there, and it also paired up  
22 well with the Spanish mackerel management, which is also at the  
23 Dade/Monroe line, and cobia as well. It kind of folded all the  
24 CMP species together with the same management boundary. Are there  
25 any comments or anything on Action 1? Are you happy with the  
26 current preferred?

27  
28 Action 2 is on page 13 in the document, and this is a -- Actions  
29 2 through 5 are South Atlantic-centric actions, but we do need --  
30 Since we have a joint plan, we do need to go through those as well.  
31 Action 2 talks about updating reference points and revising the  
32 ACL and ACT for Atlantic group kingfish, and it's broken up into  
33 Actions 2-1 and 2-2.

34  
35 2-1 is on page 13, and this talks about revising the ABC for  
36 Atlantic kingfish. The South Atlantic's preferred alternative is  
37 Alternative 2, which would revise the ABC for Atlantic kingfish  
38 for the 2016/2017 fishing season through the 2019/2020 season,  
39 based on the ABC levels recommended by the South Atlantic's SSC  
40 for an ABC under a high-recruitment scenario, and this is also  
41 preferred by both the Gulf and South Atlantic APs.

42  
43 The reason why this was selected is because the fishermen over  
44 there are reporting seeing what they describe as record numbers of  
45 smaller, like six to eight-pound, kingfish, and they think that  
46 there is a very large recruit class that's coming through and so  
47 the dip in recruitment, which was shown in the stock assessment,  
48 they don't think that that's something that's going to persist

1 through time. They think there's a big year class coming through.  
2 You guys would need to pick a preferred. The AP agreed with the  
3 South Atlantic. Our AP agreed with the South Atlantic AP in  
4 selecting Alternative 2 as preferred. Madam Chair.

5  
6 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Okay and so we are -- We have the opportunity to  
7 select a preferred alternative, and, again, the South Atlantic  
8 preferred is Alternative 2 and the Gulf and South Atlantic AP also  
9 recommended Alternative 2 as the preferred. Do I have any motion  
10 from the committee? Martha Bademan.

11  
12 **MS. BADEMAN:** I move that in Action 2-1 that we select Alternative  
13 2 as the preferred alternative.

14  
15 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Second.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** I have a motion and a second. Is there any  
18 discussion? **Seeing none, all those on the committee in favor of**  
19 **choosing Action 2.2.1, Alternative 2 as the preferred, say aye;**  
20 **all those opposed. The motion passes.**

21  
22 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Moving on to 2-2, and this  
23 one is on page 15, this would revise the ACLs, commercial quotas,  
24 and recreational ACT for Atlantic kingfish. The South Atlantic's  
25 AP recommended Alternative 2, which would revise the ACL and the  
26 recreational ACT, based on whatever is selected in Action 2-1, and  
27 where the ACL would be equal to the ABC, which would be as high as  
28 it could be set.

29  
30 However, the South Atlantic Council, and the South Atlantic's SSC,  
31 and the Gulf's AP all preferred Alternative 3, which would  
32 establish the ACL equal to the deterministic equilibrium yield at  
33 F 30 percent SPR, which is 12.7-million pounds, for the 2016/2017  
34 to 2019/2020 fishing seasons.

35  
36 The reason why the Gulf AP, the South Atlantic SSC, and,  
37 ultimately, the South Atlantic Council selected this was as just  
38 a little bit of an insurance policy, in case the high-recruitment  
39 scenario turned out to be overly optimistic. This is what you  
40 guys have now selected as preferred in Action 2-1.

41  
42 In the event that that high-recruitment scenario isn't something  
43 that persists through time, having the ACL set at the equilibrium  
44 yield still increases the ACL for that entire fishery, but it  
45 provides a little bit of a cushion. Madam Chair.

46  
47 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Okay. On Action 2-2, we have an opportunity to  
48 choose a preferred alternative. Currently, Alternative 2 is the

1 South Atlantic AP recommended preferred. However, Alternative 3  
2 is the South Atlantic Council preferred, as well as the South  
3 Atlantic SSC and the Gulf AP recommended. Does the committee have  
4 any -- Leann has a comment.  
5

6 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** I just had a question, and this is a South  
7 Atlantic question and so you might not know this off the top of  
8 your head, Ryan, but what was the South Atlantic AP's rationale  
9 for going a little less conservative? Do you remember?  
10

11 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, ma'am. Their rationale was the fishery is not  
12 overfished or undergoing overfishing and so their sentiment was  
13 let's catch as much as we can and get as much as the stock  
14 assessment will allow us to catch, since the stock is not  
15 imperiled, according to the assessment.  
16

17 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Dr. Crabtree.  
18

19 **DR. ROY CRABTREE:** I think in this case, given the uncertainty  
20 around the recruitments, we would be wise to be a little more  
21 precautionary and to make sure we keep this stock in good shape.  
22 **I will make a motion to adopt Alternative 3 as our preferred under**  
23 **Action 2-2.**  
24

25 **MR. DAVID WALKER:** I'll second that.  
26

27 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We have a motion and a second. Any discussion?  
28 **Seeing none, any opposition? The motion passes that in Action 2-**  
29 **2 to make Alternative 3 the preferred alternative.** Ryan.  
30

31 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. There is one more bit of  
32 business that we need to make sure that we take care of in 2-2,  
33 and this is the removal of Alternative 6. Currently, Alternative  
34 2 is not listed in Chapter 2, but I can go down to the Considered  
35 but Rejected and pull it for you guys if you want.  
36

37 This was removed by the South Atlantic Council at their September  
38 meeting and it fell through the cracks on us at our October meeting  
39 to remove as well, and it's just another scenario that the South  
40 Atlantic Council felt wasn't necessary to consider, and so, for  
41 parity in the document, the Gulf Council would need to remove  
42 Action 6 from Action 2-2 as well.  
43

44 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Is anyone prepared to make the motion to remove  
45 Alternative 6 in Action 2-2? Martha Bademan.  
46

47 **MS. BADEMAN:** I move to remove Alternative 6 from Action 2-2.  
48



1 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We have a motion to remove. Is there a second?  
2  
3 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Second.  
4  
5 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We have a second from Mr. Sanchez. Any discussion?  
6 **Any opposition? The motion is approved to remove Alternative 6**  
7 **from Action 2-2.**  
8  
9 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. We'll go ahead and move on  
10 to Action 3 now and Action 3 is on page 19, in Tab C, Number 4.  
11 This talks about an incidental catch of Atlantic kingfish caught  
12 in the small coastal shark gillnet fishery.  
13  
14 This is a fishery that exists only in the South Atlantic, and the  
15 South Atlantic Council preferred alternative is Alternative 3,  
16 which would allow the retention and sale of Atlantic kingfish  
17 caught with a gillnet as incidental catch in the gillnet portion  
18 of the commercial shark fishery for any vessel that has both a  
19 valid directed shark commercial permit and a valid federal king  
20 mackerel commercial permit.  
21  
22 Those kingfish caught as incidental bycatch in that fishery would  
23 have to be sold to a federally-permitted seafood dealer, and, for  
24 shark gillnet trips in the Southern Zone on the Atlantic side, no  
25 more than two king mackerel per crew could be sold from the trip.  
26 For those trips in the Northern Zone, no more than three king  
27 mackerel could be sold. This is reflective of the recreational  
28 bag limits that are in those zones in the Atlantic side.  
29  
30 The Gulf AP's sentiments on this were fish that get caught in  
31 gillnets historically have a tremendously terrible discard  
32 mortality rate and if those fish are dead anyway, they might as  
33 well be sold if they can be. They thought that by having such low  
34 bag limits per person for the allowable sale that it would prevent  
35 there from becoming a directed fishery for kingfish within the  
36 shark gillnet fishery. Madam Chair.  
37  
38 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Dr. Crabtree.  
39  
40 **DR. CRABTREE:** We had quite a bit of discussion about this at the  
41 South Atlantic Council, and Ryan is right. Based on what I  
42 understand, these fish are largely going to be dead anyway and so  
43 it just doesn't make any sense to waste them and we may as well  
44 let these folks bring them in. They're not targeting them. It's  
45 just incidental catch. **I would make a motion that we adopt, under**  
46 **Action 3, Alternative 3 as our preferred.**  
47  
48 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Dr. Crabtree. We have a motion to

1 accept as the preferred Alternative 3 under Action 3. Do I have  
2 a second?

3

4 **MS. BOSARGE:** I will second it.

5

6 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Second by Leann Bosarge. Any discussion on that  
7 motion? **Any opposition? The motion passes that in Action 3 that**  
8 **Alternative 3 is the preferred alternative.**

9

10 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Moving on to Action 4, which  
11 is going to be on page 21 in Tab C, Number 4, Action 4 establishes  
12 commercial split seasons for Atlantic kingfish in the Southern  
13 Zone, and the Gulf AP's preferred for this particular action was  
14 Alternative 1, which would not establish any commercial split  
15 seasons.

16

17 The AP's reason for that was that if the pace of landings in the  
18 Atlantic needed to be reduced, then the South Atlantic Council  
19 might consider modifying things like trip limits, but the AP  
20 thought that if there ended up being a deliberate closed season in  
21 the South Atlantic, because harvest was met in the first season,  
22 and then the first season closes and then fishermen have to wait  
23 until the second season reopens, that it might cause more fishermen  
24 to travel.

25

26 If you look at the landings of kingfish in the South Atlantic, and  
27 you will be able to see this in Figure 2.4.1, which is on page 23,  
28 this shows the Atlantic monthly king mackerel landings for the  
29 Southern Zone from 1998 to 2004. You can see the dip that occurs  
30 at about August through November, and this is the time of the year  
31 when the water is a little bit warmer and the fish just aren't  
32 really in that Southern Zone.

33

34 The South Atlantic's thought was that these fishermen are likely  
35 going to travel anyway, but if they establish the split season,  
36 then it might allow for a little bit better seasonal management  
37 and ACL management of the fish which are already allocated to that  
38 zone, and it's for that reason that the South Atlantic prefers  
39 Alternative 2, which would allocate the Southern Zone quota for  
40 Atlantic kingfish into two split seasons, 60 percent for the period  
41 of March 1 to September 30. Remember the landings tend to fall  
42 off after August. Then 40 percent for the period of October 1  
43 through the end of February, and the landings over in the Southern  
44 Zone tend to pick up after November over there.

45

46 Any remaining quota from season one would automatically transfer  
47 to season two. Any remaining quota from season two would not be  
48 carried forward to the next fishing year. When quota for the

1 season is met or expected to be met, commercial harvest of king  
2 mackerel in the Southern Zone would be prohibited for the remainder  
3 of that season, whether it be season one or two, and the South  
4 Atlantic's AP also recommends Alternative 2.

5  
6 Alternatives 3 and 4 offer similar ideas, with a little bit  
7 different working, Alternative 4 being the most different, where  
8 it sets the seasons as being 50 percent for the first season and  
9 50 percent for the second season. The first season would be from  
10 March 1 through the end of October, and the second season would be  
11 from the beginning of November to the end of February. Madam  
12 Chair.

13  
14 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Ryan. We have an action where the  
15 alternatives are differing between the South Atlantic and the Gulf  
16 of Mexico. Steve, do you have any input on this particular action?  
17 You don't? Okay. Martha or Martin, do you want to provide any  
18 input from the Gulf AP on perspective? Martha.

19  
20 **MS. BADEMAN:** Not really. Martin, I don't know if you do want to  
21 come up and talk about this one. I don't know that I agreed with  
22 the AP on this one. I don't know that I do.

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Martin Fisher, the Chairman of the Gulf CMP AP, is  
25 coming to the podium to shed light, bright light.

26  
27 **MR. MARTIN FISHER:** Good morning and thank you, Madam Chair and  
28 council, for the opportunity to represent the CMP AP for the Gulf  
29 of Mexico Fishery Management Council. In reviewing Alternative 2,  
30 which is the South Atlantic, the split is 60/40, and I'm not really  
31 sure that when we discussed it that we fully understood that. We  
32 certainly don't want to encourage effort shifting, and that's why  
33 we came up with the motion we did.

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Martha Bademan.

36  
37 **MS. BADEMAN:** I guess where I kind of struggle with that is if we  
38 don't -- If there is no split season and it's gobbled up pretty  
39 quickly, I think you still end up in a situation, and maybe  
40 encourage a situation where people are traveling over to the Gulf  
41 because their quota is gone. There is no reason for them to come  
42 back and harvest in the South Atlantic.

43  
44 **MR. FISHER:** To argue against the AP's position, actually, in terms  
45 of common sense, if you have a split season with actual allocation  
46 differences, that would encourage a slow-down in the fishery rather  
47 than a derby fishery.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Dr. Crabtree.  
2  
3 **DR. CRABTREE:** Martin, when you speak of effort shifting, you're  
4 talking about the traveling mackerel guys?  
5  
6 **MR. FISHER:** Yes.  
7  
8 **DR. CRABTREE:** I don't know, and I mean we talked about this at  
9 the South Atlantic, too. My impression is the traveling guys are  
10 going to travel anyway. That's what they do, and so I guess I  
11 don't have strong feelings about it, but my inclination is to go  
12 along with the South Atlantic Council now, but --  
13  
14 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Leann and David, if you have comments -- Leann, I  
15 know you do, and, David, if you have comments on it, I would  
16 appreciate it.  
17  
18 **MS. BOSARGE:** Well, you know we had a lot of conversation about  
19 this when we were dealing with changing our opening dates,  
20 possibly, of our seasons here in the Gulf. I think we eventually  
21 acquiesced, at least in the western Gulf, to what the South  
22 Atlantic wanted and we didn't back up our opening date.  
23  
24 I have a little reservation, looking at this, but I don't have  
25 enough knowledge of that South Atlantic fishery to really  
26 understand how this is going to play out on their side. They have  
27 the traveling fishermen that come over to the Gulf and fish over  
28 here.  
29  
30 Essentially, if they end up doing this split season, which  
31 coincides with the opening of the western Gulf season, does it  
32 ensure that they will come over here every year? In other words,  
33 if they are only fishing 60 percent of that quota in that first  
34 season, they know that they're going to come over here, because  
35 they know that they're going to fish that 60 percent out right  
36 before our season opens, whereas if they had the whole 100 percent  
37 in that first season, there may be some years where a few of them  
38 would stay in the South Atlantic, because they had a real good  
39 season and it didn't taper off, whatever the case may be, during  
40 those months where ours open up.  
41  
42 Are we ensuring that they're coming over here every year if we go  
43 along with this one? I am trying to think of the worst-case  
44 scenario for the Gulf.  
45  
46 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Ryan.  
47  
48 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Hopefully I can shed a

1 little bit of light. This is based on the behavior of the fishery,  
2 looking at CPUE over time, and the reason why a lot of those  
3 fishermen travel is because their catch per unit effort tends to  
4 go down quite a bit during that time period, from about August  
5 through November.

6  
7 It's simply because the fish aren't there. The water is warmer  
8 and the fish have moved further up north, into what would be the  
9 Atlantic's Northern Zone, and any fish that were in the mixing  
10 zone are in the Gulf still and they haven't moved down into the  
11 Keys yet, and so it's slim pickings down there, which is why those  
12 fishermen pack their boats up and travel to the northern Gulf,  
13 where there are a lot more fish to be caught.

14  
15 That effort shifting, regardless of how the seasons are structured,  
16 is likely to continue, if for no other reason than the CPUE during  
17 that time -- If you look at 2.4.1, I think is the figure. If you  
18 look at that figure, the CPUE during that time just plummets and  
19 it's just not profitable to fish over there.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** David Walker and then Dr. Crabtree.

22  
23 **MR. WALKER:** I was just going to ask Martin, do you remember how  
24 the vote went, how close the vote was on that Alternative 1 for  
25 the Gulf?

26  
27 **MR. FISHER:** It was nine to one with one abstention.

28  
29 **DR. CRABTREE:** Just to Leann's point, I mean these guys are full-  
30 time mackerel fishing. That's what they do, and if you look at  
31 that figure, you can see September, October, and November, there  
32 just aren't fish there, and so they're going to travel and they're  
33 going to come over. They've been doing it for a long time. That's  
34 what they do and I think they're going to continue to do it either  
35 way.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Dr. Crabtree. Mark from the South  
38 Atlantic Council.

39  
40 **MR. MARK BROWN:** Also, there is a group of those guys that go to  
41 North Carolina, too. They don't just all go over into the Gulf.  
42 There's some of them that migrate up the coast and follow those  
43 fish all the way up to Diamond Shoals.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Mark. Myron, do you have any comment  
46 on this?

47  
48 **MR. FISCHER:** The local Louisiana fishermen have voiced themselves

1 for years that they feel, in their eyes, their language, that out-  
2 of-state boats come from the Florida Atlantic coast and catch all  
3 or part of the quota before they really get out and get what they  
4 feel is their fair share.

5  
6 They would always like to look at a situation where every section  
7 of the ocean has its own quota, where they could fish the Western  
8 Zone, which is only allocated a little over a million pounds from  
9 basically Pensacola to Brownsville. They just feel it's a lot of  
10 area for not that many fish allocated for those fish to be caught  
11 by out-of-state commercial fishermen.

12  
13 I understand they've traveled and they've always traveled. They  
14 have traveled to Louisiana since the 1970s, different groups of  
15 them, but they just are struggling with the fact that they would  
16 like to have a season open when the fish are closer to Grande Isle,  
17 which would be in the fall, and to have some sizeable amount of  
18 fish. Early in the year, it's very long runs and they have pretty  
19 small boats.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Myron. Is there any other discussion  
22 on this particular item? If not, is the committee prepared to  
23 make a motion or to act on a preferred alternative for 2.4, Action  
24 4? David Walker.

25  
26 **MR. WALKER:** I would like to make the preferred Alternative 1 in  
27 Action 4. I move to make Alternative 1 the preferred alternative.

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We have a motion to make Alternative 1 the  
30 preferred alternative, which is no action. Do I have a second for  
31 that alternative? I have a second through Leann Bosarge. Any  
32 discussion? Dr. Crabtree.

33  
34 **DR. CRABTREE:** I was going to make a substitute motion to adopt,  
35 in Action 4, Alternative 2.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We have a substitute motion to make Alternative 2  
38 the preferred alternative, which is to allocate the Southern Zone  
39 quota for Atlantic king mackerel into two split season quotas, 60  
40 percent to the period March 1 through September 30, season one,  
41 and 40 percent to the period October 1 through the end of February,  
42 season two. Is there a second?

43  
44 **MS. BADEMAN:** I will second it.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We have a second by Martha Bademan. Any  
47 discussion? Myron Fischer.

1 **MR. FISCHER:** Yes, Madam Chair. Could you refresh us on what  
2 alternative our Gulf Panel recommended on these and then possibly  
3 what alternative the South Atlantic Panel recommended?  
4

5 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Yes, sir. The Gulf AP recommended Alternative 1,  
6 no action, by a vote of nine to one. The South Atlantic Council  
7 and the South Atlantic AP recommended as preferred the Alternative  
8 2, which is the two-season split. I see Doug Boyd had a comment  
9 or question.  
10

11 **MR. DOUG BOYD:** Just a question. In either of these alternatives,  
12 it doesn't appear, from the discussion, that the fishermen will  
13 not travel. In other words, they're going to travel with either  
14 one of these alternatives and is that correct? Is that everybody's  
15 assumption here?  
16

17 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** That would be my assumption. Yes, Mark.  
18

19 **MR. BROWN:** I would like to mention that the South Atlantic  
20 Mackerel AP is meeting next week in Cocoa Beach. I just wanted to  
21 bring that to your attention.  
22

23 **MR. RINDONE:** I am going to that meeting too, by the way.  
24

25 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Ryan will be at that meeting. Ms. Bosarge and  
26 then Mr. Boyd.  
27

28 **MS. BOSARGE:** What's the size of this fleet? I mean how many boats  
29 or permits are we talking about, just out of curiosity, of the  
30 South Atlantic fleet?  
31

32 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Ryan, do you know the answer to that or Steve?  
33

34 **MR. RINDONE:** Let's see. I bet Kari MacLauchlin has an idea.  
35

36 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We'll respond to that. We're going to expert  
37 number two. When we get an answer, we will --  
38

39 **MS. BOSARGE:** Okay, and I was asking because what I was -- It may  
40 turn out that eventually we go the Alternative 2 route. We may go  
41 it right now. I supported Alternative 1, mainly so that we could  
42 have some more conversation back and forth between the two councils  
43 on this alternative.  
44

45 My fear is that maybe -- Yes, CPUE drops off, but if the bulk of  
46 the fleet goes to the Gulf when the CPUE drops off, well, if there  
47 is a handful of boats still over there, then obviously that means  
48 that their CPUE is going to go up, those handful.

1  
2 There may be a handful that stick around and follow those fish  
3 over there. I don't want to exacerbate the problem by actually  
4 having a closed season, you know they're shutting their season  
5 down because they've hit their 60 percent quota for that first  
6 season, and now every one of them comes to the Gulf.

7  
8 If that's only two boats, if it's a very small fleet, and it means  
9 that an extra two or three boats are coming to the Gulf, then  
10 that's not really a -- You know it's not a huge issue. That's why  
11 I was wondering what the size of that fleet was.

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Mr. Boyd.

14  
15 **MR. BOYD:** A question. Does the Eastern Southern Zone primarily  
16 offload in central Florida or lower Florida? Where do those fish  
17 ultimately end up being offloaded? Do we know?

18  
19 **MR. RINDONE:** I'm assuming you mean the east coast of Florida, the  
20 Atlantic Southern Zone. Most of those fish are going to be  
21 offloaded along the eastern coast of Florida if they're caught  
22 over there. I know that David Krebs buys a fair number of those  
23 fish and there are a few other large dealers that have traveling  
24 trucks to pick those fish up.

25  
26 **MR. BOYD:** Okay, and so is this split season possibly to help  
27 availability of the product during that whole season, rather than  
28 just in one particular timeframe and to help maintain market  
29 stability, or is that not what this is about?

30  
31 **MR. RINDONE:** It will help with market stability, in that, in the  
32 past, if they had a banner season from the beginning of March until  
33 the slowdown occurs in late summer or early fall, they might have  
34 caught say 70 or 75 percent, maybe even 80 percent, of their quota  
35 during that time.

36  
37 Then when the late winter/early spring season comes around towards  
38 the end of the fishing season, they might close before they  
39 actually got to the end of February. By splitting this up, it  
40 allows for a little bit more market stability for them and it gives  
41 them the opportunity to fish over there longer while the fish are  
42 present.

43  
44 I just heard back from Kari MacLauchlin at the South Atlantic and  
45 she said there are about 550 permits registered to Florida East  
46 Coast vessels, but not all of those vessels are full-time, and  
47 that Cape Canaveral and Cocoa Beach are the primary landing spots  
48 for the east coast of Florida, and Sebastian probably, too.



1  
2 **MR. BOYD:** Thank you.  
3  
4 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Martin Fisher.  
5  
6 **MR. FISHER:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Ms. Bosarge, I believe the  
7 traveling fleet that impacts Louisiana waters and Texas waters is  
8 about thirty to forty boats during the Western Subzone season.  
9  
10 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Okay. Steve Branstetter.  
11  
12 **DR. STEVE BRANSTETTER:** Just a comment on this graphic, Figure  
13 2.4.1, and then the landings tables in 2.4.3. Keep in mind that  
14 this document is getting ready to -- Right now, come November 1,  
15 the east coast of Florida becomes Gulf group, Gulf group king  
16 mackerel.  
17  
18 These are not -- What you're seeing in this graphic from November  
19 through February is not Atlantic group king mackerel. It's Gulf  
20 group king mackerel. Now, this document, and the most recent stock  
21 assessment, says that Gulf group king mackerel don't go there  
22 anymore and so this is a little bit misleading.  
23  
24 Atlantic group king mackerel, the reason that drop-off starts  
25 occurring in July, August, and September, is those fish begin  
26 migrating to North Carolina, and you can see it in the landings.  
27 The Florida landings drop off just about August and the North  
28 Carolina landings begin to increase on Atlantic group king  
29 mackerel.  
30  
31 I don't know how well this is going to track in the future if those  
32 Gulf group king mackerel don't migrate around anymore, and I'm  
33 sure some will still do that, but this is a little bit misleading  
34 as to what we may be seeing in the future.  
35  
36 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Okay. We have a substitute -- Excuse me. Ed  
37 Swindell.  
38  
39 **MR. ED SWINDELL:** Excuse me, but this still looks to me to be a  
40 year-long season and just broken by different dates. Am I wrong?  
41 I mean it's a year-long season and the first half, the first part  
42 of it, if you're going to carry over any leftover quota to the  
43 second, are you going to take any overage in the first half away  
44 from the season season?  
45  
46 Are you going to be able to react fast enough to stop the fishing  
47 if the 60 percent quota part is reached in September? Do we really  
48 believe that we have the ability to manage it that close? I really

1 don't understand this. You know if you had one complete open  
2 season for the whole year, you're still going to carry whatever  
3 overage you have in the first part to the second part, because  
4 that's what would happen. I don't really understand the need to  
5 close it on a day and you just start it up the next morning.  
6 Sorry. Thank you.

7

8 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Ed. Ryan.

9

10 **MR. RINDONE:** With respect to Dr. Branstetter's comments about the  
11 figure, I don't think that's entirely the case, because the figure  
12 is tracking the landings by month and so it doesn't really matter  
13 if they're Atlantic fish or Gulf fish. It's still the landings  
14 for that region that are being reflected in that table.

15

16 Since this issue was largely brought up to address a CPUE concern,  
17 where CPUE in that area, whether it's Gulf fish or Atlantic fish  
18 or whatever fish, since that CPUE is dropping off, those fishermen  
19 are likely to leave that area for other areas where they're going  
20 to be able to enjoy a higher CPUE, be it North Carolina or wherever.  
21 That's the main story, if you will, that's being told by Figure  
22 2.4.1. It's less about which migratory group and more about there  
23 are either fish there or there aren't fish there. If there aren't,  
24 then the fishermen are going to go where the fish are.

25

26 With respect to the accuracy that Mr. Swindell had expressed  
27 concern over, we have made changes in past amendments to the  
28 electronic reporting methods for the CMP fishery, for the fishermen  
29 and for the seafood dealers. By switching to more electronic  
30 methods, our precision has gone up considerably and, with that,  
31 our uncertainty in the landings has gone down considerably.

32

33 I would think that the National Marine Fisheries Service's ability  
34 to track those landings is probably sufficient to be able to change  
35 the nature of the fishing seasons in the South Atlantic in this  
36 manner and not constantly have overruns or other problems of that  
37 nature.

38

39 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** David Walker.

40

41 **MR. WALKER:** I was just going to add that after public testimony  
42 -- Maybe we can move to full council and try to pick a preferred  
43 alternative after we hear the testimony from the Gulf.

44

45 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We certainly can, but we do have a substitute  
46 motion, followed by a motion, and so the motion makers would need  
47 to table their motions, if that's the desire of the committee.  
48 Otherwise, I would ask Dr. Crabtree if he has any final comments

1 before moving for a vote, if there's no other discussion. So the  
2 committee then does want to move forward with a vote for a  
3 preferred? Myron Fischer.

4  
5 **MR. FISCHER:** Prior to the vote, if we cannot figure what to do,  
6 I just want to remind everyone that our Gulf AP recommended  
7 Alternative 1, whatever the consequences may be.

8  
9 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Mr. Fischer. Okay. We're going to go  
10 ahead and take a vote on Action 4, that Alternative -- The  
11 substitute motion is that Alternative 2 be the preferred  
12 alternative. That's to allocate the Southern Zone quota for  
13 Atlantic king mackerel into two split season quotas, in a 60/40  
14 split. **A show of hands, all those in favor; those opposed. The**  
15 **substitute motion fails.**

16  
17 We go to the original motion, which is in Action 4 to make the  
18 preferred alternative Action 1, which is no action. It's the  
19 preferred alternative that the Gulf AP recommended. Any discussion  
20 on Alternative 1 being the preferred? **All those in favor raise**  
21 **your hand, six; those opposed. The motion passes in Action 4 that**  
22 **Alternative 1 is the preferred alternative.** Okay, Ryan. Thank  
23 you for the discussion, by the way. Leann.

24  
25 **MS. BOSARGE:** Ryan, the speed at which we move on these joint  
26 amendments is about that of a turtle, usually, and so I would  
27 venture to guess, you know depending on what happens -- You know  
28 if they end up going to this split season, would you keep an eye  
29 on, because, more than likely, something will play out and we'll  
30 get to see what really happens before -- Just keep an eye on it  
31 and keep us updated on how things are changing, as what Dr.  
32 Branstetter was talking about, and as there's so many moving parts.  
33 Okay?

34  
35 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, ma'am. Absolutely, and we get a pretty decent,  
36 albeit anecdotal, barometer, if you will, from Myron and the guys  
37 that he talks to down in Grand Isle, as far as the number of boats  
38 that are from the east coast that have FL numbers on the sides of  
39 their boats that make it over there.

40  
41 It has been noticed, by folks that Myron talks to and the folks  
42 that come to the AP meetings and talk about the AP meetings, that  
43 the number of traveling fishermen has increased over the last five  
44 years or so, especially. Martin, would you agree that that's been  
45 the general sentiment of the AP? We're keeping tabs on it. It's  
46 difficult to quantify the number precisely, but we can certainly  
47 work to try to have something more concrete.

1 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Okay, Ryan.  
2  
3 **MR. RINDONE:** All right. Action 5 is on page 26 of Tab C, Number  
4 4. This has been -- Action 5 used to be 5-1 and 5-2 and the South  
5 Atlantic and the IPT have done a great job of consolidating this  
6 into just one action, but, because it's been consolidated, we need  
7 to approve the change in language, and that language change has  
8 been approved by the South Atlantic, and so if you guys would like  
9 to entertain that before we move forward.  
10  
11 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Do I have a motion from a committee member to  
12 modify, in Action 5, modified to be one single action? Martha  
13 Bademan.  
14  
15 **MS. BADEMAN:** So moved.  
16  
17 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Do I have a second? John Sanchez. Any discussion  
18 on that modification? **Any objection to the motion? Seeing none,**  
19 **the motion passes.** Ryan.  
20  
21 **MR. RINDONE:** Karen, the motion was to accept the modifications to  
22 the language in Action 5, as proposed by the South Atlantic and  
23 the IPT. In Action 5, as proposed by the South Atlantic Council  
24 and the IPT. That's essentially what it was anyway.  
25  
26 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Okay. Action 6.  
27  
28 **MR. RINDONE:** We still have to go through the Action 5 stuff.  
29 Action 5 establishes a trip limit system for the Southern Zone in  
30 the Atlantic, and we have four alternatives here. Alternative 1  
31 would leave the trip limits for the Southern Zone as they are and  
32 so north of the Flagler/Volusia line, the trip limit is 3,500  
33 pounds per vessel per day, year-round. Between the Flagler/Volusia  
34 lines and the Volusia/Brevard lines, or off of Volusia County,  
35 it's 3,500 pounds per vessel per day from April 1 to October 31.  
36 Then from the Volusia/Brevard line to the Dade/Monroe line, the  
37 trip limit is seventy-five fish per vessel per day from April 1  
38 through the end of October. Then from November 1 through the end  
39 of March, no trip limit is in place from the Flagler/Volusia line  
40 to the Dade/Monroe line.  
41  
42 Alternative 2 would set, in the Southern Zone, the trip limit north  
43 of the Flagler/Volusia line at 3,500 pounds. For the area south  
44 of the Flagler/Volusia line, it would establish a year-round trip  
45 limit of seventy-five fish per vessel per day for Atlantic  
46 kingfish.  
47  
48 Alternative 3 says in the Southern Zone the trip limit north of

1 the Flagler/Volusia line would be 3,500 pounds. For the area south  
2 of that line, it would establish a fifty-fish trip limit from March  
3 1 to the end of March and seventy-five fish for the remainder of  
4 season one, as designated in Action 4, and season one, in this  
5 case, ends at the end of September.

6  
7 It has two options. Option 3a says that beginning on August 1 and  
8 continuing through the end of season one, if 75 percent of the  
9 season one quota has been taken, the trip limit would be fifty  
10 fish. Option 3b says at any time during season one if 75 percent  
11 of the season one quota has been taken, the trip limit changes to  
12 fifty fish.

13  
14 Alternative 4 says that in the Southern Zone the trip limit north  
15 of the Flagler/Volusia line would be 3,500 pounds and south of  
16 that it would establish a fifty-fish per vessel per day trip limit  
17 for season two, as designated in Action 4. In this case, season  
18 two would be from October 1 to the end of February.

19  
20 There are three options here. Option a says that beginning on  
21 February 1 and continuing through the end of February, if 70  
22 percent or more of the season two quota has been taken, the trip  
23 limit is fifty fish. If it's less than 70 percent, then it's still  
24 seventy-five fish. Then it goes up to seventy-five fish.

25  
26 Option 4b says that beginning January 1 and continuing through the  
27 end of February, so for two months, if 70 percent or more of that  
28 season two quota has been taken, then the trip limit stays at fifty  
29 fish. If it's less than 70 percent, then it bumps up to seventy-  
30 five fish.

31  
32 Option c says beginning February 1 and continuing through the end  
33 of February, and so back to just one month, if 80 percent or more  
34 of the season two quota has been taken, then the trip limit stays  
35 at fifty fish. If not, then it bumps up to seventy-five fish.

36  
37 There are no preferreds that have been selected as of yet for  
38 Action 5 by the South Atlantic Council. The AP did get to see  
39 Action 5-1 and 5-2 though and the AP's general sentiments, and you  
40 can read this in Tab C-4(a), but I will summarize it. Generally,  
41 whatever the South Atlantic thought was best as far as their trip  
42 limits is what the AP was agreeable to. It's their fishery over  
43 there, and if they think lower trip limits will help them, based  
44 on where the ACL is at certain points in time, then the AP was  
45 agreeable to that, and so whatever helped them prosecute their  
46 fishery better. Madam Chair.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Do we need to -- Since we don't have input from

1 the Gulf AP or the South Atlantic AP at this point, or the South  
2 Atlantic Council, do we need to even select a preferred or can we  
3 defer on that? Martha.

4  
5 **MS. BADEMAN:** I don't think it's really a good idea for us to do  
6 anything with this right now. The South Atlantic hasn't chosen  
7 anything, and this is one of their actions, and so I don't want to  
8 get in front of them. Also, because this is so dependent on the  
9 previous action, where right now we're in conflict with them, I  
10 don't think it's worth trying to pick something at this point.

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Mr. Gregory.

13  
14 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG GREGORY:** I just have an observation. With  
15 this Alternative 1, the current trip limit system, it reduces the  
16 trip limit off the east coast of Florida to seventy-five during  
17 approximately the same time that the landings went down.

18  
19 Given that the two councils have different options right now, when  
20 this comes back, I think we ought to try to see if we can get a  
21 more detailed analysis as to what's driving the landings. Is it  
22 the migration of the fish? Is it the trip limit? Is it the  
23 movement of the fishermen? I mean those are three variables all  
24 affecting this, and it would be nice to try to piece that out.

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you. Unless I see any objection -- Doug  
27 Boyd.

28  
29 **MR. BOYD:** I don't have an objection. I have a question, and I'm  
30 sorry that I may just not understand, but we have a trip limit of  
31 3,500 pounds north of a particular area, and then we have a trip  
32 limit of numbers of fish south of that area. How do those two  
33 things correlate and why is one in pounds and one in numbers of  
34 fish?

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Ryan or Steve, do you -- Mark Brown, do you have  
37 any comment on that? Sorry to put you on the spot.

38  
39 **MR. BROWN:** That goes back years back, when a lot of this management  
40 was being established, and the trip limit for the northern area,  
41 north of Flagler/Volusia, has been 3,500 pounds as far back as I  
42 can remember, and then management was altered in the southern areas  
43 to try to accommodate some type of a measure to -- Because there  
44 was such a number of boats that were fishing in a small area when  
45 the fish were migrating through there, to try to slow it down a  
46 little bit, but they shifted to a number of fish rather than to  
47 pounds, so they would have a general idea by just counting them,  
48 because it can be easier that way.

1  
2 I also wanted to mention that the AP will be discussing this next  
3 week, about this management right here for Action 5, and also  
4 picking a preferred. They've had some meetings with fishermen.  
5 Ben Hartig had some meetings with fishermen down in the south  
6 Florida area, personal meetings, and so they're going to bring it  
7 to the AP and they should have some decisions then.

8  
9 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Mark. Back to if there is no objection,  
10 I would like to move forward and get more clarification on this,  
11 but move forward to Action 6. Okay, Ryan. Action 6.

12  
13 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. The South Atlantic is  
14 currently conducting public hearings on the entire document, and  
15 so we'll be able to have more feedback in April as to what the  
16 public sentiments over there on Action 5.

17  
18 Action 6 begins on page 29 of Tab C, Number 4. Action 6 is where  
19 we get back into Gulf territory, and Action 6 would modify the ACL  
20 for Gulf group kingfish. Both councils' current preferred  
21 alternative is to set the Gulf migratory group king mackerel ACL  
22 equal to the ABC, as recommended by the Gulf's SSC, for the 2015  
23 through 2019 fishing seasons. That's the 2015/2016 season through  
24 the 2019/2020 fishing seasons.

25  
26 The ABC values are in millions of pounds whole weight. We have  
27 obviously moved past the 2015/2016 fishing season, and so the first  
28 ABC and ACL combination that you would see in effect would be the  
29 one for the 2016/2017 fishing season, if this document were to go  
30 final within a reasonable amount of time, in the first half of  
31 this year.

32  
33 The IPT has discussed requesting a rerun of the projections from  
34 the Center once the document does go final, and then we could  
35 follow up, at a later date, with a framework action to modify the  
36 ABC and the ACL, based on that rerun of those projections, but  
37 obviously there's a lot in here that both councils are trying to  
38 get accomplished, and so we didn't want to slow the document up  
39 any by submitting that request.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** John Sanchez.

42  
43 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Thank you. What's the timeframe for rerunning these  
44 projections, given recruitment discussions we had earlier, et  
45 cetera, et cetera?

46  
47 **MR. RINDONE:** It would behoove us probably to wait until after the  
48 end of the 2016/2017 fishing season, to get the most accurate

1 picture. Actually, at the end of the 2015/2016 season, to get the  
2 most accurate picture, which would mean after July 1, when the  
3 2016/2017 starts. That way, we can get the recreational and the  
4 commercial landings from the 2015/2016 season and know what's been  
5 caught and what's still in the water.

6  
7 Then let the Science Center rerun the projections then and, Bonnie,  
8 last time I talked to anybody over in your shop, I was given about  
9 a two to three-month turnaround on being able to rerun that stuff.  
10 Dr. Ponwith, last time I talked to anybody over in your neck of  
11 the woods, they said about two to three months to turn around  
12 updated ABC projections for the SSC to look at?

13  
14 **DR. BONNIE PONWITH:** Yes, I was just looking through the email to  
15 try and ground truth that. Let me continue looking to find that  
16 response and get you a more definitive answer.

17  
18 **MR. RINDONE:** From my memory, it was approximately that. So if we  
19 requested it say August 1 or so, somewhere around then, then that  
20 would give them time to compile the data from the previous fishing  
21 season. The MRIP waves would be in and the commercial landings  
22 should be in, and so it should allow it to move forward. It's a  
23 framework action that could be completed pretty quickly, as long  
24 as there's not a whole lot of other stuff that gets pinned to it  
25 in the process.

26  
27 For the rest of Action 6, the other thing that was being considered  
28 was a constant catch scenario. This would establish a constant  
29 catch scenario for the Gulf kingfish ACL for either a three or a  
30 five-year period, but doing this requires that the Science Center  
31 rerun projections for both scenarios, and they have to know what  
32 the allocations are actually going to be in order to be able to  
33 forecast what effort should do, in terms of how many fish the model  
34 says can be landed.

35  
36 Since we're talking about changing those allocation scenarios,  
37 even if it's just a little bit, the Science Center can't provide  
38 us with those constant catch scenarios yet.

39  
40 The other thing that the AP had discussed was that they preferred  
41 being able to catch the fish which were available to be caught  
42 now, as opposed to foregoing fish in one year in favor of catching  
43 a little bit more the next year and having that consistency. They  
44 had remarked that they preferred being able to catch whatever could  
45 be caught now.

46  
47 If Alternative 3 is something that the committee is not interested  
48 in pursuing, in favor of perhaps what the AP has recommended, then



1 the IPT would always appreciate thinning of the herd.

2  
3 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Ryan. We do have, in Action 6, a  
4 preferred alternative, which is Alternative Number 2. Is there  
5 any desire by the committee to act on staff and our Gulf AP's  
6 recommendation to consider but reject Alternative 3? Is there any  
7 discussion on this action? Leann.

8  
9 **MS. BOSARGE:** What the AP said was that they were okay with that  
10 declining and they would rather go ahead and catch as much as they  
11 can now, knowing that it would decline in the future? They were  
12 all right with that?

13  
14 **MR. FISHER:** Yes, ma'am, but what was really important to the AP  
15 was the idea of annually updating the yield projections and the  
16 ABC projections by the SSC. As long as we were going hand-in-hand  
17 with more or less a current event look at what the landings were,  
18 so that we could go up or down as needed, then the answer would be  
19 yes.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Okay. Once again, in Action 6, we already have a  
22 preferred alternative. Does anyone have a desire to remove  
23 Alternative 3? If not, then we will move forward. Okay.

24  
25 **MS. BOSARGE:** I mean if this isn't something that the AP is  
26 interested in, and if they're okay with it, which we have one  
27 representative here, then I don't have a problem with putting it  
28 in the Considered but Rejected column, as long as you feel  
29 confident that your two parallel tracks that you were talking about  
30 will in fact be the case.

31  
32 **MR. FISHER:** I think that would depend on how the council responds  
33 to the SSC projections and what you guys actually take action on  
34 in relationship to those.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Was that a motion, Ms. Bosarge, or --

37  
38 **MS. BOSARGE:** That's a good question. It sounds like there are  
39 some variables still. Let's leave it in for now, and let's make  
40 sure that the two parallel tracks do in fact happen. You can't  
41 analyze it right now anyway, and so hopefully it won't be any extra  
42 work on you at the moment, on staff, and so let's leave it in for  
43 now.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Okay. Let's move forward, Ryan, into Action 7.

46  
47 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Action 7 begin on page 31.  
48 Action 7 examines revising the commercial zone quotas for Gulf

1 migratory group kingfish, and there are four options here to  
2 examine it. The reason for this particular action is because the  
3 stock assessment indicated that the area off the southeastern coast  
4 of Florida was in fact Atlantic migratory group fish and not Gulf  
5 migratory group, and so that Florida East Coast zone that we had  
6 over there, we no longer -- There is no longer a need for that for  
7 the Gulf migratory group, and so doing away with that leaves us  
8 with a chunk of our pie. You guys remember my awesome pie  
9 discussions. They were delicious.

10  
11 We have to reallocate what remains of the commercial zone quotas  
12 in the Gulf to the remaining Gulf zones. Currently, in Alternative  
13 1, the Western Zone gets 31 percent of the commercial quota, the  
14 Northern Zone gets 5.17 percent, and the Southern Hand Line and  
15 Gillnet both get 15.96 percent each. It's that 31.91 percent from  
16 the Florida East Coast zone that we have to redistribute to the  
17 remaining components.

18  
19 Alternative 2 would revise those commercial zone quotas for Gulf  
20 group kingfish by dividing the Florida East Coast Zone's quota  
21 into four equal parts. We call this equal reallocation, which  
22 results in about 7.96 percent being added to the existing  
23 allocation percentages for each of the four remaining zones.

24  
25 You can see how all that shakes out in Tables 2.7.2 and 2.7.3. A  
26 note on Table 2.7.3 is that it assumes that the ACL is going to be  
27 equal to the ABC, which is what both councils currently prefer,  
28 and that sector allocations would be represented by Alternative 1  
29 in Action 8, which we haven't got to yet, but that's the  
30 recreational and commercial reallocation. It assumes no  
31 reallocation. You can see from all the options that everybody  
32 still gets more fish, which is a great thing for the fishermen.

33  
34 Alternative 3 would proportionally reallocate the Florida East  
35 Coast Zone's voided allocation to the remaining four zones such  
36 that if you take say the Western Zone's 31 percent and you divide  
37 it by the sum of the remaining four zones, which is about 68  
38 percent, then you get about 45.53 percent. That would be the  
39 Western Zone's new proportional allocation, and subsequent values  
40 for the remaining zones.

41  
42 Alternative 4, which is supported by the Gulf AP, would establish  
43 a Western Zone allocation of the commercial ACL of 40 percent, 18  
44 percent to the Northern Zone, and 21 percent apiece to the Southern  
45 Zone Hand Line and Gillnet components. The AP's rationale for  
46 doing it this way is they wanted everybody to be able to get more  
47 and everybody was going to get more regardless, because the stock  
48 is healthy, but this really does help all -- They thought this

1 helps all four zones, but it especially helps the Northern Zone,  
2 which has a large number of permits which haven't seen a lot of  
3 landings in recent history, the AP members discussed a few things  
4 that they thought might be the reason for that.

5  
6 One was in the past, when the season opened on July 1, that the  
7 fish were caught before a lot of the dually-permitted vessels were  
8 able to get on the water and before the fish moved farther enough  
9 south, towards say Tampa Bay, for the fishermen down there to have  
10 a chance to get to them. That's been rectified through changing  
11 the beginning of that fishing season to October 1, but they argue  
12 that 5.17 percent is still a small amount of quota and if they  
13 could have a little bit more, then that would certainly help them.

14  
15 This year, during this year's fishing season, we saw more boats  
16 with federal king mackerel permits off the northwest coast of  
17 Florida being able to fish, and the landings in that zone were  
18 landed more quickly than they have in years past, but we heard  
19 from a lot more fishermen that haven't been fishing in the last  
20 several years that said I was finally able to get out on the water  
21 and catch some kingfish. Mr. Fisher can elaborate, if he thinks  
22 so, about why the 18 percent was picked for the Northern Zone by  
23 the AP.

24  
25 **MR. FISHER:** Thank you, Ryan. Well, everything he said is true,  
26 and, in particular, the one thing that needs some light shown on  
27 it is when the zones got created, kingfish were a fairly depressed  
28 fishery. As the fishery came back, exactly what happens happened.

29  
30 The Northern Zone, from the Alabama line over to the Big Bend area,  
31 they pretty much catch up all those fish before they ever had an  
32 opportunity to get all the way down to the Lee/Collier line. The  
33 Northern Subzone, the Northern Zone of the West Eastern Subzone -  
34 - Whatever. I'm sorry.

35  
36 It's a very big zone. It goes from the Alabama line all the way  
37 down to Fort Myers. Historically, there was a very robust fishery  
38 in the Pinellas County area and north of Naples. Because of these  
39 changes, those fishermen never had an opportunity to contribute to  
40 the landings and so it's always looked like why should those forty  
41 or fifty boats that are permitted in that area have access to  
42 fishery, because they haven't caught anything. We couldn't.

43  
44 In the last twenty years, I believe there's only been three years  
45 that the season has lasted into December, and only one year that  
46 we've actually had a spring season the following year. What's  
47 interesting is -- Ryan, do you happen to have the vote? It says  
48 motion carried with one opposed, but I think it's fairly obvious

1 that if the whole AP voted for Alternative 4 that they felt it was  
2 fair.

3  
4 I might point out, on page 32 of your document, the current  
5 percentages are 31, 5, 15, 15, and 31, roughly. In Alternative 4,  
6 everybody gets an increase. It is true that by percentage, or by  
7 chunk, the Northern Zone gets a larger increase, but every single  
8 zone gets a substantial increase. The Western goes up 9 percent,  
9 the Northern Zone goes up 13, the Southern Zone goes up 6, roughly,  
10 and so everybody gets significantly more fish, and, because of the  
11 changes, we're all going to get more fish. Thank you.

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** John Sanchez and Dr. Crabtree.

14  
15 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I recall we had this  
16 discussion at length the last time we took up mackerel, and I  
17 mentioned then that during, I guess that meeting, at the time of  
18 the advisory panel, there was not a Keys representative there. I  
19 think since then there has been the appointment of some, and they  
20 are historical players in that, and so I am going to hold off a  
21 little bit on sharing zeal for going with that Alternative 4.  
22 Thank you.

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Dr. Crabtree.

25  
26 **DR. CRABTREE:** I just want to see if I understand. It looks to me  
27 like all of the alternatives give everyone some more fish, but  
28 there are concerns about the Northern Zone, and so it seems to me  
29 that we're kind of looking between Alternatives 2 and 4.

30  
31 Alternative 2 is easy to understand, because it divvies it all up  
32 equally, but, if I'm understanding where the AP was, the concern  
33 was that the Northern Zone -- One, it's a big zone and there are  
34 a lot of fishermen in that zone, and that it was historically under  
35 allocated. We're essentially taking Alternative 2 and modifying  
36 it a little bit to provide a little plus-up for the Northern Zone.  
37 Everybody is still getting more fish, but we're trying to make up  
38 for I guess what we feel like is a historical under allocation for  
39 that zone. Is that roughly where you were coming from on 4?

40  
41 **MR. FISHER:** Yes, sir. I think that's what the AP recommends,  
42 and, Mr. Sanchez, those Key West people were actually there and I  
43 don't -- Again, Ryan, do you know what the count vote was? Okay.  
44 Let me just say also that the Northern Zone is so large and when  
45 the fish migrate through the different areas of that zone, and I  
46 know this is not going to happen, but we really need to split that  
47 Northern Zone into two and give each an allocation.

48

1 Obviously that's not happening, but the point of that is that by  
2 the time the fish get to us, or south of Crystal River, it's  
3 usually fall and so any additional fish would be very helpful.

4

5 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Myron Fischer.

6

7 **MR. FISCHER:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you, Martin.  
8 Historically, I defend the Western Zone, and, from a math or  
9 science viewpoint, Preferred Alternative 3, which is proportional,  
10 where everyone got an increase proportionally, based on the size  
11 of what they had previously.

12

13 However, the components of the western Gulf that were at the  
14 meeting discussed the fact of the need for the Eastern Zone, and  
15 they actually talked to me after the meeting and they convinced me  
16 that they would rather give up -- Mackerel fishermen seem to work  
17 together and give up fish, more than any other fishery I've seen,  
18 and I would support Alternative 4, based on the AP's recommendation  
19 and my communication with those who came home from the meeting  
20 saying they thought it was the fair thing to do.

21

22 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Ms. Bademan.

23

24 **MS. BADEMAN:** I attended the AP meeting, and I asked a lot of  
25 questions about this action and about Alternative 4, because I  
26 knew that they had discussed it in a previous meeting, and we were  
27 kind of sitting here in October wondering exactly where these  
28 numbers came from and why.

29

30 I think it was a really good discussion around the table. I think  
31 just about everyone, except for one person, I think, rallied around  
32 Alternative 4 as the preferred. It was a pretty diverse group,  
33 and so I mean I'm inclined to support that at this point.

34

35 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** So is that a motion?

36

37 **MS. BADEMAN:** Sure. I will do it. **I will move in Action 7 that**  
38 **the preferred alternative be Alternative 4.**

39

40 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We have a motion in Action 7 to make Alternative  
41 4 the preferred alternative. Myron Fischer seconds. Is there any  
42 discussion? John Sanchez.

43

44 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I would like to offer a substitute that we make  
45 Alternative 2 the preferred. If I get a second, I will offer some  
46 rationale.

47

48 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We have a substitute motion for Action 7 to make

1 Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. Is there a second?  
2 Seeing none, the substitute motion fails. Back to the original  
3 motion. In Action 7, the motion is to make Alternative 4 the  
4 preferred alternative. It is to revise the commercial zone quotas  
5 for the Gulf migratory group king mackerel as follows: 40 percent  
6 for the Western Zone, 18 percent for the Northern Zone, 21 percent  
7 for the Southern Line Hand Line Component; and 21 percent for the  
8 Southern Zone Gillnet Component. This alternative was also  
9 recommended by the Gulf AP to be the preferred. Any discussion?  
10 **Seeing none, all those opposed, one. All those in favor say aye.**  
11 **The motion passes.** Ryan.

12  
13 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. That takes care of Action  
14 7. Action 8 is on page 33 of Tab C, Number 4. This would revise  
15 the recreational and commercial allocations for Gulf migratory  
16 group kingfish.

17  
18 If you guys remember from October, we had talked about the increase  
19 in the recreational landings from the 2013/2014 fishing season  
20 compared to the 2012/2013 fishing season, how they went up about  
21 53 percent, and so that was a pretty remarkable increase.

22  
23 Some of that has to do with changes in MRIP and it could have to  
24 do with effort shifting from other fisheries to the recreational  
25 pursuit of king mackerel. In light of that, the CMP AP decided to  
26 stick with their previously recommended alternative, which was  
27 Alternative 1, which would not reallocate any of the kingfish  
28 between the recreational and commercial sectors for the Gulf.

29  
30 Alternative 2 would revise the recreational and commercial  
31 allocations for Gulf kingfish by dividing the stock ACL using one  
32 of the options below: 63 percent to the recreational sector and 37  
33 to the commercial sector, or a 5 percent increase for the  
34 commercial sector; Option b would be 58 percent recreational and  
35 42 percent commercial, or a 10 percent increase to the commercial;  
36 and Option c would be 48 percent recreational and 52 percent  
37 commercial, or a 20 percent increase to the commercial.

38  
39 Alternative 3 would revise the recreational and commercial  
40 allocations for Gulf kingfish by transferring a percentage of the  
41 stock ACL to the commercial allocation annually, until such a time  
42 that the recreational sector lands 80 percent of its allocation,  
43 after which no additional allocation would be transferred from the  
44 stock ACL to the commercial allocation.

45  
46 Based on the landings from the previous fishing year, the  
47 recreational sector landed 62.3 percent -- For the 2014/2015  
48 fishing season, they landed 62.3 percent of their allocation. You

1 can see that in Table 2.8.1 and then Figure 2.8.1 on page 35. That  
2 shows the landings in a graphical form.

3  
4 Alternative 3 has two options. One would transfer 2 percent of  
5 that stock ACL annually to the commercial allocation and Option b  
6 would transfer 5 percent.

7  
8 Alternative 4 would conditionally transfer a percentage, chosen  
9 from Options a through d, of the stock ACL to the commercial  
10 sector, until such a time that the recreational landings reach a  
11 predetermined threshold selected from Options e through g. If  
12 this threshold is met, then the recreational and commercial  
13 allocations would automatically revert back to 68 percent for the  
14 recreational sector and 32 percent for the commercial sector, or  
15 our status quo allocations, in the following fishing year.

16  
17 For Alternative 4, if Alternative 4 is to be preferred, the council  
18 must also select one of Options a through d and must select one of  
19 Options e through g.

20  
21 For the conditional quota transfer, Options a through d, Option a  
22 would transfer 5 percent to the commercial sector. Option b is 10  
23 percent and Option c is 15 percent, which was added at the previous  
24 council meeting, and Option d is 20 percent.

25  
26 For determining the recreational ACL threshold, there are three  
27 options. Option e would revert to the status quo sector  
28 allocations if 80 percent of the adjusted recreational sector ACL  
29 was landed. Option f is 90 percent and Option g is 100 percent.  
30 Just to reiterate, the reversion back to the status quo allocations  
31 would occur in the year following the year in which the  
32 recreational ACL threshold was met.

33  
34 Alternative 5 would establish a sunset provision for any change in  
35 sector allocations for Gulf migratory group kingfish. After the  
36 predetermined time period, any change in sector allocations would  
37 go back to the status quo, the 68 percent recreational and 32  
38 percent commercial, and there are three options here for sunseting  
39 after five years, ten years, or fifteen years. Again, the Gulf AP  
40 recommended Alternative 1, and the council has not yet selected a  
41 preferred alternative for this. Madam Chair.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Ryan. In Action 8, we have an  
44 opportunity to select a preferred alternative. At present, the  
45 Gulf AP recommended Alternative 1, no action, maintain the current  
46 recreational and commercial allocations for Gulf migratory group  
47 king mackerel at 68 percent recreational and 32 percent commercial.  
48 Are there comments from the committee? John Sanchez.

1  
2 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I will make a motion that  
3 we select Alternative 4 in 2.8, Action 8, as the preferred  
4 alternative.  
5

6 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We have a motion to select as the preferred  
7 Alternative 4 in Action 8 as the preferred, which is to  
8 conditionally transfer a certain percentage, Options a through d,  
9 of the stock ACL to the commercial sector, until such a time that  
10 recreational landings reach a predetermined threshold, outlined in  
11 Options e through g. If this threshold is met, the recreational  
12 and commercial allocations will revert to 68 percent for the  
13 recreational sector and 32 percent for the commercial sector. Is  
14 there a second? Ms. Bosarge. Then, as part of this, we need to  
15 select an option as preferred.  
16

17 **MR. SANCHEZ:** For discussion, I will go ahead and start with this  
18 and we can always, I guess, figure out exactly which option is  
19 more agreeable to everybody, but Option b and Option e.  
20

21 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Okay. Under the motion for the Preferred  
22 Alternative 4, the preferred option would be Option b, to transfer  
23 10 percent of the stock ACL to the commercial sector. Then Option  
24 3 would be to revert to the status quo sector allocations if 80  
25 percent of the adjusted recreational sector ACL is landed. Leann,  
26 you seconded that and are you okay with those two options?  
27

28 **MS. BOSARGE:** Yes, I'm fine with it.  
29

30 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Okay. Is there discussion from the committee?  
31 Martha Bademan.  
32

33 **MS. BADEMAN:** I just wanted to ask Martin if he could talk a little  
34 bit about the AP's decision here. I am looking back at my notes  
35 and I've got some -- It looks like the committee discussed -- The  
36 panel said if the council chooses to reallocate, doing some kind  
37 of sunset, and kind of where you came from with Alternative 1.  
38

39 **MR. FISHER:** Sure. There was some presentation made, I believe by  
40 staff, that there was a huge increase in the recreational landings  
41 in a time zone, in 2014, I think that's right. The AP feels -- I  
42 guess the best way I can represent how they feel about this is  
43 that we should give the recreational community the opportunity to  
44 catch their allocation and if the numbers coming out of that report  
45 for 2014 are real, then, with an increase in bag limit to three or  
46 possibly four fish, it's very possible that the recreational  
47 community could catch their allocation and we shouldn't stand in  
48 the way of that.



1  
2 It wasn't a unanimous vote. There was one opposed. I don't  
3 remember the actual numbers. It would be nice to provide that.  
4 Furthermore, with the changes in regulatory action on other  
5 fisheries, kingfish is going to provide an opportunity to charter  
6 fishermen to be in the fishery a longer part of the year, and if  
7 we decrease that quota, that's just going to take away from their  
8 opportunities to provide that to the recreational anglers who don't  
9 have boats. Thank you.

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Martin. Dr. Crabtree.

12  
13 **DR. CRABTREE:** I will probably abstain on this one, but I do think  
14 Martin and the AP is right. If you look at Table 2.8.1, there is  
15 a substantial jump in those recreational catches in 2014/2015. I  
16 don't know what that means exactly, but it's there.

17  
18 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Mr. Boyd.

19  
20 **MR. BOYD:** I would offer a substitute motion to make Alternative  
21 1 in Action 8 the preferred.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We have a motion, a substitute motion, in Action  
24 8 to make Alternative 1, no action, the preferred alternative. Do  
25 I have a second? Myron Fischer seconds that. Any discussion?  
26 Leann Bosarge.

27  
28 **MS. BOSARGE:** This was the alternative that I had added to the  
29 document to essentially set up a loan program, so that there wasn't  
30 a hard shift of quota between commercial and recreational. I did  
31 that because if the shoe was on the other foot, I wouldn't want to  
32 see a hard shift of quota from commercial to recreational, even  
33 though we hadn't been catching it. I mean that's just the nature  
34 of the beast.

35  
36 What I was trying to do was set up something so that some of these  
37 fish that are not being landed could be landed with enough  
38 safeguards in there that if the recreational sector did get to the  
39 point where they had some increased demand for those fish, all  
40 bets are off. We don't borrow their fish any more, the commercial  
41 side, that is.

42  
43 Now, they did have a big spike in recreational landings last year,  
44 but, even with that huge spike, they only landed 62 percent of  
45 what they're given as a quota, and we're only talking about  
46 transferring 10 percent, and saying if they get all the way up to  
47 80 percent, which would take another huge spike over and above  
48 where they're at right now, if they get to an 80 percent threshold,

1 that's it and no more transfers anymore. It goes back to the way  
2 it's been for quite some time.

3  
4 One year does not make a trend. It very well could be though that  
5 with everything going on with other species, snapper and this and  
6 that, that we're starting to see a pick-up in demand, if you will,  
7 for the recreational angler catching these mackerel. That could  
8 be the case, but this has all the safeguards in place so that these  
9 fish still remain recreational fish.

10  
11 I guess I can't understand where the recreational angler loses in  
12 this scenario. The only thing I can think is maybe -- Would their  
13 season close early if you got real close to it or something, if we  
14 had borrowed 10 percent, or is it totally projected on your side,  
15 where -- Would there be a payback somewhere? I just can't quite  
16 fathom where the downside is.

17  
18 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Martin Fisher, to the point.

19  
20 **MR. FISHER:** Thank you. I can't answer the question, but part of  
21 your question. You're also considering raising the bag limit. So  
22 if you raise it to three fish and recreational anglers actually  
23 keep that extra fish, there is your 10 percent right there.

24  
25 In the very first year, we could be in a problem where the  
26 commercial industry is going to be in conflict. We don't need any  
27 more conflict. I appreciate where you're coming from and, as a  
28 commercial fisherman, I would love to have more fish, but I think  
29 we need to play out the bag limit increase and see what that does  
30 to recreational landings before we start taking or sharing --  
31 Sharing is the right word. Sharing some of their fish.

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Martin. Ryan, to that point?

34  
35 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. The bag limit analysis is  
36 a little bit more complex than that. There were a couple of  
37 methods that were used to estimate how increasing the bag limit  
38 would actually affect recreational landings.

39  
40 One assumed that recreational anglers who were catching two fish,  
41 but were discarding other fish, would then keep those fish they  
42 were discarding. The latter method suggested that anyone who  
43 caught two fish would also catch and keep three fish and would  
44 catch and keep four fish.

45  
46 More of that is in Action 9, but it describes basically the  
47 variability in how much the recreational landings could increase,  
48 and they could increase anywhere from about I think it's 2.1

1 percent, if everyone who is discarding that third fish kept that  
2 third fish, all the way to everyone who could possibly catch two  
3 fish would catch and keep four fish, which would increase the  
4 recreational landings by 21 percent over what they currently are.

5  
6 It is variable, and the other thing to remember is that the number  
7 of fishermen, and you'll see this in Action 9, in the tables, but  
8 the number of fishermen who are able to catch and keep two kingfish  
9 is a smaller percentage of the recreational fleet. It's not that  
10 everyone is going out and catching and keeping two fish, but  
11 increasing the bag limit will increase recreational landings, to  
12 some degree.

13  
14 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Ryan. Martha Bademan, to that point,  
15 and then John Sanchez.

16  
17 **MS. BADEMAN:** I was just going to say I think this is a tough one.  
18 Before I was aware of this increase in landings, I mean I think I  
19 was pretty much ready to go with what you guys were suggesting,  
20 but the landings did give me pause, and I think, to summarize kind  
21 of where the AP was coming from, is basically the recreational  
22 fishery needs to stay open. We can't have a closure. I think  
23 they were emphatic about that, in discussing this and in discussing  
24 the bag limit.

25  
26 I don't know. I guess the more conservative way to go would be to  
27 leave this alone and then maybe talk about the bag limit, but I  
28 don't know. It's a tough call. We don't know what's going to  
29 happen in the future.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** John Sanchez, Myron Fischer, and David Walker and  
32 Doug Boyd.

33  
34 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I don't know what's going to happen either. I  
35 certainly don't have a crystal ball either, but clearly the history  
36 has been that the commercial side uses their allocation. We have  
37 kind of are held to optimize the yield and maximize this fishery  
38 for the benefits of the nation.

39  
40 You have a side of the fishery that could use these fish, and it's  
41 not a taking. Again, it is like a sharing. If ever a change in  
42 the bag limit were to warrant that, give these fish back and they  
43 need them again, then we do that. I think this option that we  
44 have on the table here allows the mechanism to do that very  
45 clearly, and it's just a matter of there's a component of the  
46 fishery that really could use these fish, and could have used them  
47 for many years, and it's been underutilized and this kind of just  
48 maximizes that. That's all it is.

1  
2 **MR. FISCHER:** Leann, your method, your motion and method, I think  
3 is great, and I wish the Gulf Advisory Panel would have supported  
4 it. I spoke with some of the components about why and so this is  
5 anecdotal and I would like maybe Ryan to shed light on this and  
6 see where we could go with it, but their fear, the ones who spoke  
7 to me, was their fear was that we have this hidden buffer.

8  
9 The fact that the recreational component doesn't catch its quota  
10 leaves a buffer there, and that could be why the status of the  
11 fish are healthy. If we start shifting it to commercial and  
12 allowing the recreational to catch more fish, that we're going to  
13 shrink this buffer of uncaught fish. They're scared that it would  
14 have implications down the road for the future of the fishery.

15  
16 I don't know if this was presented scientifically. That's, Ryan,  
17 what I was going to ask you, or Martin, if -- What you all could  
18 shed onto this.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Ryan, can you respond?

21  
22 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, and thank you, Madam Chair. From the  
23 perspective of the stock assessment, the stock assessment, when it  
24 provides projections of what the overfishing limit and the  
25 acceptable biological catch is going to be, for the ABC, unless  
26 there is an ACL established lower than the ABC, the assessment  
27 assumes you will catch every single pound that it's allowing you  
28 to.

29  
30 If it says in 2016 you can catch ten-million pounds, then it  
31 expects that in 2016 you're going to catch every ounce of that  
32 ten-million pounds. Then that's how it determines what you can  
33 have in 2017 and 2018 and beyond.

34  
35 Whenever there is an underage, there is a surplus that's left in  
36 the population. That perpetual surplus that we've had is why you  
37 have the declining projections that we saw in Action 6. You're  
38 fishing down to an equilibrium yield, essentially. I know folks  
39 sometimes worry about the declining ABC projection, but that's  
40 what that is. You're fishing down the bonus. If there continues  
41 to be a bonus, then anytime you update your projections, you're  
42 still going to have that.

43  
44 From the perspective of that buffer safeguarding the fishery, the  
45 way the assessment has projected the fishery could operate is that  
46 you could catch everything and it would still be safe, because you  
47 have a buffer, albeit a small one, between the overfishing limit  
48 and the ABC. There is still a buffer built in there to prevent

1 things from going awry and overfishing occurring, but the model  
2 expects you to catch all the fish. When you don't, it's a de facto  
3 extra buffer on top of the one which already exists.

4  
5 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Ryan. Let's move forward. We've got  
6 David Walker, Doug Boyd, and Ed Swindell.

7  
8 **MR. WALKER:** I was just going to add with the increased bag limit  
9 and so many concerns in the eastern Gulf with the declining biomass  
10 of red snapper and the declining CPU and people wanting more  
11 fishing opportunities, it makes sense to me to go with 1. I also  
12 understand what John is saying that they would like to have more  
13 fish, but I mean it's -- It creates more opportunities for the  
14 recreational fishery to catch a fish. Not everybody likes to catch  
15 a red snapper.

16  
17 You know a lot of times -- There's times when I can anchor up the  
18 boat and the guys are catching red snapper and I will run to the  
19 back of the boat with my fly line to catch a king mackerel. I  
20 mean it's pretty exciting to catch a fifty or sixty-pound king  
21 mackerel, and I think when we get to Other Business, I think Martin  
22 might have something on that too, but I speak in favor of  
23 Alternative 1. The AP had discussion over it and they all agreed  
24 on it, and so I would like to support Alternative 1.

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** I am going to call on Doug and then Ed and then I  
27 want to wrap this up.

28  
29 **MR. BOYD:** Thank you, Madam Chairman. I might point out that my  
30 name is not listed on the agenda for the Mackerel Committee, but  
31 I am on the Mackerel Committee. I think that was inadvertent and  
32 that was brought to my attention. I just wanted to clarify that,  
33 in case somebody is asking.

34  
35 Martin has really said everything that I would like to say to point  
36 out why I support this substitute motion. I won't go back over  
37 those, other than to say we have had -- We have recommended a  
38 change in the bag limit for the recreational fishermen, to allow  
39 them the opportunity to use their quota.

40  
41 We have seen an increase in the catch rate, based on some MRIP  
42 recalibrations, and I think we ought to allow the recreational  
43 fishermen time to see whether they are going to catch their quota  
44 or not, and so I support the substitute motion. Thank you.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Doug. Ed and then Leann. After that,  
47 we're calling the vote.

48

1 **MR. SWINDELL:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Is there any particular  
2 reason why the recreational landings increased so significantly  
3 this last season?

4

5 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Ryan.

6

7 **MR. RINDONE:** It's an interesting question that I don't have a  
8 definitive answer to. Obviously there have been changes to the  
9 MRIP calibration methods and the way in which the landings are  
10 received and processed, but it could also be the result of an  
11 effort shift and more recreational fishermen going after king  
12 mackerel because we're in a good enough position with kingfish  
13 that they're open year-round for recreational fishermen in the  
14 Gulf.

15

16 There are certainly many more species which don't have that luxury,  
17 and so certainly hearing from the public during public testimony  
18 would be a good thing. That might be a good question for you guys  
19 to ask some folks, is are you catching more kingfish? See if,  
20 even just anecdotally here, that there's an increase in effort for  
21 last year compared to the previous years.

22

23 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you. Leann.

24

25 **MS. BOSARGE:** It doesn't sound like there's going to be the support  
26 to make this the preferred right now. Since this joint amendment  
27 does move slowly, it's something though that we can keep an eye  
28 on. I'm sure we will get another year's worth of data before we  
29 finalize this amendment. Let's see what happens with those  
30 recreational landings, you know and see if we see a spike above  
31 where we're at again right now.

32

33 If we did see another huge spike, then we don't probably need to  
34 spin our wheels on something that won't go anywhere, but if we see  
35 something staying about where it is, or even going back down, then  
36 I would like to keep an open mind and see if this is something  
37 that we can implement.

38

39 You know another thing, and this doesn't support my case, but,  
40 Ryan, you know you did that increased bag limit analysis, and that  
41 was based on where the recreational sector was before. If we see  
42 that these landings stay high on the recreational side, do we need  
43 to rerun that analysis? Would it have an effect?

44

45 **MR. RINDONE:** No, ma'am. The analysis is done based on just the  
46 data and not based on increases or decreases in recreational  
47 effort. Again, it's assuming that -- There are two different  
48 scenarios that were presented, but it's assuming that the people

1 who are fishing, be there more or less of them, but the people who  
2 are out there, there's a certain proportion of them which will  
3 catch two kingfish.

4  
5 Of those who catch two kingfish, a certain proportion of them will  
6 keep them and some won't, and so it's assuming the ones who will  
7 would also keep three, if they caught three, and would keep four  
8 if they caught four. That's how those changes are made.

9  
10 The number of fishermen fishing is less of the driver than the  
11 proportion of fishermen who are capable of actually landing that,  
12 and so, if you have more fishermen out there fishing, then you  
13 just add that proportion to it and then it would increase.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Okay. I am calling the vote. We have a substitute  
16 motion on the table for Action 8, which is to make Alternative 1,  
17 no action, the preferred alternative. That is to maintain the  
18 current recreational and commercial allocations for Gulf migratory  
19 group king mackerel at 68 percent recreational and 32 percent  
20 commercial. I have a second. **All those opposed, two opposed; in  
21 favor, five. The substitute motion passes.** Okay, Ryan, Action 9.

22  
23 **MR. RINDONE:** Before we go to Action 9, if the committee's  
24 preferred recommendation to the council is to make Alternative 1  
25 the preferred in Action 8, then, it being no action, would the  
26 committee be interested in moving Action 8 to Considered but  
27 Rejected? If your preferred thing is to not do anything with this,  
28 then the action kind of doesn't serve a purpose anymore.

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Doug Boyd.

31  
32 **MR. BOYD:** I would have no problem with that if Mara was okay with  
33 it. I don't know if we need this in there for a range of  
34 alternatives. Since it's a whole action, I wouldn't think we would  
35 need it, and we would need the alternatives underneath the action,  
36 but I would rather check with her first.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Actually, I would rather -- I would like to hear  
39 from Mara, but public testimony might shed light too, and so maybe  
40 this is more appropriate of a removal of Action 8 at full council.  
41 Mara, do you have any comment or do you want to pass?

42  
43 **MS. LEVY:** I mean you have the option to move the entire action to  
44 Considered but Rejected if you don't want to pursue it. I mean I  
45 think that's up to you all.

46  
47 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Leann.

48

1 **MS. BOSARGE:** Obviously I don't want to remove it. I mean I just  
2 said I would like to see what happens in the future, and I don't  
3 want to put words in Martha's mouth, but it was something that  
4 Martha, before we saw the spike in the last year's landings, was  
5 mulling over, at least. I would like to wait and see how future  
6 landings play out.

7  
8 If at that point it looks like we're on a trend, an upward trend,  
9 in recreational landings and that this, like I said before, just  
10 going to be spinning our wheels, then at that point I don't think  
11 I have an issue with not examining this further, but, at this  
12 point, with only one year of landings, I don't think it's something  
13 that we should do away with at this point.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Let's move forward to Action 9, Ryan.

16  
17 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Action 9 is that bag limit  
18 study and that's going to be on page 38 of Tab C, Number 4. This  
19 looks at modifying the recreational bag limit for Gulf group  
20 kingfish, and both councils' preferred alternative is Alternative  
21 3, which would establish a four fish per person recreational bag  
22 limit.

23  
24 The Gulf AP recommended three fish and their rationale for that  
25 was let's have an increase from two to three and see how that goes,  
26 see how that impacts recreational landings, especially in the wake  
27 of the marked increase in recreational landings for the previous  
28 fishing season. Is that about right, Martin?

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Is there any motions or does any committee member  
31 want to make a preferred alternative? Wait. We have a preferred  
32 alternative, Number 3. Martha Bademan.

33  
34 **MS. BADEMAN:** We have a preferred, but I will make a motion to  
35 change our preferred in Action 9 to Alternative 2.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We have a motion in Action 9 to change the preferred  
38 alternative from Alternative 3, which is to increase the bag limit  
39 to four fish per day per person, and to change that to Preferred  
40 Alternative 2, which would be to increase the bag limit to three  
41 fish per person per day, which is the Gulf AP's preferred, or  
42 recommended preferred. Do I have a second? Leann Bosarge seconds.  
43 Is there discussion? Martha Bademan.

44  
45 **MS. BADEMAN:** I mean just to kind of circle back to the conversation  
46 we had about the last action, the take-home that I took from that  
47 AP meeting was, whatever happens, we really, really do not want  
48 the recreational fishery to close.



1  
2 We have this spike in landings and we're not really sure what's  
3 going on with that, and so I think that's kind of where they landed  
4 with three fish. I think we can start there and see what happens.  
5 If we need to come back in a couple of years and we want to raise  
6 it to four, then so be it, but let's start with three and see where  
7 it goes.

8  
9 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Further discussion? Doug Boyd.

10  
11 **MR. BOYD:** A question for Ryan. Ryan, if we went to four fish, if  
12 the preferred alternative stayed the same, is there a projection  
13 that we would use up the entire quota in the recreational sector?  
14

15 **MR. RINDONE:** No, I don't think so. I mean, looking at the data,  
16 and even considering that 62 percent of the recreational ACL was  
17 landed last year, if you look at Figure 2.9.1, you get an idea of  
18 the number of kingfish harvested by mode, by the recreational  
19 sector, from 2011 to 2013.

20  
21 Most folks aren't catching one. Then you have some folks that  
22 catch one, and even fewer folks that catch two. The likelihood of  
23 somebody catching and keeping three for both methods is predicated  
24 on them catching at least two. You have a smaller fraction of the  
25 recreational fishing population, be they headboats, charter or  
26 private, that are even catching two to begin with, much less  
27 keeping them.

28  
29 I think if you went to -- Whether you go to three or four, I think  
30 that you're going to be okay. It's just that the big caveat about  
31 our August meeting to October was when we received the notice of  
32 the big increase in the recreational landings and we could no  
33 longer increase the commercial side up to 20 percent and the bag  
34 limit for the recreational side to four fish and still be okay.  
35 That's not true anymore, and we covered that at the last meeting,  
36 too, but whether you go three or four, I think you're going to be  
37 fine, based on the analysis presented in the action.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Ryan. Mr. Boyd.

40  
41 **MR. BOYD:** Thank you, Ryan, and just a follow-up. I am kind of on  
42 the fence about that. I understand Martha's concern for making  
43 sure that we have a consistent long season, but it appears that it  
44 wouldn't make any difference and we could see, if we stayed at the  
45 alternative of four, we could see what's going to happen and see  
46 if there is a larger shift and watch it play out over the next  
47 year, and so I would stay with the current alternative as the  
48 preferred.

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Any further discussion? Mr. Swindell.  
3  
4 **MR. SWINDELL:** My question previously about why the sudden increase  
5 is I guess I was a little concerned that if we don't really  
6 understand why we had a sudden increase, what makes us think we're  
7 not going to have another sudden increase, and to then, on top of  
8 that, put in another known increase of another bag limit increase,  
9 I guess I'm a little bit concerned.  
10  
11 You know we've got a resource that seems to be healthy and doing  
12 well. I don't know anything about when the last biomass assessment  
13 was done, or when one is scheduled to be done, but I mean we're  
14 going on probably old data. When was the last assessment for this  
15 fishery done?  
16  
17 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** 2014?  
18  
19 **MR. RINDONE:** It was 2014, using 2013 data.  
20  
21 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** It was 2014, using 2013 data.  
22  
23 **MR. SWINDELL:** Well, that's pretty recent. So you've got a good  
24 handle then, I guess, on where we are and so that's encouraging,  
25 but I guess I am still real iffy then about why we had this sudden  
26 big increase, all of a sudden, in the recreational landings.  
27  
28 I hate to see it happen again. I guess I'm real cautious. Here  
29 we've got a resource and I don't want to damage the resource. I  
30 just want to make certain that we still have a good fishery to  
31 continue, and everybody seems to be somewhat happy with what  
32 they're doing and the recreational people are probably happy  
33 they're catching two. I've never been out where I caught two and  
34 I think it's good. Thank you.  
35  
36 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, Ed. Martin, to that point, and then  
37 David Walker.  
38  
39 **MR. FISHER:** I think we're going to see another spike in 2015,  
40 because the water temperature has been a lot higher this year.  
41 Off of Pinellas County two weeks ago, a headboat had thirty head  
42 of kingfish on the boat, and I know a lot of my friends have been  
43 recreational fishing all the way past Thanksgiving, which is very  
44 unusual, and it was not problem to catch two fish in ten minutes,  
45 and so I think you're going to see an additional spike.  
46  
47 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** David Walker.  
48

1 **MR. WALKER:** I like the alternative of going to three fish and  
2 just seeing -- The problem is if you go to four fish and you have  
3 a problem, you will go back to two fish. It seems like it will be  
4 a lot easier for recreational fishermen to fall back one fish than  
5 telling them they've got to cut back to two fish on the king  
6 mackerel, and it's conservative, too.

7  
8 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you, David. Any further comments? We have  
9 a motion on the board for Action 9, to make the preferred  
10 alternative Alternative 2, which is to increase the bag limit to  
11 three fish per person per day. **Any opposition, one; all those in**  
12 **favor, five in favor. The motion passes.**

13  
14 I think that wraps up our discussion on Amendment 26. We have a  
15 short amount of time remaining. Ryan, why don't you go through  
16 the recommendations made by the CMP Advisory Panel, if we're ready.

17  
18 **OTHER BUSINESS**  
19 **RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY THE CMP ADVISORY PANEL**

20  
21 **MR. RINDONE:** Sure. Before we abandon 26, I want to just say that  
22 we're going to public hearings the last week of February and the  
23 first week of March, and we have nine locations. We will write  
24 that up and we're going to get that back to the South Atlantic as  
25 quickly as we can for their meeting, which is the second week of  
26 March.

27  
28 They're hoping to try to take final action on some things there.  
29 Obviously if we have some thing which we haven't had parity on  
30 yet, it might take a little bit longer to match everything up, and  
31 so it may be June before we can truly go final with this, just to  
32 give you guys an idea of timeline.

33  
34 For the remainder of the items which the CMP AP discussed, they  
35 had several things under Other Business that they wanted to talk  
36 about.

37  
38 They were concerned about the recreational bag limit for cobia. A  
39 lot of the AP members felt that cobia might be in a little bit of  
40 trouble, and so they made a motion that cobia be considered a  
41 species of high concern by the Gulf Council, and urged the council  
42 to consider reducing the possession limit to one fish per person  
43 per day, which is what they had recommended back in March. They  
44 said that this limit should sunset in five years, unless deemed  
45 otherwise necessary. Madam Chair.

46  
47 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Any discussion? Continue on, Ryan. Martha.

1 **MS. BADEMAN:** I was just going to ask a question. I mean I've  
2 been hearing a lot of this as well, and I don't know if other  
3 council members in other areas of the Gulf are. I've just been  
4 getting a lot of calls and email and questions about cobia. We're  
5 already at one in Florida, but I'm just curious.

6  
7 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** I've heard talk about in the northwest Florida  
8 area, but then other parts of the Gulf I've seen increased numbers,  
9 and so it may be migration patterns and it may be premature to  
10 act, but yes, Florida is already at one fish per day, per person.  
11 Leann.

12  
13 **MS. BOSARGE:** My question is when was our last updated assessment  
14 on cobia? Do you remember?

15  
16 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** 2011, and I know it's the lower priority on the  
17 review list.

18  
19 **MR. RINDONE:** It was 2012 was when the assessment was done. The  
20 assessment was published in 2013, but it used 2012 data, and it  
21 did Spanish mackerel and cobia. It's not currently on our list to  
22 be updated, but we are going to get updated MRIP projections of  
23 multiple stocks as a function of the effort from the Science  
24 Center, which will be done in 2017. We could get updates about  
25 cobia at that time as well.

26  
27 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you. If there's no other comments, maybe we  
28 will move forward. Ryan.

29  
30 **MR. RINDONE:** Another thing that the AP discussed was the  
31 possession of the recreational bag limit of king mackerel on a  
32 commercial vessel when the commercial king mackerel season is  
33 closed, and with this particular issue, the current federal  
34 regulations prohibit the possession of the bag limit of kingfish  
35 on a commercial vessel if the commercial season is closed and on  
36 dually-permitted for-hire vessels, unless that vessel is acting as  
37 a charter or headboat.

38  
39 The AP members thought that this rule prevented them from retaining  
40 recreationally-caught kingfish for personal consumption. Like if  
41 they're on their commercial boats when the recreational season is  
42 closed, but they're recreational fishing with their families or  
43 what have you.

44  
45 The AP made the following recommendation, that the council remove  
46 the prohibition on retaining recreational king mackerel bag limits  
47 on vessels with commercial kingfish permits, or dually-permitted  
48 charter vessels, when the king mackerel commercial season is

1 closed, but while the king mackerel recreational season is open.  
2 This carried unanimously.

3

4 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Martin, do you have any comment on this?

5

6 **MR. FISHER:** I would like the support of the committee with a  
7 motion to take it up to the full council for a vote, because it's  
8 the only fish that's left in all the fish that you guys manage, I  
9 believe, that's fished commercially and recreationally where you  
10 cannot retain a recreational bag limit when the commercial season  
11 is closed.

12

13 As a king fisherman myself, as a commercial fisherman, and I also  
14 am a recreational fisherman, I like to take my son out, or my  
15 family out or friends, and go catch some kingfish and put them in  
16 the smoker. The fact that I can't, just because I have a kingfish  
17 permit on my boat, and there is no other fish that is under the  
18 same rule and regulation, seems prohibitive to me.

19

20 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Martha and then Leann.

21

22 **MS. BADEMAN:** Those of you around the table that have some  
23 institutional knowledge here, why is this rule different for  
24 mackerel than other species? Does anybody know?

25

26 **MR. FISHER:** Years ago, the state had a rule that you could sell  
27 the recreational bag limit of kingfish when commercial was closed  
28 if those fish were caught in state waters and you had an RS. In  
29 2013, in September, as you pointed out to me at the meeting,  
30 Martha, the state changed that rule and you can now have -- How  
31 does this work? Commercial quantities. If you have commercial  
32 quantities of any fish, you're allowed a recreational bag limit of  
33 other fish. Prior to that time, you were not. I believe that had  
34 a lot to do with it.

35

36 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Leann.

37

38 **MS. BOSARGE:** I think this is something that I would support taking  
39 to the full council. I can think of some commercial fishermen in  
40 my hometown that this affects. Essentially they have center-  
41 console outboard boats and, because that boat has a permit attached  
42 to it, they can't go recreational fishing. We're denying them  
43 access, essentially, to recreational fishing for king mackerel  
44 unless they go get on a charter boat, or go get on somebody else's  
45 boat. They can't take their boat out and go recreational fish  
46 with their family for king mackerel at this point, the way this is  
47 structured.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** So is that a motion?  
2  
3 **MS. BOSARGE:** Yes, sure. **That's the motion, to take this to the**  
4 **full council to have a discussion and see if we can come to a**  
5 **consensus on this.**  
6  
7 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** We have a motion that the council remove the  
8 prohibition on retaining the recreational king mackerel bag limit  
9 on a vessel with a commercial king mackerel permit, or a dually-  
10 permitted charter vessel, when the king mackerel commercial season  
11 is closed, but while the king mackerel recreational season is open.  
12 Do I have a second? It's seconded by Martha Bademan. Any  
13 discussion? Dr. Crabtree.  
14  
15 **DR. CRABTREE:** You might give some thought about how you want to  
16 do this. Maybe you could do it through a framework or do you want  
17 to add an action in Amendment 26 that does this? I don't know if  
18 we make this change if that would have to go to the South Atlantic  
19 for approval or if we can do that on our own. There's some  
20 questions for Mara to figure out, unless maybe Ryan knows the  
21 answer.  
22  
23 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Could we, if this motion passed, could we then  
24 defer to staff at full council to have a process?  
25  
26 **DR. CRABTREE:** I think you could. I just wanted to get people  
27 thinking about how to do it.  
28  
29 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Okay. We have a motion that has been seconded.  
30 **Any opposition? The motion passes.** Ryan.  
31  
32 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Another thing that the AP  
33 discussed was modifications to electronic reporting. The AP  
34 members cited a need for completely electronic reporting for all  
35 commercial fisheries.  
36  
37 They thought we have all these tablets and iPads and all this  
38 software that's available for tabulating all sorts of data, and  
39 that, with the current technology, that fishermen should be able  
40 to electronically submit logbooks when fish are sold to the dealer,  
41 thereby decreasing the amount of time it takes for commercial  
42 landings to be compiled for the assessments. They thought it  
43 should be borderline instantaneous, with networking and with what  
44 we're capable of, from a software perspective.  
45  
46 When a no-fishing report needed to be submitted, the permit holder  
47 could go to a website and fill out the appropriate form, as  
48 applicable. The AP recommends that the council develop a dealer-

1 based point of sale electronic logbook reporting system for the  
2 commercial fishing sector, incorporated in the present IFQ  
3 reporting system or trip ticket program.

4  
5 They felt that both the IFQ system, state trip ticket programs,  
6 anything could be folded into some sort of electronic system, where  
7 perhaps you had a form which auto populated all the information  
8 for multiple different forms and satisfied the reporting  
9 requirements of all parties concerned.

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Martin, we're running over time, but do you have  
12 a comment?

13  
14 **MR. FISHER:** Yes, I do, if I may. Just I will fill in a couple of  
15 blanks. The key words are "point of sale" and "logbook". This is  
16 about filling out the logbook that we now, as fishermen, have to  
17 do by paper. We already have to meet with the dealer and give  
18 them all the information, except for two blocks on the logbook  
19 page. That goes into the electronic trip ticket program.

20  
21 The IFQ page could be modified to add a page that was non-IFQ fish,  
22 but it would populate the logbook for the Science Center. There  
23 is absolutely no reason in 2016 that we do not have electronic  
24 reporting for our logbooks.

25  
26 It takes eighteen months for the CPUE averages and numbers to come  
27 from the time I fill out a page and it goes through all the  
28 different vetting things it has to do and then Bonnie, or Bonnie's  
29 staff, actually gets the numbers and can crunch out a CPUE. We  
30 could have that CPUE in almost real time. Thank you.

31  
32 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Perhaps I can make the recommendation to have this  
33 particular motion referred to the Data Collection Committee for  
34 their consideration. I think that's a more appropriate avenue,  
35 but it's a worthy motion to consider. Leann.

36  
37 **MS. BOSARGE:** I would second that motion. That was my thought,  
38 too, that maybe that's something we could add to a Data Collection  
39 agenda at some future meeting to take a look at.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you. Okay. Ryan.

42  
43 **MR. RINDONE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. We will make sure that  
44 that's get passed along to the Data Collection Committee for a  
45 future time. The last item that the AP discussed was the  
46 incidental catch of kingfish in the Spanish mackerel gillnet  
47 fishery.

1 One AP member noted that the need for a way to sell kingfish, which  
2 are infrequently landed in Spanish mackerel gillnets, if the zone  
3 he's fishing in is closed, he needed some avenue for that.  
4 According to anecdotal information, this bycatch typically doesn't  
5 total more than about a thousand pounds of kingfish per year per  
6 Spanish mackerel gillnet fisherman. It's an occasional  
7 interaction between kingfish and the Spanish mackerel gillnets.

8  
9 Other AP members though were concerned that with some sort of  
10 incidental catch allowance that a bycatch fishery could be created  
11 amongst the Spanish mackerel gillnet fishermen for kingfish and  
12 that, if that bycatch allowance was too high, then that directed  
13 bycatch fishery could become a realized thing.

14  
15 The AP ultimately recommended to allow the retention and sale of  
16 the recreational bag limit of king mackerel caught in the Spanish  
17 mackerel gillnet fishery, even when the commercial fishery is  
18 closed. That motion carried seven to three, with the dissenting  
19 votes being those who were most concerned about the establishment  
20 of a bycatch fishery. Madam Chair.

21  
22 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Thank you. Any discussion on that item or motion?  
23 Any desire to act on it? Okay. Seeing none, I appreciate all  
24 your time, Martin Fisher. You've been standing there like a  
25 trooper and I appreciate it.

26  
27 **MR. FISHER:** Thank you very much and thanks for the opportunity.

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN DANA:** Unless there is anything else, I think this  
30 concludes the Mackerel Committee's meeting.

31  
32 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m., January 27, 2016.)

33  
34 - - -