

**Gulf Council Motions Report
January 26-29, 2015
Point Clear, Alabama**

REEF FISH COUNCIL MOTIONS

Red Snapper Update Assessment

Motion: To prepare a framework action to increase the ACL for red snapper based on the ABC recommendations by the SSC, using the provisional 2014 estimates.
Motion carried with no opposition.

Reevaluation of Gag OFL and ABC for 2015-16

Motion: To begin a framework amendment to adjust ACL/ACT and the season options for Gag.
Motion carried with no opposition.

Draft Framework Action – Greater Amberjack

Motion: In Action 1, to remove sub options 2(a) and 3(a) to considered but rejected:
Sub-Option a. No ACT buffer (i.e., ABC = ACL = ACT); note this option would require modification of the accountability measures.
Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: In Action 3, to specify trip limit in pounds gutted weight and include whole weight in parentheses for each option.
Motion carried with no opposition.

Mexican Lancha Threat Overview and Impact Analysis

Motion: To write a thank you letter to Rear Admiral Kevin Cook of the Coast Guard, copying the Secretary of Commerce, and Executive Director of TPWD thanking them for the enforcement actions relative to the foreign fishery off of Texas.
Motion carried with no opposition.

Draft Amendment 39 – Red Snapper Recreational Regional Management

Motion: That Alternative 3, in Action 1 be the preferred alternative.
Establish a regional management program in which a state or group of states (regions) submit proposals to **NMFS** describing the **conservation equivalent measures** the region will adopt for the management of its portion of the red snapper quota. Conservation

equivalency proposals would specify the red snapper season structure, bag limit, and minimum and/or maximum size limits for the harvest of an assigned portion of the recreational red snapper quota. If a region does not participate or its proposal is determined by NMFS to be inconsistent with the requirements of the regional management program selected in Action 1, the recreational harvest of red snapper in the EEZ off such region would be restricted to the federal default regulations for red snapper.

Substitute motion: Alternative 3: Establish a regional management program in which a state or group of states (regions) submit proposals to NMFS describing the conservation equivalent measures the region will adopt for the management of its portion of the red snapper quota. If a region does not participate or its proposal is determined by NMFS to be inconsistent with the requirements of the regional management program selected in Action 1, the recreational harvest of red snapper in the EEZ off such region would be restricted to the federal default regulations for red snapper.

Preferred Option a: A region **must** establish its recreational red snapper season structure.

Preferred Option b: A region **must** establish a recreational bag limit.

Preferred Option c: A region **must** establish a minimum size limit.

Preferred Option d: A region **may** establish a maximum size limit.

Preferred Option e: A region **may** establish closed areas within the EEZ adjacent to their region.

Substitute motion carried 9 to 7.

Second Substitute motion: That revised Alternative 4 in Action 1 be the preferred alternative, with options a, b, c, and d as preferred options

Alternative 4: Establish a regional management program in which a state or group of states (regions) submit proposals to a technical review committee describing the conservation equivalent measures the region will adopt for the management of its portion of the red snapper quota. The technical review committee reviews and may make recommendations on the proposal, which is either returned to the region for revision or forwarded to NMFS for final review. If a region does not participate or its proposal is determined by NMFS to be inconsistent with the requirements of the regional management program selected in Action 1, the recreational harvest of red snapper in the EEZ off such region would be restricted to the federal default regulations for red snapper.

Preferred Option a: A region **must** establish its recreational red snapper season structure.

Preferred Option b: A region **must** establish a recreational bag limit.

Preferred Option c: A region **must** establish a minimum size limit.

Preferred Option d: A region **may** establish a maximum size limit.

~~**Option e:** A region **may** establish closed areas within the EEZ adjacent to their region.~~

Second substitute motion failed 10 to 6.

Motion: That in option b in both alternatives 3 and 4, the recreational bag limit be set at 0 to 4 fish.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: That in option c in alternatives 3 and 4, regions must establish a uniform minimum size limit of 15 inches.

Motion carried 10 to 5.

Motion: To remove option d, eliminating a maximum size limit in alternatives 2, 3 and 4.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Revised Public Hearing Draft Amendment 28 – Red Snapper Allocation

Motion: For Amendment 28, Action 1, to add two alternatives:

Alternative 8 -The increase in allowable harvest (due to changes in recreational data) from the update assessment will be allocated to the recreational sector. The percentage increase for the recreational sector should be that amount attributable to recalibration of MRIP catch estimates. This would result in an increase of XXXX pounds in the recreational sector.

Alternative 9: The increase in allowable harvest (due to changes in recreational data) from the update assessment will be allocated to the recreational sector. The percentage increase in the recreational sector should be that amount attributable to recalibration of MRIP catch estimates and the change in size selectivity. This would result in an increase of XXXX pounds in the recreational sector.

Motion carried 11 to 4.

Revision to purpose and Need for Amendment 28

Motion: The purpose of this action is to evaluate reallocating, in a fair and equitable manner, red snapper resources between the commercial and recreational sector to increase the net benefits from red snapper fishing.

The need for the proposed actions is to base sector allocations on the best scientific information available and use the most appropriate allocation method to determine sector allocations, while achieving optimum yield, particularly with respect to food production and recreational opportunities, and rebuilding the red snapper stock.

Motion carried by voice vote.

Report of the Ad Hoc For-Hire Red Snapper AP

Motion: To convene the Ad Hoc Red Snapper for For-Hire AP to provide recommendations to the Council.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: That the Council create an Ad Hoc Reef Fish Headboat AP. The charge will be to evaluate the EFP program and consider the future continuation of the current program with the intent of expanding to full participation for that industry.

Substitute motion: That the Council create an Ad Hoc Reef Fish Headboat AP. The charge will be determined after the Headboat EFP report is presented.
Substitute motion carried by voice vote.

Motion: To begin the development of an amendment, considering a wide range of management approaches to improve flexibility and accountability in the federal charter for-hire component.
Motion carried by voice vote.

Motion: To begin the development of an amendment, considering a wide range of management approaches, to improve flexibility and accountability in the federal headboat component.
Motion carried by voice vote.

Other Agenda Item Motions:

Motion: To remove red snapper SPR consideration from the status determination document and request Council staff develop a plan amendment to adjust the F_{SPR} levels for red snapper to alternatives for: status quo, $F_{SPR24\%}$, $F_{SPR22\%}$, F_{MAX} ($F_{SPR20\%}$). The plan amendment should also determine the timeline for $F_{Rebuild}$ at each F_{SPR} .

Substitute motion: To remove red snapper SPR consideration from the status determination document and request Council staff develop a plan amendment to adjust the F_{SPR} levels for red snapper to alternatives for: status quo, $F_{SPR40\%}$, $F_{SPR30\%}$, $F_{SPR24\%}$, $F_{SPR22\%}$, F_{MAX} ($F_{SPR20\%}$). The plan amendment should also determine the timeline for $F_{Rebuild}$ at each F_{SPR} .
Substitute motion carried with no opposition.

MACKEREL COUNCIL MOTIONS

Scoping Document for CMP Amendment 26

Motion: To recommend that Amendment 26 go out to scoping.
Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: Proposed Scoping Hearing locations –
Galveston and Port Aransas, Texas
Mobile, Alabama
Biloxi, Mississippi
Kenner or Grand Isle, Louisiana
Key West, Tampa Bay, and Panama City, Florida

Substitute motion: Proposed Scoping Hearing locations –
Galveston, Port Aransas, and San Antonio, Texas
Mobile, Alabama
Biloxi, Mississippi
Grand Isle, Louisiana
Key West, Tampa Bay area, and Panama City, Florida
Substitute motion carried without opposition

Scoping Document for CMP Amendment 28

Motion: To move forward with Scoping Hearings on CMP Amendment 28 at the same meetings as CMP Amendment 26.
Motion carried with no opposition.

Gillnet Fisheries Issues

Motion: To create a framework action plan to evaluate alternative gillnet trip limits and accountability measures and elimination of latent permits to minimize the potential for enforcement action due to accidental trip limit overages.
Motion carried with no opposition.

DATA COLLECTION COUNCIL MOTIONS

Motion: That the Data Committee directed staff to begin developing a plan amendment that would require electronic logbooks for the charter for-hire vessels in the Gulf and South Atlantic that considers the use of VMS and other recommendations from the Joint Council Technical Subcommittee report.
Motion carried with no opposition.

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY COUNCIL MOTIONS

Update on AP & SSC Appointment Process

Motion: To integrate the 3 SSCs, which currently total 35 members, into a single Standing SSC of 18 individuals with the following approximate multi-disciplinary structure:

- Not less than 7 stock assessment or quantitative biologists/ecologists,
- 3 ecosystem scientists,
- 3 economists,
- 3 quantitative anthropologists/sociologists,
- 1 environmentalist scientist, and
- 1 other scientist from one of the above disciplines or from some other field.

Substitute Motion: To integrate the 3 SSCs, which currently total 35 members, into a single Standing SSC of 18 individuals with the following approximate multi-disciplinary structure:

- Not less than 7 stock assessment or quantitative biologists/ecologists,
- 3 ecosystem scientists,
- 3 economists,
- 3 quantitative anthropologists/sociologists,
- 2 other scientists

Substitute motion carried by voice vote.

Motion: Create a Special Socioeconomic SSC to be comprised of 2 economists and 2 anthropologists / sociologists.

Motion carried by voice vote.

Motion: To limit the size of the Special SSCs to no more than five members each.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: Postpone Selection of the SSC appointments until June, 2015 due to the 45-day lead time needed for SOFI's to be submitted and to reduce potential confusion and workload during the transition to staggered terms and the online application process.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: Discontinue the Private Recreational Data Collection AP and integrate its function into the Data Collection AP.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: That in the first Council meeting of each year, the Council evaluate each Ad Hoc Advisory Panel, and if they deem the panel has completed its assignment, that the panel will be disbanded.

Motion carried with no opposition.

Motion: Eliminate the three State Habitat APs.

Motion carried with no opposition