

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

251ST MEETING

WEBINAR

March 3, 2015

VOTING MEMBERS

- Kevin Anson (designee for Chris Blankenship).....Alabama
- Martha Bademan (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
- Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- Doug Boyd.....Texas
- Roy Crabtree.....NMFS, SERO, St. Petersburg, Florida
- Pamela Dana.....Florida
- Dale Diaz (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
- Myron Fischer (designee for Randy Pausina).....Louisiana
- Johnny Greene.....Alabama
- Campo Matens.....Louisiana
- Harlon Pearce.....Louisiana
- Corky Perret.....Mississippi
- Robin Riechers.....Texas
- John Sanchez.....Florida
- Greg Stunz.....Texas
- David Walker.....Alabama
- Roy Williams.....Florida

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

- Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC

STAFF

- Steven Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
- Doug Gregory.....Executive Director
- Beth Hager.....Financial Assistant/IT Coordinator
- Morgan Kilgour.....Fishery Biologist
- Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
- Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- Emily Muehlstein.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist
- Charlene Ponce.....Public Information Officer
- Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- Charlotte Schiaffo.....Research & Human Resource Librarian
- Amanda Thomas.....Transcriptionist

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

- Tom Adams.....
- Jason Adriance.....
- Kent Alphonso.....

1 Pam Anderson.....Panama City, FL
2 Adam Bailey.....NOAA
3 Jeff Barger.....Ocean Conservancy
4 Chris Blankenship.....AL
5 Heather Blough.....NOAA
6 Susan Boggs.....Orange Beach, AL
7 Mark Bollinger.....
8 Eric Brazer.....Reef Fish Shareholder's Alliance
9 Steve Branstetter.....NOAA
10 Anthony Bresnen.....FWC
11 J.P. Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL
12 Lindslee Brunson.....
13 B C.....
14 William Venney Cable.....
15 Shannon Calay.....SEFSC
16 Michael Christopher.....
17 Anik Clemens.....NOAA
18 Jim Clements.....Carrabelle, FL
19 Bill Cochrane.....Galveston, TX
20 Richard Csuhata.....
21 George Davis.....
22 Michael Drexler.....Ocean Conservancy
23 Trent Dykes.....
24 David Eggeman.....
25 John Ewald.....NOAA
26 Nick Farmer.....NOAA
27 Elizabeth Fetherston.....Ocean Conservancy
28 Brett Fitzgerald.....
29 Melissa Ford.....
30 Kevin Frank.....
31 Stephanie Freed.....
32 Brad Gentner.....
33 Robert Gill.....FL
34 Keith Guindon.....
35 Dennorris Hall.....
36 Chad Hanson.....Pew Charitable Trusts
37 Steven Head.....
38 Steve Heath.....
39 Frank Helies.....
40 Charles Heller.....
41 John Hexter.....
42 Darrell Hingle.....Galveston, TX
43 Stephen Holiman.....NOAA
44 Peter Hood.....NOAA
45 John Inzetta.....
46 David Kilmartin.....
47 Tyler Knox.....
48 Terril Kyzar.....

1 Eric Mahoney.....
2 Rich Malinowski.....NOAA
3 Jared Manning.....
4 Shelly Marshall.....
5 Sharon McBreen.....Pew Charitable Trusts
6 Kristen McConnell.....EDF
7 Cynthia Meyer.....NOAA
8 Janet Miller.....NOAA
9 K P.....
10 Coe Parker.....
11 Steve Papan.....
12 Will Patterson.....GMFMC SSC
13 Todd Phillips.....Ocean Conservancy
14 Clifton Quiggins.....
15 Tracy Redding.....AL
16 Skip Roberts.....
17 Lance Robinson.....TX
18 Mike Salley.....
19 Blake Schindler.....
20 Ed Schroeder.....
21 Michelle Sempsrott.....FWC
22 Jeff Sharnowski.....
23 Joe Shepard.....LA
24 Brooke Shipley-Lozano.....TPWD
25 Thomas Sminkey.....NOAA
26 Carly Somerset.....MS
27 Jessica Stephen.....NOAA
28 Ret Talbot.....
29 Bill Teehan.....FL
30 Steve Tomeny.....Port Fourchon, LA
31 Russell Underwood.....Panama City, FL
32 Ted Venker.....CCA
33 Michelle Walker-Harmon.....
34 Wayne Werner.....Alachua, FL
35 Thomas Wheatley.....Pew Charitable Trusts
36 Daniel Willard.....EDF
37 Chris Wilson.....Pensacola, FL
38 Carolyn Wood.....
39 Bob Zales.....Panama City, FL
40
41
42

- - -

43 The Full Council of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management
44 Council convened via webinar, Tuesday afternoon, March 3, 2015,
45 and was called to order at 1:10 p.m. by Chairman Kevin Anson.
46

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

48

1 **CHAIRMAN KEVIN ANSON:** Thank you everyone out there. This is
2 unusual circumstances, but we have some important business to
3 take care of, I think, with this webinar and hopefully it will
4 go as smoothly as possible. Welcome to the webinar. I am
5 going to read the opening statement and then we will go through
6 the agenda.

7
8 Welcome to the 252nd meeting of the Gulf Council. My name is
9 Kevin Anson, Chairman of the Council. The Gulf Council is one
10 of eight regional councils established in 1976 by the Fishery
11 Conservation and Management Act, known today as the Magnuson-
12 Stevens Act. The council's purpose is to serve as a
13 deliberative body to advise the Secretary of Commerce on fishery
14 management measures in the federal waters of the Gulf of Mexico.
15 These measures help ensure that fishery resources in the Gulf
16 are sustained, while providing the best overall benefit to the
17 nation.

18
19 The council has seventeen voting members, eleven of whom are
20 appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and include individuals
21 from a range of geographical areas in the Gulf of Mexico and
22 with experience in various aspects of fisheries.

23
24 The membership also includes the five state fishery managers
25 from each Gulf State and the Regional Administrator from NOAA
26 Southeast Fisheries Service, as well as several non-voting
27 members. Public input is a vital part of the council's
28 deliberative process and comments, both oral and written, are
29 accepted and considered by the council throughout the process.

30
31 The Sustainable Fisheries Act requires that all statements
32 include a brief description of the background and interest of
33 the persons in the subject of the statement. All written
34 information shall include a statement of the source and date of
35 such information.

36
37 Oral or written communications provided to the council, its
38 members or its staff, that relate to matters within the
39 council's purview are public in nature. All written comments
40 will be posted on the council's website for viewing by council
41 members and the public and will be maintained by the council as
42 a part of the permanent record.

43
44 Knowingly and willfully submitting false information to the
45 council is a violation of federal law. A digital recording is
46 used for the public record and therefore, for the purpose of
47 voice identification, Doug Gregory is going to handle the roll
48 call at this time.

1
2 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG GREGORY:** Please unmute yourself and
3 then respond "present" when I call your name and mute yourself
4 again. Roy Williams.
5
6 **MR. ROY WILLIAMS:** I am here, Doug.
7
8 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Roy Crabtree.
9
10 **DR. ROY CRABTREE:** I am here.
11
12 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Martha Bademan.
13
14 **MS. MARTHA BADEMAN:** I'm here.
15
16 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Okay. Pam Dana is here. Right now
17 she's in the Mackerel AP meeting right next door, the next room,
18 and so she will be here. John Sanchez. We have found where the
19 reverb is coming from. John, it's your computer, however you've
20 got it set up. The next person is David Walker.
21
22 **MR. DAVID WALKER:** I am here.
23
24 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Johnny Greene.
25
26 **MR. JOHNNY GREENE:** I am here.
27
28 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Leann Bosarge.
29
30 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** I am here.
31
32 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Corky Perret.
33
34 **MR. CORKY PERRET:** I am here.
35
36 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Dale Diaz.
37
38 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** Present.
39
40 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Harlon Pearce.
41
42 **MR. HARLON PEARCE:** I am here.
43
44 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Camp Matens?
45
46 **MR. CAMP MATENS:** Okay.
47
48 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Myron Fischer.

1
2 **MR. MYRON FISCHER:** Myron is here.

3
4 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Next on the list is Doug Boyd.

5
6 **MR. DOUG BOYD:** Doug Boyd is here.

7
8 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Greg Stunz.

9
10 **DR. GREG STUNZ:** I am here.

11
12 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Robin Riechers.

13
14 **MR. ROBIN RIECHERS:** I am here and Lance is also here.

15
16 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Now everybody can mute themselves
17 and, Kevin, everyone is here.

18
19 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

20
21 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Great and, again, welcome everyone. Before we
22 go much farther, let's talk a little bit about how we're going
23 to handle this. We're going to go through the agenda and adopt
24 the agenda and what we talked about, Doug and I, before we
25 started the webinar today, was to have everybody present the
26 individual items as listed. For instance, Dr. Patterson would
27 give the SSC Summary and then after each presentation, if people
28 had questions, to go ahead and indicate as such.

29
30 Robin is having some communication there in the chat box and if
31 you just type "yes" in the chat box, you will be called upon and
32 so if you have any questions as we go through or if you want to
33 make a comment on something, please type in the chat box that
34 you want to speak or comment and then Doug, since he's in the
35 office -- I tried to make it there in the office today, but the
36 flight was canceled due to weather and so I am relying upon Doug
37 to pretty much handle the meeting for me as far as who to call
38 on and so that's how we're going to handle it.

39
40 With that being said, we have an agenda that's Tab A, Number 1.
41 Hopefully everyone has that in front of them and has had a
42 chance to review it. Are there any changes to the agenda?

43
44 We have a motion to adopt the agenda as written from Roy
45 Williams and it's been seconded by Johnny. Is there any
46 discussion to adopt the agenda as written? Any opposed to
47 adopting the agenda as written? The agenda is adopted. That
48 takes us to Tab A, Number 2, the SSC Summary. Dr. Patterson,

1 are you ready?

2

3 **DISCUSSION OF FRAMEWORK ACTION TO REVISE RED SNAPPER QUOTAS**
4 **SSC SUMMARY**

5

6 **DR. WILL PATTERSON:** I thought I would cover a couple of slides
7 from Shannon's presentation to us as well, to kind of frame the
8 context of this. Is my screen being shown?

9

10 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Yes.

11

12 **DR. PATTERSON:** Okay and so I'm not going to go through all of
13 the slides from Shannon Calay's presentation to us on our
14 webinar from February 19, but I would like to go through a
15 couple, because I think they're going to be important for some
16 of the issues the SSC discussed.

17

18 This second slide of her presentation includes a timeline of
19 landings estimates and it just shows that on December 3 that
20 landings through 2013 were available for the update assessment.
21 December 29, that update was submitted to the SSC and on January
22 8, that update was presented at the last SSC meeting, not
23 including the webinar. On January 22, provisional total
24 landings for commercial and recreational were available and so
25 that was after the SSC meeting.

26

27 January 26, update assessment and preliminary run with the
28 provisional 2014 total landings were presented to the Gulf
29 Council and that's when the discussion ensued about how to have
30 the SSC comment or weigh in on using these provisional landings
31 and whether the OFL and ABC might change.

32

33 February 6, updated provisional 2014 landings were available by
34 fishing mode and region, which is important for the assessment,
35 and then February 19, there was an updated run presented with
36 provisional 2014 landings presented to the SSC.

37

38 The next slide here from Shannon's presentation just indicates
39 the various sorts of information for recreational, because the
40 recreational landings, provisional landings, were more uncertain
41 than the commercial and one of the issues you will see at the
42 bottom -- There are two tables here and so we have 2014
43 provisional recreational landings estimated by various surveys
44 and we have MRIP, the Louisiana Creel Survey, the NMFS Headboat
45 Survey, and then Texas Parks and Wildlife Department Creel
46 Survey.

47

48 In particular, MRIP -- We didn't have information for the last

1 wave, Wave 6, November 1 through December 31. However, and this
2 is the bottom table there, the comment was that no landings were
3 reported by MRIP during Wave 6 from 2013 and so perhaps we're
4 okay there.

5
6 Then the other issue is that for Texas Parks and Wildlife there
7 were no provisional recreational landings available from May 16th
8 through December 31st and so, because of that, the 2013
9 information provided was utilized and so that includes 41,801
10 fish and 228,344 pounds of fish. That was what was estimated by
11 Texas for that second half of the year of 2013 and then was
12 utilized here as a proxy for 2014.

13
14 We had quite a bit of discussion about that uncertainty and one
15 of the things that kind of sparked that is if you just look at
16 the top table, you see the Louisiana Creel, for example, and we
17 saw almost 77,000 fish estimated at landings and then, when you
18 go down to Texas, it only shows 5,329.

19
20 There was some discussion about whether that was an accurate
21 number and Shannon checked back with information that was
22 forwarded to her by Andy Strelcheck and confirmed that
23 information was accurate and then we discussed that was only
24 from the first half of the year, but for a fishery that was open
25 in state waters during that time period, there was still some
26 question about the low number.

27
28 Then if you take the 2013 proxy of 41,801 and add it to the
29 5,000, you come up with about 42,000 fish and it's still about
30 half of what was estimated to be caught in Louisiana during 2014
31 and so we had some discussion and another part of the discussion
32 was the mean weight of landings in Texas. It was quite a bit
33 lower than either Louisiana or Gulf-wide and so that was part of
34 the discussion about the data.

35
36 Really, we just wanted to make sure there wasn't any type of --
37 Whether data were transposed incorrectly, but, again, Shannon
38 checked with the numbers from Andy and confirmed that these were
39 the numbers as reported from Texas.

40
41 Another concern, and, actually, I am going skip here to the
42 report, because this is broken out right before the first motion
43 in the report and so basically this top paragraph says the
44 following factors contribute uncertainties to projections made
45 with these provisional landings.

46
47 First, the final landings estimates will not be available
48 probably until June or later of 2015. However, based on

1 previous years, changes between provisional and final landings
2 estimates have been small and so Andy then checked on what was
3 meant by small and he said it's typically less than a 5 percent
4 change between the provisional and the final landings estimates
5 and so we didn't feel like that was a large percentage.

6
7 Next was this issue about the average weight of recreational
8 catches from Texas and so the average weight for 2014 seemed low
9 at 4.4 pounds, compared to 5.5 pounds from May 16 to December 31
10 of 2013.

11
12 Again, we had NMFS staff go back and look at the information
13 they had and they confirmed it was accurate and so there was
14 some discussion about the magnitude of the Texas landings and
15 whether that was accurate forwarded from Andy and then also the
16 mean weight of the landings was another thing. Again, both of
17 those were confirmed from Strelcheck.

18
19 Then, lastly, discards in 2014 were assumed to continue at 2013
20 levels and there is another statement here that says projections
21 for 2015 and beyond may require further revisions until discard
22 estimates are finalized.

23
24 We probably could have phrased that a little differently and
25 just said that these provisional landings will have this added
26 bit of uncertainty because the total kill in 2014, we are
27 borrowing the discard information from 2013 still and so we
28 would rather have had discard, both dead discard and live
29 discard, information available for 2014, in order to use those
30 provisional data. However, that wasn't available.

31
32 Based on all of this review and examination of Shannon's
33 information and analysis, the SSC passed a motion without
34 opposition that reads: The red snapper SEDAR-31 update
35 assessment model run with updated provisional 2014 recreational
36 landings estimates represents the best scientific information
37 available and is suitable for management advice.

38
39 From there, we looked at the OFL, using the currently adopted
40 MSY proxy, and ABC, using the same methodology we used to
41 compute ABC previously, and this is the table that resulted and
42 so here we have year, OFL, and ABC. That table here is at the
43 bottom of the page.

44
45 The motion was to set 2015, 2016, and 2017 OFL and ABC for red
46 snapper according to the values presented in the table below and
47 so OFL is 16.13 in 2015 and in 2016, it's 15.32 and in 2017,
48 it's 14.80 and then ABCs for those years being 14.30, 13.96, and

1 13.74. This motion passed with one in opposition. That's
2 basically the gist of what we discussed and the report that was
3 produced, including these two motions.
4

5 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Will. I have a couple of questions
6 for you. First would be Roy Williams, followed by Corky.
7

8 **MR. WILLIAMS:** I don't have anything. I'm sorry, but I don't
9 have anything.
10

11 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Sorry about that then. Corky, go ahead.
12

13 **MR. PERRET:** I am curious about the weight of the Texas fish at
14 whatever it was, 4.4, compared to some of the other estimates.
15 Did anybody look -- I don't know how many headboats in Texas are
16 in the headboat program, but did anybody compare the Parks and
17 Wildlife average weights with the headboat catch, to see if it
18 was similar or how different they were?
19

20 **DR. PATTERSON:** No, that question didn't come up in the webinar.
21 I don't know if it's been looked at outside of that, but that's
22 a good point and another comparison that could have been made,
23 but we did not discuss that.
24

25 **MR. PERRET:** Another follow-up question. That's the only area
26 of the Gulf -- You used region, but that's the only region that
27 had that lower average sized fish, was that area of Texas during
28 that period of time? Was that correct?
29

30 **DR. PATTERSON:** There was some variability among regions, but
31 that was by far the lowest estimated mean weight.
32

33 **MR. PERRET:** Thank you. I suggest that Mr. Gregory or whoever
34 the appropriate people are may want to look at Texas headboats
35 and see how it compares with Parks and Wildlife data. Thank
36 you, all.
37

38 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Corky. I next have Dale.
39

40 **MR. DIAZ:** I've just got a question, just to be clear in my own
41 mind and make sure I'm correct. I know all the state directors
42 at one time sent in asking for another stock assessment in the
43 next year and we went back and forth the last meeting I was at,
44 but I was not at the January meeting and where are we at now as
45 far as when will the next red snapper stock assessment occur,
46 whether it's a standard or a full or whichever level of stock
47 assessment we will see again?
48

1 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I can try and look at my notes, but, Doug, if
2 you have someone there from staff that might be able to provide
3 that answer, but we'll get that to you as soon as possible,
4 Dale. Is there anyone else who has any questions for Dr.
5 Patterson? David Walker, you have a question, I think.

6
7 **MR. WALKER:** Will, did you have much discussion about the
8 inconsistent seasons?

9
10 **DR. PATTERSON:** I am not sure what you're asking, David.
11 Inconsistent in what way?

12
13 **MR. WALKER:** As far as the different states having different
14 state openings. I think Florida is looking at seventy days
15 right now for this year and I just wondered if there was
16 discussion of the inconsistent fishing seasons for different
17 states.

18
19 **DR. PATTERSON:** No, in this case we were just simply looking at
20 what the landings estimates were and I guess part of the
21 discussion with trying to rectify some of the perceived
22 differences among the states and what has been reported is
23 trying to get a handle on when fisheries are actually open, open
24 in state waters versus federal waters.

25
26 There was some discussion of that in the context of why we have
27 some landings reported from some periods and not from others,
28 but otherwise, we didn't really get into the states and how
29 they're managing state waters versus federal waters.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Does anyone else have any questions for Dr.
32 Patterson? Leann.

33
34 **MS. BOSARGE:** Dr. Patterson, I was looking through the report
35 and I see where there was a discussion about possibly using that
36 constant catch, because of the uncertainties involved, and it
37 says you all had a discussion about it and you decided that
38 since this was the best scientific information available that
39 you decided to go with the motion that takes it at face value,
40 essentially, the 2015, 2016, and 2017 OFL and ABC.

41
42 I want to make sure I understand what, because I was not on that
43 call, the discussion -- Essentially what you're saying is you
44 took the Texas information and the other pieces of information
45 at face value and used them for what they were and so any
46 uncertainty that we may have about maybe some of those numbers,
47 that has to be put into our management uncertainty and what we
48 decide to do on this Action 1 and that's how that uncertainty is

1 going to be accounted for, through the management perspective,
2 as opposed to the scientific uncertainty? That was your
3 recommendation?

4
5 **DR. PATTERSON:** There is a lot to that. Uncertainty is quite
6 the word here. We fully recognize that there is a considerable
7 amount of uncertainty, one, in using provisional instead of
8 finalized estimates. There is uncertainty also by using the
9 proxy for 2013 for half the year for Texas, the proxy of 2013
10 for 2014. Then there is some uncertainty obviously in the mean
11 size of the fish reported in Texas versus other places.

12
13 There was a presentation I gave to you guys a couple meetings
14 back about whether the current ABC rule adequately captures the
15 broad suite of uncertainties that are available, that are
16 possible. That's one aspect of this and so we do indicate that
17 there is some uncertainty that perhaps we're not fully
18 accounting for here.

19
20 However, the issue about whether to recommend a constant ABC or
21 to recommend an ABC based on the control rule, the discussion
22 here was basically that the council didn't give us specific
23 instructions to recommend a constant ABC and so the predominant
24 view was, given the fact that you guys didn't give us specific
25 instructions on a constant ABC, we provided you the ABC by year
26 that came out of the control rule.

27
28 Whether you decide to adopt a constant ACL or ACT, that's
29 obviously your decision, but since you didn't give us specific
30 instructions to provide you a constant ABC, we gave you the
31 control rule ABC. This wasn't really related to the issue of
32 uncertainty and uncertainties about these provisional catch
33 estimates. That was basically we gave you this because we
34 weren't asked for a constant ABC scenario.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Let me have a few here. Doug or Steven, did
37 you -- I see your comment, Doug. The next red snapper stock
38 assessment is currently scheduled to be a standard assessment in
39 2017. Dale, that answers your question. Steven, did you want
40 to add anything else to your statement that you provided in the
41 chat box?

42
43 **MR. STEVEN ATRAN:** No, I had an older SEDAR schedule than Doug
44 did. Doug's information is more up-to-date than mine.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you and so that will take us next to
47 Robin and then Doug Boyd and Corky.

48

1 **MR. RIECHERS:** (The comment is not audible on the recording.)
2
3 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** We will go to Doug Boyd.
4
5 **MR. BOYD:** My question is that there was one dissenting vote on
6 this motion and I wondered if the dissenting vote was a vote
7 against the OFL and then the ABC or was it a dissenting vote
8 based on some component before you got to the final ABC and OFL?
9 Does that make sense?
10
11 **DR. PATTERSON:** Your question makes sense, but I don't have the
12 information to answer that. We typically don't ask folks'
13 rationale for dissenting votes and so I don't even know who the
14 dissenter was. I think the important thing is that it was
15 nearly unanimous.
16
17 **MR. BOYD:** Okay and I just wondered if there was some component
18 that was in question or maybe if it was based on the weights and
19 they were dissenting because they didn't like the way the
20 weights were done or felt like there was incomplete data or
21 something like that. I wasn't really trying to question who the
22 dissenter was, but more --
23
24 **DR. PATTERSON:** I couldn't tell you what their rationale was,
25 because I don't even know who the dissenter was. Maybe if I
26 knew who cast that vote, if they said something specifically
27 about why they cast that vote, but I don't even know who that
28 voter was and so I'm not -- I wouldn't even begin to try to
29 recreate what their rationale was.
30
31 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Steven, I see you have a comment on the
32 dissenting vote.
33
34 **MR. ATRAN:** Yes and if you read the SSC summary, there was
35 initially a motion made to set ABC at a constant catch level
36 equal to the smallest OFLs and ABCs for that three-year period
37 and that person felt that, as I recall, that because of the
38 uncertainties that were previously outlined that the SSC should
39 go with the more conservative level of holding a constant catch
40 at that lower ABC and I believe that person was the one who cast
41 the dissenting vote when the substitute motion was made to pass
42 ABCs that were directly correlated to the OFLs.
43
44 **DR. PATTERSON:** Again, that's possible. It's supposition,
45 because we don't have it recorded, and so that is a possibility.
46
47 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. I have Corky and then, Robin, I
48 will try to come back to you after Corky.

1
2 **MR. PERRET:** Will, we can talk about uncertainties of all types,
3 management and biological and so on and so forth, but just
4 looking at a fishery where we're talking a harvest of some
5 eleven to now thirteen or fourteen-million pounds and I'm
6 looking at these numbers on the uncertainty on the size of Texas
7 fish.

8
9 We're over by about a pound average per fish and if you look at
10 the number of fish taken by Texas, we're still talking about a
11 very, very, very small percentage of the overall take and so, to
12 me, that's a very minor uncertainty, that one-pound difference
13 basis, based on the number of fish that are taken in Texas. Do
14 you agree with that statement or not?

15
16 **DR. PATTERSON:** Well, if you frame it as one-pound, in the
17 context of the weight of my pickup truck, one-pound isn't a
18 whole lot, but when you couch it in the weight of a five-pound
19 average, one-pound is 20 percent of the weight of the fish.

20
21 In that case, I think it does make a difference and can be
22 substantial and that's why we spent so much time discussing that
23 data point and made sure to confirm that in fact we had the
24 numbers right that were conveyed through Andy Strelcheck to
25 Shannon.

26
27 **MR. PERRET:** Okay and I just respectfully disagree. I guess
28 that's an uncertainty, but if you look at the percentage of the
29 total recreational catch taken by Texas, the number of fish, and
30 multiply that by that one-pound, we are talking about a small
31 percentage compared to the whole of your pickup truck. Thank
32 you though.

33
34 **DR. PATTERSON:** Fair enough.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Corky. It looks like -- Robin, are
37 you able to get on now?

38
39 **MR. RIECHERS:** (The comment is not audible on the recording.)

40
41 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** There is an echo, but that's not as bad as it
42 was before. I take that back. It is bad. I sent you a
43 recommendation just a minute ago and I don't know if you saw it
44 or not to manage your sidebar there. That helped me the other
45 day, by making sure that the appropriate audio source was
46 checked. I will try you again in one second, but, Dale, you had
47 a question?

48

1 **MR. DIAZ:** Yes and, Dr. Patterson, I noticed in the report, like
2 Leann was talking about, when you all talked about constant
3 catch this time that you recommend the lowest of the three
4 years, but in the past when we have asked for a constant catch,
5 how did you all do it in the past whenever we've asked for that?
6

7 **DR. PATTERSON:** I think the first thing to note here is that we
8 didn't recommend a constant catch. The original motion was
9 crafted using the rationale that in the recent past the council
10 has chosen to go with a constant ACL for red snapper and so I
11 think what was presented was in the context of that recent past
12 and the council having expressed interest in using a constant
13 catch scenario, but since we didn't have a term of reference
14 asking us for a constant catch ABC, one wasn't computed by the
15 Southeast Fisheries Science Center.
16

17 Given the fact that we didn't have one computed across our time
18 series of three years, the only other way -- One way or I
19 shouldn't say the only other way, but one way to provide the
20 council with a constant catch scenario for ABC would just be to
21 take the lowest among the three years, because using the control
22 rule, none -- 13.74 would be the ABC resulting in year three and
23 the ABC from the previous two years wouldn't exceed that. 13.74
24 wouldn't exceed what came out of the control rule.
25

26 I think that was the rationale for using 13.74 in the first
27 motion that was offered for ABC, but this substitute motion was
28 quickly offered and had quite a bit of support.
29

30 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Any other questions to Dr. Patterson? Robin,
31 do you think you might want to try it again?
32

33 **MR. RIECHERS:** (The comment is not audible on the recording.)
34

35 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Robin, I can't hear you if you're trying to
36 speak. I don't see any other questions and maybe we can come
37 back to Robin and he can make his comments a little bit later.
38 That will take us to our next item and that will be Review of
39 Framework Action and Steven Atran. Steven, are you ready with
40 Tab A, Number 3?
41

42 **MR. ATRAN:** Yes, I can. Can you either give me control of the
43 screen or put up the framework action and start on page 3? I
44 wanted to point something out. Can you folks see my screen?
45

46 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I can see it.
47

48 **MR. ATRAN:** This is a table that's in the framework action and I

1 just wanted to show this to give you an idea of what the history
2 of catches relative to the allocations look like. These
3 catches, and the ones with the overages are highlighted in red,
4 on the recreational side are converted to MRIP-equivalent values
5 for the earlier years and it's a little bit like comparing
6 apples to oranges, because we're comparing MRIP-converted
7 landings to quotas that were based upon the old MRFSS method,
8 but still you can see that almost every year since we started
9 the allocations in 1991, the recreational sector has gone over
10 its allocation.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Steven, I am sorry to interrupt, but I do see
13 Leann had a question and hopefully Will is still on the phone.
14 Will had a question and then I can read maybe what Robin had --
15 About what his comments were and Roy Williams might have a
16 question. Leann, did you want to ask your question?

17
18 **MS. BOSARGE:** Yes and I was wondering -- I am leaning back and
19 forth, as we look forward into Action 1, between this constant
20 catch scenario and then the Alternative 2. I wanted Will's
21 perspective and it sounds like we did not specifically ask them
22 to examine a constant catch scenario and therefore, we have the
23 motion that was made for these OFLs and ABCs.

24
25 Will, if you think -- If we had asked you to look at a constant
26 catch, what do you think the discussion would have been? Do you
27 think that would have encompassed the uncertainties that we're
28 looking at more accurately than the Alternative 2?

29
30 **DR. PATTERSON:** No, I think the uncertainties are in the data
31 themselves and so I don't think, as far as the scientific
32 uncertainty, being asked for a constant catch versus a constant
33 fishing mortality rate scenario really would have impacted the
34 uncertainties in any respect.

35
36 It's simply averaging, in a sense, what that mortality is across
37 three years instead of doing it year-by-year. One of the
38 greatest uncertainties in this is the difference between east
39 and west.

40
41 I have brought this up in past presentations on the red snapper
42 stock assessments, but the SSC recommended in 2009 that the
43 rationale for east/west assessments implies east/west
44 populations and the SSC recommended that the east and the west
45 be managed separately based on the biological information that
46 indicated east and west subunits existed and the way that's
47 captured in how the stock is assessed.

48

1 One of the biggest uncertainties is what is going on in the east
2 and when we presented the assessment results, it was shown that
3 recent years of low recruitment in the east -- Hopefully that's
4 a temporary issue, but it has persisted now for four years. If
5 it is temporary and perhaps recruitment will tick up here
6 shortly, then that will affect projections.

7
8 If you will recall, the projections are made -- One of the
9 methodological details of the projections is that the recent
10 recruitment -- An average of that recent recruitment is
11 projected forward and so one of the reasons that the Gulf
12 biomass, the eastern Gulf biomass, is not estimated to recover
13 like what is happening in the west, is because that recent low
14 recruitment is being projected forward.

15
16 If recruitment improves, then that projection should improve as
17 well, but using the methods that have been used in the past, it
18 leads us to that projecting to the out years of a very low stock
19 size in the east and so that really is the biggest source of
20 uncertainty, from my perspective, is that difference between
21 east and west and what's going on in the east, especially with
22 low recruitment.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** There are a couple of comments that are made.
25 I will try Robin one more time. You have a chat box comment,
26 but do you want to try your phone one more time? He still seems
27 to have some difficulty and so, Mara, your comment, was that
28 related to the table that Steven was presenting or was that
29 related to one of the tables that Dr. Patterson was talking
30 about?

31
32 **MS. MARA LEVY:** The table in the document that Steven was
33 presenting.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Can you repeat that? The volume was low and I
36 could barely hear you.

37
38 **MS. LEVY:** The table in the document that Steven was presenting.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Johnny Greene, you have a question
41 for Dr. Patterson?

42
43 **MR. GREENE:** Will, you said the recruitment was low over the
44 last four years and what was the recruitment like before that?
45 Was it comparable to the western Gulf or no or any idea?

46
47 **DR. PATTERSON:** In both regions, from maybe the late 1990s to
48 the later 2000s, there was increasing recruitment from both

1 sides of the basin and spawning stock biomass was tracking quite
2 nicely. The east was growing at a faster rate than the west,
3 because the west had been higher when you guys started some more
4 restrictive management measures in the mid-2000s and so the east
5 really came along quite quickly.

6
7 Both the east and the west had a low recruitment event in 2008,
8 which was a very wet year, but then recruitment quickly
9 recovered in the west and there is lot of variability in those
10 recruitment time series, but recruitment recovered in the west
11 and continued to track upward, while in the east -- 2009 was a
12 little bit of an uptick, but then 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013
13 have all been low.

14
15 One thing that Shannon Calay pointed out in her presentation is
16 that the benchmark, the recent benchmark for red snapper, the
17 most recent assessment, showed an estimated recruitment for 2010
18 of being really low, I think the lowest in the time series.

19
20 She pointed out that once you have year classes in the fishery -
21 - Once that year class had recruited to the fishery and you had
22 some information in the catch at age matrix coming from the
23 fishery-dependent data that that 2010 year class recruitment
24 wasn't estimated to be quite as low as it was previously, when
25 there wasn't any catch at age matrix information, as that year
26 class moved into the fishery.

27
28 It could be that these 2011, 2012, and 2013, similarly, will be
29 perceived to be higher recruitment once we have some catch at
30 age matrix information on those cohorts as well, but for right
31 now, recruitment for all of those years after 2010 is quite a
32 bit lower than it had been in the years before.

33
34 **MR. GREENE:** When will you have the catch at age matrix?
35

36 **DR. PATTERSON:** These fish start to recruit to the recreational
37 fishery when they're about two and they're fully recruited by
38 age three and so it typically takes about three years after
39 their birth date for them to fully be in the fishery and then
40 usually it takes a few years being in the fishery to really get
41 a good picture of the strength of a given year class. There is
42 that time lag.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Will, I have a question. With the increases in
45 average size of fish being brought to the dock, at least from
46 the recreational side, do you think that's going to impact that
47 year class recruitment estimate, at least for the last couple of
48 years or -- Again, as average size increases, you won't

1 necessarily see those fish recruit into the fishery, because
2 they would be discarded fish on the recreational side and we
3 wouldn't have any length information and is that a possibility?
4

5 **DR. PATTERSON:** Definitely on the recreational side that will
6 affect the catch at age matrix in getting that year class
7 signal. On the commercial side, the small young fish are still
8 being caught and so you get that signal in those data.
9

10 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Do you think that's being accurately accounted
11 for in the assessment?
12

13 **DR. PATTERSON:** I am not sure of your question and what's your
14 question?
15

16 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** If they were treated roughly 50/50 and if you
17 put 50 percent weight on the recreational fish and 50 percent on
18 the commercial fish to use to determine year class strength or
19 recruitment, if now all of a sudden a large portion of that 50
20 percent from the recreational side is no longer being put into
21 the model, is the model then weighting more heavily to the
22 commercial or is it interpreted as missing information?
23

24 **DR. PATTERSON:** Part of your question is that the recreational
25 50 percent is not being included, but I don't understand where
26 that inference comes from.
27

28 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I am unsure, and you may be as well, as to how
29 much emphasis each of the two fisheries are placed when the data
30 is compiled or used to look at recruitment or to compare to
31 estimate recruitment.
32

33 If each of the fisheries were looked at equally to try to fill
34 in that estimate or determine that number, the recreational
35 data, again, is not going to provide a lot of information in the
36 amount that it had previously provided, because those fish
37 aren't coming to the dock. Those three-year-olds aren't coming
38 to the dock and so I am just wondering if the model is then
39 weighting or looking to heavily to the commercial fish for the
40 information.
41

42 **DR. PATTERSON:** I've got you. I don't think that the
43 recreational fish in that context aren't informing the catch at
44 age matrix from the recreational samples and aren't informing
45 recruitment. It's just that if larger fish are being targeted
46 or retained, then there is going to be a longer lag, because if
47 you're now fully selecting five-year-old versus three-year-old
48 fish, there will be a longer lag until you get that recruitment

1 signal.

2
3 Another thing to keep in mind is that there are more than just
4 two fisheries, commercial and recreational, that are modeled in
5 the statistical catch at age model, the SS3 model here, because
6 you have closed season discards and open season discards and
7 those are really treated as separate fleets.

8
9 One of the biggest uncertainties is what is the age and size
10 composition of recreational discards, because if you think about
11 it as total kill, you mentioned before 50/50, which is basically
12 51 percent and 49 percent, the split between the two sectors.
13 In fact, if you look at the total kill, the recreational fishery
14 has a bigger influence, because of the number of dead discards
15 and live discards estimated to die that are coming from the
16 recreational fishery versus the commercial fishery.

17
18 That's a big source of uncertainty, because we don't have really
19 good information about what the age composition or even the size
20 composition is of those discarded fish and so that would have a
21 big impact on what you're referring to here.

22
23 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. I have been asked to read -- Robin
24 had responded or written some comments relative to some of the
25 discussion that has occurred or Dr. Patterson's earlier briefing
26 and I am just going to read those so they go into the record.

27
28 Robin wrote that he was going to respond in regards to the
29 estimate on the weight of the Texas fish and that Texas measures
30 the fish and then uses a weight/length relationship to determine
31 the weight.

32
33 Then he had a second comment I think regarding Corky's inquiry
34 to headboat information and this is Robin's statement.
35 Comparison to headboats may provide some validation, but
36 comparison to headboat landings may provide some info, but it
37 may not be a comparison to determine if there is a difference.
38 A comparison may be helpful, but it may actually be different
39 based on depth of water fished, locations, et cetera.

40
41 Those are his comments and so I don't see anyone else that has
42 asked to ask any more questions for Dr. Patterson, but if you
43 could stay on the line, Dr. Patterson, a little bit longer, that
44 would be appreciated.

45
46 **DR. PATTERSON:** Sure and to Robin's statement, it seems that
47 weighing the fish would be easy enough to get rid of that
48 uncertainty, but another important consideration is if they

1 could just report what that weight/length regression is and
2 whether it's different in that region versus other places and
3 that could probably get at some of the uncertainty.

4
5 I agree with his statement about headboat landings and how that
6 would be difficult to compare to the other fisheries off of
7 Texas, because you have different selectivities, but what I
8 thought Corky was saying is that you could compare headboat
9 information from Texas versus Louisiana versus Florida and just
10 see if you see similar differences in those datasets in the mean
11 size or weight of fish among regions.

12
13 If that's present, then it would sort of verify the fact that
14 there is something different going on off of Texas that the SSC
15 was questioning when we looked at the provisional landings data.

16
17 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Points noted and hopefully if it's provided,
18 the Science Center -- Hopefully Robin and his staff can provide
19 you the length/weight regression formula that they use to
20 estimate weight and so at least you will have that available and
21 could review it. Steven, could you continue on? I am sorry for
22 interrupting earlier.

23
24 **REVIEW OF FRAMEWORK ACTION**

25
26 **MR. ATRAN:** That's all right. This table has been up on the
27 screen for some time and so hopefully it's burned into
28 everybody's eyes by now and Mara is correct that that ACL for
29 2013 was a typo and it was in place for 2014.

30
31 The other thing I wanted to point out here, if you look at the
32 bottom of the recreational landings, is although the
33 recreational sector has been over in most of the years, in 2014
34 it was under by quite a bit, a 1.494 million pound underage in
35 2014.

36
37 That may very well be a function of the very short season that
38 we had. With the short seasons, any number of factors, weather
39 conditions, environmental factors, or some other things might
40 affect whether we're over or under on the projections.

41
42 We will be getting projections from the Regional Office at the
43 council meeting that's coming up at the end of the month and so
44 what we're going to do here is decide what the quota should be
45 and then they will calculate what they think the projections
46 are. I just wanted to give you an idea of what the historical
47 perspective was.

1 Going to the alternatives, which are on page 8, I believe, we
2 kept the alternatives as simple as possible and there are three
3 alternatives. Alternative 1 is no action and we would retain
4 the current overall quota of eleven-million pounds and with the
5 51/49 split and that's a 5.61 million-pound commercial quota and
6 a 5.39 million-pound recreational quota. Since we have a 20
7 percent buffer to set an ACT, that would create an ACT of 4.312
8 million pounds.

9
10 Under Alternative 2, this is setting the quotas at the ABCs for
11 each of the three years and so for the current year, the ACT,
12 the total quota, would go up to 14.3 million pounds. That would
13 be divided into a commercial quota of 7.26 million pounds and a
14 recreational quota of 7.04. The ACT, which is what the season
15 projections are based on, would be 5.632 million pounds.

16
17 In 2016, it would decline to 13.96 million pounds overall and a
18 commercial quota of 7.12 million pounds and a recreational quota
19 of 6.84 million pounds and a recreational ACT of 5.472 million
20 pounds. Then in 2017, it would be 13.74 million pounds and a
21 commercial quota of 7.01 million pounds and a recreational quota
22 of 6.73 million pounds with a recreational ACT of 5.384 million
23 pounds.

24
25 I put a "+" symbol after the 2017 and hopefully we'll get the
26 next stock assessment and we will get new projections in time
27 for the 2018 fishing year, but if we don't, the intent is that
28 the 2017 quotas would stay in place until we got those new
29 projections and can adjust it accordingly.

30
31 Alternative 3 is the constant catch scenario. As Will
32 indicated, we did not get an analysis of some equivalent
33 constant catch to the three-year ABC and so the alternative is
34 to use the lowest ABC of each of those three years going forward
35 and that would be 13.74 million pounds. The commercial quota
36 then would be 7.01 million pounds and the recreational quota
37 would be 6.73 million pounds and the recreational ACT would be
38 5.384 million pounds and those values would be in place from
39 2015 until the next stock assessment or the next projections are
40 made.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Steve. Let me double check here and
43 so -- Corky, let me go ahead and take you. You all submitted at
44 the same time and let me go ahead and take your question first.
45 Robin has proffered a motion, but, Corky, go ahead and then
46 Robin.

47
48 **MR. PERRET:** My question, Steve, is this. Under Alternative 2

1 or Alternative 3, setting something for 2015 plus 2016 and 2017
2 or Alternative 3, 2015 plus, that's all well and good, but six
3 months or a year from now the council, with a majority vote, can
4 change that, can't they, as long as they stay within the limit
5 that the scientists say we should be in?
6

7 **MR. ATRAN:** Yes, the council could always request a change in
8 the quotas. I think we would probably want to have some new
9 information on which to base that. The Regional Office has
10 usually not been very good as far as approving a change just for
11 the sake of approving a change and so if we had new information,
12 and that might be perhaps requesting a new projection after a
13 year or so that showed that we could go with a different ABC, we
14 could do that. Right now, we could go with any ABC or any quota
15 that the council wishes, as long as it doesn't exceed the ABCs
16 that are listed here.
17

18 **MR. PERRET:** Thank you, Steve, and I just wanted to make a
19 comment that the council in the future can change it and I just
20 wanted that brought out. Thanks.
21

22 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Corky. **Robin, I've got your motion**
23 **here and you moved to select Alternative 2 as the preferred**
24 **alternative.** Is there a second to the motion? Dale seconds.
25 Any discussion on the motion?
26

27 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** A point of order, Mr. Chair. We
28 had scheduled for public testimony.
29

30 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** But aren't we just selecting a preferred at
31 this time and then we'll come back after public testimony to --
32

33 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Okay. That will be fine, if this
34 is like a preliminary.
35

36 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I think this is what we normally try to do, is
37 select a preferred and then the public has an idea of which
38 direction the council is going. Leann, do you have a comment or
39 a question to the motion?
40

41 **MS. BOSARGE:** I know Robin can't talk to us, but I was hoping
42 maybe he would type in some of his rationale for why he likes
43 Alternative 2, because I am going back and forth between
44 Alternative 2 and 3. Just so that maybe Robin can respond to me
45 when he types in.
46

47 Right now, I am sort of leaning towards Alternative 3, just
48 because we do have some uncertainties in there and that's one

1 thing and in Alternative 2, we do have the declining ABCs and
2 humans being humans -- It's kind of like your income and you
3 always want to see it go up and you don't want to see it come
4 down, but I like Alternative 3 in the sense that they will have
5 a constant 13.74 for 2015 plus. Last time, we did it for three
6 years, but at least they won't have something that is declining.

7
8 I know that there are some things out there that make us think
9 that maybe when we get more information that some of these
10 numbers may go up, but that's a big if and I think I would
11 rather see something constant that's a little more conservative
12 that will allow people to at least catch the same every year
13 rather than see things decrease. Maybe Robin can help me with
14 that and convince me otherwise.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Robin, do you want to try one more time on the
17 phone or are you typing? Maybe he's typing. Corky, do you have
18 a comment?

19
20 **MR. PERRET:** I just have basically the same comment Leann had.
21 We've got a fishery that's improving, yet we're going to have a
22 number that goes down and to me, that's just a negative. If the
23 number were going up from 2015 to 2016 to 2017, that would be
24 one thing, but to start higher and then go lower, to me that's a
25 negative.

26
27 We are not talking about a whole lot of difference, but I do
28 prefer to see a constant catch rather than a declining catch in
29 a fishery that is supposedly being better managed and is
30 improving. Thank you.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Roy Williams has a question for Dr. Crabtree
33 and I will read it. His question is could we take the average
34 of the three years in Alternative 2 and set ABC at fourteen-
35 million pounds?

36
37 **DR. CRABTREE:** If you were to set it at fourteen-million pounds,
38 you would be okay in 2015, but you would be exceeding the ABC
39 from the SSC in 2016 and 2017 and we're not allowed to do that
40 and so I think to try to set it at fourteen that you would have
41 to go back to the SSC and get a new ABC for 2016 and 2017.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dale, do you have a question?

44
45 **MR. DIAZ:** I guess it's kind of a comment. I was just going to
46 kind of make a comment on what I'm thinking about. I agree with
47 a lot of stuff that's been said here recently. The numbers are
48 not a whole lot and Corky said that. I do agree that I don't

1 like to see a number going down either.

2
3 I probably would support a constant catch if it was some sort of
4 an average across the three years, but being as we're picking
5 the lowest year out of the three and it doesn't sound like
6 that's the way we've done constant catches in the past, that's
7 kind of my rationale for seconding Robin's motion and leaning
8 towards Alternative 2.

9
10 I do want to hear public comments and see what kinds of things
11 we hear from the public, but I just wanted to get my thoughts
12 out there and let people know what I was thinking. Thank you.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Dale, and so Robin did type in some
15 rationale. Leann, you had the question and I will go ahead and
16 read it. His response is either way we will be revisiting this
17 information, as we do, especially for red snapper, each year.
18 While I do agree typically with the continuity notion from year
19 to year, red snapper gets reviewed every year and the
20 uncertainty we are talking about is there every year. The
21 constant catch scenario is at the lowest of the three years and
22 this is just leaving poundage, trips, and fishery dollars on the
23 table.

24
25 Then Robin also had a question for the Science Center and has
26 the economic analysis been done for the alternatives? Doug, do
27 you know if Bonnie or someone else from the Science Center is on
28 the phone call?

29
30 **DR. CRABTREE:** Kevin, I don't believe she is on and I think
31 whatever economic analysis is going to be done should be in the
32 framework amendment.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. It certainly would help explain or
35 justify the rationale for what we're attempting to do or what
36 methods are selected. They're reviewing the document right now
37 to see if it's at the end. There is some economic analysis
38 there.

39
40 **DR. CRABTREE:** Kevin, if you look on page -- Starting on page 37
41 of the document, there is the effects on the economic
42 environment.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Okay and so we do have some analysis in there.
45 Thank you. Doug Boyd, do you have a question?

46
47 **MR. BOYD:** A comment and a question. I agree with Dale on the
48 reduction each year. I would rather see a constant catch

1 scenario, but I feel like the numbers should be higher and I
2 didn't realize that we had not asked the SSC for a constant
3 catch scenario and so what they've done is take the lowest year
4 and just give it to us and I would rather see a higher number,
5 even if we have to go back to them, or I would rather go with
6 the Alternative 2.

7
8 The question was when will the 2017 standard be available to us?
9 Will it be available for the 2017 fishing year or will it be
10 available for 2018?

11
12 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Dr. Crabtree, do you want to respond to that?

13
14 **DR. CRABTREE:** I don't recall whether we specified when the
15 assessment would be done. If it was done in 2017 and you wanted
16 to get the data through 2016, then we wouldn't get it until
17 2018. If it was done in 2017 and you were willing to have the
18 terminal year of data be 2015, then it could be done in the
19 first half of the year, but I don't know -- Maybe Mr. Gregory
20 can recall, but I don't know if we were that specific in terms
21 of our scheduling request.

22
23 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** The 2017 is a date that was
24 recommended by the SSC in January. We brought it to the council
25 in January and the SEDAR Committee and we discussed it briefly,
26 but the discussion became more focused on the amount of effort
27 it's going to take the Science Center analysts to do the MRIP
28 effort estimation updates and calibrations and so the council
29 never really discussed specifics about whether the 2017
30 recommendation of the SSC was okay or if they wanted to use 2015
31 data and get the assessment in time for the 2017 season, similar
32 to what we've done this year, getting an assessment at the end
33 of 2014 in time for the 2015 season.

34
35 The one thing I do recall from our SEDAR Steering Committee
36 meeting is that the Science Center was not eager to do an
37 assessment in 2015 and so the council did not make a motion in
38 January, but we presented that schedule to the council in
39 January and I think we just got sidetracked in our discussion.

40
41 Also, on the question of constant catch, we have been asking the
42 analysts and the SSC to provide us with a constant catch
43 scenario for every stock assessment we've had since we did this
44 with red snapper in 2014, 2013. The analysts have not provided
45 that information. It's more work and so the SSC kind of punted
46 and just said, well, we'll recommend the lowest number and that
47 could be constant catch.

48

1 At this point in time for this upcoming season, I don't think
2 there's enough time to do a constant catch scenario for the
3 council to review and approve and get it in place for 2015, but
4 it's something I intend to make sure we get in the future when
5 we have these stock assessments that have declining or
6 increasing catch trends, that we also get a constant catch
7 analysis that's equivalent to those three-year trends that we're
8 presented.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you for the update, Doug. Based on some
11 of the discussion that we're having here in regards to the
12 rationale for selecting Alternative 2 as the preferred
13 alternative, specific to red snapper, we may want to make sure
14 when we ask for analyses, we being the council, that we include
15 that in any motions, because it is a burden on staff, Science
16 Center staff, the assessment scientists, to run the analyses.

17
18 If it's not the intent of the council to ask for a constant
19 catch, again relative to red snapper, seeing that it's a unique
20 species of the species we manage, we need to be -- I think we
21 need to be clear when we make our motions of what it is we would
22 like to see generated and reviewed by the SSC so that we can
23 make these decisions.

24
25 If it's not our intent to do such analyses, then maybe that's
26 all that we should be requesting and so, anyway, we can deal
27 with that for the next time around, but I have a -- I think Doug
28 Boyd has a question.

29
30 **MR. BOYD:** I don't have another question. I had input that
31 twice, because I didn't see it go through. Thank you.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Corky.

34
35 **MR. PERRET:** Did I understand Doug Gregory to say that with the
36 constant catch scenario, if we selected Alternative 3, we would
37 not be able to have that in place for the coming season or did I
38 misunderstand him?

39
40 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** That was a misunderstanding. The
41 constant catch scenario we did in 2013, where we ended up with
42 eleven-million pounds, that eleven-million pounds was equivalent
43 to the three-year trend in landings.

44
45 We do not have a similar constant catch estimate before us now.
46 The one that was presented in Alternative was the lowest of the
47 three years and so it's like a no-brainer that yes, you can do
48 this and you're not going to exceed any of the other ABCs, but

1 it's not equivalent to the average, let's say, of all three
2 years and the analysts have not been providing us with an
3 average of the three years since we did that in 2013.

4
5 That's what we do not have in front of us and we would not have
6 time for the analysts to calculate that and provide it to the
7 SSC and then back to the council in time for our 2015 season
8 this year.

9
10 **MR. PERRET:** Okay. Then that leads to my next question. Are we
11 able to modify or to include an additional alternative? My
12 suggested alternative would be a modification of Alternative 2
13 and for the year 2015, the total quota would be 13.96 million
14 and for 2016, it would be 13.96 million and for 2017, it would
15 be 13.74 million.

16
17 That alternative, if it's allowable and if the council wants to
18 go that way, we would only have a decrease that third year, in
19 2017, and who knows. Perhaps we may get an assessment earlier
20 in the year that could change that, but at least we would not be
21 -- First off, we would not be exceeding the quota that the
22 scientists say we could get at 13.96 million in 2016 and we
23 would be under what we're suggested in 2015, which is a good
24 conservation measure. Are we allowed to modify an alternative
25 at this stage of the game?

26
27 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Yes, that can be a substitute
28 motion or a different alternative added to the framework and
29 then voted on.

30
31 **MR. PERRET:** If I make a motion -- Robin has got a motion on the
32 floor and could I make a substitute motion to have a fourth
33 alternative included or should we vote on Robin's motion first?

34
35 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Corky, since this is still going to public
36 comment, we could probably vote on Robin's motion. It is to
37 make Alternative 2 the preferred and then if you wanted to make
38 a motion to add a new alternative, I don't see necessarily any
39 problem with that, but the document would have to go back for
40 analysis and the new text would have to go with the new
41 alternative and that could potentially slow things down, the
42 extra staff time and such, and so I don't know -- It depends on
43 how the vote goes and what we recommend to the Secretary, but if
44 we vote on Robin's motion for the preferred and it stays that
45 way all the way through the process, the it's just additional
46 staff time and effort to add the additional alternative.

47
48 **MR. PERRET:** It seems like the analysis I am talking about is

1 already done. Dr. Crabtree, if we add an additional
2 alternative, is that going to slow the process down?

3
4 **DR. CRABTREE:** Yes, it will slow it down. I don't know how much
5 it would slow it down, but we would have to go into the document
6 and add the alternative and do the additional edits and
7 everything else that it would take.

8
9 I would remind you that time is of the essence here and to try
10 and get this done by June 1, and you're really talking about
11 relatively small amounts of fish here, and I guess there's some
12 kind of psychological concern about having the catches go down.
13 I guess I am not so sure, Corky, that what you're asking is
14 really worth it, but it would slow it down some and I don't know
15 if it would slow it down enough to be a real concern or not.

16
17 **MR. PERRET:** The last thing I want to do is slow things down.
18 We all want to get what we can in place this year. It's a
19 psychological thing and when you see a number that we're going
20 to start at one level and then instead of increasing in
21 subsequent years, we're going to go down and so that's my issue,
22 but thank you, Roy.

23
24 **DR. CRABTREE:** If I could just make a comment. I think there's
25 the notion that a constant quota equates to having a stable
26 fishery, but, in fact, the quotas are coming down because the
27 abundance of the fish is declining over time and so by having
28 the higher catches now, while you have higher fish abundance and
29 higher CPUEs, you probably would have a more stable season, at
30 least on the recreational side, if the quotas fluctuated and
31 tracked the fish abundance. Again, I would point out these are
32 relatively small changes from year to year.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** We have a motion on the board and that is to
35 make Alternative 2 the preferred alternative. It was seconded.
36 Doug, how do you want to go about -- Do you want to do a roll
37 call like we did for introductions as far as getting everyone's
38 vote?

39
40 **MS. CHARLENE PONCE:** Kevin, Doug just stepped away. I am happy
41 to go through the council member list and do that for you.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** That might be the easiest, because we would
44 probably have to read them off anyway if everyone responded in
45 the chat box. If you can do that, go down the list, that would
46 be great.

47
48 **MS. PONCE:** We will start with Roy Williams.

1
2 **MR. WILLIAMS:** Yes.
3
4 **MS. PONCE:** Martha Bademan.
5
6 **MS. BADEMAN:** Yes.
7
8 **MS. PONCE:** Dale Diaz.
9
10 **MR. DIAZ:** Yes.
11
12 **MS. PONCE:** Robin Riechers. You can type yours in if you need
13 to. He said yes. Doug Boyd.
14
15 **MR. BOYD:** Yes.
16
17 **MS. PONCE:** Camp Matens.
18
19 **MR. MATENS:** Yes.
20
21 **MS. PONCE:** Pam Dana is absent. John Sanchez.
22
23 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Yes.
24
25 **MS. PONCE:** Corky Perret.
26
27 **MR. PERRET:** Yes.
28
29 **MS. PONCE:** Johnny Greene.
30
31 **MR. GREENE:** Yes.
32
33 **MS. PONCE:** Myron Fischer.
34
35 **MR. FISCHER:** Yes.
36
37 **MS. PONCE:** Dr. Crabtree.
38
39 **DR. CRABTREE:** Yes.
40
41 **MS. PONCE:** Harlon Pearce.
42
43 **MR. PEARCE:** Yes.
44
45 **MS. PONCE:** Leann Bosarge.
46
47 **MS. BOSARGE:** Yes.
48

1 **MS. PONCE:** David Walker.

2

3 **MR. WALKER:** Yes.

4

5 **MS. PONCE:** Dr. Stunz.

6

7 **DR. STUNZ:** Yes.

8

9 **MS. PONCE:** Chairman Anson.

10

11 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Yes.

12

13 **MS. PONCE:** The motion passed unanimously.

14

15 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Charlene. I saw an email that -- Do
16 we need Dr. Patterson anymore? He asked, I think, to leave. I
17 think he is no longer needed and so I guess, Will, if you're
18 still online, thank you very much for attending the meeting.
19 That will take us to our next item and that is Review of
20 Codified Regulations, Tab A, Number 4. Do we know who is going
21 to review that? Doug, do you know who is going to be reviewing
22 the -- Go ahead.

23

24

REVIEW OF CODIFIED REGULATIONS

25

26 **MR. ATRAN:** It's actually intended that somebody from the
27 Regional Office review it, since they were the ones who wrote
28 it, but if there is nobody there to review it, I looked this
29 over and there is a lot of placeholders in the codified text,
30 because obviously they did not know which alternative was going
31 to be adopted.

32

33 However, I looked it over and it appears to adequately portray
34 the intent of the council if you go with this alternative that
35 is currently the preferred alternative. It updates the
36 recreational quotas and it updates the commercial IFQ quotas as
37 well.

38

39 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right and do we have any questions to
40 Steve? Mara.

41

42 **MS. LEVY:** I just wanted to point out that it does have a lot of
43 placeholders. It assumed the preferred alternative that you
44 picked, just to show you what it would look like to put in all
45 the quotas for the different years, as they changed, and it also
46 assumes that Amendment 40 would be approved and implemented and
47 so that's how it's structured, because we proposed that, and
48 that the accountability measure framework will be implemented.

1
2 We have all these things going on at the same time and so the
3 way that we structured this codified text is assuming those are
4 implemented and this comes on top of it. If any of those things
5 don't happen, obviously the things in this would need to be
6 changed to reflect that, because all of these things are still
7 pending. I just wanted to point that out.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Does anyone else have anything they
10 would like to add before we move on to the next item? That will
11 take us to Written Comments Received, Tab A, Number 5, and
12 Emily.

13
14 **WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED**

15
16 **MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN:** Thank you, Kevin. Just very quickly, we
17 don't actually have a tab for this, because of the nature of
18 this. We kind of sprinted to gather comment as soon as we could
19 and we published a video and I didn't actually summarize those
20 comments until noon today, because we had been receiving them up
21 until then.

22
23 On our video, we received 575 views, but very few comments.
24 Many of the comments were in support of increasing the quota and
25 there was also support for the no action alternative, because
26 recreational anglers didn't want to see the commercial sector
27 benefit if there wasn't going to be an increase in the
28 recreational season, despite some sort of quota increase.

29
30 There was also support for Alternative 2, because the red
31 snapper are rebuilding and we should catch as many as possible,
32 and also support for Alternative 3, which is that constant quota
33 scenario.

34
35 Many of the comments that we received focused on the short
36 recreational season, with some recognition that the season
37 lengths are not directly dependent on the stock health or the
38 quota size. Anglers suggested that we try smaller bag limits or
39 higher minimum size limits in order to extend that recreational
40 season and also some wanted to find a way to pick their own
41 fishing days in the private recreational sector and then there
42 was also support for more local-scale management and that's all
43 we got.

44
45 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you. Does anyone have any questions for
46 Emily? That will take us to Item Number IV, Public Comment. I
47 have already read the introduction regarding requirements for
48 testimony. Doug, I think you or Charlene were going to handle

1 calling on those that are in order if they wish to speak. At
2 this point, I will pass this on to you.

3
4 **PUBLIC COMMENT**
5

6 **MS. PONCE:** Okay and so to the members of the public out there,
7 if anyone has a comment that they would like to present to the
8 council, if you could click on the hand icon on your desktop in
9 the control panel, that will let us know that you have a comment
10 and we will call on you in the order that your hands are raised.
11 The first is Bob Zales.

12
13 **MR. BOB ZALES:** Bob Zales, II, President of Panama City Boatmen
14 Association. We support the 14.3 million and we also support
15 the --

16
17 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Bob, there seems to be an echo.

18
19 **MR. ZALES:** I am hearing it, too. How about now?

20
21 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** That's much better. Thank you.

22
23 **MR. ZALES:** Anyway, like the email I sent earlier, we support
24 the 14.3 and I believe the motion that you all did, the way I
25 understand it, is saying that for 2015 we're looking at 14.3 and
26 then you'll play with 2016 and 2017 down the line.

27
28 There is a lot of concern by fishermen, and I'm currently at the
29 Mackerel Advisory Panel and we have the same issue with the
30 mackerel recommendations, is when these projections come out,
31 you get a high number this year and it trickles down to a low
32 number over the next several years, the way that the SSC does
33 these projections.

34
35 People don't understand this and what we've suggested in the
36 Mackerel Panel, and I think this is a way that you could do this
37 here, is that you simply have the SSC review the numbers, kind
38 of in a mini update, to look at the next year's recommended ABC
39 or ACL, to try to get away from this decrease, because if the
40 fishery shows that you can increase it, you need to take that
41 increase.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Bob. Charlene, I just wanted to add
44 the time limit. I think for this webinar we're going to use a
45 two-minute time limit for each of the members of the public that
46 want to provide testimony.

47
48 **MS. PONCE:** Yes, that's what we decided.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I just wanted to make sure that everyone was
3 clear. Thank you.

4
5 **MS. PONCE:** The next speaker is Chris Wilson.

6
7 **MR. CHRIS WILSON:** I am from the Panhandle, up here in
8 Pensacola. I have been keeping a close eye on -- for the past
9 two years now and I actually am in the process now of getting a
10 commercial license to start doing commercial fishing.

11
12 From what I have seen from all the recent posts from all the
13 meetings lately, we are in agreement with the numbers that you
14 are trying to work with right now and I also noticed something
15 about possible tagging in the future, to try and keep a better
16 track of the numbers, and I believe that would be good,
17 especially on the recreational side, to help us be able, as
18 recreational fishermen, to have more opportunities to go out and
19 catch the red snapper, because I know here in the Panhandle, we
20 catch them yearly, all year-round, and there is even times where
21 we can actually catch them from shore. I mean the population up
22 here has got so big.

23
24 **MS. PONCE:** Okay. Thank you, Chris. Next up is Eric Brazer.
25 Eric, it looks like you need to pin into your telephone, number
26 193#, to allow me to un-mute you so you can speak. While you
27 are doing that, we will move on to J.P. Brooker.

28
29 **MR. J.P. BROOKER:** This is J.P. Brooker with the Ocean
30 Conservancy based in St. Pete, Florida. Thank you for the
31 opportunity to comment, Chairman Anson and the council. On
32 behalf of the Ocean Conservancy, more than 120,000 members, who
33 are concerned fishermen, environmentalists, outdoorsmen, and
34 average citizens, we recommend that the council select
35 Alternative 3, which would set the total red snapper quota at
36 13.74 million pounds for 2015 through 2017, as this alternative
37 offers the greatest conservation benefit for the stock.

38
39 Alternative 3 will facilitate rebuilding and may result in a
40 decrease in the rebuilding timeframe for the stock and will
41 reduce the chances of overfishing. From a conservation
42 perspective, these benefits will aid the long-term health and
43 resiliency of Gulf red snapper and, again, thanks for the
44 opportunity to give comment.

45
46 **MS. PONCE:** Eric, we're going to try you again. Go ahead.

47
48 **MR. ERIC BRAZER:** Thank you. My name is Eric Brazer and I'm the

1 Deputy Director of the Shareholder's Alliance and thank you for
2 the opportunity to comment. I will make this brief. We had
3 hoped that the council would take a precautionary approach and
4 approve Alternative 3.

5
6 We do feel that it promotes conservation and that it's going to
7 help us rebuild this red snapper population more quickly and,
8 just as important, it doesn't implement declining quotas over
9 the next three years. We feel this constant catch helps us
10 hedge our bets against the uncertainty that we talked about
11 earlier, that you guys talked about earlier, and we feel that it
12 promotes better commercial and charter business stability and,
13 in the long term, increased recreational access.

14
15 -- Robin typed in, and I am paraphrasing here, that because
16 there is uncertainty there every year and so they don't want to
17 leave poundage in the water and money on the table and maybe I
18 am missing something, but having uncertainty there every year is
19 exactly why we would want to take a precautionary approach and
20 go with Alternative 3.

21
22 When it comes down to it, Corky hit the nail on the head. We
23 don't like to see declining yields when we have a recovering
24 resource, especially when we have clear choice to avoid it.
25 Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

26
27 **MS. PONCE:** Thank you. I don't see any more hands and so I will
28 ask again if there is anybody out there who wants to provide the
29 council with some input on this. Kevin, I am not seeing any
30 more hands and so I will hand it back over to you.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Charlene. That will take us to our
33 next agenda item, Number V, Council Action on Framework Action
34 and Codified Regulations. We just voted on making Alternative 2
35 the preferred alternative and is there any discussion? Does
36 anyone want to make a motion?

37
38 **COUNCIL ACTION ON FRAMEWORK AND CODIFIED REGULATIONS**

39
40 **MR. PERRET:** Yes, I've got discussion.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Go ahead, Corky.

43
44 **MR. PERRET:** I would like to move that we make Alternative 3 the
45 preferred alternative.

46
47 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** There is a motion to make Alternative 3 the
48 preferred alternative and is there a second to the motion?

1 Leann has indicated she seconds the motion. Is there any
2 discussion on the motion?
3
4 **MR. PERRET:** I would like to discuss it, please.
5
6 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Go ahead, Corky, and then Leann.
7
8 **DR. CRABTREE:** A point of order. Since we just passed a motion
9 establishing a preferred, wouldn't this require a motion to
10 reconsider?
11
12 **MR. PERRET:** What about a substitute motion?
13
14 **DR. CRABTREE:** I would ask Mara to comment, but we passed a
15 motion and if we're going to change it, I think it's a motion to
16 reconsider.
17
18 **MR. ATRAN:** It was my understanding that the first motion was
19 made just for purposes of public testimony.
20
21 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I made that comment, but we are in full council
22 and so we didn't officially go through a committee and so I may
23 have misspoken on that. Mara, do you have any comments?
24
25 **MS. LEVY:** I tend to agree that the motion was related to the
26 same -- You need a motion to reconsider. There is nothing on
27 the board to substitute at this point.
28
29 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right and so it sounds like we need a
30 motion to reconsider the previous motion making Alternative 2
31 the preferred. Does anyone want to make that motion?
32
33 **MR. PERRET:** I was under the impression we simply had a
34 preferred alternative for public hearing and we would discuss it
35 after we had public testimony. Now, that's fine if there has
36 been misunderstanding. **I would like to move that we reconsider**
37 **the motion that we made that the preferred alternative be**
38 **Alternative 2.**
39
40 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** We have a motion to reconsider the motion that
41 we passed previously to make Alternative 2 the preferred. Is
42 there a second?
43
44 **MR. PEARCE:** I will second it.
45
46 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** It's been seconded. Is there discussion? Do
47 we have any discussion on the motion or, Doug, do we just go
48 right to a vote? Is there any discussion for a reconsideration

1 of previous motions?

2

3 **MS. BOSARGE:** Kevin, am I able to give my discussion at this
4 point?

5

6 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Let me just make sure that I am not doing
7 anything to conflict with any parliamentary procedure, because I
8 am unsure as to what the proper procedure is for reconsidering
9 of a motion, if there is a comment period or if we just vote on
10 it directly. Doug, could you assist?

11

12 **MR. ATRAN:** A motion to reconsider is debatable.

13

14 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you very much. Go ahead, Leann.

15

16 **MS. BOSARGE:** Obviously I want to see the quota go up each year.
17 I think that if 2016 rolls around and we have a quota that's
18 lower than what the fishermen received in 2015 that the
19 screaming that we will hear will wake the dead, probably, and I
20 can't blame them.

21

22 I think that Alternative 3 would alleviate that situation. It
23 is more conservative, but on the same token, you will have a
24 little bit of short-term pain, if you want to look at it that
25 way, for a long-term gain. If you catch fewer fish than what
26 you say you're allowed to catch, then surely you will see some
27 increases in the future.

28

29 In the big scheme of things, I see it, even with Alternative 3,
30 we are taking a fishery that was scheduled to be at eleven-
31 million pounds for 2015 and increasing it to 13.74 and so
32 they're still getting a 2.74-million-pound increase and so I
33 still see Alternative 3 as pleasing all sectors, in the sense
34 that all sectors are going to get substantially more fish than
35 what they had previously been scheduled to get and yet, leave us
36 a little wiggle room for, number one, some of these
37 uncertainties that we haven't been able to hash out just yet
38 and, number two, to have hopefully an increasing quota for the
39 next three years.

40

41 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Does anyone else want to make a comment to the
42 motion? It appears that no one else wants to address the motion
43 to reconsider. I guess we will do the same thing as we did with
44 the previous motion, is to go down a roll call. Charlene or
45 Doug.

46

47 **MS. PONCE:** Okay. Are we ready?

48

1 **MR. PEARCE:** Could you explain what a yes vote means and a no
2 means on this one?
3
4 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** A yes would mean that we would reconsider the
5 previous motion, essentially the alternatives would be available
6 to make a preferred. A no would be that there would be no
7 further discussion and the Preferred Alternative 2 would go
8 forward.
9
10 **MS. PONCE:** Are we ready? Johnny Greene.
11
12 **MR. GREENE:** Yes.
13
14 **MS. PONCE:** Robin Riechers. He said no. Doug Boyd.
15
16 **MR. BOYD:** No.
17
18 **MS. PONCE:** Roy Williams.
19
20 **MR. WILLIAMS:** No.
21
22 **MS. PONCE:** Dr. Crabtree.
23
24 **DR. CRABTREE:** No.
25
26 **MS. PONCE:** John Sanchez.
27
28 **MR. SANCHEZ:** No.
29
30 **MS. PONCE:** David Walker.
31
32 **MR. WALKER:** No.
33
34 **MS. PONCE:** Leann Bosarge.
35
36 **MS. BOSARGE:** Yes.
37
38 **MS. PONCE:** Harlon Pearce.
39
40 **MR. PEARCE:** Yes.
41
42 **MS. PONCE:** Dr. Dana.
43
44 **DR. DANA:** No.
45
46 **MS. PONCE:** Myron Fischer.
47
48 **MR. FISCHER:** Yes.

1
2 **MS. PONCE:** Dr. Stunz.
3
4 **DR. STUNZ:** No.
5
6 **MS. PONCE:** Camp Matens.
7
8 **MR. MATENS:** Yes.
9
10 **MS. PONCE:** Dale Diaz.
11
12 **MR. DIAZ:** No.
13
14 **MS. PONCE:** Corky Perret.
15
16 **MR. PERRET:** Yes.
17
18 **MS. PONCE:** Martha Bademan.
19
20 **MS. BADEMAN:** No.
21
22 **MS. PONCE:** Kevin Anson.
23
24 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** No.
25
26 **MS. PONCE:** **The motion fails.**
27
28 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** That would mean that the Preferred Alternative
29 Number 2 would go to the Secretary or go to the Regional Office.
30
31 **MS. PONCE:** It's eleven to six.
32
33 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** **The motion failed.** Okay. That will take us to
34 -- We need to accept the codified regulations as well with that
35 approval and is that correct, Doug? We need to make a statement
36 to send the codified regulations as written.
37
38 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Yes, we do.
39
40 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right and so we need to have a motion to
41 send the codified regulations as written.
42
43 **MR. WILLIAMS:** **Can I make that motion?**
44
45 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Roy Williams moves to send the codified
46 regulations as written to the Secretary of Commerce.
47
48 **MR. WILLIAMS:** **Yes, I do.**

1
2 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Do we have a second? Dale, I see that you
3 second. Any discussion to the motion? Mara, would you like to
4 make a comment?
5
6 **MS. LEVY:** I think did you actually make the motion -- You
7 picked a preferred and then you would make the motion to submit
8 the framework action to the Secretary of Commerce and deem the
9 codified regulations as necessary and appropriate, but I didn't
10 see the motion to actually submit the framework action for
11 implementation. Did I miss it?
12
13 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** No, you did not. Good catch. Roy Williams --
14
15 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** We are retyping that now. We are
16 retyping that motion and so please wordsmith it, Mara.
17
18 **MR. WILLIAMS:** We need an "and" after "implementation."
19
20 **MS. LEVY:** Send the framework action to the Secretary of
21 Commerce for implementation and deem the codified regulations as
22 necessary and appropriate.
23
24 **MR. WILLIAMS:** That's my motion.
25
26 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I think "to the Secretary of Commerce" needs to
27 go before "implementation". Roy, is that still agreeable to
28 you?
29
30 **MR. WILLIAMS:** Yes. I move to send the framework action to the
31 Secretary of Commerce for implementation and deem the codified
32 regulations as necessary and appropriate. That's my motion.
33
34 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** All right. Dale, do you still second the
35 motion? I see that he has written in that he does still second
36 the motion and so any discussion on the motion? Steven, do you
37 have a comment?
38
39 **MR. ATRAN:** I don't know if this really needs to go in the
40 motion, but I am assuming that there will be editorial comment
41 to revise the codified regulations and in the outcome of
42 Amendment 40 and the framework action for accountability
43 measures.
44
45 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** I think that was stated earlier and I think
46 everyone understands that.
47
48 **MR. WILLIAMS:** Yes.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Does anyone else want to comment on the
3 motion? All right and so, Charlene, do you want to do this one
4 as well?
5
6 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** She has passed it on to me. I will
7 call on Dr. Dana first.
8
9 **DR. DANA:** Yes.
10
11 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Dr. Crabtree.
12
13 **DR. CRABTREE:** Yes.
14
15 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Matens.
16
17 **MR. MATENS:** Yes.
18
19 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Walker.
20
21 **MR. WALKER:** Yes.
22
23 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Ms. Bosarge.
24
25 **MS. BOSARGE:** Yes.
26
27 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Perret.
28
29 **MR. PERRET:** Yes.
30
31 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Riechers. He typed in yes.
32 Mr. Sanchez.
33
34 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Yes.
35
36 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Pearce.
37
38 **MR. PEARCE:** Yes.
39
40 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Dr. Stunz.
41
42 **DR. STUNZ:** Yes.
43
44 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Ms. Bademan.
45
46 **MS. BADEMAN:** Yes.
47
48 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Diaz.

1
2 **MR. DIAZ:** Yes.
3
4 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Fischer.
5
6 **MR. FISCHER:** Yes.
7
8 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Boyd.
9
10 **MR. BOYD:** Yes.
11
12 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Greene. Mr. Greene noted in
13 the chat box yes. Mr. Williams.
14
15 **MR. WILLIAMS:** Yes.
16
17 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** Mr. Anson.
18
19 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Yes.
20
21 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** It's unanimous. The motion passes
22 to send the framework action to the Secretary of Commerce for
23 implementation and deem the codified regulations as necessary
24 and appropriate.
25
26 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Doug. That takes us to our last
27 item on the agenda and that's Other Business. There was no
28 other business brought forward at the beginning of the webinar
29 and would anyone like to add anything? I am giving the
30 opportunity.
31
32 **MR. PERRET:** Good job.
33
34 **CHAIRMAN ANSON:** Thank you, Corky. Thank you, everyone, for
35 your participation and patience in working through this.
36 Hopefully we won't have too many of these. I prefer to see
37 everyone in person and thank you, Doug, you and your staff and,
38 Dr. Crabtree, you and your staff for bringing this document
39 forward in a timely manner and hopefully it can continue so, so
40 that we can reap the benefits for this fishing season. I
41 appreciate your efforts. With that, I am going to adjourn the
42 webinar. Thank you.
43
44 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 3:14 p.m., March 3, 2015.)
45
46

- - -