NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

+ + + + +

ATLANTIC HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES ADVISORY PANEL

+ + + + +

MEETING

WEDNESDAY
SEPTEMBER 6, 2017

+ + + + +

The Advisory Panel met in the Sheraton Silver Spring, Cypress Room, 8777 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland, at 8:45 a.m., Bennett Brooks, Facilitator, presiding.

PRESENT

BENNETT BROOKS, Facilitator JASON ADRIANCE, State Rep PATRICK AUGUSTINE, Recreational ANNA BECKWITH, Council Rep TERRI BEIDEMAN, Commercial RICK BELLAVANCE, Recreational ROBERT BOGAN, Recreational ANDRE BOUSTANY, Academic BENJAMIN CARR, Environmental J. MARCUS DRYMON, State Rep SONJA FORDHAM, Environmental WALTER GOLET, Academic* JOHN GRAVES, ICCAT Advisory Committee LISA GREGG, State Rep RANDY GREGORY, State Rep LUKE HARRIS, Commercial DEWEY HEMILRIGHT, Council Rep RUSSELL HUDSON, Commercial

ROBERT HUETER, Academic

STEPHEN IWICKI, Recreational

CHARLIE KLUCK, Proxy for Martin Fisher,

Commercial

ANDREW MARSHALL, Commercial

SHANA MILLER, Environmental*

ROBERT NAVARRO, Recreational

JEFF ODEN, Commercial

MICHAEL PIERDINOCK, Recreational

GEORGE PURMONT, Commercial

KIRBY ROOTES-MURDY, Council Rep

RICHARD RUAIS, Commercial

MARK SAMPSON, Recreational

MARTIN SCANLON, Commercial

DAVID SCHALIT, Proxy for Christopher Weiner,

Commercial

MICHAEL SISSENWINE, Council Rep

RICK WEBER, Recreational

KATIE WESTFALL, Environmental

ANGEL WILLEY, State Rep

ROMULUS WHITAKER, Recreational

ALSO PRESENT

NICOLAS ALVARADO, Highly Migratory Species Management Division

RANDY BLANKINSHIP, Highly Migratory Species Management Division

LT. WYNN CARNEY, Supervisory Enforcement

Officer, Northeast Division, Office of Law Enforcement

JENNIFER CUDNEY, Highly Migratory Species Management Division

TOBEY CURTIS, Highly Migratory Species Management Division

GREG DIDOMENICO, Garden State Seafood Association

CLIFFORD HUTT, Highly Migratory Species
Management Division

RAYMOND KANE, Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Alliance

JACK KEMMERER, U.S. Coast Guard*

BRAD McHALE, Highly Migratory Species Management Division

KATIE MOORE, U.S. Coast Guard

DELISSE ORTIZ, Highly Migratory Species
Management Division

LOREN REMSBERG, ESQ., Office of General Counsel, NOAA*

MARGO SCHULZE-HAUGEN, Division Chief, Highly Migratory Species Management Division CARRIE SOLTANOFF, Highly Migratory Species Management Division

*On the phone

CONTENTS

Welcome/Introductions 5
NOAA/NMFS Leadership Remarks 8 Chris Oliver, NOAA, Assistant Administrator
Overview of Recent Activities/Rulemakings HMS Division Staff
Upcoming Rulemakings
HMS Charter/Headboat permit proposed rule
Enforcement Updates
Caribbean Management Update
Pelagic Longline Closed Area Research Exempted Fishing Permit Update
Recreational Issues
Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Management Review of 2017 Year to Date
Public Comment
Adjourn

8:56 a.m.

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

FACILITATOR BROOKS: All right, good morning and welcome to the HMS Advisory Panel meeting.

We thank you all as always for making the time to be here. We really do know how busy you all are and we know it's not trivial to cut a couple of days out of your week and be here.

Obviously there's also a major storm brewing down in the Caribbean right now and so there are a number of folks who are not going to be here because they are having to deal with that and we're just hoping that this storm plays out a little better than it's looking like right now.

We have the new assistant administrator with us, Chris Oliver. In a minute we'll hear from him and have our usual opportunity to hear what's on the mind of NOAA Fisheries Assistant Administrator and ask him questions.

But before we do that we thought it would make sense just to go around the room with your name and organization so Chris knows who's around the table and everyone else does too.

And Fly, I think we'll start off with you. And just remind yourselves to hit the speak button and when you're done turn it off. Fly.

MEMBER NAVARRO: Fly Navarro with Fly Zone Fishing, recreational.

MEMBER HARRIS: Luke Harris,

commercial.

MEMBER HEMILRIGHT: Dewey Hemilright, Mid Atlantic Fishery Management Council.

MR. KLUCK: Charlie Kluck, commercial. MR. SCHALIT: David Schalit, American

Bluefin Tuna Association.

MEMBER AUGUSTINE: Patrick Augustine, New York, recreational.

MEMBER WILLEY: Angel Willey, Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

MEMBER GREGG: Lisa Gregg, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

MEMBER HUDSON: Rusty Hudson, Directed Sustained Fisheries, commercial.

MEMBER HUETER: Bob Hueter, MOTE Marine Laboratory, academic.

MEMBER BEIDEMAN: Terri Beideman, U.S.

Seafood Industry Association, commercial.

MEMBER IWICKI: Steve Iwicki,
recreational, Cape May, New Jersey.

MEMBER GRAVES: John Graves, Virginia
Institute of Marine Science here to represent the
U.S. ICCAT Advisory Committee.

MEMBER SISSENWINE: Mike Sissenwine representing the New England Fishery Management Council.

MEMBER WHITAKER: Rom Whitaker,
Hatteras Harbor Charter Boats, recreational.
MEMBER GREGORY: Randy Gregory, North

Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries.

MEMBER SCANLON: Marty Scanlon, owner, operator of fishing vessel Provider II. I also sit on the board of directors for Blue Waters Fishermen's Association.

MEMBER WESTFALL: Katie Westfall, Environmental Defense Fund, environmental.

MEMBER DRYMON: Marcus Drymon, representative for the State of Alabama.

MEMBER ADRIANCE: Jason Adriance,

Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries.

MEMBER ROOTES-MURDY: Kirby Rootes-Murdy, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

MEMBER BECKWITH: Anna Beckwith, South Atlantic Council, recreational and charter.

MEMBER BOGAN: Robert Bogan, captain of the Gambler, also representing RFA, PVA, NECO. I was supposed to be here last spring but I broke my foot so hello everybody.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: And just to note Robert is a new member of the advisory panel so welcome.

MEMBER BOGAN: Yes, thank you.

MEMBER BELLAVANCE: My name's Rick

Bellavance. I run a charter fishing business in

Point Judith, Rhode Island, and I sit on the New England Fishery Management Council.

MEMBER PURMONT: George Purmont,

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Mike Pierdinock, charter boat captain out of Massachusetts, Stellwagen Bank Charter Boat Association and the RFA.

MEMBER RUAIS: Rich Ruais, American Bluefin Tuna Association, commercial.

MEMBER MARSHALL: Andrew Marshall, 1 2 fishing vessel Typhoon, commercial. 3 MEMBER FORDHAM: Sonja Fordham, Shark 4 Advocates International, environmental rep. 5 MEMBER ODEN: Jeff Oden, North 6 Carolina, commercial. 7 FACILITATOR BROOKS: Great. And then 8 On the teleconference I think we have a 9 couple of folks. Maybe if you could introduce 10 yourself quickly and we can start with the AP 11 member Walt. 12 MEMBER GOLET: Hi, this is Walt Golet from the University of Maine, School of Marine 13 14 Sciences. 15 FACILITATOR BROOKS: Other folks on 16 the phone. 17 MS. REMSBERG: Loren Remsberg, NOAA 18 Office of General Counsel. 19 MS. STEPHEN: Diane Stephen, HMS 20 division staff. 21 FACILITATOR BROOKS: Great. And then 22 if we can just introduce ourselves around the 23 room quickly and we'll start. MR. MILLER: 24 Ian Miller, HMS Silver 25 Spring. MR. SILVA: George Silva, HMS Silver 26 27 Spring. 28 MS. Baertlein: Heather Baertlein, 29 HMS. 30 MS. Cudney: Jennifer Cudney, HMS St. 31 Petersburg. 32 FACILITATOR BROOKS: Let's go to the 33 way back of the room. 34 MR. KANE: Raymond Kane, Cape Cod 35 Commercial Fishermen's Alliance. 36 MR. PEARSON: Rick Pearson, HMS St. 37 Petersburg. 38 MR. MCHALE: Brad McHale, HMS 39 Gloucester. 40 MR. BLANKENSHIP: Randy Blankenship, 41 HMS St. Petersburg, Florida. 42 MR. CURTIS: Tobey Curtis, HMS 43 Gloucester. 44 MS. WILSON: Jackie Wilson, HMS Silver 45 Spring. 46 FACILITATOR BROOKS: And Ben if you 47 move really quickly you can introduce yourself. 48 MEMBER CARR: Ben Carr, environmental.

 OPERATOR: And excuse me, we also have Ms. Shana Miller also on the phone.

MR. OLIVER: Do you want me to make a few comments?

FACILITATOR BROOKS: It would be great if you would make a few comments. And then typically we then open it up for AP members to share some thoughts or questions they might have.

MR. OLIVER: Great, thank you. Well, good morning everybody and welcome to Silver Spring. I'm happy to be able to join you today. I won't take a whole lot of your time this morning.

I do want you to know that you are part of my training program. I've been in this position now for about two months and I came from 27 years of experience in the North Pacific region and thought that I knew a little bit about fisheries management.

But I can tell you that the breadth and depth of all the issues that we have in front of us around the country has been quite the learning curve for me. And so I appreciate the opportunity this morning to meet with some of you and introduce myself.

I think that one of the things that interested me in coming to D.C. and coming to this position was the opportunity to experience and learn about other fisheries and other regions, and to hopefully have some influence on our national policy at a national level on our fisheries management programs.

I think that highly migratory species is something that's never been really on my radar screen, we don't have a lot of those up in the North Pacific, but it's certainly one of the most interesting species, interesting from a commercial perspective, from a sport fishing perspective and all the international aspects.

I look forward to learning more about the process.

I've already learned this morning how big our HMS staff is. It's quite a big group with a lot of attention and understandably so.

I've caught HMS species. I grew up down in the Gulf of Mexico and fished for tuna and billfish down there, but I don't know frankly a lot about the various management programs.

This process is new to me. When I walked in the room my first thought was wow, this looks kind of like a Council meeting. And so I appreciate the opportunity again.

I just wanted to address a couple of issues.

I know there's one issue I would just speak to briefly right up front. One of the issues that's on your agenda that you're going to address this week and it's become a bit controversial is the pelagic longline closed area experimental fishing permit that we approved.

And I know it's very controversial because my phone and my email have been going kind of off the hook. I've gotten a lot of interesting correspondence on it over the past few weeks.

I do still believe it's an appropriate action and it's going to give us important information on species distribution and abundance and a lot of other information that will be useful for future stock assessments and other management considerations.

I know one of the things I've learned and heard is there's a large amount of swordfish, U.S. swordfish that's going unharvested. And one of the priorities of this administration is to be able to maximize our commercial ground fish harvest, increase them where we can, increase aquiculture production where we can.

And at the same time maintaining our recreational fishing opportunities. And at the same time maintaining long-term sustainability.

And I think that the information that we hope to gain from this will give us that kind of information.

I think it doesn't mean that these areas are going to be flung wide open, but I think that the approval of that EFP was in the spirit of that basic philosophy.

I hope to be able to spend some time here today. I've got some other meetings I have to go to downtown and on the Hill, but I hope to be able today or tomorrow to spend a little bit more time in the room just listening to your discussions.

I do want to thank you all for the time that you put into this. I know that many of

you have fishing opportunities that you're missing, or other business or family obligations that you're taking away from to spend time in this process.

But like many of the other management processes and fisheries that we manage we certainly can't do it without stakeholder input. And so it's very much appreciated, all the time and energy that all of you spend on this.

Just a last couple of comments. On a personal note for those of you who live in the coastal areas and I know many of you do with the storm approaching I wish you all the best.

I just spent most of my last week down in Rockport, Texas where I grew up and where my mother still lives, and spent most of last week down there cleaning up my home down there and helping some of the neighbors with theirs.

Once we got all the debris and trees off my house we realized that our house was relatively unscathed which we were very lucky. Many of our neighbors were not so lucky. So I wish all of you the best in that.

I again thank you for giving me some time on your agenda, a chance to introduce myself and to meet you all.

Again I hope to be in and out of your meeting over the next couple of days. I understand there may be an informal get-together this evening that I hope to get back and participate in and have a chance to talk to some of you more informally on the side and learn more about your issues.

So I appreciate your time and I'd be happy to take a few questions as long as you promise to make them easy.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Excellent, good. Well, thank you very much and let's see who at the table would like to have a question. Rusty I see you and then over to Anna.

MEMBER HUDSON: Chris, welcome aboard. I've been involved in this AP for the best part of two decades and involved with shark for four decades.

Based on that about a month ago you were at an MSA hearing and Senator Cory Booker had a question with regard to shark finning in the United States.

We've been getting a lot of bad press when we have a lot of people with permits that play by the rules.

And so he had put a number of 500 plus investigations and you said yes, you would check into that assertion.

That does not match up with the OLE webpage. And so whether you want to talk sidebar about it or talk to the folks we know that that's not an issue, shark finning. Anybody that's doing it is poaching and they need to be prosecuted.

There's this effort by Oceana to kind of cause us to throw away all our shark fins which we think is totally counterproductive.

And so we're trying to make Congress understand a reasonable, prudent measure that would allow us the continued right to exist as permitted directed limited access permit owners. Thank you.

MEMBER BECKWITH: Hey, Chris, we were

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Hang on one second. I think he was just going to jump in with a quick response.

MR. OLIVER: I don't have a response for you on the exact numbers. That's something I can try to get back to you with or talk to you more informally on the side and maybe better understand your question.

I personally believe that if you kill a shark to throw away the fins kind of doesn't make sense. That's my personal view.

But in terms of the enforcement and violation issue I'll talk to you further on the side.

MEMBER BECKWITH: We were looking forward to hosting you next week but that may not be possible.

One of the discussions that we've been having at the Council level is the different definitions of optimum yield, and how optimum yield might be achieved differently for commercial than recreational fisheries.

And specifically for the South Atlantic Council we've been discussing that around dolphin, mahi mahi, that optimum yield for recreational is achieved by actually having high

levels of abundance in the water and easing the ability for recreational fishermen to catch fish.

So I say that only because as you sort of move forward with this mandate to achieve optimum yield it hasn't been something that has been sort of in the mindset of national marine fisheries that optimum yield can also be defined separately and differently for recreational fisheries than they are for commercial fisheries, that abundance is an issue that is of most importance for recreational fishermen, not just the actual harvest numbers.

MR. OLIVER: Thank you, Anna. You promised not to give me any difficult questions so I won't consider that a question I'll just say that I agree with you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Terri, then over to Marty.

MEMBER BEIDEMAN: Hi. I want to offer congratulations on your appointment and good luck. There's lots.

And I did want to say with regard to the concerns that our fisheries are perfect platforms to collect real data and that we need to keep doing it.

We close areas. Some of these areas have been closed for almost two decades.

All of the people sitting around this table should know that though swordfish were enhanced by having these closed areas for juvenile swordfish at the time the real rebuilding was due to international regulations being enforced and enhanced.

And a segue off of that is concerns about how the agency is going to deal with the MMPA regulations, Marine Mammal Protection Act, comparability for imports.

And I know currently that there's a comment period for a list of foreign fisheries.

But our fishermen are very aware from dealing with other countries at ICCAT and all of these fisheries are managed there that a lot of times countries will tell you what you want to hear but they don't necessarily do it.

And our concern is to be sure that it's comparable, really comparable because our goal is zero mortality rate goal.

And that we have some teeth in finding

out and making sure that they're following the rules if they're going to be afforded the ability to bring their product into our country and compete with us. We need a level playing field.

So we've been talking about that at this table for a decade or more in different fisheries, but particularly now since it seems to be going ahead I believe that we'll be talking more about this in the days to come.

But I look forward to talking to you at the MAFAC meeting. Perhaps I'll see you at the ICCAT meeting. But I'm currently chair of MAFAC so I'll be talking with you about this and other things. So thank you very much for coming to our meeting today.

MEMBER SCANLON: Yes, Rusty brings up an important point and it's not just really limited to shark finning and stuff like that.

One of the things that I think that the agency can do to help us is to do a better job of promoting the work that we do here as far as fishing sustainably within the United States.

And that pertains to all domestic fisheries. A lot of times we face a lot of outside pressure from groups that want to sort of propagate problems and issues, and they don't really fully explain what's going on.

I think we as an agency here need to do a better job of defending what we're doing here and promoting what we're doing here as far as fishing sustainably, especially domestically.

In other portions of the country like in food, for example, if there's bad food being distributed the U.S. government will come up and make it clear of what's being brought in and what to watch for.

But we don't seem to do that to defend our fisheries. When there's false news and people are being misled into believing certain things we don't ever seem to step up and defend what we're doing here.

So we'd like to see us go more in that approach. I think that would help all of our domestic fisheries, just not in the HMS fishery.

MR. OLIVER: Just a comment on that.

And I agree with you.

During my many years with the council and my participation on the council coordination

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

committee, the eight regional fishery management councils, that was an issue that we repeatedly discussed with the agency was how do we tell our story better. It seems like only the bad press gets out there.

And so I very much agree with you. I've had a number of discussions recently about how to do that. Some of it was in the context of the various certification programs.

And I think to your point if we are -you look around the country at the work we've
done on rebuilding fish stocks.

When we have a directed fishery on a stock it's by definition a sustainable fishery. And so that by definition -- we need to get that story out better.

At one extreme we could talk about a government labeling program I suppose where we basically have a government stamp of endorsement on the various fisheries similar to the certification programs.

But I think the key point I guess I wanted to make is I agree with you. When these fisheries that we have are by definition sustainable or we wouldn't be fishing on them, so I agree with you.

MEMBER BELLAVANCE: Thank you. Thank you, Chris, for coming to spend a little time with us. I appreciate your efforts there.

I spent a bunch of time over the last decade or so trying to think about ways to improve recreational catch estimates and the data collection process in the recreational fisheries, particularly in the for-hire sector.

And I'm encouraged by the work that's being done using modern technologies like electronic reporting software, things like that to help us tell our story a little bit better.

One thing I did want to just mention to you quickly while I had the chance was I think it's really important that as we work through this new technologies that we try to do our best to develop standards that are similar across all regions.

I'll use my business as an example. I report to the southeast regional office for dolphin/wahoo. I report to GARFO for my groundfish, and I report to the State of Rhode

Island for tautog. And I report to HMS for my HMS fisheries that I fish in. And they're all different.

So I think it's important that we really work hard and think a lot about how we can streamline that process so that I can have one tool that I use that helps me report to all those different agencies or offices or bodies with one stop and not have to open up this tablet and do this on this program, open up this laptop, do it that way, fill out this piece of paper for that group, and so on and so forth.

So I appreciate the time. I just wanted to put that on your radar as we move forward. Thank you.

MR. OLIVER: Quick response. Over the past two months a huge amount of my time has been focused on the very issue that you raise.

A lot of the discussions I've had about whether it's the marine recreational information program or new smartphone technologies in terms of data collection for recreational fisheries.

A lot of that discussion was in the context of red snapper management, but it's not limited to red snapper. And I agree with you.

Part of the problem with that is the consistency and calibration to the other data collection methods.

But I can assure you that it's a priority for us. It's been made clear to me from the Department of Commerce leadership that they fully expect us to expedite the resolution of that issue and to get to a point where we can effectively utilize modern technology better than we're doing it now.

MEMBER RUAIS: Hi, Chris. It's the first time we meet. I just wanted to echo the sentiments around the table. Welcome aboard. And I did notice that one of your first comments was that HMS has a very large staff. I wanted to make it clear that most of us feel that it's absolutely essential. The work load is tremendous between the international and the domestic. And the staff is excellent.

And it goes beyond -- I saw Alan in the room earlier. I don't see him anymore. You've got some talent there.

And also on the outside I know there must be somewhat that you're familiar with. Rollie Schmittert once held the post you have now and he was a longer serving AA. And he was our ICCAT Commissioner at the same time and he did an excellent job.

So if you ever have to reach out he's a source of expertise.

And Bill Hogarth passed Rollie's length of service and is also an expert in that field as well.

The final point I wanted to make which you did mention the commercial and recreational fisheries here.

And I just wanted to add that the bluefin is a little bit unique coming from the northeast where the home of the bluefin fishery really did originate in the United States.

We also have -- I had to get that plug in. We also have a combination of commercial and recreational in what we call the traditional fishery. And that includes within the General category where we allow sale and recreation in the same category.

So we have it all up in New England and it's all very important to us. And there are literally thousands of families and coastal economies that are dependent upon that traditional fishery. So welcome aboard.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: I'm not seeing any other cards. Oh wait, Dewey has jumped in. Dewey.

MEMBER HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. You briefly spoke about swordfish and our country not landing our quota.

I've been involved in this advisory panel in one way or another for the last 20 years or 25 years going back to the nineties with sharks.

In the last 10 years HMS division has come to us, this advisory panel on numerous occasions and meetings and asked what can they do to revitalize the fishery. Asking us the fishers. People around the table.

It's crystal clear to me that in the last four or five years we've gone from 60 percent landing our quota, 46 percent, 41 percent, 35 percent. The ship's going down.

And at the last meeting I asked one of my questions will this division, HMS, come to the advisory panel and to the fishers and tell us what they're going to do to revitalize the fishery.

They're the captain of the ship. You're the captain of the ship now. So under your watch is our swordfish quota, which country is it going to be given to.

Because it's crystal clear that we're not going to land our quota. We're not landing it.

And it kind of leaves me a little bewildered of what this agency HMS in the last seven or eight years has done and what they're going to do to help the U.S. fishermen in our country land our quota.

Because is it better for the U.S. to land it, or is it to give to some other country that doesn't have vessel monitoring systems, that doesn't have cameras onboard for one reason or another, that doesn't have 100 percent observer coverage for five months of the year, that doesn't have circle hooks, that doesn't have all these other pilot whale take reduction teams type of stuff.

So in short form you've got an unreal task ahead of you because this ain't the Council. And there's a lot more things involved in here and a lot more history.

Sometimes you can play on history, but things that happened 20 years ago is not what's happening now.

And so it'll be interesting to see how under your leadership we're going to land our swordfish quota and how that's going to change.

So I look forward to hearing that in future.

But it's a mess. It didn't happen overnight. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Dewey. MR. OLIVER: I'll just briefly

respond.

I said earlier one of the interesting things about highly migratory species is the international aspects, and that also makes it one of the difficult things about it.

I certainly don't want to see a

situation where our unharvested fish ends up going to some other country.

And that's why I need to better understand the reasons why in order to answer your question what we're going to do about it, I need to understand the various reasons. And I know there are various reasons why that fish is going unharvested.

I can assure you once I better understand that it will be my goal to help reverse that trend the best that I can.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Well, thank you very much, Chris, for being here this morning. We know you've got a busy schedule and need to head out but I think you got a really good scan of the kinds of issues that we will continue talk about. So thanks so much for being here.

Okay, thanks everybody. Just to sort of jump back into setting up the meeting here. Let me just do a quick agenda scan. As always we've got a lot on the agenda.

Just to note we will stay in plenary today and tomorrow so we will not be having breakout sessions. We'll be around the table together till 3 or 3:30 tomorrow.

Today we will start with Margo's overview of recent HMS activities and rulemakings. The remainder of the morning we'll review a couple of the upcoming rulemakings and we'll get some updates from enforcement folks.

After lunch we'll come back. In the afternoon session we have a mix of issues. We'll have an update on Caribbean management issues. We'll have an update on the pelagic longline closed area exempted fishing permit.

We have a series of recreational issues to talk about, and then we'll get the year to date review on Atlantic bluefin tuna management.

We will have public comment from 5:30 to 5:45 and then this evening as Chris mentioned we will have our sort of usual no host informal social. That will be downstairs at the lobby and as always it's great to have everybody there. It's a good chance to talk informally.

Tomorrow in the morning we will start at 8:30 so just note we'll start a little bit earlier tomorrow morning and that's to

accommodate folks' travel schedules towards the end of the day.

We have a couple of topics. We'll talk about electronic HMS dealer process overview and updates, and then we'll talk about an upcoming rulemaking around the commercial shark closure threshold and advanced notice.

But the bulk of the discussion will really focus on this last topic we were just talking about which is the swordfish fishery and trying to come at that again in a way where I think just to sort of follow up on Dewey's remarks I think it's going to -- getting your way to a more productive place there is going to require everyone pulling in.

It's going to be both information from the agency, information from folks around the table, and really hope to make some progress on that conversation tomorrow.

After lunch we'll come back and have a couple of topics as well. We'll talk about the bluefin tuna General category January fishery, and then we'll talk about final Amendment 10 on essential fish habitat.

And we will again have public comment from 3 to 3:15. We may do a little agenda tweaking here and there based on where we are on timing in the meeting but that's the basic plan.

Just quickly around the table are there any issues that we should be trying to squeeze in that aren't on the agenda already? Marty.

MEMBER SCANLON: I would like to know the update from the pelagic take reduction team and what the status of that is, and when that will be implemented.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay. Margo will try to work that into your intro today, this morning? Okay, great.

Let me just then quickly hit some ground rules and then we'll get into it.

Again, this should be familiar to most of you but, Bob, for your benefit ground rules that we work on.

First of all, just to emphasize this is an advisory panel input, but it's seeking your individual advice. This is not a consensus seeking body.

I think we all know that, but it's always worth repeating.

The conversation is around the table among advisory panel members. While there are opportunities for public comment again the conversation is around this table.

We will fold in AP members who are on the teleconference so please be sure to let us know. Chime in, chirp in however you can so we know. We're monitoring it? We'll check in with you periodically as well.

Our goal here as always is to have focused dialogues to get a range of views on any issue that's under discussion, for the HMS staff to get a sense of what are ways forward that make sense, that can garner support.

And so to that end we just need to hear from all of you. We need you to stay focused on issues. We need to be succinct in our comments so it creates the opportunity for other folks to weigh in as well.

Just be respectful in how you use the time. If there are differing perspectives as always we ask you to be respectful. Ask questions of each other. Try to understand why there are differences because it will help Margo and her staff figure out ways forward.

Just in terms of meeting logistics as we've already been doing when you want to get into the queue just please put your name placard up on its end and I'll see who wants to get into the queue.

I will generally follow the order of the placards going up, but I will deviate from that because, one, I want to make sure that everyone around the table gets a chance to weigh in.

I know some of you are really eager to contribute and appreciate that. At the same time we really want to make sure we're hearing from everyone around the table.

It's very important for Margo and her staff to understand what people are thinking. And this is why we bring the AP together.

As always if I'm missing you just let me know. Sometimes in the corners of the room or Jeff's sitting in my blind spot over there, but I've already told him to throw things at me if I

5

miss him. Just let me know.

If your cell phones aren't off or on silent please do so. If you need to take calls we just ask that you step outside the room.

And I will repeat what I say at every meeting. Please do not have side conversations. I know you all think you have the quietest whispers in the world but the reality is the voices really travel and it makes it really hard for anyone around the table to hear the conversation.

So, if you are desperate to have a conversation with your neighbor please step outside so that we can stay focused on the conversation here.

With that I think that's all so over to you, Margo, for your overview.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: All right. So, I'm going to try and make sure that I'm close to the mike but if anyone is having trouble hearing me please let me know. Just wave your hand or chat Pete on the webinar if you can't hear me.

Before I get started I wanted just to take a couple of minutes and acknowledge some of the folks that are not with us because of the various hurricanes. Perry Trial who is our State of Texas representative is clearly not able to be with us since he's dealing with the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey.

And then we also have a number of our south Florida representatives to the panel that are bracing for Hurricane Irma.

So we have quite a number of folks who aren't here. I wanted to especially acknowledge Charlie Kluck who is here as a proxy for Martin Fisher who may be needing to leave early to head back home.

And I would say that is true for all of you depending on where the track is going and we'll be looking to Fly for regular updates.

If you need to leave, safety comes first absolutely. We can accommodate changes to travel and please just do what you need to do.

And specifically thinking of Marcos Hanke in Puerto Rico today as Irma is going overhead. So there's a lot going on. I think we just want to know that we're thinking of you all and support you if you need to leave.

And so just before I get started too I wanted to do a quick shout out to Brad McHale and Pete Cooper over the summer who took turns filling in for me while I did a temporary tour down the hall helping Alan with the office.

It was great to be able to take a little time and know that the division was in very capable hands. So thank you Brad and Pete for that.

And so at this point I'll run through what we've been doing for the last couple of months.

I would note that this meeting is a bit shorter in time from our usual spring to fall because the May meeting was later than normal.

So a number of things that we'll be talking about are things that are about to come out, upcoming things, and part of that is just the amount of time since May.

And so again, trying to give a brief overview of things that are not otherwise covered on the agenda. And so things that we will be talking about later I will not touch on here, but there's plenty of other things that are happening. And just finding time to fit it all in is tough.

And so since May we have published the proposed rule on the shark 2018 specifications. And we are very close, and I'm hoping that we'll hear this week about our final rule on adjusting quotas carry forward from last year for bluefin tuna, northern albacore, and swordfish.

It has also been a very busy summer for us with in-season actions. Very active management of particularly our bluefin tuna fisheries in the northeast with quota transfers, and retention limits, and closures.

As well as in our shark fishery with the quota closure of the western Gulf of Mexico blacktip, large coastal and hammerhead fisheries, and the retention limit for large coastals and hammerheads, as well as an adjustment to the swordfish general commercial retention limit. So that has been a busy summer for us.

On the EFP front we'll talk about the pelagic longline closed area research EFP. But that's not the only one.

We also had a comment period on white

shark research. I'll give you an update on that in just a minute.

And have otherwise issued 33 EFPs, scientific research permits, and letters of acknowledgment as well as 5 shark research fishery permits.

We're registering tournaments. We're at 263 to date for the year and have held 27 workshops, protected species and shark ID workshops. Although I would note that we have rescheduled the one for Panama City later this week.

We've got about 5,600 people on our email distribution list. And I would not hopefully you have not noticed but we changed our email delivery system.

And so if you have noticed maybe it wasn't quite as seamless as it was supposed to be. So.

Specifically to the shark 2018 specifications, the proposed rule came out August 22. We're proposing to open all the shark management groups on January 1, on or about, as close as we can get.

All proposed quotas are the annual based quotas with the exception of a few that are adjusted for underharvest. That includes the western Gulf of Mexico and eastern Gulf of Mexico blacktip as well as the Gulf and Atlantic smoothhounds quotas.

The proposed retention limits are also a little bit different than what we have proposed before with the eastern Gulf at 50, western Gulf at 45, and the Atlantic at 25. So these would be the opening retention limits that we've proposed with the ability to adjust in season throughout the year as needed. Comments are due September 21.

And then on the quota adjustment, this is what we call a temporary final rule because it's only in effect for less than a year. It would adjust northern albacore baseline quota for under harvest carrying forward what we can under ICCAT rules. So that would be an adjusted quota of 658 metric tons.

North and south swordfish also carrying forward the maximum available. And we would have about 3,300 metric tons dressed

weight, 75 south swordfish.

And then for bluefin tuna the Reserve category would be augmented by the carry forward and so as soon as it publishes it will be 156 metric tons.

So like I said that is hopefully going to be announced this week. And so then we'll have those additional quotas available to us.

And then if you recall in the spring we had an afternoon of discussion on national policy and implementation plan requirements.

And so I have a few updates for you. Not everything is updated. Our allocation criteria, plan amendment, and the national standard guidelines.

There's a lot of internal discussions happening, but we don't have documents or drafts ready for you all. But we will keep you apprised as we do and we will take your input to be as specific as possible from the spring. Certainly understand that there's a lot there.

On ecosystem based fisheries management as you recall we will be drafting an HMS implementation plan in compliance with the national policy and roadmap.

This one has slipped a little bit in terms of timing and so we are now anticipating the draft plan would be available for the spring meeting with the final by the end of 2018. So you'll be hearing more about that.

And so the SBRM, that's standardized bycatch reporting methodology, there was a final rule that requires all FMPs to come into compliance by 2020.

And what we've done so far is done a review of what the final rule requirements are, comparing that to what is in our HMS consolidated FMP, and have determined that we're in compliance with the exceptions of descriptions for standardized bycatch reporting methodology for spearfishing, buoy gear, and green stick gear. And these are all gear types that have been authorized since the 2006 plan.

And so we will be working on in the meantime folding some of the new information into our SAFE report so you'll be seeing some of that.

And then working that into a plan amendment over the next couple of years.

At this point we don't anticipate needing to do rulemaking to make these changes. This would be in a plan amendment.

And we will of course be checking in with you as we go.

And finally, the National Bycatch Reduction Strategy. This is another thing where the HMS fisheries are getting their own implementation plan.

We are currently waiting for finalization of the national plan and then we'll be moving out on the HMS plan.

So we anticipate sharing that with you in the winter or spring as well.

So lots of thinking, lots of planning. Not much in terms of document sharing yet. But stay tuned.

And so then if you recall in the last meeting I had a series of graphs on landings updates for you all and have tried a slightly different approach here since we send these out and they're publicly available through listserv notices and things.

So I thought I would just provide the links so that you could find them.

If you prefer to have them actually as part of this presentation I'm happy to go back to it. I just thought I'd mix it up a little bit.

So then looking at some of the exempted fishing permit updates as I mentioned we'll talk about the closed area research EFP later.

But we also received the Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's request June 19. This was a request to retain bluefin tuna on vessels with unauthorized gear on board and using electronic monitoring video data for compliance and monitoring.

We, as with all the EFPs that don't fit into our normal annual EFP notice put it out for separate notice with comment. And we had a comment period through mid-July.

And so comments received included opposition to issuance of the EFP stating that it didn't need to be an exemption from the current regulations as well as concerns that if all vessels that had unauthorized gear onboard could fish for bluefin tuna there would be a sizeable

increase in the amount of effort on bluefin.

Groundfish fishermen who were the ones seeking this in part I think were supportive and look at this as a way of diversifying their trips, making use of available resources even though they have, again, this unauthorized gear onboard.

And they viewed it also as an incentive for expanding electronic monitoring as a way that this could be monitored.

So we are currently analyzing these comments and coordinating with the greater Atlantic region who is also working on a permit for this group.

And so I don't have a decision for you. We're still thinking about it. But wanted to make sure that you had the latest updates.

And then specific to white sharks we also had a standalone public comment period on the issuance of white shark research where we previously had issued permits for tagging.

But as you recall we modified our rules for archival tag last year, or the year before, and removed the requirement to submit reports and be permitted when simply deploying archival tags.

That rule had been implemented in the nineties when archival tags were new and people didn't know what kind of mortality would be associated with them.

And since that time mortality is very low. And so we took those regulations off the books.

But we've been continuing to receive comments and requests for us to actually direct or control some of the research activities for white sharks specifically.

And so we put that out for comment. We talked about this in spring where we had a lot of comments coming in in support as well as some opposed due to concerns about mortality.

And so after considering these comments we are issuing what are called letters of acknowledgment. They are not permits. They don't authorize the activity. They simply acknowledge that what has been submitted to us is research. And that is specific to shark research on research vessels.

If there are private vessels that are otherwise permitted and may need an exemption to possess a prohibited species like white sharks to implant a tag then they would need an EFP for that.

But the research vessels themselves don't actually need that letter from us. They are doing research and it is outside the purview of Magnuson.

And so wanted to just share with you all that that's the status that we have now. And we will continue to provide those letters of acknowledgment if asked. But we do not have the authority to actually control those activities.

And a quick update on the General Category Cost Earnings Study. This is something we talked about at the spring meeting as well where we are starting a one year cost earnings logbook study of the Atlantic tuna General category that will run for the calendar year of 2018.

And the purpose is to estimate the economic activity of HMS fishing under this quota.

And so we will be selecting General category and Charter/Headboat permit holders with recent history of commercial bluefin landings.

They'll be selected for reporting.

And we added the Charter/Headboat folks based on the AP input in the spring.

And we expect to send out notification letters in October. Participation is required if selected and that will be an electronic logbook.

So we'll be looking for reports, trip basis, for trips that are landing or targeting HMS including cost earnings data.

There will be a no fishing report if no trips were taken for HMS in that month.

And then a final survey of the annualized costs, vessel costs, insurance and things that would follow in 2019 after the conclusion of the year.

And we anticipate having that final report in the summer or fall of 2019.

On the international front ICCAT is shaping up to be a heck of a year this year.

We have new assessments and negotiations for measures for bluefin tuna east

and west, swordfish north and south, shortfin make north and south as well. And so that kind of covers the gamut of the major species.

We are also keeping an eye on landings for yellowfin, bigeye and sailfish as those measures have triggers for review and potentially renegotiation if the total allowable catches were exceeded.

And there is some thinking that some of those at least may have been exceeded.

And so in addition this is a year where the convention amendments may be adopted which would be a revision of ICCAT's charter and a number of measures.

And as if that wasn't enough it is also a new year to select a new executive secretary as well as elect all of the panel chairs.

So it'll be a doozy. We will be there in support of the Office of International Affairs and have the government leads for many of these panels. So it's a heavy workload for us as well as the international office and so I would encourage you all if you are not on the Advisory Committee for ICCAT to stay tuned and we will be in touch.

On international trade not a lot of updates here, just a note that the Seafood Import Monitoring Program is expected to come online January 2018.

And that will expand the reporting requirements to the BAYS tunas and require electronic reports of imports.

The International Trade Data System has been online as well as the Electronic Bluefin Catch Document Program for a little more than a year as well. And so things are going fairly well I think on that front, but I would encourage you all to pay attention to the SIMP program is what they're calling it.

On ESA updates, our biological opinions, we've been under re-initiation of consultation for a while.

The update here is that the southeast had a large influx of consultations that they are working through and have reached out and so I think we may be seeing more movement on that in the near term.

And on the oceanic whitetip petition to list under ESA, that final rule is in progress. The comment period to list that species globally closed in March. And so they're working on that final rule.

And silky and thresher sharks effectiveness of Appendix II listing under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species is in effect October 4. So that's a little more than a month away.

If folks have questions we can connect with you Fish and Wildlife Service that has the lead on implementation.

On the Deepwater Horizon oil spill front the Oceanic Fish Restoration Project which is the new name concluded its first year of the pelagic longline and alternative gear program that ran from March through June of this year.

And so I think we have some results that we could share offline if you're interested. But then also wanted to let you know that the application period for 2018 should be coming out later this fall.

And we've got a link there if you want more of the details.

And then on the long-term restoration front the Open Ocean Trustee Implementation Group had a public request for ideas for long-term restoration on the 2017 to 2020 planning years.

That comment period closed in the spring and project ideas are being screened and vetted now for things to take up in the near term, things that might be a little further out.

So there continues to be quite a lot of work on this front. And there's quite a lot that goes into this on the agency side.

And we are participating in that to make sure the HMS fisheries and interests are represented.

And then on a few other fronts I mentioned before there's an electronic pilot for an electronic logbook that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center had developed.

That pilot is now complete and they are looking to have the electronic logbook available on a voluntary basis for the fleet starting in 2018.

I think there's an idea that there

would be an initial period where it's voluntary, get broader participation, and then likely move to maybe a mandatory program at some point. I don't have a time frame for that.

We wanted to make sure if folks are interested in moving away from paper logbooks that this option would be available to you in the new year. And I can connect you with folks from the center that can make that happen.

And also in the southeast there's the Southeast For-Hire Integrated Electronic Reporting Initiative.

This is a Gulf and South Atlantic Council initiative for their charter fleets. Because there's so much overlap between the HMS and the council fisheries we are participating in the internal planning groups and in a support role as those initiatives progress.

And there may be follow-up in the HMS fisheries regs after they're further along.

And then we've also gotten requests to look at regulation changes for landing tuna chunks where right now the requirement to land tunas in specified form so that minimum size measurements can be made where there's shark damage and the chunk is clearly larger than the minimum size, that requirement to land in the proper form does not allow those fish to be landed.

We have a provision for swordfish for this very reason and the request was to consider doing this for tunas as well.

So finally, kind of taking a step back, looking at what we talked about in the spring.

If you recall we had received a fair number of requests for changes to the regulations over the previous months.

About 45 individual requests for changes had come in. And we wanted to get your input on where the agency should prioritize its time and energies.

And so we had what we called the dot prioritization exercise. We gave you all dots, different colored dots by kind of the AP sector with a priority dot, a dot within a dot, and had put all 45 of those requests up on poster boards around the wall and asked the panel members to

put their dots where they think that we should put our time.

And so this was not intended to be a vote. It was simply a signal of where the AP was advising the agency to pursue different actions.

And so please don't try and read this. We have these. These are all online, the results of the exercise. We also I think brought the poster boards if you want to see it in real time.

But you can see that there were definitely signals of where the AP thought some things were higher priority than others.

And so we as our responsibility to you all take your input quite seriously and have you'll see in this agenda for this meeting there's a number of things that correspond fairly directly to where AP prioritization indicated we should spend our time.

So I wanted just to refresh your memory there before we get into the agenda.

So then looking ahead, shark specs, comment period towards the end of this month. We look for your input there.

As I mentioned ICCAT the annual meeting and then the ICCAT advisory committee meeting in the fall. Look for a final rule on shark specs hopefully by December 1.

And then we have a number of upcoming proposed actions that we'll talk about in more depth in a minute. Again, looking back at your input to us from the spring.

And so this is the same slide that I've had for many meetings now and it continues to be true which is my personal goal that you know exactly what we're doing and why.

And you let us know what you think. We don't like to be surprised. I like to know what the impacts of what the agency is doing or not doing are and I also look to you all for your input.

There are some loud voices here. There's sometimes some strident discussions. We need to hear from all of you.

And I would really hope that we're providing the venue where you can feel comfortable to share your thoughts and reflect both for us and for you all to know what everyone thinks around the table.

And so we look to you to be informed, engaged, for us to be aware and informed. We ask that you listen, contribute, and then also share back home with what the discussions are, what the views were.

And our commitment to you is that we'll make sure that we're following the international and domestic requirements, that we raise issues that are relevant to you whether it's directly from the division or other parts of the agency, or even other agencies, that we will engage with you.

And then that the decisions that are made will reflect your input. So we take all this very seriously.

And then we've got a packed day and a half in a little bit. So I think we'll have some good discussions. Hope to hear from you. And that's all I've got.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Great. Thanks, Margo. We have time for some questions or comments on anything Margo presented. Stephen.

MEMBER IWICKI: Margo, I was just wondering at some point today maybe the mobile catch reporting app, kind of get an update of what kind of response you're getting, if it's helping, if it's more than the traditional reporting, that kind of thing.

But I think that was a really great capability you guys introduced earlier in the year. I'm just curious to see how it's working out.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks.

MEMBER WESTFALL: Thank you, Margo. Just curious what the next step is in the process for the oceanic whitetip listing.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: I think the agency will release the final rule with the determination and then whatever's in that there may be subsequent actions that flow from it. But the next step is the final rule.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Rick.

MEMBER BELLAVANCE: Thanks, Margo. A quick question on the cost earnings survey for the General category. Who's the contact person to offer comments on to that?

I don't want to muddy up the waters here or take up too much time, but just who would

I speak to on that, general comments?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: That would be George Silva over here or Cliff Hutt who's behind you.

MEMBER BELLAVANCE: And one more comment if I can. Quick comment.

I just also wanted to add that NMFS also published a proposed rule mandating electronic reporting for the for-hire sector for mid-Atlantic permitted vessels. So that also adds to the kind of need to get going.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Yes. Thank you. FACILITATOR BROOKS: Let's go Bob,

Ron, George, and then back to Katie.

MEMBER HUETER: Thank you. Bob Hueter, MOTE Marine Lab.

Margo, you mentioned the seafood import monitoring program. Can I ask you if you can make this short and sweet what is the status currently of NOAA's authority to stop imports of shark products, especially the fins from IUU countries that practice unsustainable shark fishing pursuant to the Shark Conservation Act of 2010 which was supposed to begin the process of allowing us to restrict those imports?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: You know, I want to connect you with the right folks before I answer that. A legal question like that is not something I want to try and answer right now.

I think obviously we have those provisions in place. I think the seafood import monitoring rule is coming from a couple of different places in terms of the impetus for it.

How these actually connect legally I would want to get you in touch with the right folks first.

MEMBER HUETER: And the reason I bring it up is it really lies at the crux of the issue of the shark fin ban. And you hear all kinds of things. We do have the authority. We don't. New legislation is needed. Legislation is not.

We have to answer that question first before we can address the question of whether or not bands are appropriate.

So I raise it and I hope that we can maybe look at it in depth at a future meeting.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Okay.

MEMBER WHITAKER: Yes, Rom Whitaker,

Hatteras Charter Boat.

5

I just -- you covered the mutilated tuna by the sharks, yellowfins in our area mostly, occasionally bigeyes and bluefins.

But I apologize for missing the May meeting, and you all may have come to some conclusion, but this is an issue.

And I think these fish are maybe being landed illegally now. And I hate to see them just being thrown away.

So hopefully if it's not -- I want to be sure we discuss that and come to some kind of resolution. Thank you.

MEMBER PURMONT: Good morning, Margo. In regards to the Deepwater Horizon Gulf of Mexico status is there any update as to larval studies inasmuch as we consider that as a prime spawning area? Looking forward is there any feedback?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Specific to the Gulf of Mexico?

MEMBER PURMONT: Yes.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Well, there were papers that were published on some of the impacts of Deepwater Horizon on larvae that came out a couple of years ago.

I think they showed larvae were impacted, heart muscle. There may be others that know more of those details here. But certainly there were studies that have come out showing negative impacts from exposure to oil for larvae.

I don't know of any recently, but I know there were some.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Mike.

MEMBER SISSENWINE: Yes, thank you. I'd like to get a little bit of clarification on the request from the Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Association for being allowed to retain bluefin when they have unauthorized gear

I assume these fishermen that are requesting the authorization to retain have a permit for the bluefin. The issue is only the unauthorized gear. Is that correct?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: I'm not sure. Okay, so Brad is saying yes, that they do have a permit. But I think these are lobster and groundfish fishermen that can't have unauthorized

onboard.

gear onboard.

MEMBER SISSENWINE: Right. So, if they have a permit for the fish then clearly it isn't a conservation issue per se. They would be allowed to catch it if they didn't have the gear onboard.

So presumably the issue is about whether having the gear onboard creates some sort of an enforcement problem. That is, you can't really understand whether they caught it with this unauthorized gear or they caught it with the proper gear.

Obviously it's not an enforcement issue if somebody has a lobster pot onboard. I don't know about the groundfish trawl.

But in any case I think one ought to consider this in the context of a struggling New England groundfish fishery and to the extent that they are authorized to catch these fish and it's not a conservation issue I would clearly be viewing to what degree this represents an enforcement issue.

Clearly if it's an enforcement problem then one has to deal with that. But if it's not then it seems to me that it would be a reasonable way forward. Thank you.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Mike Pierdinock. Two things.

In response to the Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Association proposal if this is being conducted as an enforcement issue one question I had is that as they did do the videos of the fishing events does somebody actually review those videos. And therefore what's done and what's the process to address any non-compliance?

Or otherwise we'll just have another Carlos Rafael issue up in our waters with all these bells and whistles in place and there's no enforcement. That's the first thing.

The second thing is in response to EVTRs I am for EVTRs and is the road that we're going down.

I'm one of the 30 boats in
Massachusetts participating in a pilot project
and as a result of what I heard this past several
months of certain issues associated with the EVTR
I would just ask that we take baby steps and not
make this mandatory for everybody to use because

there are issues associated with it that need to be addressed.

In addition, presently we prepare on the federally permitted vessel paper VTRs. And if you do not submit those paper VTRs in a timely fashion nothing happens.

The only thing that happens is that you won't get your permit for the next year.

This gets down to timeliness. If you have an EVTR or a paper VTR they have to be submitted within 24 hours. And if not something has to occur or otherwise we'll be in the same situation whether we have electronic reporting or paper reporting that you have it and there's nothing done to address the timeliness of that submittal. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Dewey and then over to Pat.

MEMBER HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. I was wondering about the Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Association exempted fish permit application that had to do with the use of electronic monitoring.

And if it was with cameras how would they be activated if they were not using hydraulic wheels. Would it be like something attached to their hand crank wheel where it would automatically kick in when they cranked the handle? Or just how would that work for that electronic monitoring part if it's not used with hydraulics?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: My understanding is that the northeast requirements are that video is recorded as soon as they pull away from the dock. It's 24/7 while they're out.

MEMBER AUGUSTINE: Thank you. Pat Augustine, recreational.

Just a quick question. I didn't read all the detail and I should have, I should have been able to answer this question, but has anyone considered the negative impact on the overall stock by adding 30 additional vessels to the fleet during the period. If this were to be in effect through 2017 unless it goes into 2018 and then it's considered as a part of the total base.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: I'm sorry, what issue are you talking about? I missed the beginning.

MEMBER AUGUSTINE: I'm talking about the Cape Cod request. Will there be a negative impact by adding 30 vessels that now can land fish to this year. Will it go over the quota? Do we have an experimental quota? Where does the quota come from?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Those are all

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Those are all questions that we're working on answering. I think there's quota available.

As again we have not issued the final decision so these are things we're considering.

MEMBER AUGUSTINE: Just a quick

follow-up. According to our comment this morning the comment was made that it looks as though that we're basically approved.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: What's approved?

MEMBER AUGUSTINE: By our introduction of our new man at the top. He said with the introduction of this, his words were basically that it was approved. There was an inference there. I wrote it down. And maybe I was wrong, but did anybody else catch that? I guess others caught it.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Oh, I think he was referring to the pelagic longline closed area research EFP. Not the Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen.

MEMBER AUGUSTINE: I stand corrected because that scared me.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay, I don't think I see any other cards up so thanks, Margo. It sounds like there's a couple of issues that maybe we'll get back to during the meeting or to Bob specifically.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: And I forgot to hit the pelagic longline.

OPERATOR: Excuse me, did you want to go over the phone?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Give me just one second, please.

To the request for an update on the pelagic longline take reduction process they are still working on the proposed rule.

So I don't have a timeline for you, but they are still working on it. Full intent to get that out as soon as they can.

And I think we'll be sure to cover that once it's out at the subsequent AP meeting.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay,

teleconference. Operator.

OPERATOR: Yes, sir. You have two -three panel members. If they want to say anything, if you do your lines are open.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Walt or Shana?
MEMBER MILLER: No, thank you.
MEMBER GOLET: All set, thanks.
FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay.
OPERATOR: Very good. Thank you, sir.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thank you. In that case let's get you to a break a couple of minutes early and we will reconvene at 10:30 sharp. Thanks.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:10 a.m. and resumed at 10:32 a.m.)

FACILITATOR BROOKS: All right. So we want to shift to a couple of upcoming rulemakings. We'll hear from Tobey Curtis first on the HMS Charter/Headboat permit proposed rule, and then we'll take some questions after that, and then we'll hear from Carrie Soltanoff on the individual bluefin tuna quota accountability proposed rule.

So, Tobey, you're up first.

MR. CURTIS: Thank you. I'm Tobey Curtis and I'm happy to be talking to you about something other than dusky sharks this meeting.

This is a brief, real quick overview of the Charter/Headboat permit and the sale of HMS issue that's popped up a few previous meetings, so this is an update on that action.

If you recall this action is sort of being driven by changes in Coast Guard policies. So they updated their policies in 2016 on dockside examinations and vessel safety requirements for commercial fishing vessels.

These new requirements would extend to any fishing vessel that sells or intends to sell fish, including HMS Charter/Headboat vessels.

These vessels currently have the option to sell their catch. However, only about 7 percent of the vessels, of those permit holders have sold fish in recent years. So the vast majority of the fleet doesn't sell any of their catch.

But based on the updated Coast Guard

requirements these vessels would be required to meet the same safety regulations for other commercial fishing vessels including life rafts, EPIRBS, survival suits, and other safety requirements. Whether they actually sell the fish or not because the Charter/Headboat counts as an intent to sell.

These safety requirements would be overly burdensome and impractical for some vessels, especially smaller vessels.

And so the purpose of this rule would really be to address this issue and find a way to create a separate regulatory provision for commercial sale of HMS by these Charter/Headboat vessels. So the intent here is to revise the regulations such that Charter/Headboat vessels that do not intend to sell any catch would not be subject to the updated Coast Guard safety requirements for commercial fishing vessels.

Charter/Headboat vessels that wish to sell their catch would be subject to the Coast Guard safety requirements for commercial fishing vessels.

So, we've had some discussions and we've basically narrowed it down to three basic approaches that we could take on the regulatory side to address this issue. The fourth being just sort of status quo, no change.

The first option would be to prohibit the sale of HMS on all Charter/Headboat vessels, but allow these vessels to also obtain tuna or swordfish general category permits if they wish to sell those species.

The second option would be to split the current Charter/Headboat permit into a sale and no-sale categories. So basically where we had one permit we'd now have one permit.

The no-sale permit would be prohibited from selling any catch and they wouldn't be subject to the Coast Guard requirements.

The third option would be to add a commercial sale option as an endorsement to the current Charter/Headboat permit similar to the shark endorsement under amendment 5B.

So vessels that don't have the endorsement would be prohibited from selling catch. And again they would not be subject to the Coast Guard requirements.

 So, that's it, that's where we're at right now. Stay tuned for the proposed rule which we hope to have out pretty soon.

If you have questions you can contact HMS and Brad is the one that's been following this issue the most closely.

So I guess we've got a couple of minutes for questions but that's it on Charter/Headboat for now.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Yes, so questions or comments about this proposed rule. Dewey?

MEMBER HEMILRIGHT: Thank you for that.

I was kind of wondering in your options there when you look at all four of your options a couple of them would work.

But I was kind of interested in something that's a little more accountable, something that you had to give a -- before you landed your fish you had to give your logbook number or something like that.

Like some more I guess the word stringent regulations. Some of what the commercials have to do when they go to land a fish.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Dewey, what would be the -- what's the intent behind your thinking there?

MEMBER HEMILRIGHT: My intent behind the thinking is to clear up all the trivial areas so we don't have so much -- it's straightforward.

You know, right now in this type of thing, the stuff that's going on, there's so much behind the scenes happening and so it's more a way of straightforwardness of accountability that's simple.

To get the gray areas out and make it more yes or no.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So, I hear you on that. We heard you before as well.

A little bit of context. We're hoping to have this rule in place final and effective for the January fishing season. So the next permit cycle.

And so we necessarily needed to have a fairly tight, narrow focus of this rulemaking in order to do it quickly.

And so I think we're going to have to

take some of these issues step-wise and start with some separation, clarity, commercial versus rec for this permit, stick with that for now.

If we try and add a lot to it in terms of other reporting or other issues we are not going to have this in effect for January. That's just kind of the reality that we're working on.

So it's not that the issues aren't valid or that we don't want to deal with them in some way, it's just right now for the clarity of when the Coast Guard requirements for commercial fishing vessels apply we needed to do something fairly quickly.

MEMBER HEMILRIGHT: Just a quick follow-up.

Yes, I just think it was better -- I know you all have a serious workload with a lot of things, but I think it was better to do it right all the way and get it done than to do haphazardly a little bit at a time because a lot of this will still be going on even though you got one part of it.

So I was kind of looking for a quick inclusive thing that is to clean it up versus a little piecemeal thing because it takes time.

And you know we could be discussing this four or five years from now. And it would still be going on, the accountability, the accounting, stuff like that.

For me this is just kind of what I see up on the board alternatives is just a start, but I was looking for something more inclusive like one-stop shopping and it's done. You don't have to deal with it.

And so it doesn't appear like that's going to happen. Thank you.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: It wouldn't happen quickly. To do something all-inclusive probably wouldn't be in effect for several years.

So I think we wanted to get this clarity sooner than later.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Great. I've got a few people in the queue. We'll start with David, then over to Mike, then to Rick, then to Katie, then to Rick Bellavance. So, David.

MR. SCHALIT: Is it part of the intent of this to establish some measure of control over these permits in the sense that let us say when

one takes out a permit they would be obligated to enter a control number which would identify that they have been inspected by the Coast Guard. In the case in which they are taking out a permit with the intent to sell. Is that part of this project?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So what we're trying to do is given some of the Coast Guard safety requirements for commercial vessels as applied to the current universe of HMS permitted vessels provide greater clarity of what is considered a commercial vessel so that all of the equipment, EPIRBS, life rafts, all of that applies.

So it's clear to Coast Guard where it applies and it's clear to our permit holders when it applies.

Entering numbers and things are things that I think are more -- they could be enhancements, but right now we're just trying to get that clarity on when those rules apply and have that in place for 2018.

So we're necessarily a narrow scope in order to get an action in place.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Thank you, Mike Pierdinock.

The second option, the sale/no-sale category, that takes into consideration the small let's say center console 21 foot vessel fishing down in the Keys that never sells anything and provides them that option that they can go down the road in no-sale.

In addition they don't have the ability to have all the bells and whistles with the commercial requirements.

Now if you take into consideration for instance the members of the Stellwagen Bank Charter Boat Association with the Charter/Headboat category and so on, and that they want to be able to sell the fish.

One thing I think needs to be considered here is that the recreational trophy quota is very small and that closes really quickly every year.

So automatically everybody's going to sign up then for the sale category because that quota is so small.

I don't know if there's any

consideration to increase that quota that I believe your statistics also show that the vast majority of the vessels, there's only like 10 percent of the vessels that are really landing the fish commercially.

And I suspect maybe the other 90 percent of the ones that if there was a greater trophy recreational quota that didn't close so early they'd go down that road and wouldn't sign up for the sale.

So I'm for the sale/no-sale as well as the members up north, but I want you to take that into consideration because I think that ties in this whole trophy issue and why it closes every year so early.

Because it would be counterproductive because everybody then will just sign up for the sale category that has the ability to do it because their boat's big enough to have the commercial bells and whistles. Thanks.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Mike. Rick Weber.

MEMBER WEBER: All the options seem to accomplish your goals so I'm assuming there are nuance differences between them.

Option one would require essentially permit stacking, yes?

But between two and three they seem to do the same thing.

So we can give you better advice can you give us some feedback as to what you see as being the differences between the different options?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: You're right, I think they all do meet our goal so that's good to hear that you agree with that.

And yes, there is -- some of the flavors of the differences are getting at things like the ability to hold multiple permits.

Some of the things we considered were moving from someone having to get one permit now to do what they intend to do to having to get three potentially.

And so none of them are trying to actually effect change in terms of what happens on the water because of the need to have a fairly narrow scope in order to move more quickly.

And they're different ways of doing

similar things so that we have either two separate categories trying to think about how people are going to -- coming into the website and what are they going to notice. What's going to be intuitive to users when they're thinking about what they're doing. What they want to do.

So I think that's -- there aren't tremendous differences but some of it was, you're right, permit stacking would be one way of describing one of the alternatives versus our most recent experience with the endorsement for dusky sharks, you know, that kind of model. So they're similar. Does that help?

FACILITATOR BROOKS: I don't know if this is correct, Margo, but it also seems like part of it is who's got the burden to take an action.

In option two everyone is going to have to say sale or no-sale. In option three only that segment of operators that are wanting to do sale would have to take a positive action.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Right. That's true.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay. Katie.
MEMBER WESTFALL: Thank you Tobey and

Margo.

Along similar lines I'm curious in terms of how this relates to enforcement and which one of those three options would be most easily and effectively enforceable.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: I think they're all similar. They would provide greater clarity which is what we're trying to do. It would just be what we need to help Coast Guard and NOAA OLE look for when they're doing boardings and things.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Rick Bellavance and over to Anna.

MEMBER BELLAVANCE: So I had a question on the proposed rule. Do you envision the proposed rule incorporating these options and looking for comments on that, or do you think the agency is going to select one and that's going to be the proposed rule? That's my first question.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So, in order to have proposed reg text for people to look at we need to prefer one of them. But we always have to have some range of alternatives under the requirements for federal rulemaking. So these

would likely be the ones that we would analyze as alternatives to that, but we would pick one that we prefer and would have proposed reg text that would go along with it.

MEMBER BELLAVANCE: Follow-up. So with that in mind I polled the folks in our association over the last couple of days and the general consensus was that preferred option from our perspective was number two. And they were opposed to number one. From Rhode Island Charter Boat.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Anna.

MEMBER BECKWITH: Yes, my concern with option three over option two would be that there would be some educational component necessary for people that maybe aren't following the details, that they might click on the endorsement without truly understanding what that requires.

So, I think option two for my personal viewpoint would be the preferred. It would certainly be the cleanest and most easily understood and the most easy to enforce.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thank you.

Andrew.

MEMBER MARSHALL: I know each region is different but I can just tell you in practice in the northeast if you're out with a Charter /Headboat permit and you're fishing with 130s for example you're considered to be commercial fishing. And the Coast Guard views you as commercial fishing whether you are or not. So it's just what I see out there. You are considered to be commercial fishing with a Charter/Headboat permit. And that's how they enforce it. So you have to have the safety gear.

That is kind of some of the impetus of us embarking on this action is to clarify when our for-hire sector fleet, regardless of where they're at along the coastline, is operating that it becomes very clear to the Coast Guard and those boarding agents what safety gear is required on these vessels and which isn't.

MR. MCHALE:

And so you're absolutely right, especially in the northeast a lot of it has been gear-centric.

Because the current permit has that

So, if I could just chime

built in for-sale provision that a number of these vessels are not capitalizing on. We've shared some of the numbers. Ninety-three percent do not sell HMS.

We're trying to make something extremely clear that all of a sudden a boarding party jumps onboard your vessel. Sir, I'd like to see your permits. Here's your permit. It's a Charter/Headboat permit. Does it or does it not have an endorsement. Is it a Charter/Headboat for-sale permit.

So it eliminates that level of subjectivity that the Coast Guard is then defaulting to.

We've seen the announcement that I think Katie will touch on as well is well, do you have a state permit or do you not. It becomes very clear. Here's the piece of paper. Here's what I'm authorized to do. And then they flip to their book to figure out exactly what safety gear am I now searching for.

And so that's really the main driver of this particular action to acknowledge, Dewey, yes there are other layers to this, no doubt about it.

But the core of this action is to at least divide that user groups into those that want to continue to have the ability to take paying passengers as well as still catch and those don't. And the ripple effects of what that now means as far as investment in safety gear.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Let's take a few more comments. We'll go over to Lisa, then Rom, then George, then Dewey you'll get a last word on this.

MEMBER GREGG: I just had a question. I'm assuming that this isn't just an HMS issue, that this is something that potentially the councils are also addressing, or at least would have to be facing.

Because I mean, some of the Charter/Headboat sectors in some of the fisheries for the Councils are also allowed to sell commercially.

Have any of the councils addressed this and how have they done this? Can we provide some consistency?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So, I think the

regulations vary by council and how the Coast Guard applies them varies as well.

I'm not going to try and speak to the details of that.

We have had some input from I think the Mid-Atlantic Council as well as some interest from the South Atlantic on this issue, but not from a make it consistent, more of a make it clear kind of approach.

So, those folks are here. They can maybe speak to them.

MEMBER GREGG: Just real quick. I would just like to know what the councils are doing so maybe we don't reinvent the wheel.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Any council folks here that can weigh in? Anna?

MEMBER BECKWITH: Yes, the South Atlantic Council has not permitted any sales for our charter permits. So we have defined a charter only as recreational and then commercial is commercial.

There has been some interest in reconsidering that for mahi, but that's the only species that's really been brought forth and so far there's not any impetus to change our current boxes.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Tobey
MR. CURTIS: Yes, just to add, my
understanding from New England and Mid-Atlantic
Councils is their permits do the same thing.
It's permit type. If you have Charter/Headboat
there's no sale allowed on any charter permit.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So some of the confusion here is that maybe while the charter permits don't allow sale the vessels are able to have multiple permits that do.

And so we have one permit that allows both. And so what we're trying to do here is create some of that separation and clarity.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Rom.

MEMBER WHITAKER: Rom Whitaker,
Hatteras Charter Boat.

It's my understanding now, and Dewey this might -- but if my intentions are to sell something on a commercial permit, whether it be Charter/Headboat or straight commercial then I have to have a vessel inspection, dockside inspection, safety decal on my boat. That's

pretty well cut and dry now I think.

 Second thing. I think that probably the guys I've talked to, option two would be preferred or leave it alone.

The third thing was what Mike referred to as increasing the trophy category would certainly -- I think a lot of guys would opt out of the selling or the sale part of the category.

I brought this up at the last meeting but I think maybe we need to look at that a little closer. Thank you.

MEMBER PURMONT: Bennett, roughly how many vessels constitutes 7 percent and what percentage of the 7 actually participate in a regulated Atlantic fishery. So you're talking about 7 percent of the Charter/Headboats.

MR. MCHALE: I might have some of those numbers in the 2017 fishery in review. Roughly there's about 3,500 on an annual basis permitted Charter/Headboats up and down the coast.

And so we're looking at 7 percent of that that are involved in utilizing that for-sale provision of the current permit.

The vast majority are kind of New England centric, Mid-Atlantic centric with the Atlantic tunas versus the example I think Mike shared of somebody fly fishing down out of the Keys as an example for other HMS.

But we can tease out those numbers to get the exact universe if I don't have them already in my presentation.

MEMBER PURMONT: Okay, thank you. I just wanted a ballpark and I appreciate that.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Dewey, I want to give you a last word and then over to Marty for a really fast last word.

MEMBER HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. There is a couple of parts to this, but one thing to look at is HMS is issuing the permit that allows this to happen, these fisheries.

And so just because -- the Coast Guard doesn't go out there. I'd venture to say how many vessels they stop to inspect or check out on the water.

So what I was looking for and I think different people have given comments on this is this is one part of it.

But the second part is the reporting requirements that are not being followed that shows that probably less than 50 percent of the maybe General category are reporting their fish at landing or within 24 hours.

You know, it would be interesting to hear from the Coast Guard and from the enforcement on these options right here as far as going to the effect, going further.

Because you do need, you should have something that allows you to give your unique identifier before you get your permit issued.

And also you should have to report upon arrival the sale of your fish, your VTR number.

And so we're just looking for ways to tighten this up a lot more because once this is done you're still going to have the shenanigans that have continued on and we're seeing that with the enforcement, probably with the enforcement report here today about the illegal fishing and unreported catches that are going on throughout the east coast.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Dewey. Marty, last word and we do need to get to Carrie's presentation.

MEMBER SCANLON: One of the things I don't see even being discussed here is we're talking about a sale of fish. And I don't know how we can discuss the sale of fish here without implementing VMS units on these vessels.

I mean, you're talking about complying with the Coast Guard. I mean, one of the things that we do in the pelagic longline industry now is not only do we have to declare our intent before we leave the dock, but we also have to within 12 hours give notice of where and when we are coming in to the dock.

So, if you're talking about allowing these guys to sell fish then I think that you need to consider having them put -- if you're going to sell the fish that's fine, but you need to be under the same regulations that we are.

We have to declare our intent before we leave the dock so there's no misunderstanding once we're out on the water.

And on returning to the dock, once you've caught whatever you've got to do the Coast

Guard should be informed of where and when and how you intend to land those fish.

So I think that's an important element that hasn't even been discussed here.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: I know there are several cards. I'm going to actually not call on them. We've got to go to Carrie's presentation. If we have a little more time I will come back.

I just want to note that of the folks who weighed in on the alternatives that were discussed it seems like there is a preference for alternative two, at least that's what was articulated.

There's clearly interest in other issues that are tied to this, whether that's looking at the trophy quota and considering the ramifications there, and then as we've heard from several of the other speakers there is more to this issue for folks around the table than just safety regulations, issues of reporting, identifiers, declarations before you go out. So there's more here to be thinking about.

So thanks to those who had cards up that we couldn't get to, but we'll come back if we can after Carrie.

MS. SOLTANOFF: Thank you. Good morning. So I'm going to be talking about individual bluefin quota program accountability measures.

A quick background on the IBQ program. IBQ allocation is used to account for bluefin tuna bycatch including landings and dead discards when fishing for target species with pelagic longline gear.

At the start of each year the IBQ share recipients receive a portion of their annual IBQ allocation from the Longline category bluefin quota.

And the objectives of the IBQ program, in addition to limiting bluefin landings and dead discards in the longline fishery, are to minimize constraints on fishing for target species and optimize fishing opportunities and maintain profitability.

Looking at the accountability measures within the IBQ program, in 2015 we had annual accountability where vessels were allowed to fish throughout the year with an IBQ balance that was

below the minimum allocation or with quota debt.

And then the vessels were required to account for any quota debt they had accrued by the end of 2015. And if they hadn't accounted for that quota debt it was subtracted from their subsequent year's annual allocation.

Starting in 2016 we implemented triplevel accountability where a fishing vessel has to have the minimum IBQ to fish before departing on each trip and it must account for quota debt after each trip.

And in order to account for that quota debt or meet the minimum allocation the vessels can lease IBQ allocation from other program participants.

Looking at what we've heard from the advisory panel and from the fishery in the dot exercise that we did at the spring AP, having increased flexibility in IBQ accounting was a request that received 11 dots as you can see here.

And some of the reasoning behind wanting that increased flexibility. Fishery participants have expressed concerns about the dynamics and costs associated with leasing IBQ including that those dynamics can negatively affect their ability to plan their business including the timing and price at which they choose to lease IBQ.

It can also affect their opportunity to fish for target species and the profitability of target species catch.

It can impact their operational cost such as crew pay and it can increase the uncertainty around the availability of IBQ to fish and lease.

So looking at some potential alternatives to address IBQ accountability.

So, the status quo is the trip-level accountability where vessels must account for quota debt and maintain the minimum balance after every fishing trip before they depart on the next trip.

And if the vessel has a low balance or has quota debt they have to lease additional IBQ or they have to delay their fishing trip until they can account for that debt.

One alternative, quarterly

accountability. The vessels would need to account for quota debt at the end of each calendar year quarter, and they would be able to fish with a balance below the minimum throughout that same calendar year quarter.

Biannual accountability, similarly they would account for quota debt at the end of June and December and they'd be able to fish with quota debt or low balance during the same sixmonth period.

And annual accountability as we had in 2015 they would account for quota debt at the end of the year and they would be able to fish throughout the year in quota debt or under the minimum balance.

Some potential impacts of these alternatives, regarding timing flexibility to allow vessels to shop around for IBQ to lease.

The longer the accounting period going from trip-level to annual accountability the more flexibility the vessel would have to determine when, from whom, and at what price to lease additional IBQ.

Looking at potential impacts on the IBQ lease prices or market dynamics, the longer the accounting time period the fewer times throughout the year that they would have a deadline to account for any quota debt, and the more IBQ lease prices could potentially surge in advance of those deadlines or IBQ could become less available.

Looking at impacts on target species catch and the ability to fish with longline gear, the longer the accounting time period the less constrained the vessel could be to lease IBQ and depart on their next trip.

And impacts on bluefin catch reporting or longline quota tracking. These alternatives wouldn't have any effect on catch reporting or quota tracking because all bluefin landings and dead discards would continue to be reported in the IBQ system and would be deducted from the vessel's IBQ balance as they are now.

So looking at these same impacts visually. When going from trip-level to annual accountability the flexible timing to lease IBQ would increase.

Potentially impacts on IBQ leasing

market dynamics could also increase.

The constraint on fishing for target species would decrease from trip-level to annual. And again, bluefin catch reporting and quota tracking would be the same under any of these alternatives.

So, please stay tuned for a proposed rule. If you would like any further information you can contact me or Tom Warren. And happy to take any questions or comments.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: At this point, Carrie, would you be interested in comments on these different alternatives?

MS. SOLTANOFF: Yes.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Great. So any comments or questions? George.

MEMBER PURMONT: Yes, again, good morning. Could you please enlighten me as to the nature of the lease agreement? Who is leasing and to whom? And what quantity of fish are involved in this lease? Thank you.

MS. SOLTANOFF: So, that would be up to the individuals who are making the lease to determine how much quota they're leasing.

But it's from one person who receives annual allocation and has some leftover annual allocation of the IBQ. Then they would be giving it to whoever is looking for IBQ allocation.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: George, were you also seeking information on sort of the total volume that's leased throughout the year?

I think we're going to see that in a later presentation.

MEMBER PURMONT: Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay. If there are no other -- yes, there are. Okay.

MEMBER SISSENWINE: Thank you. So, looking at the statement that the impact of bluefin tuna catch reporting/longline quota tracking under all of the alternatives basically all the catch will be accounted for and overages deducted I guess from the next year's allocation. Is that a correct interpretation?

So I take that as saying that the conservation effect of each of these alternatives is the same. At the end of the day the sustainability or risk to the stock isn't affected by these alternatives. Is that the

correct interpretation?

MS. SOLTANOFF: Yes, that's right. We wouldn't expect any environmental impacts.

MEMBER SISSENWINE: So why wouldn't one move to alternatives that increase flexibility?

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Duly noted.

Jeff.

 MEMBER ODEN: I still have a serious problem with the fact that we still can't have carryover for the following year of quota.

To me that is a very important issue. I've sat on the last three years I've not utilized one pound of quota. Well, I'm sorry, maybe two years ago I did, or three actually.

It's just hard to watch that go to

waste.

And again, I would give it to a friend if he needed it. You know, it would just be very beneficial to us I think to allow that flexibility.

And what percentage I don't know, but it needs to be in there.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Jeff.

Rich.

MEMBER RUAIS: In the first year the implementation of the program after the initial proportional IBQ allocations were distributed among the Gulf of Mexico fleet and the Atlantic fleet in the defined proportion we saw coming out of the reserve early in the next year an amount of quota, I forget whether it was 30 or 40 tons that was taken out of reserve and added to the IBQ and the second round of distributions was made.

And when we asked the answer was, well, something to the effect that we were trying to prime the pump and get the system going.

And I think we've done that more than once now. And so the question remains to the rest of us how many more years is there plan, or what is the criteria that would change the agency stopping the second round of free allocations I believe in the active year into the IBQ program and taking it from reserve, obviously making it not available to anybody else unless it's not used and we wait for the 108 metric tons to come around the next year.

I know that's kind of a complicated question, but it has to do with the impact it's having on the remainder of the fishery.

And if I could just add to Jeff's point, I just can't see the logic of how you roll over IBQ. I mean it's a fixed amount of quota. Unless you raise the 10 percent rollover number that we're allowed to keep of ICCAT underage to 20 percent of something and dedicate that extra 10 percent to say, okay, let's let Jeff do that and let's let pelagic longliners do that, that's one reasonable way of doing it.

Going back to 20 percent of the quota, or 30 percent, or whatever the amount has to be.

But without doing that and you allow -- if everybody is catching and the IBQ program is a success and it's being used to catch tuna but some guys on December 31 have quota left over, you've got to report that to ICCAT within the total U.S. catch. And we'll be over quota and out of compliance unless you take it.

Again, unless you refrain from giving reserve to other historical users of the resource to make way for that rollover that Jeff and others want to see from the IBQ program the rest of us, the rest of the fishery suffers.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So Rich, I think just a couple of points.

You're right, we have done transfers inseason to the Longline category each year. I think 34 and most recently 45 metric tons are transferred. Inseason transfer criteria, there are 15 of them. We look at them each and every time we do inseason transfers to each category. It includes General, Harpoon, Longline, all of that, Angling.

And so we apply those criteria each time. I would encourage you to read the Federal Register notices because we step through them every single time. And they are all free to all categories.

So it's something we look at. There's a reason there's 15 criteria. There's a lot of factors to look at that vary by situation.

MEMBER RUAIS: If I could just follow up. But if a big part of the 108 metric tons that we have to wait till the following August of unused, untouched, non-transferred quota is

rolled over the rest of the fishery is denied that quota until the following year when the 108 is brought back into the fishery.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So in the beginning of the year as you recall amendment 7 established transfers from unused Purse Seine quota to the reserve. A formulaic approach.

We've done that every year. The quota that is moved to the Reserve at that point which is a sizeable amount of quota at this point is available to all U.S. users. Not just Longline.

We have done an earlier transfer to Longline than we have to some other categories, but other categories have benefitted from that quota as well in addition to the 108 that comes later when all the numbers are in.

So, all 15 criteria are applied to the reserve each time. It's not lost to the U.S.

MEMBER RUAIS: It's lost in the current fishing year. We can't access it. Right now we're still waiting, or in the past we have waited until late in August before you have identified how much you can put back into reserve to see what can be re-allocated to other users.

And again it's a disadvantage. It's an institutionalized underage as it stands right now. Until it's proven to be a success. Until the IBQ program is actually being utilized.

If it's being fully utilized then I don't have a complaint. But the complaint is when you're not using the quota and it's being denied to people in a given year, next year the fish might not be here and we might not need that quota next year. We needed it this year for example, or could have used it in the month of August if the fishery would have had consensus. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Terri.

MEMBER BEIDEMAN: Well, I look forward to seeing which way you go on this because we really have needed flexibility.

And it could, something like this, prevent having to have an early in the year type of transfer. I can't say that it would.

But this trip-level accountability is an issue. It prevents people from being able to go back out fishing when fishing is good for them, not on bluefin because we don't target

bluefin.

But all the other food fish, all the other 100, the pelagic longline guys catch 100 food fish for every bluefin they catch. Or they did in the data I analyzed. So that's food for Americans for the most part.

And being able to go back out fishing when fishing is good, or weather is good and you're trying to connect with somebody to get quota, this is exactly why this was raised. It's an issue.

And early in the year it's an issue more because people don't want to let their quota go because they haven't even started fishing yet.

But someplace down south they might need quota and they can't find it.

And that's the reason that we did it. It wasn't to try to secure quota that was for only one category or any of that.

And I think somewhere along the line you have to take a look at the huge percentage of highly migratory species that are caught, non-bluefin that are caught by other harvesters and who are constrained by having to account every trip.

They can't go out fishing until they find enough quota. It's not as easy as you might think. NMFS has tried to help. But it's not a snappy easy thing to do.

Plus the fact that you have to pay for it. None of the other categories are having to pay for their quota.

So anyway, I'd be interested. I don't want it to be too long because I don't want to see people go in debt too deep and then have a problem. My opinion.

But let's remember this is not just a single species fishery for a lot of the people around that catch most of our HMS.

And the only thing I wanted to add to the previous thing is we're talking about food. The Coast Guard might be talking about safety, but commercial sale is food. And every harvester needs to be held to food safety standards to land food in this country.

And if they have to get a different permit so be it. But there's other regulations that are not being adhered to and it can make people sick. So commercial fishing needs to be safe.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Terri. So just to wrap this one up not unlike the Charter/Headboat conversation there's a couple of issues that came up that are sort of tangential to the proposed rule itself.

We didn't hear a lot of comments on the alternatives themselves, but at least one comment in favor of if there are no conservation consequences then why not increase the flexibility.

So with that thank you, Carrie, and at this point I think we will shift to the next agenda item which is enforcement updates. And so invite Katie Moore with the U.S. Coast Guard up here and then OLE folks are here, right? We've got Wynn Carney and John Reghi. Are you going first, Katie?

MS. MOORE: Good morning. Thanks for having me. I've met most of you before but welcome to new member.

And my position is a fisheries manager for the Coast Guard Atlantic Area Command. So that's everything east of the Rockies.

And I typically give you the same type of information every meeting so that way you can see where we've been and where we're going.

Where we are compared to this time last fiscal year, we're actually doing pretty well and I'm very happy about that.

Looking across all of our fisheries in this geographic area we're up more than 10 percent in our resource hours towards this mission.

Coast Guard has 11 missions so anywhere from search and rescue to homeland security, ice breaking, marine pollution response. So it is hard sometimes to maintain a focus on fisheries to the level I would like. And we have the upcoming storms and that is a draw on our resources. But so far pre-storm we are doing pretty well.

And the major increase was in major cutters. So I think that benefits this fishery for enforcement and oversight.

Now it did result in larger numbers of boardings in HMS compared to the last two fiscal

years. So up through mid-August we had approximately 300 boardings.

The increase of significance was in the mid-Atlantic. You can see that we had a high number of boardings of pleasure craft. We also had a slight increase in our Gulf of Mexico.

So we break down our boardings by the different commercial, Charter/Headboat, and pleasure.

Now the violations we saw in the early part of the year in the May zone were very similar. Undersized yellowfin, and that was by commercial vessels.

Then we started seeing some recreational violations. Those tended to be more so on lack of permit, retention of the species without fins, and we also had undersized in the rec category.

Some other violations continued to be lack of having the appropriate permit, and then also not having the turtle release and handling gear. So these were violations that were in the northeast, mid-Atlantic and in the southeast. We did not detect any violations in the Gulf of Mexico from our domestic fisheries.

Now as everyone's aware we do have the Mexicans coming over trying to hit HMS and also red snapper.

So far this was pretty good. We had lower detections. And that was compared to prior years. And as you saw we had higher resource hours towards this mission set.

Our interdiction rate still remained very high compared to prior years and I take that as progress. Definitely not the solution yet but progress.

So we only saw longlines. We did not see gillnet in terms of the gear catching any HMS.

I also include other species that were caught, not HMS, when HMS species were caught.

So I'm not going to get any feedback on misidentification because we only got it to the level of shark, not blacktip or any other type of shark.

So the first one, there was a significant number of sharks. Ninety percent of the catch during that haul were actually released

alive.

And as always we try to prioritize human safety. Our advisement is identify the species as best you can and we reiterated that guidance again. So, HMS species, primarily sharks.

Now, ongoing efforts domestically we did update our shark handling and release quidance.

We also included the information HMS just recently gave out to the domestic fishermen as well.

So we have ensured that our Coast Guard members have access to the videos, know about the shark ID guides, and we've reinforced the value of the at-sea identification of species where they can.

We also made sure they were aware of the not more than 3 feet of line attached to the sharks when they are released.

It came up a couple of meetings ago that the pelagic observer program sometimes has information on potential pollution incidents.

And so we have a process in place where I receive that information and it's relayed down to our district commercial fishing vessel safety examiners to further look into it.

If there is an outreach, education, or enforcement effort that's required. So that's been flowing pretty well. It's a timely process and we keep doing that.

Other efforts that are beyond just the domestic fisheries. We continue to be active. I'm working with the ICCAT delegation to look at what can we do on the high seas for enforcement.

And one step towards that is working with our partners that are ICCAT members over in Africa to make sure that they have law enforcement capacity and knowledge.

So we're actually right now deployed over there working with the Senegalese and we're helping train them on appropriate law enforcement efforts to help address their fisheries as well as general law enforcement.

So this year we've already worked with Benin, Togo, Cape Verde, Cameroon, Senegal, and other partners beyond just the U.S. It's the UK and France who are trying to help build this

capacity.

We're also having a huge amount of effort expended to address the issue that we have on our Mexican border.

So, opportunities such as concurrent patrols where the Mexican Navy is out patrolling at the same time as the U.S. so they can use their authorities on their citizens.

Other opportunities are considering having one of their law enforcement officials on a Coast Guard cutter so they can bring their jurisdiction. And those are still in development.

We do meet with the Mexican government quite often and that is done at the high level. So it's equivalent of Chris Oliver and we bring our admirals.

So we just last week conducted a tabletop exercise for the North American Maritime Security Initiative and that was a way to address general law enforcement as well as fishery-specific incidents should they occur at sea.

So it's a way for the two nations to coordinate efforts so that way we are practiced should there be a case that evolves.

And then finally Coast Guard has been active in administering the U.S. government's port denial of Mexican fishing vessels.

Since the launches were being an issue due to IUU the U.S. government took the posture of no Mexican vessels can come in. No Mexican fishing vessels, not just the launches.

So we are active in monitoring any advance notice of arrivals, and should a vessel come we make sure that their port services as well as their entry into the port is effective. So that is ongoing.

And as a reminder whenever we have a case with a lancha we do develop a case package and we transmit that to Mexico for them to prosecute. So these are ongoing efforts that U.S. Coast Guard is party to.

Now, there were a couple of questions that came up during the conversation about the commercial fishing vessel safety which is not my program area but I'm your enforcement advisor here.

So what we have done is we've linked

in our commercial fishing vessel safety program. So hopefully everyone received a copy of the marine safety information bulletin and it includes information on our program lead in the top right corner, Mr. Kemmerer.

And I wanted just to remind you of some of the things that we do with NOAA fisheries to try to address any issues that come up.

So, we work very closely with HMS on any emerging regulations. So we do brainstorming and we also have an enforcement working group where we review proposals that are coming out to make sure they're enforceable and enforcement considerations are taken into account.

This issue with the commercial fishing vessel safety, what is commercial, what is recreational, that evolved with conversations and it's probably been at least six months that we've been working on it.

So it's been multiple conversations with HMS and we've been looking at the issue holistically. Changing permits. Changing the way that you apply for the permit at sea. What information does Coast Guard need.

What was our intent in terms of the commercial fishing vessel safety. So there's a lot of behind the scenes actions that have taken place.

We've been partnering in terms of developing outreach and education materials. And that is ongoing.

So I do want to appreciate the emails, the phone calls, and the feedback we've gotten from anyone ranging from associations to the councils.

We do have Coast Guard fisheries officers on each one of the councils as enforcement advisors and we have not heard of other species running into comparable issues in terms of what's running commercial and what's recreational.

So wanted to say thank you to everybody. We understand that there is a lot of nuances in here. And Coast Guard just wanted to be clear as to what's commercial and what's recreational.

So if Mr. Kemmerer is on the line I would say we could turn that over to him. I'm

not sure if he's had the opportunity to call in.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Operator, do we have Mr. Kemmerer on the line?

OPERATOR: Sir, if you are on the line.

OPERATOR: Sir, if you are on the line please press *0.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Katie, do you want to take a question or two now, or do you want to have OLE present first?

MS. MOORE: Well, I just wanted -- I have some extra copies of the marine safety information bulletin with his contact information on there.

I think that I feel comfortable that we've heard the gist of most of people's concerns about the commercial fishing safety requirements and who does it apply and what are the burdens.

So I think I've heard that, but I'm happy to receive any of that information but I don't want to take away from NOAA OLE's time.

OPERATOR: Mr. Kemmerer's line is open.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Great.

MR. KEMMERER: This is Jack Kemmerer with Coast Guard headquarters and fishing vessel safety. And with me is Jonathan Wendland, one of my staff who's been involved with working with NOAA and NMFS on a number of issues.

So if there's any particular questions I can do that. Otherwise I just had a kind of brief summary from the last meeting when Mr. Belvo came and spoke with you.

And Katie already referred to a marine safety information bulletin that we issued after that meeting to explain a little bit about how we would address those charter vessels that have permits and whether we would look at enforcing fishing vessel safety requirements in Part 28 or not.

So I would just remind folks that have the headboat charter permit that if you're operating with that and you're a documented vessel you have to have a coast wise endorsement on your document and the master has to be licensed if you're taking passengers.

If it's a state registered vessel it's got to be registered for commercial purposes.

And regardless of what type permit you might have if you're selling your catch

technically you are a commercial fishing vessel and have to comply with Part 28 requirements.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: We're going to have a presentation from OLE. So, do you want to wait for that, Jeff, or do you want to jump in?

MEMBER ODEN: I would like

clarification from the gentleman -- is he still on the line? What's his name, I'm sorry?

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Kemmerer.

MEMBER ODEN: Kemmerer. Good morning, sir. I would like clarification there that all commercial vessels as per Coast Guard regulations are required to have identifying either state registration or coastal documentation numbers on the side of said vessel if they are in commerce. Is that correct? Ten inch numbers I believe, or letters.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Can someone respond to that?

MR. KEMMERER: I'm not sure. The documented vessels I believe only have to have the hailing port on the back and maybe if there's a permit number that's required by NOAA or NMFS that may have to be posted somewhere.

State registered vessels have to have their state registration number on the hull.

MEMBER ODEN: Okay. Well, I guess somewhere down the line I was misled because I thought all commercial vessels really had to have in 10-inch letters or numerals their documentation numbers or their state registration numbers on the side.

MR. MCHALE: So yes, thank you, Jeff. Those regulations actually aren't Coast Guard regulations, they're fishery regulations. And they do exist currently not only in the HMS regulations but northeast, southeast.

Where those vessels that have commercial permits, and I'll have to go back to the actual reg text, but must have their vessel identification numbers either on port and starboard side, sometimes on the roof.

And the size of the lettering is based upon the size of the vessel.

But I can get you those regulations. They do exist. You're not misinformed. They're in the fisheries regs versus Coast Guard.

MEMBER ODEN: Thanks.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: David.

MR. SCHALIT: Thank you, Katie, for this presentation.

The enforcement -- I look forward to the enforcement presentation. It seems like the most entertaining aspect of the meeting.

But I want to focus specifically on a couple of comments you made in connection with ICCAT.

Essentially what you're suggesting is that you are working in these countries in the Gulf of Guinea with a view toward helping them to build enforcement protocols and so on.

And then you made some reference to some discussion that you are involved in in connection with boarding and inspection on high seas. I take that to mean outside of the EEZ of any country.

And with ICCAT now. And I'm just curious if you could elaborate a little bit upon that and maybe let us know if there are some impediments that you've encountered in that project.

MS. MOORE: So, and it's been actually even before I was party to ICCAT on the delegation we've been trying to build a high seas boarding inspection initiative which has not passed ICCAT. In order to pass it has to go through a large number of nations and we haven't gotten there yet.

So as a step towards that we just recently put out a joint concept paper to show the partnering aspects which would be step one towards a high seas boarding inspection initiative.

And that is to show what are we doing elsewhere to build law enforcement capacity, to build inspection regimes, share best practices.

And that does not have to be on the high seas. So one of the examples is our efforts over in Africa where Coast Guard for several years has been providing bodies to train up other nations so that they can enforce their fisheries regulations.

Currently what we're doing in Africa is within their own waters. So it is not high seas.

Some of those nations in Africa are

also party to ICCAT. So we can bring those lessons learned and partnerships and trust and showcase that within ICCAT.

So we're also working with Canada on NAFO and that's a joint effort where we put a Coast Guard body on a Canadian platform.

And that's been working very well for over 10 years. So what we're doing in ICCAT is to try to share that information that it is a good thing for working towards having inspection, knowing what's going on in the water. But it has not gotten there yet.

I'm hopeful it will get there but no, we do not have a high seas inspection requirement for ICCAT. And we're still working towards that goal.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. I want to let Wynn and John present their information and then Mike we'll start off with you.

MR. REGHI: Good morning, everybody.

My name is John Reghi. Some of you may know me.

I've had the pleasure of presenting to you in the past. I'm now the domestic enforcement operations special agent for headquarters. We've had some staffing realignment so not only do I handle sustainable fisheries issues and HMS issues but also protected resources issues as well.

Today's enforcement overview, we were asked by the HMS division to try to keep it at a treetop level.

And that's actually a good thing because we have so much good work that's been done out in the field particularly with the augmentation of our uniformed officer cadre that today's goal is to show you where to find that information.

We're doing a great job of revamping our websites and keeping the information updated at least weekly regarding enforcement actions. So I'll be pointing you to those.

I also have with me today Lieutenant Wynn Carney from the northeast enforcement division. Lieutenant Carney is going to be speaking specifically to certain enforcement trends and what the enforcement officers are up to in the northeast enforcement division.

Southeast could not send OLE reps

today and they apologize. They're in the process of preparing for the hurricane and likewise our HMS attorney Ms. Loren Remsberg also sends her apologies and regrets. She also is preparing for the impending hurricane situation in Florida.

Most of you know, you've probably visited our home webpage. It's been -- it's in the process of being enhanced and it has been reworked.

And right now our second annual report for fiscal year has been posted to the web. This is for the cumulative results of fiscal year 2016.

In there you'll see case summaries, trend analysis and basic needs projection assessments for all of the enforcement divisions.

Our priorities are very important. The Office of Law Enforcement, that provides a framework which the Office of Law Enforcement operates in and provides services to our customer base and also to you as well.

At the top of the webpage we have a dedicated tab for priorities and we have a hard copy of the last document for 2012 through 2017 which is embedded in the webpage.

Recently this summer we posted for public comment on our website, it's now closed though, our new assessment for priorities for fiscal year 2018 through 2022.

Again that was during the summer. And if you do find reference to it on the internet and you do find that there is nothing on the webpage it's not a broken link it's just that we're handling it a little bit differently this year.

The document itself has been taken down. Certain comments have been processed and it's currently under review by NOAA leadership. So please stay tuned. It'll be published in the not too distant future.

Our newsroom tab is very, very important and this is actually where we're having weekly updates to enforcement actions.

You're going to have featured news stories, summaries of some of the more complex cases that the agents and the officers are working as well as other noteworthy activities that the organization is engaging in.

Also specific enforcement actions. Weekly highlights are posted to the web and that's on the right side of your screen.

Weekly I provide an enforcement summary to the deputy assistant administrator for regulatory programs and I go through each of the division's reports and provide enforcement summaries.

So there's a lot of very, very good enforcement work done with HMS. And that's where you're going to find your case numbers so you can actually follow that as it progresses in almost near real-time on a weekly basis.

OLE has also been very, very active in Twitter. We're posting a lot regarding our activities as well, videos and case summaries as well as priorities and other updates.

General Counsel Enforcement section. We've had a change of leadership. The section chief now is Mr. John Han. And he is supported by deputy chief Charles Green and Alexa Cole.

Again, GCES website is the place where you're going to find the penalty schedules and case summaries that have been adjudicated by that office.

This is a screenshot from our priorities document from FY '16, actually our annual report.

And northeast enforcement division as you can see the Magnuson Act continues to be a primary area of focus.

And with that I'd like to turn it over to Lieutenant Carney to give you an update on what's been going on there.

LT. CARNEY: Thank you. As he said I'm Lieutenant Carney from the northeast division even though I don't sound like I'm from the northeast division.

So, some of the highlights that we've had this year in the northeast and the southeast, I'm going to go over a few of them.

But at the beginning to highlight some of the illegal sale of HMS that we found this year.

One of them was an illegal sale of shark at a shark tournament by the shark tournament was selling the shark that was caught in the tournament.

That was on Long Island and that was -- we had officers there as well as DEC officers from the State of New York.

And they turned around and looked and saw that the tournament was actually selling the sharks that were caught in the tournament.

They didn't know they couldn't do that. At least that's what they said. And we fixed that situation.

It was about 10 people participating and the money was going back, they said the money was going back to help the tournament. But you can't do that. So that was one of the illegal sales of HMS this year.

In addition, on the Delmarva Peninsula, specifically Delaware, we found at least five vessels that were selling HMS illegally.

These five vessels were two General category vessels, two Charter party vessels, and one Angling vessel.

They all were selling to non-federal dealers, whether it be a restaurant or whether it be a fish dealer without a federal fisheries permit.

So I believe we've issued summary settlements for each one of those. We may still have one pending right now.

We've attended several marlin tournaments this year in the northeast and the southeast division with our outreach efforts.

Some more of the other enforcement activities. Those are my highlighted ones because I know that's big -- it's been a big issue as far as the illegal sale of HMS.

If you know that somebody is selling HMS illegally please let us know. Our resources are limited and I wish I could snap my fingers and everybody would come turn themselves in but it doesn't happen that way.

I have one officer in New York. I have one officer in New Jersey. And I have no officers in the Delmarva Peninsula. And I have two officers in Virginia. That's just in the northeast division.

We rely heavily on our state partners and the Coast Guard to give us information and to make cases that we can continue with through

prosecution.

So if you know somebody that's doing this please let us know.

I believe that's all as far as what we have on our list.

Oh, in the southeast recently off of Miami there was a vessel that was caught with no HMS permit in possession of a sailfish as well.

And then also in the southeast possession of prohibited shark species at shark tournaments. I think that happened once, maybe twice in the southeast.

MR. REGHI: That concludes it.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Great. So let's see if there's any questions or comments. Mike, we'll start off with you and then up to Jeff.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: This gets into earlier -- the past several years I've had to get my charter boat inspected. And that's done through the Coast Guard auxiliary.

And then for my commercial inspection I go directly to the Coast Guard. And you have two different inspections, two different individuals, and so on.

I don't know if there's any consideration to streamline the process because we all have issues with not having enough time to do anything to get one inspection.

Especially if we're going to have this sale/no-sale HMS type of permit that if I call them up the Coast Guard then would do the inspection that would include charter/headboat as well as commercial. Because right now I don't know whether it's a Massachusetts issue or what, but the charter/headboat inspection is done by the auxiliary. Different people. Not the same person. The commercial is done by the local Coast Guard office.

So hopefully there could be some consideration to streamline it and just have that one inspection. So that's one thing.

Next question. Just I'm curious with the aircraft. Does that include drones? And if you do have drones can we identify them? Because I don't like to be 50 or 100 miles offshore and see some drone buzzing me and wondering really who it is. I'm just curious.

MR. REGHI: I can answer that question

for you. We've been moving forward very carefully and methodically and within the law regarding deployment of UAV/UAS platforms. And that's something that's going to happen in the future.

We had to develop a policy regarding the legality of their use within the four corners of the Constitution.

And it's something that the agency is embracing and will be moving forward with. But slowly though.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: As in not using them now but looking into it?

MR. REGHI: That's correct.

MEMBER ODEN: I'm just curious to know, do you know per chance how much the NOVAs were for the recreational sale? Because it comes to a point that what is the cost of doing business sometimes.

Those of us in the industry know what it is. It's prohibitive.

For instance, a guy who bought an old commercial vessel I had got fined \$130,000. Thirty of that rescinded over a 300 pound trip limit on 4,800 pounds of -- he was 300 pounds over his trip limit on a 4,800 pound monkfish trip.

We get it, okay, but you know, when you slap the wrist of a recreational angler who may go sell this through the backdoor of a restaurant you're not making a point if you don't fine these people prohibitively. And that's my point.

I'm just curious to know what the fines were.

LT. CARNEY: The fine for the illegal sale of HMS for a single fish is \$750.

So these were different because it's the amount of fish were sold in each different one. One was a small amount of tuna. Others were up to four tuna.

And in one situation specifically in Virginia the Virginia marine police and the Virginia health department were involved as well.

And the Virginia health department seized the fish, I guess embargoed the fish, and poured Clorox bleach on it and put it in a trash bag and put it in a dump.

So, part of that was that that specific one the person was given a \$1,500 summary settlement plus the fish were seized for four fish.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks.

MEMBER BOGAN: I had a proposal. I know this hasn't probably been brought up but as a party head boat we're having a problem with the filet regulation.

 Like we'll carry like 20 or 30 people on our boat and we have a six hour ride home which we used to be filleting our fish on the way back. We can't do that anymore.

So I was wondering if there could be possibly some kind of an exempted permit for just yellowfin and longfin tuna.

We could save the racks, tag them, put a corresponding tag on the filet bag, one fish per bag, like in a big bag, and ice them up.

It's just been such a hardship where we used to go back to back trips. We can't do that anymore. We just can't.

And we've lost a lot of customers because they don't want to sit at the dock. If you happen to have a good trip you could be there for three or four hours.

So we need some kind of an exempted permit or something like that. We already have that in New York and New Jersey for fluke because otherwise of course we'd be there for hours cutting fish while people waited.

So I just was wondering if there's something that we could do towards working towards that. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: So how to explore that as an option is the question.

LT. CARNEY: I think this is the way to explore it, through the HMS advisory panel. There's nothing that we can do for that.

I will say someone else brought that question up with mahi mahi earlier this year which I know mahi mahi is not HMS.

The difference between northeast and southeast are that a lot of southeast states don't allow -- you have to land a fish whole, intact. Fins and heads intact which is different from the northeast.

So if you had an oceanwide or a

coastwide policy on that for mahi mahi each state is different. So there's nothing I can help you out with except in this arena here to try to if you wanted to get that or go to HMS as far as the permit exemption.

MEMBER BOGAN: I guess it's a good time to bring it up. You know, it's one thing if you have a 6 passenger vessel, but we have like 20 or 30 people. So it's something that this panel I would like to just address this. It is a problem.

And a party boat, actually the amount of party boats is probably cut in half since that law went into effect.

Well, it started with the three fish limit. And it's not that people catch three fish every time they come out. Unfortunately we sometimes get five fish, but sometimes we're blessed with a good catch.

And it's just a real burden for the people to have to stand around while we're cutting fish, my crew.

So if this advisory panel would take this under consideration I think it is important.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Thanks, Bob, for bringing that up. I think we had recommended he bring this up now because of some of the aspects of needing to have good enforcement if we were to consider anything like that moving forward.

So maybe we can table this for now and talk about how something like that could work, if it would be enforceable or not.

And then I think it's a good point about the state regulations and how we need to navigate some of that. So maybe we can talk about it in the future.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Sonja.

MEMBER FORDHAM: Thank you. Sonja Fordham, Shark Advocates.

I'm afraid I'm going to compliment one agency in order to raise a concern about yours.

So as you might have known since I'm really happy to hear that Office of Law Enforcement is on Twitter.

But we've seen in recent months several, sort of a rash of incidents of mistreating sharks in Florida.

And the compliment I have is actually

for the State of Florida because when these incidents came up we saw real rapid reaction in the press and real public effort to tell people what was and wasn't legal, and what options there were to change policies and so forth. And really took it head on.

And yet we've seen also a lot of actually illegal mishandling of smalltooth sawfish which are listed on the Endangered Species Act.

So it might seem as slightly off topic but since you're working with protected resources and a lot of these incidents involve shark anglers I just wanted to put out a request for a little bit more help in that regard.

We have the NOAA office in the southeast does a great job with education and lots of outreach in terms of how to legally handle and release sawfish.

But in my opinion we could use a little bit more help in law enforcement when we have illegal events.

We actually had a very high profile incident of illegally tagging a sawfish that involved the vice president. So it got a lot of attention but as far as I could see the only people calling it out were NGOs.

And if we could have the backup from the law enforcement agencies that would really help get out the message that not only is some of this inappropriate it's actually illegal and you can get in trouble.

So I've been meaning to put that in writing and I will, but since you're here I just thought I'd take that opportunity to raise that concern from me and a lot of other sawfish conservation colleagues. Thank you.

MR. REGHI: Thank you. You raise some very, very good and very, very important points. Everything from humane handling during the harvest process to respecting protected resources.

This week you may see a writeup in our webpage regarding the sawfish matter that was handled.

Also, we may not have publicized it as well as the state did, but there was also a very quick dual federal/state response regarding the

inhumane treatment of the animals on the federal side, particularly dragging of the shark that had happened online.

OLE initiated an investigation on that pretty quickly.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Oh, please jump in.

MEMBER GREGG: Sonja, I just want to say we did a lot of work on that so we do appreciate you noticing.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. We'll take two more commenters and then let you get to lunch. So Bob and then over to Dewey.

MEMBER HUETER: Okay, I wasn't going to make this point, but to follow up on what Sonja's talking about.

I'm involved as a consultant on the famous shark dragging case. And it's opened my eyes to the challenges that you guys face with the incredible proliferation of violations that these not very bright people posted themselves on social media.

And how you guys handle that it almost could require a whole new division of effort.

So I don't know if you want to react to that first before I make my other point.

MR. REGHI: Absolutely. Good example is our southeast enforcement division. We work very, very closely with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

They are joint enforcement agreement partners. We fund their federal operations in assisting our agency.

They also have an internet-based crime squad that they're working round the clock looking at the internet, seeing what's out on social media and what's posted with other news outlets.

Like you said, you almost need a dedicated division to work on it because there's just so much information out there.

MEMBER HUETER: Thanks. For sure. If I could just ask the lieutenant for a clarification of the shark tournament case that you mentioned.

Was this a well-established tournament that was properly registered with HMS?

LT. CARNEY: Yes, it was registered

with HMS. And it was a shark club type thing.

MEMBER HUETER: You said it was in the northeast.

LT. CARNEY: Correct.

MEMBER HUETER: And was this the tournament organizers themselves, the operators themselves that were selling the meat?

LT. CARNEY: Yes, it was a group of everybody that was within the tournament. The tournament organizers and volunteers.

MEMBER HUETER: So it wasn't the fishermen, it was the organizers, the people that were running the tournament that supposedly registered that tournament with NMFS.

LT. CARNEY: Correct.

MEMBER HUETER: And last question. What species of shark, do you know? Do you recall?

LT. CARNEY: I think the majority of them were makes, makes and probably -- yes, I think it was make.

MEMBER HUETER: Okay. Just a point. I think these kinds of cases argue for a need to actually have a permit for tournaments rather than just registering them. We need to permit these tournaments when abuses like this happen.

For a tournament to be registered, especially one that's well established to be so ignorant of the regulations really cries out for the need for a permitting process.

Go ahead, and the guys who are doing it right, fine, but these kinds of folks need to be excluded.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Just to clarify, you're suggesting permitting for tournaments that have violations.

MEMBER HUETER: A permit to run a tournament, not just a registration process but a permit to run that tournament.

That includes all the requirements that we put on the fishermen themselves and especially the commercial guys.

Tournaments are commercial enterprises. They're not run to lose money. So I think they should be held up to the same standards that our commercial fishermen are held up to.

And they should be permitted and know

what species they're dealing with, and know the laws. Clearly these guys did not.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Bob.

Dewey.

MEMBER HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. Wynn, in August of this year you gave a presentation to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council and the law enforcement section.

And the report was in our briefing book and it was from June 1, 2017 to July 31, 2017.

And on page 13 of that report you had cases that were being sent to NOAA General Counsel.

And in that under the Atlantic Tuna Act the program and the law and then you had the violations, failure to report bluefin tuna, 17 counts, failure to report bluefin tuna, 11 counts, failure to report bluefin tuna, 7 counts, failure to report bluefin tuna, 11 counts, all of them coming from the State of Massachusetts.

I was wondering if you can enlighten us about the gear that that was caught in and what category they were fishing under. Thank you.

LT. CARNEY: I think hook and line. I can't say for certain because that's not my area of responsibility. There's another lieutenant who was over there but I think it was hook and line. And I think it was General category or Charter/Headboat.

MEMBER HEMILRIGHT: And that was individual vessels that had 17 counts, individual vessel 11 counts, individual vessel 7 and individual vessel 11 counts. So it's not a majority of one vessel of all of these, it's four different occasions.

And also, if people want to look at that in the briefing book it's an interesting report that also has the fines of different fisheries in the northeast, not only HMS species but everything else goes on.

So it's in the briefing book of the August meeting for the Mid-Atlantic Council under law enforcement. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Dewey.

Bob, were you looking to get back in? No, okay.

So, just a couple of issues just to

highlight from the conversation. One, a request to look at ways to streamline inspections. I think keeping folks informed as drone usage becomes something that goes forward.

To look at penalty rates for recreational fishers violations and ensure that they're significant enough to capture someone's eye.

Similarly if we've got tournaments that are not following well established regulations we should be thinking about permitting tournaments so that similar requirements that are imposed on commercial fishermen are imposed there.

As well think about ways that you can continue to push at issues of mistreatment of animals, protected resources, the things you're doing, but just amplifying it.

And then again a request to start looking at an issue around is there a way to do exempted permits for filleting of yellowfin tuna as Bob requested. So that's obviously a longer term ask.

So, I think the three of you, anything you want to add before we adjourn for lunch?

MR. REGHI: Thank you for having us.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Well, it's always good to have you guys here. Oh, we've got a teleconference. Go ahead.

MR. KEMMERER: I'd like to add a couple of clarifications to the gentleman that spoke earlier about different exams or inspections on the vessel.

The headboat charter boats, some of them are inspected vessels. If they carry over a certain number of passengers they have to get a certificate of inspection from the Coast Guard.

If they're not, they're uninspected passenger vessels and the Coast Guard auxiliary can conduct those exams and issue a UPV sticker.

But if it's commercial fishing it's got to be a qualified fishing vessel examiner that's generally a Coast Guard person but Coast Guard auxiliary also has some qualified fishing vessel examiners.

Marine inspectors are not always qualified to do the exams and issue decals on commercial fishing vessels.

So you may need to have two different people do the exam, but some cases one person may be able to do it all. You just have to work with the local Coast Guard office to see what you need to do with that.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Great. Good. Thanks very much.

With that we should get you all to lunch. We will reconvene at 1:30 with an update on Caribbean fisheries management. Thanks.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:04 p.m. and resumed at 1:31 p.m.)

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay. A couple of things to note as you get settled.

First and most importantly if you haven't found them yet Pat has once again baked his heart out for us all. And so they are in the back, the cookies are in the back of the room, the back far right corner, at least my right. Pat, where did you go to? Well, wherever you are, Pat, thank you. And we'll thank you again.

A quick agenda note. We are going to jump in as planned to the Caribbean management update with Delisse so if you are here -- there you are Delisse. If you would head on up here.

We recognize that a couple of folks who care and think most about this aren't here, most importantly Marcos, but this is also something that Dave Kerstetter and others think about.

So we're going to give the presentation. We'll have whatever conversation makes sense today, but I think Margo's thinking is that we'll need to really revisit this at the spring meeting given the storm's impact on AP members. So just as a heads up to folks.

After that, before we get into the exempted fishing permit update we're going to have a quick presentation and discussion on final Amendment 10 on essential fish habitat which was scheduled for late in the day tomorrow. But we think since we will probably spend a little less time on the Caribbean conversation we can fit that in here.

So that's the game plan. Try to get those done and then off to the fishing exemption. So Delisse, up to you.

MS. ORTIZ: Thank you. So we're going to go through just a bit of an update since our last meeting in the spring.

I'll go through a brief background on the requests that we've received just to refresh everybody's mind, some of the AP comments that we received back in the spring meeting. Some research updates. Some of the outreach that we've done to local agencies in the USVI and Puerto Rico.

And the idea was to have a discussion on next steps but like Bennett said we're going to save that for the spring meeting.

So very quickly, requests for management changes. We received a lot of requests for changes in terms of shark and swordfish management in the Caribbean region.

Part of this entailed increasing the shark retention limit under the commercial Caribbean small boat permit and establishing an in-season shark retention limit adjustment criteria.

That also involved requests to have the -- any shark landings in the Caribbean be counted against the -- its own shark quota as opposed to the Gulf of Mexico quota which is what we currently do under quota monitoring.

The other specific thing was to create a Caribbean-specific authorized shark species list that includes the most commonly caught shark species in the region.

One of the difficulties with this was that a lot of the species that are landed in the Caribbean are prohibited, on the prohibited list, such as the Caribbean sharpnose, Caribbean reef and Caribbean sharpnose shark.

And in terms of swordfish we currently have a retention limit under the commercial Caribbean small boat permit and one of the requests was to increase that retention limit that now is currently two to a higher limit, one that potentially matches the limit under the swordfish general commercial permit which is six.

So as you know we met on our -- this is a lovely picture of our spring meeting. We had very good discussions during the meeting and also informally during the lunch hour.

And this is again a summary just of

the comments that we received very briefly. One was to prioritize, everybody agreed that we did need to prioritize management in the U.S. Caribbean, that we needed definitely more data, that we should take a precautionary approach when considering any management changes in the region.

That we should consider scalloped hammerhead sharks. And the fact that -- any impacts on them because their distinct population segment has been considered threatened in this region.

And overall I think there was support but there was a lot of like, okay, put on the brakes, we need more research, we need more information on prohibited species. There were enforcement concerns.

So what we did is we went back and did outreach to try to determine what research is currently being carried in the region relating to improving -- doing HMS data improvements specifically for sharks.

Currently the NOAA Southeast Fisheries Science Center in collaboration with the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission is doing a study that started last month.

And the idea of the study is to estimate annual commercial fisheries landings in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands and do mostly investigate temporal and among site variability in those landings during one year of sampling.

They started in August of this year and they're hoping that this will carry on not just for a one-year period but also for two.

Another other research that is going on is being carried out with Raimundo Espinoza. He is the founder of a non-profit organization called Conservacion Conciencia in collaboration with MOTE Marine and our very own Marcos Hanke.

And the project aims to work with both -- this is recreational but it's also commercial vessels in order to just get some sort of life history and species identification information of some of the sharks that are mostly landed in Puerto Rico.

So right now what they're doing is they have very limited fundings, but they did have the tags so they are documenting all their

catch, identifying the shark's species, sex, measuring them, tagging them and then releasing them.

There's also the potential for collaboration with Marcos Hanke and Marcos Drymon on applying for an exempted fishing permit to basically sample some of the sharks, take fin clips and properly identify some of the catches of sharks in Puerto Rico.

A lot of the concerns is that there's not proper identification of the sharks that are landed and they really can't be identified just visually by photographs.

In addition, there's been several recent scientific research papers that have come out that have been focused on sharks in the Caribbean region that look at length relationships of some of our Caribbean sharks that we authorize in the region.

And they're giving a clear picture that these sharks are around, they're there year round, and it just gives us a better picture of what a shark species composition is and some of the biology in the territories.

In addition, Carol and Tobey attended the America Elasmobranch Society meeting and they encountered also two upcoming papers that looked at the spatial ecology of some of the sharks around the MPA in St. Croix.

And also they looked at population structure and phylogenetics of Atlantic and Caribbean sharpnose sharks which actually shows that Caribbean sharpnose goes all the way up to - are found all the way up to Virginia.

We also did some outreach to Puerto Rico news via state agencies and the Caribbean Fisheries Management Council because the idea was to, you know, we're just trying to get an idea of what exists, what data is there, what research is being carried out, how can we start carrying out some HMS data improvement projects in there.

When we spoke to the Puerto Rico Department of Natural Resources staff they're currently modifying their territorial regulations to make them compatible with our regulations.

And we did find out that at this time the agency has very strong concerns about promoting a commercial shark fishery which was

due to the lack of enforcement and species identification problems, and also vulnerability to overfishing. So that was -- I guess that was a bit of a surprise at that time.

We have gone to the Caribbean Fisheries Management Council where the state agencies are present and we've received support for allowing an incidental federal shark fishery in the region.

So one of the questions, what are the next steps. We're in this situation where we've received all these requests from fishermen, from the commercial and recreational sector.

We've had their support to do an incidental shark fishery and potentially increase in the retention limit in the commercial Caribbean small boat permit.

The council has supported it. The state agencies and UCI have supported it. And the state agencies in Puerto Rico are a bit concerned about moving forward.

So the question is where do we go from here. And I think like Margo said the idea was to have an ample discussion about the subject since it was -- there was a lot of good conversations last time, but given that with the hurricanes and such people can't be here I think we'll leave it up to the spring unless I guess folks have anything to say.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Let's assume we will revisit this and have a fuller conversation, but if there are a couple of comments now certainly be happy to hear that. Rusty I see your card's up.

MEMBER HUDSON: Thank you, Bennett. Rusty Hudson.

On slide 3 you mentioned Caribbean reef, Caribbean sharpnose shark on prohibited species. Slide 5 you also include the sevengill which is also on prohibited species.

If I recollect right I don't recall much science being used to create that list. Are you going to have some kind of science that will be used to be able to verify that you can go ahead and take it off the prohibited list and not have issues, litigation issues or anything to be able to create that?

And the last comment is the scalloped

hammerhead. Is that a distinct population segment one of concern separate from ours up here?

MS. ORTIZ: So with regard to the scalloped hammerhead, yes, it is different. It is DPS for the Caribbean specifically.

And then your other question was if we take a species off the prohibited list what would we use to take it off the prohibited list?

MEMBER HUDSON: Yes, because you know as I had suggested last meeting about the bignose and the night shark which is more of an animal that we could see up here. And I always believe that it's got a pretty strong populations.

I wouldn't mind knowing how we segue out of prohibited and into something that's allowable.

And I assume you have to do all that through a full amendment, probably take a year or a year and a half to get it accomplished.

But I just was wondering what the protocol was when there was no scientific assessments done on those species to begin with to put them on the list. Thank you.

MS. ORTIZ: Well, if we take species off the prohibited list it would be the first time that we ever did that so there's no precedent.

There is a criteria that is established very clearly in our regulations that states how we can put a species on the prohibited list and how we would take it off. I don't know it off the top of my head but we can talk offline and I can show you what that criteria is.

MEMBER HUDSON: As a final comment it would be great to collect the genetic stuff and other details with regard to the Caribbean sharpnose in particular.

I know it's been said about it maybe being a subspecies of our Atlantic sharpnose and I know that's technically the mice of the sea for our region.

With the Caribbean reef I know that it's more common except for south Florida on down that way and over into Central America and stuff like that. So I'm just wondering.

And I saw blacknose on your other list. And if that's the very same blacknose that

we have.

 You know, those little questions like that wouldn't be a bad thing to be gathering the samples to be able to utilize besides doing link measurements as you had. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Rusty. Sonja.

MEMBER FORDHAM: Thank you. Thank you for your presentation.

I just, if we're going to have a fuller presentation about the Caribbean next time. Last time I had asked about the SPAW protocol, the specially protected areas and wildlife of the Caribbean.

I think so it must have been just a few months, our last meeting since they listed a number of sharks including hammerheads and whale sharks and sawfish and so forth. Oceanic whitetips I guess.

I found a little bit -- there's a NOAA page about the people that go to that meeting. But I'd love to just have some more information next time about how that overlaps with HMS, and the species of sharks that we have in common, and what are the U.S. plans for implementing those SPAW listings for sharks. Thank you.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Sorry, I'm remembering that request now so we'll be sure to do that in the spring.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. All right. Well, not seeing any other cards at this point and again knowing we'll revisit this with a fuller conversation in the spring, Delisse, thank you very much.

And at this point Jen if you would come on up here. And again, for anyone who might have come in late we're going to go a little bit out of order here and fold in the end of the day tomorrow conversation on final Amendment 10 on essential fish habitat.

MS. CUDNEY: All right. Hello, everybody. So hot off the presses, we just filed with final Amendment 10. It's going to publish fully in the Federal Register tomorrow and we have just initiated our rollout procedure. So you should be getting an email shortly that has a lot of this information.

But we wanted to go ahead and walk you

through some of the final updates for our essential fish habitat amendment and try to give you an idea, a very high-level overview of what's in it and where you can go to find out more information.

So, and we're not going to have time of course to touch on all of our stocks and all of our species.

So if you would like to meet with me or with Lauren Latchford -- she's back in the corner there -- we'd be happy to show you maps or kind of talk you through any particular species.

And then of course you're welcome to call me if you'd like to or Lauren after the meeting if you have any questions and you want to discuss it next week. Perhaps after the storm.

So, very quickly HMS EFH again refers to those waters and substrate that are necessary for fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity.

In the case of HMS this is of course our federally managed species. It may or may not include state waters. We do include state waters in our EFH designations.

However, we do not designate EFH in international waters.

It has to be periodically reviewed and revised so our regulations say every five years you're required to do an update. And our last revision was in 2009.

So we had initiated the five-year review actually in 2014, published it in 2015, and then started the draft amendment after our five-year review.

And so this will be updated with the date of our publication for final amendment 10.

So, the last time we met and we talked about draft amendment 10 we gave you a review of the public comments.

I'm not going to go through them in great detail here but I did want to remind everybody that what we heard from the public were suggestions regarding methodology, EA content.

There was support and opposition for our HAPC alternatives which mainly were to make adjustments to the bluefin HAPCs and to sandbar HAPCs and to create lemon and sandtiger shark HAPCs.

And then we also had some very specific adjustments to our EFH boundaries. For dusky sharks and for several of our large coastal and small coastal sharks, and for smoothhound shark.

And some of those suggested adjustments comments that we received also included some new data sets that the public wanted us to consider.

So I'm now going to now go through some our preferred alternatives that we are finalizing under this amendment.

Alternative two is essentially our method. We are rolling forward the methodology that was sorted out under Amendment 1.

And in a nutshell it's what we call our kernel density estimation 95 percent volume contour method.

So this schematic describes that. We're basically taking a number of data sets, pulling them together, formatting them, putting them into some geospatial tools that then estimate what would be -- what an area containing 95 percent of those points would be.

And then we would take that polygon and submit it to QA/QC and very rigorous scientific review to produce our final boundaries.

So, since you last saw these boundaries in draft Amendment 10 we did want to point out that there were some updates to them based on public comment, based on the fact that in some instances we did receive updated data sets. So we had some new data that came in.

We had some requests from our primary user of the EFH text descriptions, our Office of Habitat Conservation to provide some more specificity in our text descriptions.

So you will see when you look at those some increased attention to detail in that section of the EA.

And then as I mentioned some of the public comments and scientific submissions may have resulted in some minor adjustments to some of the boundaries as well.

And all of this is detailed on a species by species basis in our EA. So if you go in there, you look at chapter 6, you can look it

up for every single species that you might be interested in, but following the text description there is a paragraph that describes changes from the draft to the final, and then also changes from amendment 1 to amendment 10.

And then of course as we got this new information in we went to our folks at the science center and we basically did that same QA/QC process to make sure that what we were seeing with our models was actually grounded in science and made sense.

So, in general I want to emphasize in general we didn't see substantial changes from draft to final in terms of the habitats that were identified for each species.

There are some changes though. I do want to give you some examples here that kind of show what some of the differences are for some of our higher profile species.

So, the next couple of slides are going to have some maps on them and if you look at the label on the right side of the screen it's going to say either draft amendment or final amendment. So that's going to give you an idea of whether you're looking at the older version or the most recent version of the map.

You're going to see a polygon that's either in general going to be orange, pink, or green. That is going to be the boundary that we had identified either in the draft or the final amendment.

And you're going to see a little like hash marked area. And that is what we had under amendment 1. So that is the old EFH. The color polygons are essentially the new EFH.

So, digging in, this is bluefin tuna, our adult life stage. This is what we have put forward in the draft amendment. And this is what we had put forward in the final amendment.

And so there are a couple of differences that are highlighted here in the pink circles.

When we took our model results after we got public comment back to our science centers, looked at the distribution of the data and some PSAT data that we had identified we felt that they are off of the northeast should have been expanded a little in terms of the bluefin

adult EFH.

We had also identified an area off of south Florida that had been included in our models because of a concentration of data points that were actually in the Bahamian EEZ.

However, we didn't have any data points really in this area so we actually removed part of the Straits of Florida from our adult EFH.

And then you'll notice there's also a big area in between North Carolina and off the coast of central Florida that has been added.

And that is in part due to some PSAT data that we had identified. Now, this is from the NRDA DIVER database so this is actually data that came through Deepwater Horizon funded research out of the Block Lab.

And these are tracks for 24 bluefin tuna. And what really immediately caught our eye is that these fish are coming out of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, going to North Carolina, and you see a lot of habitat utilization between North Carolina and really the Bahamian waters.

But we wanted to capture that in our adult EFH boundary delineation so we added that area.

Another species of interest was dusky shark. So again you're going to see the identifying whether we're talking about draft or final amendment on the right.

Look at the polygons. And in some cases we have inset maps like you'll see here because the areas that we're talking about are fairly small.

So draft Amendment 10 we constricted our -- this is the neonate young of year EFH. We constricted it from what was put forward in amendment 1.

And based on the public comment that we had received we were asked to take a look at - and this is what we had in the final, but we were asked to take a look at this area that was off of southern New England.

Because we heard a lot of people say that there are dusky sharks in this area. We also got a lot of feedback where people were suggesting that we use certain landmarks like Long Island, or an area called the dump as sort

of delineation for our EFH.

 Well, our EFH is based on where the data is. But when we looked at these coastal areas of Rhode Island and southern Massachusetts there really weren't a whole lot of data points there.

It was more captured as a function of the model output.

So we felt that there was sufficient justification to remove these areas from inclusion in the EFH boundaries for neonate and young of year.

Kind of similar case with the dusky shark adults. However, when we're comparing draft Amendment 10 and final Amendment 10 the area that I really want to emphasize here is in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

So a lot of the data points that were in this area were old tagging data that were provided to our cooperative tagging program. And a lot of it is not verified.

So some of our scientists were suspicious that there may have been some misidentifications. We only had 8 data points out of 130 that were photo verified. And our scientists tend to not see as many dusky sharks in this coastal area. So it was recommended that we remove it. So that gives you kind of an idea of the sort of QA/QC discussions that we have as we're looking at some of these data points.

So, the other part of this amendment was a discussion and consideration of HAPCs. As you are probably aware HAPCs are subsets of EFH that are evaluated based on either their ecological importance, their sensitivity to environmental degradation, whether development activities will be stressing that habitat, or how rare that habitat is.

Sometimes a certain area is going to come to our attention based on one of these. Sometimes it's going to come to our attention based on all four of these factors.

We had identified in our five year review several species that we analyzed in the draft amendment.

Our final preferred alternatives are not changed between draft and final.

So there's a lot going on here but

what you're seeing are maps showing the final locations of our HAPCs for bluefin tuna and sandbar shark which are in green.

Those are fairly unchanged in terms of what you saw -- well, they are unchanged in what you saw in the draft amendment.

And then the new HAPCs that we added for sandtiger and for lemon shark and those are shown here.

Okay, so our next steps for this project are mostly based around outreach. We have an amendment 10 website that you may have seen for our draft amendment.

We are in the process of adding our final amendment documents to that website. So when you get our listserv notice you will have a link in there to this website.

We will be adding maps and shape files for individual species that you'll be able to download and look at as much as you would like in the next few weeks.

And then we're also looking at developing some online mappers. So you'll be able to go in and interact with the shape files and look at your particular areas and see whether or not you have any intersecting EFH perhaps in places where you like to go fishing or local places that you might be interested in.

We are also going to be looking at habitat consultation aids for our Office of Habitat Conservation and possibly developing some additional EFH products based on public and partner requests.

So this is the team and I will take any questions.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks so much. That was good. Any questions or comments on Amendment 10. Anybody. Bob.

MEMBER HUETER: Thanks. Can you just remind me what the procedure, what the process is when there's historical data about the presence of a species and the life stage of that species in an area but no -- because of overfishing or other effects that species is not present in that area anymore?

Does that then disappear as EFH when in fact at one time it did support that life stage for that species?

MS. CUDNEY: Not necessarily. So we had some data sets that spanned very long periods of time.

Our current procedure wasn't necessarily to disregard very old data. There are certain [approaches] -- I've heard of people basically doing EFH assessments on the last five years of data.

But we tended to take a longer look at some of the -- at our data sets through this process.

So I would say that some of that historical data is going to be captured in our analyses. You're just going to be adding other data on top of it.

So there could be a dilution effect, but it's still there.

MEMBER HUETER: Okay. The reason I asked the question, I just noted in looking at the dusky shark slide that the west coast of Florida was -- there was a tiny spot before and then that didn't make it to the cut. Yes, right there.

In fact, there's sufficient data from the nineteen sixties that dusky shark was a much more common inhabitant of the Florida Gulf coast, especially the big pregnant females.

So I just wonder where information like that goes. And it would be not preferable if something like this got out and would then somehow make people forget that these animals did exist in these other areas at one time.

MS. CUDNEY: I think that's a valid concern. We certainly do try to in the life history section capture information like that.

We do have a -- the point of EFH is not to, as we all know, the point of EFH is not to designate it across the entire range or extent of the species. It's to try and identify those core areas.

So we did look at all of the data that we had. It's just this time around that area didn't ping so much as something that needed to be included.

But that's definitely something that we do keep in mind when we're going through these analyses and we're looking back at the data through time.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Bob, is your concern about less that it isn't included and more just that this historical look and perspective and relevance of that area could get lost?

MEMBER HUETER: Yes, because people's attention span isn't very long. And if you look at the latest papers and see that something is not an area you just assume it never was.

And when you look to a process like this, I mean it's a fair assumption to think that the agency has done everything it can to capture data not only from the last 5 or 10 years but all the way back as far as it exists.

So I totally understand the decision but it would be a mistake if we didn't acknowledge that there were previously areas that supported these various species that don't now support them because of perhaps problems that we ourselves have caused.

It's hard to say but certainly in the case of the dusky shark that's an overfishing issue.

And we still again as much as the commercial guys hate to hear me say this every meeting we still haven't seen them return to the Florida Gulf Coast in any numbers when they in fact were there 50 years ago.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Bob. Let me come up to Sonja, then to Rick, and then over to David.

MEMBER FORDHAM: Thank you. I agree with Bob, I think that's a really important point. Thank you for making it.

I just want to confirm that the presentation is going to go up on the site? So even though you've given it early you're still going to post it so we can look at it later.

MS. CUDNEY: Yes, we -- there was some uncertainty about the timing of whether we'd be even able to present this so we didn't post it. It will be there.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Rick.

MEMBER WEBER: I've been on the usage side of EFH and it wasn't fun because we weren't able to dredge because the winter flounder might recover and want that space back.

The argument on the other side of it,

Bob, is this isn't -- there are regulations and permits going to be issued or not issued based on the EFH.

And while I agree with you that we need to protect what is the current essential fish habitat if the recovery you're concerned about is going to take longer than the EFH cycle then we should save what is needed for the current population.

And when the fish recovers I assume that you would get more data points and the EFH would shift and change as the population shifted and changed, correct?

MS. CUDNEY: So, our current method is based on the data. We make an assumption that the fish are going to be where the important habitat is.

And so if you do get more data points in different areas, yes, it's logical to make the step that things could change in the future.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: David and then over to Rusty.

MR. SCHALIT: Thank you for your presentation. Were there any findings of significant concern in connection with bluefin or BAYS species?

MS. CUDNEY: So, I'm not sure what you mean in terms of a significant concern. There are no regulatory aspects to this.

This is basically an exercise to identify the important habitats based on the distribution of the data that we had.

So we didn't say, okay, this area, the habitat is particularly stressed here so we're going to close fishing.

No, there are no regulatory aspects to this. So if that's the sort of significant finding that you're referring to then that's not part of this amendment.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So, just to add a little bit. This effort is to identify things for the habitat itself. And most likely, HMS fishing gears don't actually affect the habitat. The water temperature is still the same. The salinity is still the same whether the gear's gone through it or not.

That isn't always the case with some gear types where dredging on the bottom can

affect the habitat itself.

And so that's part why the HMS EFH exercise doesn't have regulations associated with it. But it's also to support the consultations where other activities of other federal agencies that could affect the habitat, having this information, the most up to date data is available to the habitat office so that when the core comes with the drilling permit they'll know that's an important area for this HMS in this life stage.

So it's largely in this context used to support those habitat consultations.

MEMBER HUDSON: Thank you. Rusty

Hudson.

Tarpon Springs is north of Tampa Bay. I had vessels that would come out of there, two in particular, two fish houses.

And when I was in the shark fin buying operation until I folded the tent in September '97, since March of '92 you had state waters closed out to 9 nautical miles. There was a certain time of the year that those big females would be right there around that 9 mile line.

And they were caught. And I have them documented in my records. I would really doubt that they disappeared, it's just the simple fact that we have nobody really fishing anymore in those regions.

So that is an area I know those duskies will get to. And I can go back, look through my stuff, and give you the dates of when I was purchasing from those two fish houses.

MS. CUDNEY: I mean, we would be happy to look at the data but at this point we are done with the EFH analyses for another couple of years.

But we're going to be reopening this book in five years when it's time to redo -- or when it's time to do updates.

So at that point in time we can take a look at it.

Most of the data that we look at though is going to come -- we do look at the fishery independent data.

The fishery dependent data that we look at is largely observer data. So if there were no observers onboard the chances of us

actually getting fishery dependent data are small - it is just not one of the data sets that we are regularly incorporating [into the analysis].

MEMBER HUDSON: I was thinking about research to verify, check and verify. That would be something you could do over the next five years before you do the next EFH.

You've kind of left them out. I know they're there.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Anyone else want to get in on this? Yes, please, Mike.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Just a quick question. Since many of these areas are now located in state waters like for instance the tiger sharks up there in Plymouth.

You're doing this to protect areas if they're going to do dredging or do different activities and so on.

Is there anything proactively they're going to do from the standpoint of the contaminated stormwater runoff, or the combined sewer outflows that ultimately discharge into these areas? Or is that separate from what the objective of this is. As you stated it's for dredging and other proactive activities within that area.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So EFH is a requirement under Magnuson-Stevens Act. And so the nexus is federal activities. And so that's where Army Corps of Engineers, BOEM, things of that nature would be where those agencies have to consult with us on activities that they're doing.

So state activities, I think we offer the information, we provide it to them if they ask, but there's not the same requirement for states to consult with us and consider mitigation if there's an impact to EFH.

So it's a little bit different when it's a state-based activity.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Because most of those locations have federal permits in order to discharge stormwater or combined sewer outfalls during storm events into these areas so that's why I was curious.

They have those federal national pollution discharge elimination system permits that periodically discharge into these areas.

So is there any wiggle room there to

deal with that?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: My understanding if there's a federal nexus then there would be. And so a federal permit could be that. But I don't know for sure. I'd need to check.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: I appreciate the answer to that because that could open up a whole bag of worms which I think are well overdue and justified to be looked into. Thanks.

MEMBER GREGG: I don't know how it is in your state, but in the State of Florida NPDES is actually delegated to the states for many activities. So that's actually a state license or permitted activity. I don't know how it is in your state.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: No, you are correct but it is a federally led permit and it could -- the authority can be delegated to the state and then the state to manage that activity.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: So, let me just suggest that let Margo look into this a little bit and see what nexus that actually creates and come back to this.

Lisa, are you okay with that? Did you need to jump in? You're good? Okay.

All right, then let me push us on just so we stay vaguely on schedule here.

So our next topic which I'll hand off to Margo here is to get an update on the pelagic longline closed area research exempted fishing permit. Not a new topic here.

This is a permit that has been authorized at this point so the conversation today isn't about whether to or not, but it's to understand background of where this issue, again, where it sort of came from, considerations, the analysis, the alternatives.

So really catch everybody up on where -- the background here.

And then we'd like to spend time in conversation hearing from you around your thoughts around how to best go forward in terms of implementing it, tracking it as things evolve.

So Margo, with that I will hand it off to you.

Oh sorry, before I do that, just one thing. Somebody in the audience lost a pair of glasses. You have them. They're in your hand.

You're okay. Good, okay. Margo, all yours.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: All right. So,
like Bennett said this is something that we've
been discussing for a bit so I'll give you an
overview of how we got to this point and then
include some of the details of what the permit
includes, what the provisions are, and things of
that sort.

And so a bit of background. This is for the east coast Florida closed area that was closed in 2001 to the use of pelagic longline gear.

At the time of the closure a number of factors were significantly different from what they are now. This is a bit of a comparison from that point in time to now where we've seen in the fishery side of things a decline in the number of vessels that are active in the fishery, and active in this context is having landed at least one swordfish in a year. This last point was 2015.

We've also seen a similar decline although not to the same degree in hooks fished over this time period.

And as has come up a couple of times elsewhere the U.S. landings of swordfish there's been a large persistent underharvest with approximately 39 percent of the base quota and 34 percent of the adjusted quota landed in 2016.

And on the stock side of things there have also been a number of changes. North Atlantic swordfish was declared fully rebuilt in 2009. And so this area was in part to address juvenile catches. And so a change in that stock to a fully rebuilt status.

Western bluefin tuna was no longer experiencing overfishing. North Atlantic albacore rebuilt as of last year. And sailfish no longer experiencing overfishing.

And so there have been a number of large changes both in the fishery side. I should also mention gear changes such as circle hooks in this area, individual bluefin tuna quota program in place. There's been a lot that's happened since this area was closed both in the fishery side and on the stock side.

And so one of the ideas that was posed to us in the exempted fishing permit application

was the purpose to evaluate the pelagic longline catch and bycatch rates from within the closed area and compare it to those outside in the open area and try to evaluate the effectiveness of the existing area closure meeting current conservation and management goals.

The application requested six boats to participate in the research with an additional number of boats as backup if there were technical issues.

All of these vessels are associated with Dayboat Seafood.

I should mention that the applicant is Dr. David Kerstetter who is an AP member who unfortunately is not with us at the moment due to the hurricane.

And Scott Taylor is another AP member who is the manager of the Dayboat fleet who is also not here due to the hurricane.

The application requested authorization for 12 months with a view that pending an annual review an additional potential authorization for two additional 12-month periods.

And that all fish that could be legally caught and sold would be sold.

And we received that complete application November 6. As we do with all EFPs that we feel deserved more attention and public input.

We put this out for public comment. That comment period started January 13. To help inform that public comment we prepared a draft environmental assessment of what the potential impacts of this would be if it were to be issued.

And so we had a little bit more than two-month comment period. We had a public webinar towards the end of it. And we presented to the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council as well since this is in waters off of their jurisdiction.

And in that environmental assessment we analyzed three alternatives.

And so the first is the no action. So do not issue the research permit. And so this gives you some scale where you can see the gray area is the entire east coast of Florida closed area.

1

2 3

4

5

11 12 13

10

18 19 20

21

> 40 41 42

> 43

44

38 39

45 46

47 48

And that the red box here is for a general indication of where this research was proposed to be done. So it's not its entirety.

So, we also considered two different alternatives two and three that have slightly different geographic scopes here with alternative two being a straight north-south line that does not encompass the 100 fathom curve.

Alternative three which is preferred has kind of a jog to the west there to encompass the 100 fathom curve.

The level of effort is the same between these two. It is simply the configuration of the area.

And then the open area is in green That's where they're proposing to do the here. comparative sets.

And so in order to do an analysis of impacts we needed to project what catches would possibly be under the research permit.

And since this area has been closed since 2001 we have only been able to get data from a very limited study conducted from 2008 to 2010. Otherwise there's no information coming from this area with this gear.

And so what we chose to do was use the catch rate information from that 2008 to 2010 study for the areas inside the closed area as the most recent.

But then use observer data from 2013 to 2015 from the open areas to look at what the catch rates would be in the open areas.

And so it's using the information that

And so the EFP analysis would be those catch rates for the closed areas combined with the one open area, and then the analysis for not issuing the EFP is all of the effort remains in the open areas.

One important point is these boats are assumed to be fishing. It's not that there's no effort in this research effort. These boats are fishing, it's just where they're fishing, whether it's in exclusively the open areas, or whether they would do some limited sets in the closed area as well.

We also analyzed both what the applicant requested in terms of effort which was

we have.

1,080 sets per year with 750 hooks per set.

But then we also looked at the more historical level of effort which was about 720 sets per year and 600 hooks per set. So you'll see those numbers in a minute.

So this is from the EA. We looked at a long list of species. I don't expect you to read this. I would encourage you to refer to the EA for the full detail of this.

But what it shows is that there are differences in catch rates. And so some of the projected catches actually show declines in the closed area versus the open areas.

And so at a summary level we predicted that catches, so that would be fish kept and discarded dead of all tunas would decline.

White marlin, dolphin, and sea turtles would also be projected to decline.

And again this is based on catch rates being different between the closed areas and the open areas.

We predicted that swordfish kept, discarded dead, and discarded alive would increase but remain within the U.S. quota and without impacts to the stock from increased catches of juvenile fish.

Sailfish discards were projected to increase some, but relative to the scale of mortality on the stock it's small. It would not be expected to lead to overfishing.

And you will have seen that there were also projected discards of dusky, silky, and night sharks to increase.

And so when we put it out for public comment we included a number of terms and conditions that we were considering to make sure that that was within acceptable limits. And so we have also finalized those and I'll go through those in a minute.

Our summary of socioeconomic impacts was that the benefits for the participating vessels would be positive due to increased swordfish landings as well as lower costs associated with lower fuel, food, and ice costs largely because the trips would be shorter because they'd be closer to shore.

We predicted adverse impacts to the recreational fishing community from potential

gear conflicts and potential reduced catches of HMS and other species as well as some potential adverse impacts to other commercial pelagic longline vessels that are not participating in the research due to more competition on the market.

We also saw several long-term benefits from obtaining current statistically valid catch rate data from the closed areas in comparison to open areas as well as advances in use of real-time electronic logbooks linked to an electronic monitoring system that the applicant put forward as a private system that they would be using.

This is in addition to the NMFS electronic monitoring system.

And that we would also have benefits from increased biological sampling of several of these shark species.

So in our public comment period we received over 500 comments. Most were opposed to issuance of the EFP at all. And those comments expressed concerns about bycatch levels including undersized swordfish, billfish, a couple of sharks and sea turtles.

And comments in favor supported collecting current catch information from the area, the benefits of increased swordfish landings as well as obtaining information on electronic logbooks and enhanced monitoring.

So after weighing all of the public comments and the concepts that we had put forward the agency decided to issue the permit. It was issued on August 10.

You can see the blue area there. There's a northern area where 240 sets would occur up to a closed area with similar distribution of sets, and then 240 sets in the open area.

These sets would be distributed across both time and space, so on a quarterly basis throughout the areas.

The permit was issued for up to 12 months. We'll be paying very close attention in real-time, but then there will be a formal annual review and potential issuance beyond that remains to be seen but is a possibility.

And so at a snapshot level what was requested to what was authorized. What was

authorized was the 720 sets as a maximum based on that historical effort with up to 600 hooks per set.

Forty percent of all of the sets would have human observer coverage. And then the shark-specific terms and conditions I'll talk next.

Six boats would be authorized, are authorized with up to I think six now at this point as sort of backup. So no more than six boats would be involved at one time.

There will be electronic logbook submission tied to the private EM system for all trips. The data would be available to the agency.

And then obviously there's the current requirement for electronic monitoring. And the agency has committed to reviewing 100 percent of that video.

All of the other pelagic longline regulations apply. So 100 percent logbook coverage, regular observer coverage, limits, seasons, IBQ program, GRAs, workshop attendance, things of that sort. So all of that is the same.

And then the details of the sharkspecific terms and conditions are that a positive identification of all live sharks. So that's fin clips and photographs.

They'll all be sent to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. And that biological samples of all sharks dead at haulback, so that's vertebrae, reproductive organs, stomachs would be retained and those also sent to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

Hook timers at approximately every 15 hooks would be deployed. That will give us valuable information on when mortality on the line occurs.

And then specific to dusky sharks, if three dusky sharks are dead at haulback on a particular vessel then for the duration of the EFP a maximum soak limit of 10 hours would be required.

And if an additional three dusky sharks occur on that vessel they would be removed for the remainder of the 12-month period.

And so again, all of the details that we have are posted online in the EA. And so

we'll be looking to providing regular updates to you all.

One of the things that we'll also be posting are the detailed protocols. We've been getting a lot of requests for that so people will have a good sense of what's happening.

We'll be working on getting that up on the site as well in the near term.

So, it's a high-level overview. I'm happy to answer questions and turn it over to Bennett.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Great. Thanks, Margo. And again, this permit's been authorized so the point today is to make sure people understand it and the decision-making behind it, and then questions or comments around how this moves forward from here.

So let's go to Rusty and then Bob and then Marty.

MEMBER HUDSON: Rusty Hudson. I'd be remiss without bringing this up, but I purposely would have my swordfishermen for 2001 put 50 hooks on the west end of the gear, swing into that 100 to 200 fathoms from the region from Port Canaveral north. You'll get the duskies in late February through March and then on their way back September-October.

And then if you get up around that Fernandina line south Georgia, 31 degrees north, you'll get into the Cuban night sharks.

Now you only have the actions with the duskies but I'm afraid that based on their increased frequency during those times with migration coming from over-wintering in Mexico and going back.

And remember, 16 to 20 percent of those tags for duskies came from Mexico. And that's the type of thing that I keep in my mind that those areas haven't been touched.

So I would say that you're going to have an increased frequency and don't be surprised when it happens.

MEMBER HUETER: Yes, I'm basically -- I've been in support of this EFP because I think this is going to provide needed data on what's happening in these closed areas.

I want to commend HMS for doing what appears to be a very diligent job of taking this

proposal very seriously and maintaining some very high standards including increasing the observer coverage percentage. I think that that was critical.

And I believe I understand that video monitoring will be on all the sets and it will be even done in an even more intensive way. So kudos to you guys.

Two questions or one comment is I request that NMFS keep a very tight leash on this project.

And I personally would like to hear a report every single AP meeting, the latest data summaries that they have from what's happening.

I don't want to see this thing go on for three years before we know what the results are.

And this dusky shark criteria here is pretty strict. I just wondered, I assume that if there's an observer onboard the observer makes the call as to whether the animal is dead or not.

But if there's no observer onboard who's going to actually determine whether or not the animal is dead at haulback? Because you know, well you know. I don't see a captain doing that. But tell me.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Well, so recall we've committed to 100 percent EM review. And there's two cameras. One is on the rail to get at exactly this issue.

And if need be, if there's a discrepancy in our review of the video and the captain's report we can rely on our video.

So it can be a determination that we make. It doesn't have to be the captain. Hopefully we will agree.

MEMBER HUETER: Yes, well okay. Well, EM is as you know I work in EM. EM is excellent for species ID in a lot of cases. But the burden of proof is going to be on the agency to say that an animal that's not moving much in the video is dead versus what the captain says. So you know, best of luck with that. But keep a tight leash, please.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Yes. And so in terms of kind of periodic updates certainly updates every AP meeting would be easily done. FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Let's go

to Marty, then Lisa, then Katie, then Mike.

MEMBER SCANLON: I do have a question here about slide 7 where you use the CPUE rate from 2008 to 2010 within the research project.

 $$\operatorname{But}$$ then you use the observer data from 2013 to 2015.

I mean, I don't know why you didn't use the same year, apples to apples, oranges to oranges in that.

And the other question I have there is on slide 14 is that three duskies per set, per trip, or per boat for the year. Those are my questions.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So, the dusky is per boat per year.

And the reason that we used observer data from 2013 to '15 was that that was a more recent time period. Seemed to be better to use more recent information.

I get that it's not strictly apples to apples, but 2008 to 2010 is quite a while ago at this point. And so we wanted to use more recent information.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Lisa.

MEMBER GREGG: Thank you. Just a
couple of questions. Slide 10, Margo, the
summary of socioeconomic impacts.

The fourth bullet you talk about scientifically valid catch data. But in the EFP and in the EA as far as I can tell you only established a maximum number of sets, not a minimum number.

And scientifically valid is kind of dependent on a minimum number. So where is that minimum number being addressed?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So, I think I understand what you're asking. What we have authorized is what we've authorized.

We looked at information that would try and get at that and the information is unfortunately not what we have -- from the closed area is not particularly rigorous from the previous study.

So we used what we could of that information and are trying to get some rigorous information moving forward.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Lisa.
MEMBER GREGG: Okay. And another

question is what is being considered as bycatch?

The reason why I'm asking is because a boat is out targeting swordfish. And I would assume that anything they catch besides a legal swordfish would be considered bycatch. And that would be an undersized swordfish, or a bluefin tuna, or any other species.

Even if you were allowed to sell it, even if you had the ability to sell it and all of that that would still be bycatch because it's not the targeted species. So how are you guys defining bycatch?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So, no, a yellowfin tuna that's caught on a pelagic longline is not bycatch. There's mixed targets.

Typically in our parlance bycatch would be things that cannot be retained. So juvenile swordfish even though it's a target species would be bycatch. All of the billfish are bycatch. Sea turtles are bycatch.

Bluefin tuna there is an allowance but it's an incidental fishery. And so that would be kind of mixed.

But yellowfin, bigeye, albacore, those would all be in my view target species even though they're not swordfish.

MEMBER GREGG: Okay, so if they can sell it if it's open season, if they've got quota or if it's a legal catch then it's not considered bycatch.

But once the quota is met is that going to be -- then will it be shifted to being considered bycatch? If they're not allowed to retain it and sell it.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: I think that would be a fair way of characterizing it. If you're talking about like a shark season that is open and can be retained that wouldn't be bycatch until the fishery is closed. Is that kind of what you're asking?

MEMBER GREGG: Right. Okay, so that's what you're considering as bycatch, but is that how the study is going to characterize bycatch?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So what the study is doing is comparing catch and catch rates of all species, and how we classify them is something that we do.

But what we're looking at is catch and

catch rates, all species, inside the area, outside the area.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Lisa.

Katie.

 MEMBER WESTFALL: Yes, I want to second Bob's comments. I want to commend the agency in carefully considering this project and ultimately approving it.

It's a very thoughtfully designed research project and it will collect crucial data, pilot new technologies, and could ultimately lead to great improvements in the way we manage fisheries.

Specifically I think the EM, ER components are particularly exciting. The fact that they're using EM for all species, both target and bycatch is exciting.

Carefully tabulating catch across all fisheries is incredibly crucial for managing imperiled HMS.

Also, another component that I don't think was mentioned here is the linking of catch data to oceanographic data. And that will allow researchers over time to be able to identify trends as to where and when bycatch species are found and ultimately hopefully minimize bycatch.

And could also lead to more precise real-time management that could approve catch of target species as well.

And as we mentioned earlier I think we've heard several times in this meeting and in every meeting that really I go to there's an importance of catching more of our U.S. quota for swordfish.

And we think this project collects the type of information we need in order to have those informed discussions on how to responsibly harvest our U.S. catch of swordfish.

So kudos to the agency.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Margo, anything on that, or just have her repeat it? (Laughter)

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Mike.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Mike Pierdinock.

I think we've gone through some considerable changes to the recreational commercial catch and release methods as a result of our current concern for dusky sharks.

Yet what I see here and I think it's the second from the last page. And maybe I need some help with my math.

But we're allowing three dusky sharks per vessel. That's 6 vessels times 3 is 18. So that's 18 dusky sharks that can be caught and dead.

They're also -- I noted earlier that they have backup vessels. Are the backup vessels also considered independent of that number? Is that another six that they can catch -- so no.

Then the next bullet, does that mean that three additional duskies are caught at haulback then the vessel could not make another trip.

Does that mean that they can catch more than that 3, another 3 and then that would be 36 duskies in total?

So, okay, so now we're up to 36. So I'm just a simple fisherman from Massachusetts. I'm assuming then that this 36 duskies if harvested is not any concern to the dusky shark stock and the major revisions that we made, or are in the process that are going to be made in 2018 to protect the stock. I just need some clarification to that. Thanks.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: You need clarification of what the terms and conditions are?

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Impact. Back when we went through all these discussions my understanding was if we had the potential to land one dusky that we needed to implement these measures to make sure that's not the case.

We have a study here that we're going to be allowed to land 36 over one year. What's that going to do to that stock and is the stock going to be in trouble that more stringent measures are going to have to be implemented as a result of landing and killing or harvesting that dusky.

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So if you're talking about the measures that were implemented in amendment 5B we do not feel that this is inconsistent with that.

We feel that the benefits of this information as well as getting hook timer information when the dusky shark mortality would

have occurred is very useful.

We feel that this is not going to jeopardize the stock or we wouldn't have proceeded.

And so this is not analogous I don't think to the recreational fishery which is continuing and will occur with circle hooks where dusky sharks are occurring. This fishery is already using circle hooks.

Does that answer your question? FACILITATOR BROOKS: Please.

MR. KLUCK: Thank you. By the way I spoke to Scott this morning and he's running his boats up the coast of Miami up to Florida right now to get them into safety.

I have to admit when I first heard this program I was kind of skeptical, but after I did my research on it I think it's a fantastic program.

And of course I've known Scott for a long time. He worked for me back in the seventies and I think you picked the right person to grant this permit for. So I just want to applaud you on that. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Rusty, did you want to get back in?

MEMBER HUDSON: Thank you, Bennett. Without getting the exact number 2015 northeast longline survey out of Narragansett dusky was almost tied with Atlantic sharpnose for second and third most frequently caught sharks. And they didn't even get to dusky country.

Sandbar of course was off the map like six times the level.

So I think the population from what we're seeing is becoming fairly prolific. Just like sandbars, just like the duskies. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Mike, were you looking to get back in? No. Randy, you wanted to jump in on this?

MR. BLANKENSHIP: Coming back to Lisa's point earlier, Lisa, about minimum number and statistical rigor.

I think a couple of things there is related to discussions that have taken place within the science center that indicated what would be required as far as the amount of data to be collected in order to be sufficient through

power analyses. And that those are covered.

One of the key points here is that this permit is not a contract with the researcher in order to accomplish a certain number of samples and then be paid for it.

That's not what the purpose of the permit is for.

The permit is set up in order to protect the resource and authorize up to a certain number of samples.

And so a couple of points there to make that distinction. And that the responsibility will be the researcher still to accomplish the goals of his research project.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Anyone else want to jump in on this at this point. Marty.

MEMBER SCANLON: Any word on when this is actually going to start? I know there was discussion on giving them time since this was just authorized to set up and get that thing started. Any set date on when it will begin?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: No, I don't have a set date. I think they were several weeks out. I think thinking possibly mid-October. But the hurricane may impact that. So no, I don't have a set date at this point.

They did wait to commit resources to this until the permit was issued. So they were not going to start the next day.

MEMBER SCANLON: But the agency is flexible with them on when they can do it? You don't have a deadline of when they have to start or anything like that, right?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: No deadline for that, no.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: All right, so thanks for the feedback. Clearly a number of kudos for a thoughtful -- Rom just raised his.

MEMBER WHITAKER: Rom Whitaker,

Hatteras Charter Boat.

Just would like to add of course I'm sure you know when I first heard of this project of course speaking from for-hire and the recreational side there was great concern. I'm sure you've seen it in your emails.

But some of our guys in North Carolina in the PLL fleet are already doing the things that these guys are required to do to go in a

special area.

So I think it's incumbent on you all that you make sure that everything is -- I think Bob mentioned at least meeting updates to know kind of where it's going.

But I think you have to keep your credibility to make sure that it's followed. After looking at it and studying on it a little bit it looks like a pretty good project to me and you can learn a lot from it.

But the credibility, you have to keep that in there.

I mean, there may be times in our area where some of our guys get shut out of an area for whatever reason, dusky sharks comes to mind and a lot of other things.

But I just say the credibility has to be there, especially looking at it from the forhire and recreational side. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Rom. So again just to -- Jeff.

MEMBER ODEN: From the perspective of a fisherman who has witnessed a remarkable recovery for duskies, for instance, I sure hope the agency if there are far more duskies interacted with in this study I would certainly hope they would be aware of that.

The facts will show themselves I'm afraid in this case. And that being the case it's not all bad news.

And please make it a point there to take note of that in your assessments. And anyway, I'm very appreciative of the agency for going forward for this and hopefully we can start on the road to regaining some of our sword quota.

MEMBER HUDSON: 2015, large coastal shark survey, it was 312 duskies, 181 of them were tagged, brought 88 of them onboard.

And Atlantic sharpnose 367 and the sandbar was 1,706. And that was an incomplete trip in my estimation. So it's been improving for the last four surveys.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: All right, I'm going to pause because every time I talk a card goes up. Three, two, one, all right. Last chance.

All right, so thanks for the feedback. Clearly a lot of support for the thoughtfulness

of the survey, for the learning potential as well as some concerns lingering.

And I think a very strong message of tight leash, close eyes, really track this and share those findings with the AP at every meeting going forward.

So thanks very much for the conversation. Walt, you want to make a comment from the phone?

MEMBER GOLET: Can everybody hear me

okay?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Try again.
MEMBER GOLET: Can everybody hear me

okay?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Yes.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Go ahead, Walt.

MEMBER GOLET: Can you hear me okay?

MS. SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Yes, you're good.

Go ahead.

MEMBER GOLET: Okay. So, sorry. I appreciate the ability to connect remotely here. Sorry I couldn't make this meeting.

With respect to the dusky shark conversation the one thing I wanted to piggyback on from Bob's point of view was the caution exercise in the discretion of whether or not a dusky is dead.

And what I'd like to just highlight real quick is that our dusky shark study is going out for review very shortly and two quick highlights.

Our mortality estimates were very low. In fact they were 5 percent. And just as a caveat four of those dusky sharks that came to the vessel had a release condition of four which was indicative of our worst release condition.

One of those four also had an injury condition of four, which again is a shark that has sustained injuries from the catching process.

And all four of those sharks despite sinking out of sight straight down once they were released actually survived.

So again, what Bob was talking about is very prudent here. Interpretation is going to be a big thing and very key to whether or not an individual shark actually survives the process.

They may look dead or morbid at the vessel but in the case of these individuals who

did sink straight down they actually did survive and we have data on them 10, 15, 20 days post release.

So I just wanted to make that comment. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Walt. So Margo, a question for you. We are about 25 minutes ahead of schedule. Should we just jump into the first of the recreational issues or take a break?

All right, we'll take a break but we'll try to get back here at 3:15. So you get a longer break than you would have but we'll start sooner. 3:15.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:54 p.m. and resumed at 3:22 p.m.)

FACILITATOR BROOKS: All right, let's get going again. We've got a couple of topics we still want to cover here.

We're going to spend the next hour on a series of rec issues and then we'll hand it off to Brad to talk about the 2017 year to date for Atlantic bluefin tuna management.

But let's start off with rec issues and hand it off to Cliff Hutt to talk about HMS tournament survey update, and then MRIP and LPS priorities.

MR. HUTT: Good afternoon, everybody. First off we're going to talk about an update on some preliminary figures from the HMS tournament survey.

As you all remember the goal of the tournament study was to quantify the economic activity and impacts of HMS tournament operations and participants in 2016.

We conducted a survey which was sent out to all HMS tournament operators that had registered in 2016 with the exception being tournaments that lasted longer than 10 days. You know we have a few that are kind of like go all year round type club tournament things that we decided to exclude from the survey.

We also excluded some registered surveys in the Bahamas as that's technically out of the United States.

And we sent flyers to be distributed to tournament participants at roughly half of all

registered tournaments.

We received responses from operators of 75 different tournaments with the majority of those being in the south Atlantic or mid-Atlantic region. The next biggest area would be in the Gulf of Mexico.

Similar distribution responses for the participant survey.

We received participant responses from 104 teams participating in 29 different tournaments in 2016.

Top target species from the tournaments we heard from were blue and white marlin and yellowfin tuna. No big surprise there.

We did some analysis to determine if there was any potential non-response bias from our tournament operators.

For the most part primarily what we looked at was species targeted because we had that from the registration data.

And for those tournaments that were required to report additional effort data, the billfish tournaments, we looked at those that we had gotten reporting from to look at vessel effort in the tournaments to see if there were any differences between respondents and non-respondents.

Looking at all those things, the only thing we found any significant difference was that tournaments that actively targeted sharks were somewhat significantly more likely to respond than those that did not target sharks.

That could be due to maybe some of the more controversies that they run into and feeling a greater need to have the information on their economic impacts, benefits to communities out there.

But otherwise we found no difference based on whether or not they targeted tuna, or billfish, and no significant statistical differences based on the amount of effort expended in the tournaments.

Some basic descriptive statistics we found from our operator surveys. Tournaments on average lasted about three days. The median or the 50th percentile was about two days. But it ranged from a minimum of 1 to 10 days.

And overall in all of our data there was great variability in these tournaments. We had everything from small club tournaments with maybe 4 or 5 vessels to massive ones with 300 vessels participating.

The mean number of total vessels participating in the tournaments reported was 43. The mean number of vessels that were registered to target HMS was 33. And the tournaments averaged over 228 anglers participating. But the median was significantly less than that, about 128.

So there was a big skew. As you can see the range ranged from like 6 for a small club tournament to 2,500 for a very large major tournament.

So naturally we found huge variability in terms of the costs and earnings reported by the tournament operators.

Because these ranged from club events that basically had no registration fees and no costs associated with them other than what they spent on gas for the boat and their bait to massive events with significant costs.

The average revenues brought in were just under \$100,000 but ranged as high as over \$5 million.

Prizes on average, prizes and trophies awarded to the winners averaged \$46,000. The range is as high as almost \$4 million.

Operator costs on average are a little over \$30,000. But the median was only about \$2,500. So, huge kind of skew just because of the huge range we were looking at.

Earnings. On average tournaments turned a profit based on the data we saw of around \$22,000. But you know, again huge range from losing about \$100,000 to having over \$800,000 in earnings.

Donations averaged about \$30,000 but ranged as high as \$850,000 to charitable donations from the tournaments.

Some of the data we got from participant teams. On average total expenses of teams participating in a trip were a little over \$20,000.

We had this broken into categories of travel, registration and fees, boat fuel and

other expenses.

About on average a little over half their expenses were associated with registration and fees followed by their travel expenses of about \$4,000 per team on average, boat fuel of nearly \$3,000 and other expenses around \$23,000.

But again you can see from the ranges these skewed very widely.

And you might ask how could someone participating in a tournament have no boat fuel expenses for their team. Some teams actually chartered charter boats and then that was covered by whoever was running the charter boat, the boat fuel.

Our next step for this are to basically expand these estimates to kind of total expenditures across all tournaments.

We're still working out some tweaks in the statistics on how best to do that. And then we'll be able to run the economic analysis in the IMPLAN software and get total economic outputs to the national economy, jobs supported, numbers like that.

And hope to have kind of a draft final report by sometime this winter which we'll then present at next spring's AP meeting.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Any questions on that. Yes, please.

MEMBER IWICKI: Steve Iwicki. So Cliff, that's tournament stuff, but have you guys started to look at true rec costs?

I mean, I'll give an example. One day in July, a Saturday, a bunch of us go out to a place called the Hot Dog. We get there in the dark, we come up, there's 100 boats out there. Three quarters of them are not charter boats.

It's costing my crew probably about \$1,500 that day times say 75. That's \$112,000 in one day between bait, ice, fuel, food.

I mean, we say we're talking about this in a rec term, but it's all about tournaments right now.

So is there anything going on that's going to capture the recreation costs?

MR. HUTT: So, at the same time we were doing this we were also doing nationally the Marine Recreational Expenditure Survey which had an HMS subcomponent to it.

We have that data and I'm working on that data. That was expenditure data for HMS anglers from Maine to Texas, but it isn't quite ready for presentation to the AP yet.

But hopefully next spring AP I will have when I have the final numbers for this to present I'll also have the final numbers from that study as well.

MEMBER IWICKI: Yes, I would just say then it's got to be compounded. Because say if it was 75 boats at one spot on one day of one weekend and there's spots like that all up and down the coast it's millions. So just a thought.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Mike and then over to Dewey.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Thank you. As I look at the expenditures and the range there from seven, ten, to twenty thousand dollars for a sixpack, I mean depending upon the tournament I think that's pretty good. I think you've done a good job with that.

That somewhat jumps over if you're a recreational angler and you're just taking a bunch of guys depending upon the tournament and so on I would suspect that range maybe within there.

Actually the boat fuel depends upon the proposed per gallon. I remember when it was up to \$4 a gallon for diesel and that was ridiculously high. And that's a great variability to there.

With your registration and fees a lot of these tournaments have calcuttas and you bet in the boat. Is that in that fees? So that's in there.

That range, that could be anywhere from \$500 up to ten or fifteen thousand dollars depending on the tournament.

But I think you've done a pretty good job here, what I would expect up in my neck of the woods from my experience of what I've seen over time. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: That's great. That's helpful to hear.

MR. HUTT: Yes, I actually went to the White Marlin Open the year we were doing the tournament and saw some guys pay their registrations and their calcuttas with cash. It

was impressive.

 FACILITATOR BROOKS: Dewey.

MEMBER HEMILRIGHT: I was just curious on page 3 you have your targeted species the percentage for blue marlin and white marlin.

What is the stock status of Atlantic blue marlin and Atlantic white marlin?

MR. BLANKENSHIP: Well, actually I have a slide covering that in my presentation that'll be coming up a little bit.

So for blue marlin they're overfished, overfishing is occurring. For white marlin it's overfished and overfishing is not likely occurring, just quickly.

Let me clarify, that's the international. That's the SCRS stock assessment.

MR. HUTT: And I'd add as folks are aware we have the 250 limit for the year. So we're really -- if overfishing is occurring it's really not us that are being the primary contributor to that to our understanding.

MEMBER HEMILRIGHT: And that 250 is post release mortality, or is it dead fish that are counted dead?

MR. HUTT: Those are landings.

MEMBER DRYMON: Cliff, that's really cool stuff. Just to clarify a question. Are these strictly HMS tournaments or any tournament that has HMS as a component?

MR. HUTT: Technically any tournament that has HMS as a component is required to register so they would be covered.

There are a few that definitely were much more targeted towards other species than HMS.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Cliff, if you want to shift to the next presentation.

MR. HUTT: So, next one is talking about MRIP and the regional implementation plan that we have been working on for Atlantic HMS.

So, as all of you know MRIP is the program that is primarily responsible with collecting recreational effort and catch data in the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean.

And in the last several years MRIP has been working to develop and certify a series of scientifically sound surveys to meet our recreational fisheries management data needs.

And a key component of that program has been to develop implementation plans for each region that kind of set our priorities for what our data needs are and what steps need to be taken to improve them.

We are developing our own plan which will include our kind of data priorities, identifying existing data caps and some budget estimates for different programs.

In this presentation I want to lay out just basically the primary priorities we've identified through that process.

That plan has currently been handed over for review by the MRIP operations team and their executive steering committee.

The number one priority we identified was kind of completing conducting the LPS redesign and re-estimation similar to what MRIP has done recently for the APAIS survey and the fishing effort survey.

This would incorporate probability-based sampling for the LPS, improved data collection on trips originating from private access sites, particularly early morning and at night. Optimizing sample sizes to improve the precision of estimates on rare event species particularly like sharks, and addressing biases from over-sampling tournaments.

Next big priority is expanding kind of targeted HMS data collection through the rest of the Atlantic HMS region.

Currently LPS is only conducted from Maine to Virginia. We want to kind of find a way to expand more targeted data collection on HMS trips for the rest of the region from North Carolina to Texas.

The main thing here is kind of the debate on whether to simply expand the existing LPS design, or to try to add like an offshore strata to existing MRIP intercept surveys such as APAIS.

A big thing that'll take into account for that will be issues like budget, how we wind up redesigning the LPS, and kind of issues with the states as for the most part the states have taken over the intercept portions of the APAIS surveys in recent years.

Next big priority is kind of making

sure Atlantic HMS Charter/Headboats are included in the new for-hire electronic logbook data collections that are underway through the councils.

We have HMS staff including myself who are participating on the various subgroups with the SEPHIER process that Margo talked about earlier to make sure that those electronic logbooks will be collecting the appropriate data that we would need for HMS management at least from those for-hire captains who have dual permits with the council permits.

Also looking for ways to integrate catch and effort estimates for species encountered by multiple surveys.

Currently right now, particularly like through the LPS region you've got LPS estimates for tuna. You've also got estimates being generated by the more traditional MRIP surveys. And we're looking for ways to try and integrate that data and improve better estimates.

We are looking to expand selection of tournaments for landings reporting to potentially include all Atlantic HMS tournaments instead of just billfish tournaments.

Evaluate ways of expanding the catch card data collections through additional states or other ways of reporting landings.

And improve data on recreational shark fisheries. These tend to be kind of hampered by the rare event nature for many species, and also by misidentification of species, particularly released species and night trips. Many sharks being caught during night trips that aren't intercepted by the various MRIP or LPS surveys.

We hope that the shark endorsement that's taking effect in 2018 will help produce a more targeted sampling frame for shark anglers in federal waters but that's going to depend on what percentage of HMS anglers wind up getting the shark endorsement.

As we'll be talking -- as Brad talked about earlier also looking at modifying the Charter/Headboat permit that will allow for improved recreational trip sampling. It says discussed earlier on here.

Revise the large pelagic biological survey to allow for greater collection of

 biological samples from all HMS species.

Currently right now they prioritize bluefin tuna but they've been making efforts to get more samples on yellowfin tuna.

And that data includes things like collecting otoliths or tissue samples for genetics that can help support stock assessments.

And lastly we're looking to try to improve HMS data collections in the Caribbean region.

The Caribbean region has its own MRIP implementation plan on which Randy sat on the team for that to kind of represent us and our interests as they're looking to improve their own data collections down there.

So our next steps. As I said earlier our regional plan has been submitted to the MRIP operations team and executive steering committee for review.

Then we're hoping to look to start initiating the LPS redesign and re-estimation in the coming years which will eventually help to lead to supporting its expansion although that will be a long-term project that will be years in the making because it will require pilot studies and calibrations and things of that nature.

And eventually design and fully implement a new and expanded HMS or LPS survey. And we are hopeful that lessons learned from the MRIP design process should speed up that process.

With that, have any comments or questions?

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay, questions or comments on that? Yes, please, Rick. Then over to Katie.

MEMBER BELLAVANCE: Thanks, Cliff, great presentation. I'm reading the part that you went over regarding expanding the LPS survey and HMS data collection.

And I guess I'm thinking about how we currently collect data with the APAIS survey and then the independent LPS survey, the folks that that come down the dock, intercept me as a captain for the LPS, my clients for the APAIS survey.

And I'm thinking -- I guess I would recommend combining those, so you add a little thing -- add an existing stratum to the APAIS.

think that's what I would recommend.

Because you fish all day, we leave early, we fish all day, maybe you get beat up a little bit, and you come to the dock and there's a slew of people walking down trying to interview everybody. And you maybe had a bad day or maybe had a good day, you're just tired and you don't want to talk to anyone at that minute as soon as you back in and here are these people.

So I think the states are doing a pretty decent job of getting to understand the different personalities or the captains and who you can approach and who you can't and when is a good time and how many minutes this guy needs to calm down and that guy and all that.

So I think the state folks would probably be better served to try to take on that extra LPS stuff. That's my recommendation.

MR. HUTT: Reducing, you know, burden on the public is definitely one of the considerations we're having in this design. But as you said, you know, the states have kind of taken over the APAIS sampling and a lot of that will depend on kind of negotiating with them on what they're willing to take on and their priorities. But it is definitely something we are considering in that process.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Katie?

MEMBER WESTFALL: Thank you so much,
Cliff. Along a similar line, I'm curious -- I
want to dig in a little bit more on the option
between expanding LPS in an offshore stratum.

And I'm wondering if you guys are looking in detail as to, you know, what are the tradeoffs associated, which ones will provide a more reliable stream of data, which ones will be more timely. And if you could talk about that a little more?

MR. HUTT: That's all stuff that we will be looking at through the LPS redesign process and whatever eventual pilot studies we wind up conducting.

Basically, the way an offshore stratum would work is it would entail, you know, a more targeted sampling of those marinas, those access sites where you're more likely to have people going out for offshore trips, which is basically what the LPS is doing right now, only it would

involve trying to merge that in with the APAIS.

So the issue whether which will be better will depend in part on kind of funding. You know, if we add it to APAIS, is that an issue of taking away from sampling in other places or, you know, if we merged the LPS with the APAIS, you know, merge those pots of money, maybe we, you know, don't involve decreasing the overall

I know talking with the folks in S&T, you know, they've already looked at -- with the existing data collection states where they could essentially just in the analysis end kind of add in like a stratum and certain weighting just with the existing data for states like North Carolina and Florida.

dependent on the different locations.

But that's going to be kind of

They've got enough intercepts at those access sites that already have a lot of offshore fishing that they could probably do it with what they have now. But then you get a lot of states like Georgia that don't have a whole lot of sites that are -- you know, guys going offshore. The existing data is just not really feasible.

So it's trying to determine like how much extra effort would be required to be able to do that in different states, depending on their offshore fleets and how -- on the feasibility of it. But it's a lot we'll have to be looking at for the next really several years through this process.

MEMBER WESTFALL: But that's great and really hopeful, because my next question was going to be whether or not you guys are collaborating with the states and the regions because I know there are a lot of states that are working on improving their recreational estimates. And the more you can integrate, the better.

My other question is, are you looking at any type of -- incorporating any self-reporting to have another stream of data to be able to compare, you know, LPS data streams or MRIP data streams?

MR. HUTT: Well we already have the self-reporting for the landings, the bluefin tuna, swordfish, billfish and those natures. They could certainly be compared. And also the

 sampling.

catch cards, things of that nature.

And all that stuff is stuff to consider through the process going forward through the next few years. Obviously, you know, the new for-hire electronic logbooks are another thing that are going to be considered in this process.

Right now those are just covering, you know, the federal ones. It's not, you know, the guys who are just out in the state waters. So it doesn't mean -- just because we're initiating these logbooks doesn't mean things like the forhire survey are going to end, because we definitely have -- that's definitely not covering everybody. But those are all different things we'll be looking at.

MEMBER BECKWITH: Just a point of clarification. The federal for-hire charter permits will require the federal -- anybody holding a federal permit to also put in information for their state trips. So all -- it'll be all trips for those people.

So while we won't be covering -you're right, just the people that are state permitted, we will have some information on trips run in state waters.

MR. HUTT: Correct. Absolutely. FACILITATOR BROOKS: Jason, and then over to Rom.

MEMBER ADRIANCE: Yes, thanks. Jason Adriance. We found adding an offshore stratrum, what we did in Louisiana with our LA Creel program, helped tremendously.

Also on the effort side, we've gone to weekly calls on effort, which is -- which gets at effort very well. But I had offered to Margo that in the spring if you all want, I can do a presentation on LA Creel and show you some of the things we've done and how we've been able to reduce some of that error in those offshore species and the rare event species.

MR. HUTT: I've seen that recent PowerPoint presentation that went around and it was -- it looked very impressive what you all had accomplished there.

MEMBER WHITAKER: Rom Whitaker, Hatteras Charter Boat. Just to add a few things, of course I'm participating in an electronic logbook program and it's -- I'm not very computer literate, so it's a slow process.

But any rate -- and this is in response to what Rick mentioned earlier, I don't want to have to -- I want to just fill that thing out and mash the button and it goes wherever it needs to go, whether it's state, federal, south Atlantic, mid-Atlantic, you know?

Our days are long and there's a lot going on. You've got to get home, you got to answer the phone, you got to line up your bait, everything for the next day. You need to make it as painless as you can.

As far as MRIP goes, it's not -doesn't have to do with HMS, but some nightmares
with some other species with MRIP. And it
usually boils down to the multipliers. And our
state does dockside surveys. They don't survey
me, they survey my customers.

But they mostly look at the fish that I throw on the dock, so it's not like you can tell them one thing and -- they see what we catch. They measure it, they weigh it, they record it and then they talk to the people about if we turned loose a sailfish or a shark or some other species that we released for whatever reason, a barracuda maybe.

But, you know, be very careful with MRIP. You know, we live or die by it. When you come up with those numbers, we have -- we're the ones that have to pay if they're wrong.

And the other thing was the dockside surveys, all the catch cards. Our catch card program works good -- swordfish, billfish, bluefin tunas. It really seems to work good. I think Massachusetts -- or Maryland's doing it also. I thought Massachusetts was doing it, but it seems like it works good in our state. I don't understand why other states wouldn't want to follow suit.

MR. HUTT: The main thing we have heard about the catch card problems that makes it problematic for some states is the amount of access sites.

North Carolina and Maryland both have shall we say a more concentrated, you know, number of access sites for their offshore fleet. So they don't have too many points where they

5

have to collect them or distribute them.

But in a state like Massachusetts where the main problem they had was they have so many private access sites where you have boats who are going off offshore or are going out to catch bluefin tuna because they come in fairly close up there, it makes it a little harder to distribute and collect those cards, which is the primary difficulty that Massachusetts had with it. And so it just varies depending on the nature of their HMS fishery in a given state.

MEMBER WHITAKER: Well, I agree. But, I mean, Morehead City area, Wilmington area, there's hundreds of private docks -- hundreds. And they all got to get fuel or ice or bait, so it can be -- it seems to work good. I think it can be handled there too.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Let's go over to Mike, then Pat. And Katie, did you want back in?

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Thank you. You know, with what Rick and Ron said about the one-shop stop -- shopping, push the button and everybody gets notified with EVTR. That would be definitely the way to go.

The MRIP process is laden with those high PSEs that we see for a wide variety of species. And, you know, one way that Massachusetts has dealt with this is that we have 589 different locations where we do dockside interviews.

It's all about the numbers. It's all about funding. It's all about cost. As a result of that, we take our saltwater fishing license and we take that money and it goes to doing more dockside interviews, which ultimately brings down the PSEs.

That's a difficult thing to do state to state because the money's not there. So I just throw that out there because then we continue to have issues with PSEs and every species imaginable. And I would hate to have that go down that road with this.

We also went through this process that they were calling people in the western part of the state on landlines and they're not fishing at all and they're not getting anybody responding for phone calls. So hopefully it's evolved to the point you're not going to do that.

We're not doing the tags anymore. We did that a little bit, for a little while. Just another thing to note with the EVTRs, what we're -- me and 30 other captains are participating in this pilot. And we -- I have my six pack. I got six people in a boat. If I -- they're from Ohio.

They come on and they fish once a year. They don't have a clue of what -- only clue they have is what we're bringing home. They don't have a clue how much your catch is. So, "How many cod did you catch?" They'd said, "Oh, 30, 40." They may have -- you know, throw back 30, 40. It may have been 10.

So their numbers are way off. So what they're doing with our pilot is they're interviewing -- there's an observer in the boat that interviews those anglers. Then they interview me, and the observer observes what they caught.

And I think this is very important that that be evaluated, which I'm not sure if it's been evaluated elsewhere. And this is what I talked about earlier. We need to take some baby steps prior to implementation, so then it could show the inherent errors associated with me as a captain, associated with the people on the boat and the person that is observer.

Now say as an example, if I don't have a first mate in the boat and we're groundfishing and we're catching fish left and right, what I found the other trip where they had the observer in the boat is they're throwing the fish back that they're too small to catch. I don't even know it, so I can't record it. So these things happen too.

So I think it's part of what they're trying to do with that pilot is ultimately understand the percentage of error that you're going to get from that data and then implement that later.

So I would ask you to look at that carefully before you implement such. In addition, typical fishing trip, I'm going to go out and go groundfishing for cod and pollock and haddock. I fish there for a few hours, see some tuna, I'm going to chase tuna. And then I will do some sharking.

So as far as effort goes, one of the things that's critical with these EVTRs, you press the button, it's your transit time. Then maybe I fish for two hours. You press another button.

I'm fishing for two hours for the groundfish. Maybe I'm fishing for an hour for sharks or two hours or something, that you press those buttons and it's part of the -- part of that EVTR, so effort is reflected.

Otherwise, the effort could be I was
-- I had eight hours of fishing time and I was
targeting bluefin for eight hours, which I
wasn't. I was doing multi-species. And that's
one of the difficulties too with estimating
effort. So I think it's important that the EVTR
do that as part of the process, otherwise we're
going to get back to another issue with effort.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. I got to push us here.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Think that's it. Thanks.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay, thanks. I've got a few people on and we need to push to the next topic, so I've got Pat, Katie, Randy and Michael.

MEMBER AUGUSTINE: Thank you. My question is on the next steps for planning the LPS redesign. You said that the HMS region plan has been submitted to MRIP operations team.

Do you have any clue as to when they're going to finally review and when you can move on to your next step? And I think the next question would be, along with the LPS redesign, re-estimation and so on, do you have a timeline or will you have one maybe by the spring meeting of next year to give us a clue as to how this is going to start being packaged together?

Sounds like an awful lot of work, and again for the data that we're trying to collect so we find out what the status of our stocks are, where we really are, I think it's the most important we get some timelines established. So do you have a clue?

MR. HUTT: So to the first question, the review of the plan should be done fairly soon. I mean, that will be finalized this year. As far as the timeline, I mean, we haven't formed

the final timeline yet, but I can tell you it will be years.

This is a process that will probably take, in total for full implementation expansion, you know, upwards of a decade because just like with MRIP, it's -- the redesign alone can take a couple of years.

Then you have to do pilot studies where you're running the new survey along the existing survey for three years for calibration purposes. And then, you know, you finally can start -- once you've done calibration, you can finally start rolling out the new ones. And then we have that whole step for doing the expansion.

So I don't know if we'll have like a final timeline by the spring. And I'm -- at this stage, I'm not entirely sure when S&T is going to be ready to start actually doing the LPS redesign because they are very busy with a process of, you know, the -- rolling out the fishing effort survey, the new mail survey.

So we'll try to have more by the spring meeting, but at this time, I'm -- we're not ready to make any promises on that. I would definitely think by next year we would definitely have more information on that though.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks.

MEMBER AUGUSTINE: Just a quick follow-on. In regard to what Mike and Rick were talking about, other methods of reporting, I know Rick had been working on a project of his for years -- what, three years, Rick -- for a reporting system. And it'd be pretty easy to go quick, bang-bang, you put your input in.

Is there any way that we can look at existing technology in the meantime as a side to try to do some of this collection quicker and implement that or at least utilize that while we're waiting for the new redesign?

FACILITATOR BROOKS: So I'm going to let that just stand as a topic for you all to consider just to get to the next. Thanks Pat for the comment.

Katie?

MEMBER WESTFALL: Yes, just a point on improving the recreational estimates for sharks. I think the data collection efforts need to go hand in glove with outreach and education on

identification.

There was a great feature in the AFS publication that included John Carlson from NMFS that showed that I think catches of prohibited shark species -- I think it was 1.2 million and there was an additional 17.5 million that couldn't -- that weren't identified.

So the misidentification or the lack of identification of shark species remains to be a huge issue and will continue to hamper our ability to understand what's going on in the recreational sector with regards to sharks.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks Katie.

Randy?

MEMBER GREGORY: Randy Gregory, North Carolina Marine Fisheries. Just real quick, I was just going to ask about the timeline, and probably in bold letters. And to your planning, everybody does have to buy fuel and we've capitalized that in North Carolina with our catch card survey and where we put that stuff. So that's it.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Great, thank you. And last word, Michael.

MEMBER SISSENWINE: Yes, thank you. I have to admit, a lot of the discussion about recreational data collection and so forth has gotten into more detail than I care to know about or remember.

But, you know, I'd just like to make the observation that, you know, I've been involved in this stuff longer than most people and there's been frustration with the issue of recreational data and how it's used in management as long as I can remember or at least going back to when it was first determined that a recreational survey would be used for withinseason closures of the bluefin recreational fishery.

I remember that very specifically because at the time I was the chief scientist of the agency and went to the director and said, "There's no way in hell you're going to estimate in a timely enough fashion bluefin tuna recreational catch to ever satisfy anybody within-season management of a recreational species."

And the answer was, "We have to do it,

and we don't care what it'll cost. Just spend more money until we can do it." This is about 1992 or something like that. And so the program expanded tremendously.

And to the credit of people within S&T or whatever it was called in those days, it had a different name, they did a reasonable job. And it sort of worked at that time at a tremendous increase in cost.

The same time we said, "Don't kid yourself that we're going to do this for red snapper, for codfish for --" on and on on, for bluefish, for every species you can think of.

And -- because there's just no way it'll ever be affordable. But that's basically the way we're trying to manage recreational fisheries today.

And it's inevitable that until people sort of step back and say, "What's reasonable to produce," given realistic costs and so forth for management purposes and then manage accordingly, we're going to have frustration when it's, "Here the way we manage. Figure out how to do it," statisticians.

Because it's just not going to work and this frustration will continue and continue until there's some recognition that you need to harmonize the way you're going to use the data with some realistic understanding of what the statistical sampling problems are and the feasibilities. And I just don't see us getting closer on that regard. Sorry about the sermon, but it's been a lot of years that I've been listening to this.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: All right, thanks. Appreciate it. That's a good comment to end the discussion on.

Let's shift to the next topic, which is an update on the Atlantic tournament registration and reporting online system.

DR. ALVARADO: Good afternoon. I'm going to be giving an update on the Atlantic tournament registration and reporting online system.

And just to recap for those of you who are not familiar with this system, in 2010 and 2011 we started focusing most of the registration communication efforts in an email and moving away from paper, mail and fax.

In 2011, there was an AP presentation on the results or the status. In 2012 and '13, we surveyed the operators to get a perspective on yielding -- which yielded an AP presentation that Cliff highlighted in his presentation.

In 2014 and '15, HMS began cleaning up data and began entering information into the Southeast Fishery Science Center Recreational Billfish Survey database in anticipation of merging the HMS database and the existing RBS database.

In 2016, my predecessor obtained funding to transfer the data and upgrade the recreational billfish survey database to the Apex-based Atlantic tournament registry online system.

In 2017, we completed the Atlantic tournament registration online system and reporting and it is now live and we had the rollout in the last week or two.

So the -- this slide gives you a flow chart of the Atlantic tournament registration system. There's two paths. There's the operator registering a tournament on the left side and the same operator reporting their catch seven days after the tournament is over.

They are entering the system -- or the data into a centralized database. And if you follow the arrows -- I don't know if you can see that, there's the tournament registration confirmation and there's also the report, Catch Confirmation.

And one of the outcomes of that is there's an automated -- the dash line on the right side of the flow chart gives you an automated reminder to the operators based on the previous year's tournament history to register upcoming tournaments, and then seven days later, to report tournaments seven days after they've occurred.

As I mentioned, the centralized data is very helpful for requesting outreach for the various user groups that you can see at the bottom of that flow chart. So we have HMS Management, Southeast Fishery Science Center, Law Enforcement from the federal and state levels and Outreach.

In addition to being helpful for those

different user groups, it helps HMS manage and monitor compliance with tournament requirements and HMS recreational landings.

So the take-home messages -- take-home message for this slide is it makes it easier for the public to use because it's smartphone, tablet and PC-compatible; it improves the efficiency of registration and reporting processes for data managers; it increases the availability of information for the agency; and it also allows for the expansion of HMS tournament catch-reporting programs; it automates, facilitates tournament operator notifications; and last but not least, it reduces the use of paper and mailing costs for the public and for the agency.

So here's a screen grab of the tournament online system and the Web page that will get you to there, and -- any questions? Thanks.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Questions?

DR. ALVARADO: Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay, Mike.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: This somewhat ties into the -- we had a discussion this morning about some tournaments not following rules and regulations and so on.

If you go in and you register, then you get an ID number that is complete or that -- is there any mechanism in here to make them be provided the rules and regulations and requirements associated with the HMS species?

They make it -- try to make it dummy-proof, but it never is. But I don't know if that's an easy fix to try to address, you know, that issue.

DR. ALVARADO: When they register, if they request outreach materials as part of the kit, that they receive the recreational tournament compliance guides. So that's given to the operators. And depending on the numbers that they request, they can provide this -- those outreach kits for the participants in the captain's meetings.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: But -- so that's if they request?

DR. ALVARADO: That's if they request. Yes, because I was going to say then it's apparent they're not reading it. I don't know if

this is a mechanism for outreach that they automatically get those kind of answers they need to the different questions or the different species that are permitted to be landed and they can't be sold commercially and so on and so forth. So maybe that's one way to try to address that issue.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Good thought. Katie, did you want to jump back in or is that leftover? Okay.

Okay, great. Thanks. Randy, I think you're up with an update on billfish circle hook tournament requirements.

Thanks, Randy.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: All right. Thanks, Pete.

My name is Randy Blankinship. I'm the Southeast Branch Chief located down in St. Petersburg, Florida.

This presentation is intended to be kind of a continued consideration or follow-on to discussions that had an input that we received during the recreational breakout session at our last meeting.

If you remember, there were several where some of this kind of -- I guess where you can see it synthesized is in the summary of the dots that were applied to that piece of paper, and Margo had that in her overview presentation.

One of the subject that received quite a few dots was this one about the circle hook requirement in tournaments. We -- that wasn't the only time that we heard about this.

We've heard about it over the last several years since implementation, and so we wanted to continue that conversation, give you all an opportunity to give us a little bit more input on this subject and some of the considerations involved.

So this is regarding the existing circle hook requirement that requires anglers that are fishing in Atlantic HMS tournaments to use only non-offset circle hooks when they're using natural bait or natural-artificial lure combinations. This has been a requirement since 2008.

The purpose was to reduce post-release mortality for all billfish species. Initially

when this requirement was implemented, it received a lot of negative feedback. However, since that time, much of the billfish fishery has adapted to the requirement.

So hitting a little bit of the stock status information that supports the reason for circle hooks initially, reported here on this slide is billfish stock status according to the assessments by the SCRS. So this is international determination here.

For blue marlin, it's overfished and overfishing is occurring. For white marlin, overfished, but overfishing is not likely occurring. And for West Atlantic sailfish, it's not likely overfished and overfishing is not likely occurring.

So continuing this discussion about the reason for circle hooks, there are several studies that have been conducted looking at postrelease survival of fish when they're caught on J-hooks, but then also when caught on circle hooks and in comparisons between different bait types and those kind of things.

This slide summarizes some of that information. For instance, for white marlin, you see a mortality rate with J-hooks of 35 percent. For circle hooks, post-release mortality rate of 1.7 percent. You can kind of see the reason for the savings of fish that occur with that -- with white marlin.

For blue marlin, another study found that J-hooks had 6.7 percent mortality while circle hooks had 0 percent mortality.

And then some additional studies over time have shown some benefits of circle hook use for both hooking up a fish using certain fishing techniques for certain species like sailfish and then also the improved ability to retain a fish on a hook with certain species and certain bait types.

However, other studies have also shown some not necessarily consistent results with that, particularly with some coastal pelagic species such as wahoo and dolphin and yellowfin tuna.

Most notably a study -- it's actually not referenced on here, but was done by North Carolina Department of Marine Fisheries and NC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 27

28 29

30

31

32

33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42 43

44

45

46 47

State that looked specifically at the effects of circle hook and J-hook use with coastal pelagics that found that the successful hookup was not as good with circle hooks as with J-hooks with certain bait types. There's several other details in that study as well.

And so the gist of this is that there is clear evidence that there is improvement in post-release mortality rates when circle hooks are used, some variation depending on the type of fishing that's done and the type of bait that's used.

But there is a lot of variance in how successful that hookup rates can be and retention rates can be between circle hook use and J-hooks, with oftentimes for many species J-hooks having a much better success rate at catching and retaining fish in some situations.

So ten years later after the implementation of circle hooks, two issues keep coming up. One is the request from some areas of the fishery to exempt trolling for blue marlin from the circle hook requirement because trolling for blue marlin in these areas is done without a dropback.

In other words, a dropback is when a lure is trolled and a fish comes up and either whacks the bait with its bill or strikes it and misses it or something like that, then the angler can flip their reel into free spool, allow that bait to fall back, mimicking the death of the bait where the fish comes back around and picks the bait up.

It's a common technique that's used not only in billfish fishing, but also in other species. And in that kind of a situation, oftentimes the fish can grab the bait and ingest it before the reel is flipped back into engaging the gears and the line comes tight.

In that kind of a situation with a J-hook, it is more likely that a fish can be deep hooked. With a circle hook, that's -- the purpose is that it allows more frequently for that hook to come up out of its throat and then get hooked in the jaw.

Returning to the key point here, is that folks that want the exemption from the circle hook requirement are contending that they

fish with blue marlin without using a dropback technique that the fish are hooked up on the strike, and therefore J-hooks would be much more effective in having a successful hookup rate and that there is not a concern in their opinion about post-release hooking mortality because J-hook and deep hooking is not very likely to happen.

So we heard this at the roundtable discussion at our last meeting, but like I said, that was not the only time that we've heard that. We've heard that over the course of the last ten years repetitiously through phone calls but then also at tournament operator meetings.

The second thing, an issue that has kept coming up, is related to lures that are built with a natural component to it like the head of a fish that is completely encased in some synthetic material like acrylic. And there's a picture here of one type of those -- of that lure.

The request is to exempt lures with the natural component that's encased in this kind of material from the circle hook requirement. The way that their interpretation has been is that circle hooks are required with this kind of bait because there is a natural component to it.

The argument is that the hard, synthetic material completely removes any type of a natural effect to the bait because there's no scent that's escaping, there's no texture to it that mimics the real thing.

And so therefore the contention is that it should be exempt from the circle hook requirement. Once again, this is something we've heard repetitiously over the last few years and including at the last meeting.

So for discussion, here are some prompt questions. And this does not have to be limited to these. Should NMFS consider changing the way that the circle hook requirement applies in billfish tournaments? Are there fishing techniques for blue marlin where circle hooks should be required, such as when using live bait?

What modifications to the regulations can be made that maintain the benefits of circle hooks for reducing post-release mortality for billfishes, and can modifications to the

regulations be enforced?

So some things to think about as we engage in this discussion, and I look forward to your comments and/or questions.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Great. And we -thanks, Randy. We have about 10, 15 minutes to
chew on this. Start with Fly and then over to
Rom.

MEMBER NAVARRO: Good afternoon. Thanks, Randy. A couple of things that I noticed in there, and I was also in that discussion in the recreational, you have it broken down here into two different questions. But the truth be told, it's the same question. You're just talking about in two different ways here, and it's actually your fishing technique.

If the bait is encased in polyurethane or if it's in some kind of synthetic material, it's going to be trolled at something in the 8 -- 7 to 8, maybe even 9-knot range.

And with a lot of those guys in the Gulf of Mexico, they're trying to fish artificials along with dead baits at the same time. So while that's happening, there is no dropback for blue marlin when you're going at that speed.

Now if you were to slow the boat down, even if you're blue marlin fishing and you're doing 6 knots and if you fall under the "blue marlin tournament" but now you're allowed to use J-hooks because you're fishing for blue marlin, but you can still give them a dropback, it's a very fine line there. And how do you enforce that?

I'm not opposed to having J-hooks in a ballyhoo or a mackerel while you're going at such speeds, but how do you enforce it in a tournament? How do you enforce it outside of a tournament? It's a very, very fine line and I'd be very careful.

Just because we've done really well with the circle hooks over the last now, what is it, nine, ten years, and we have learned a lot of new ways to fish with circle hooks successfully for billfish, and just to go back on it to encompass one kind of fishing is kind of counterproductive.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Fly.

Rom?

5

 MEMBER WHITAKER: Yes, Rom Whitaker, Hatteras Charter Fisherman. Am I missing something here? First of all, we fish for blue marlin the same way in the Atlantic that they do in the Gulf. There's no difference.

Yes, we had this big argument ten years ago about -- we around my area are the biggest fans of a J-hook and islander combination probably in the world. And we were -- we argued hard about it ten years ago and we decided -- we didn't decide, you all decided that the mortality was too great for that combination.

So unless I'm missing something, we're allowed to use J-hooks and a lure. And this plastic thing you showed in the picture here, I would call a lure. There isn't nothing about that that's natural. You can put all the fish heads in there you want, but if it's inside plastic, it's a lure.

So if they want to put a J-hook in that, I have no problems with that. But it seems like we're rehashing something that we pretty much I thought put to bed eight -- well, ten years ago almost.

So yes, we -- if you do an exemption for them, you better be ready to do an exemption all over Bermuda to anywhere anybody fishes for blue marlin. But yes, as Fly pointed out, we've learned how to use circle hooks. Better circle hooks have come out and hooked much better.

And if you're using a natural bait, whether it's popping out of a outrigger clip or you're dropping it back with your thumb, it's going to probably hook some -- it's going to be -- cause more mortality. So I'm -- I don't even know why we're discussing this. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: It was the sticky dots, the evil sticky dots. Randy?

MEMBER GREGORY: Randy Gregory, North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries. I just want to agree with Rom and Fly and say no. Yes, even longer got -- 2003 Randy is when we started this.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Anna?

MEMBER BECKWITH: Yes, I need to echo
that sentiment as well. It's not worth the
exemption to go backwards.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Mike and then over to Rick.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Is this just for blue marlin or -- it does say for all billfish tournaments, but you have the two questions here. So are you saying white marlin, blue marlin, everything, or just one or the other?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: So in the first question, it's related to an exemption related to blue marlin fishing, and particularly related most likely to them actively trolling without a dropback. The other second question about a luring cased in acrylic or some other material is not specific to blue marlin. It would be across the board for all billfishes.

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: One last question. I mean, I was in that breakout session. I wish the fellow that was from New Orleans -- I think Fishing Club was very outspoken about this. He isn't here, probably for obvious reasons. I think that from what I recall, there was a big issue with enforcement with this. So do you have any response of how to address that?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: So first of all, say that he might be online or on the phone, so we might give him a chance to speak up if he is here in a moment.

Secondly, so there is an enforcement aspect to this that is a difficult one. As has been discussed around this table quite a bit, the existing circle hook requirement for tournaments is difficult to enforce as well from an enforcement agent standpoint because the technique that's being employed on the water during a tournament usually isn't able to be observed by an enforcement agent.

And so you depend upon voluntary compliance to a great extent and compliance with oftentimes tournament regulations that require that fish be landed legally. And so those things are at play with some limitation on enforcement. There -- then similarly, an exemption might be hard to enforce as well if you make some specific requirement that allows that.

Like say for instance if you said that a certain leader material -- mono leader greater than 100 lb test could be exempt. That sounds pretty logical and it might work, but it also

might be difficult to enforce.

The same things I would mention apply to even things in other fisheries like the circle hook requirement for reef fish in the Gulf of Mexico in the South Atlantic where it depends upon, to a great extent, voluntary compliance on the water because oftentimes you don't have an enforcement agent right there watching to see whether that bait that you let down has a circle hook in it or not when you're fishing for red snapper, for example.

So it wouldn't be without precedent to make such a distinction, but it is difficult to enforce.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Let's hear from Rick and then see if there's anyone on the phone who wants to weigh in. Rick?

MEMBER WEBER: I'm going to start by agreeing with Mike that we don't have a lot of Gulf Coast anglers around this table right now. And it's -- I don't -- I'm with you, Rom.

I think his analysis is accurate that probably we're not getting a great savings on blue marlin, but I think the enforcement is a real hassle and not -- it's probably not worth backing up.

But I think we owe it to our Gulf Coasters. I hope they are on the phone and can speak up on that. But I disagree with Fly that these are the same question when we talk about that encased fish head because these two things are not related. I think you should move forward on that encased fish head. That's a lure by any definition.

MEMBER NAVARRO: I was just saying that it was the same fishing techniques as -- you're just trolling. It's -- you're going 8 knots whether they're encased in the lure or whether it's a ballyhoo and a Hawaiian eye. That's what I meant.

MEMBER WEBER: I understood. I didn't want them to make a mistake and think there was only one question. It was either a full yes or a full no because I see the split.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, helpful distinction. Anyone on the teleconference who wants to be weighing in there? Mike?

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Yes, since they're

not in a teleconference, with these tournaments, you -- I believe the anglers are required to report what they land, is that correct? So do they also report what's dead or discards?

And I'm curious with that, with what they landed, what they released, and are we confident with that data, what does that tell -- or are they, since they're not complying, not even telling us they're using Js or whatever?

I'm just curious of whether you can glean anything from the data or there's no data there in order to come to any conclusions to see if it supports the finding that date -- that have been researched, the death with circle hook use.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: So the first question about reporting, for tournaments, reporting of effort and landings and including dead discards, that is all information that is recorded and reported by tournament operators to the agency.

That tournament reporting is -there's a little bit more information in there
than there is with just the requirement for nontournament fishing -- fishermen to report their
landings only. All right? Distinction there
between tournament and non-tournament.

So I think you were getting at a question about any evidence of successful implementation and real savings of fish as a result I guess to -- is that what you were getting at with the second part of that?

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Yes, that's part of it. But if they weren't aware, I don't know if they're blatantly just using Js or -- and not aware? Are they stupid is as stupid does, they're actually putting in the information to use Js when they should have used circles? I don't know, I'm just curious.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: So as I mentioned before, there's -- and we've had this discussion before about different ways that enforcement can find out about, you now, what type of terminal gear is used. So to say that it's completely unenforceable is not right. It can be enforced.

It may depend upon photographs, video, videos posted, you know to Web sites, those kind of things where an enforcement agent could use it as evidence in order to take an action.

Secondly, as I mentioned before, tournaments -- most tournaments have some provisions in their rules where -- that state that fish must be landed in -- using legal means and methods.

And there are tournament operators that employ lie detector tests on their winning teams in order to get some kind of verification, albeit oftentimes questionable, but some kind of verification that they can hang their hat on that says that they checked or they asked.

Other tournaments have observers on all the boats, and so there's verification that way. And others depend completely on us fisherman and no real way to verify. Others may have photographs.

So there are different ways that tournaments can get some kind of confidence that there is adherence to the circle hook rule. Oftentimes it does lean upon the tournament rules and the tournament operators in some form or fashion for that to take place.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. I see that there are a handful of cards that have gone back up, but for sake of time, unless it's going to cause massive strain for somebody, I'd like to push us on.

Also, Margo is whispering in my ear that because we don't have Gulf folks here, that we will probably need to come back and revisit this a little bit. So if that helps you put your card down, I would appreciate that. Yes? Okay.

So I don't know what you heard, Randy, but what I've heard at least given who's around the table today is not much support for exempting the trolling, some support for exempting the lures. But again, a strong recognition that we don't have all the voices around the table, so take all of that with a grain of salt.

Okay, thanks. So with that, we want to shift to getting you up here, Brad, so you can give us the end review as to where we are right now. And I -- while you're coming up here, I just want to check for folks in the audience.

We will have public comment in an hour from now at 5:30. How many people, if anyone in the audience, want to be making some sort of public comment? One, two. Okay, thanks. So if

you could just hang in there a little longer. Thanks.

MR. MCHALE: All right, good afternoon. I appreciate being put on the agenda. You put an Irishman between you all and happy hour, always not necessarily a safe bet. But we're also talking bluefin tuna, so I'm very conflicted.

So anyhow, as we were kind of setting up the agenda for this meeting, and sometimes as we do in the fall, we try to give a snapshot of what's transpired.

And I think for those folks that are either interested in bluefin tuna or just can't avoid hearing about it in your daily duties, there's been a few things happen this year that once again fall outside the norm.

And so I figured we'd kind of report back on that, kind of let folks see kind of some of the data that we're seeing reflect back in some of the conversations that we have around the table here, over the phone, via email and then ultimately try to make heads or tails of it as we try to figure out how to continue to adapt this fishery.

So first and foremost, I'd like to actually call out Sarah McLaughlin on the HMS team there in Gloucester because she has primarily had the pen to draft a number of the inseason actions that are conducted, whether they relate to quota transfers, retention limits what have you, and I think we're at 15 to date and I suspect there'll be more.

So as far as the amount of Margo's resources that are then used to kind of manage the fishery in season, it's been a little higher than what we've experienced say over the last five, ten years.

But one thing to point out is that -we touched on a little bit this morning is that
the division is very active in moving quota
around, especially given some of the flexibility
authority that we had put into place and
finalized with amendment 7, so whether that's
moving quota around for the winter fishery,
whether it's reallocating Purse Seine quota based
on the previous year's catches, whether it's
moving quota from the reserve to the Harpoon

category, which is usually a guarantee that fishery will catch no more fish, which has transpired the last two times we did it.

Although I think there have been a handful of fish this year -- and then also kind of looking to see how the remainder of 2017 will play out and what quota we still have available to kind of review the needs of the fishery that's recreational, that's commercial, regardless of gear type, and kind of move that quota where it needs to be.

In regards to the recreational fishery, just a very quick synopsis that we started the fishery off with a default limit of one fish per vessel per day. That fishery lasted right up through the end of April and then we kind of established a consistent, like we have done in years past, retention limit both for the private recreational vessels.

And then for our for-hire fleet, we did a slight uptick in the retention limits for school bluefin tuna, and so that fishery's currently ongoing. As it relates to the trophy fishery that we've discussed around the table to some degree today, that each of the respective areas that were redesigned in amendment 7 have since closed.

So the southern area, which essentially is from southern New Jersey down through the east coast of Florida, that closed on March 20. The Gulf of Mexico fishery closed on June 7. And then lastly the North, which is southern New Jersey through Maine, closed on August 11.

So one thing that we're keeping tabs on, as we always do, but some data that had piqued my interest when received our first wave of information derived from the large pelagic survey was looking at -- if you look at the last two rows there, it's stacked from 2013 through 2017, was to keep tabs on the numbers of fish that are coming through both from the school as well as the large school fishery as they relate to say the past four or five years.

You know, granted, it's a data point. I know we have some preliminary numbers coming through here momentarily for the month of July, but just to keep tabs that -- I know that there

was some discussions around the table.

Looks like one individual in particular happens to be missing for some reason during this discussion -- but how quota is actually used and where does it go and where is it allocated, is that it is not just a longliner and a commercial handgear component of the bluefin tuna fishery. Oh yes, there's this recreational aspect to it as well, go figure.

So we will also be looking at the needs of everybody that is participating in the harvest and the catch and release of this fishery and what it means to the quota utilization to ultimately get back to the overall optimal yield.

But this is a dynamic that we haven't had to contend with in the last few years that it -- the trend may drop off, it may continue, but just another dynamic to make my beard that much more whiter each year that goes by.

Continuing on with those inseason actions I mentioned. So as we look at the commercial retention limits, you can see that it hasn't necessarily been a dull year, whether it's starting off the winter fishery at three, seen catch rates kind of go up quite dramatically, dropping it down to one.

And knowing that -- or not knowing, but then still seeing catch rates are high, then ultimately closing that fishery on March 30. It would have closed automatically on the 31st, but again, catch rates were really cranking right there at the end of that winter fishery.

A lot of debate over the last couple years of where to start the kind of summer/fall fishery, offshore fisheries, inshore fisheries. We started off at four fish this year.

Just shortly after July 4, we saw catch rates go up and those catch rates kind of remained constant, if not even increased, as time marched on. Tried to respond there in early August with the two-fish retention limit reduction.

And then catch rates actually even increased after that, whether that was an effort increase or whether just the catch rate itself for the effort that existed gone up. A little difficult to tease out, but those catch rates continued.

And then ultimately we had to close the fishery on August 17, and that's an action that we haven't had to take since -- as I went back through the FR notices, since August 8 of 1998. So we're close to 20 years since we've had to have that kind of interim closure, at least that early in the season.

And then ultimately the fishery had reopened on September 1, and we reopened that fishery at a one fish per vessel per day. And the statistics I have to date is we've landed about 31 metric tons out of an available 123 and we got about 8 metric tons coming in at that one fish limit right now. And so if those catch rates were to continue, we'll get about 15 fishable days out of that base 123 quota.

In regards to the Harpoon category fishery, we kept the large medium slot limit at 2 fish per day. There was some increase that I'll touch in a latter slide to have a larger allotment of large mediums or a larger retention limit of large medium.

And currently, we transferred additional quota into that fishery. And again, there hasn't been a lot of activity the last few weeks and that fishery will be closed automatically on November 16 if the adjusted quota isn't harvested in the fall.

Some more statistics regarding that Harpoon category fishery, kind of breaking down the catch composition of how many metric tons are being landed that fall into that large medium group versus the unlimited giant group.

Ultimately we're at, as of yesterday, with 40.1 metric tons. You know, we did that transfer. And then what we've also been sharing over the last few years is this composition of those vessels that have been successful, how many are catching zero, large mediums and only giants, how many are catching at least one large medium too.

And then we've done the same statistical breakout or percentage breakout for the giants. Again, trying to use what is actually taking place on the water and then helping the form where we set some of those large medium retention limits at versus what's the data state versus what are some of the requests we

field.

 When it comes to the General category, looking across the different time periods, you know, here in particular in January looking at the retention limits, looking at the landings and then ultimately where we ended up, you know, having to close that fishery.

You know, I've got March 30, but with a rather substantial harvest that had taken place through those winter months whether, you know, you look at January through March where we had a three-fish limit, you know, catching just shy of 70 metric tons.

But then when the daily retention limit dropped to one fish, you can look there just over those few weeks in March, you know, we had 40 metric tons. You know, the catch rates were still rock solid there -- fish availability, weather windows, what have you, it all contributed to large catches.

You know, so ultimately that winter fishery racked up at about just shy of 108 metric tons being landed from January through the end of March.

And then kind of the same breakout. If you look at the percent of trips landing at least one bluefin -- so these are only successful trips, you know, how many vessels caught one fish, two fish as well as three fish. And you'll see a trend that, you know, the vast majority of the fleet are catching one or two fish. And these same catch rates apply throughout the summer and fall months as well.

So there's been a lot of feedback that the agency's been receiving regarding our decision to start the fishery at four fish, and a lot of consternation that that directly led to we'll call the premature closure in mid-August.

In breaking down some of these numbers, we had a whopping 8 metric tons landed for the entire month of June. But then when you start into July and August, you're almost getting 8 metric tons a day.

You know, so those shifts of, you know, what's actually taking place on the water versus the information we're using to help inform our decisions -- what were the catch rates last year, where were the fish available, were they

inshore, were they offshore, what were weather windows -- you know, all those different variables that, you know, we can look at till we're blue in the face and try to make, you know, a solid estimate, but sometimes it doesn't always play out.

So for a total of, you know, June through August, there was about 324, 325 metric tons landed. You know, again, catch rates really skyrocketing there in the end. I've got another graph that'll show that. And then ultimately where we stand, again, some of the base allocations right now for the General category at about 93 percent of that January through August.

Again, there's still a quota available potentially in reserves and what have you. And then kind of the -- some of the same breakout numbers there in the end, but the patterns are pretty consistent when you look at the June through August that the vast majority of the fisheries landing that one/two fish limit when it's available.

So I actually worked with some of the staff that aren't around the table or in the audience up in the Gloucester office to kind of map out what does fisheries look like, where our quotas were at and what the catch rates are at, especially given a lot of the feedback that we're receiving through social media and emails -- you know, why did you make this decision, why didn't you act sooner, you know, why are you so awful at managing this fishery.

And so to kind of map it out of some of the dynamics -- and this is just one snapshot of this year, but, you know, where we can kind of -- I know it's probably difficult to see, probably better on the laptops.

But where you can kind of see where we took actions, what the data was and, you know, ultimately how we're trying to respond to these variables in the fishery and try to stay out ahead of it as much as we can.

Needless to say, there's still room for improvement, you know, to snap out of the mindset that we've been in probably say for the last dozen or 15 years of, you know, how do you provide access to the fishery.

Well, a year like this is not actually

-- how do you try to extend the fishery and, you know, dropping down to one-fish limits and, you know, even having discussions of restricted fishing days coming into the conversation at least on the public side is a flashback to where we're at almost 20 years ago.

So some of the dynamics that we then internally have to contend with is we do have 24-hour reporting requirements. They have been consistent. But what I was trying to look at is what are some of the dynamics that compromise our ability to be so responsive to the dynamics in the fishery and trying to look at what sort of lag times we might be getting from our dealer reports.

And so looking at some of those higher-volume dealers and look at the lag times, you know, we have some of those dealers that are reporting, you know, right on time to some of those dealers that are reporting four or five days late.

And, you know, on average we're looking at two and three-quarter day kind of lag time when you look at those high-volume dealers, and especially right off the weekends.

So I think what we're observing is maybe some dealers aren't necessarily staffing up their office folks that may actually be submitting the reports. So all of the sudden, we're not necessarily seeing Friday, Saturday and Sunday landings until late on Monday.

And especially as we start to approach filling these quotas or sub-quotas, it really compromises our ability to really adapt, which ultimately then feeds into some of the metrics we were talking earlier.

So amendment 7 implemented requirements where vessels, whether they be charter, General or Angling for that matter, have a vessel reporting requirement. And that's either via the phone application or over the Web site.

And so currently I only have this teased out for those putting fish into the General category versus Harpoon as far as landings, but I think we can kind of take another look, George, to get at your question, a Charter/Headboat versus a General breakout of

those numbers.

But what's glaringly apparent here is there is significant room for improvement with our commercial handgear fleet. The General category's still hanging just about 45 percent compliance. And much as I've tried to work with our ABTA members and other folks in the fishery that we have, the dealer data, we can do a direct comparison.

It takes nothing for me to print out a spreadsheet and give it to Wynn Carney and have him go fill his quota as far as violations of however they're tracking it. Hence why the multiple count, Stewie, that you were talking about earlier today, is they may go jump on a vessel, compare the numbers, and if that one vessel caught 17 fish and didn't report one, there's your 17 counts.

And so we're working directly with OLE right now where we've transitioned out of that education phase and trying to work folks is that, okay, how else do you get folks' attention when you're looking to improve compliance. And violations is a clear way to do that.

So we'll be continuing to work on that -- this because when we're trying to manage the fishery, especially as catch rates are extremely high, and trying to determine which way to go, all this data helps inform those decisions.

A few other dynamics of what we've been hearing pretty loudly this season is poor quality of fish, poor prices on fish. And so we looked at some of the averages looking back over January of '16 at least through currently '17. And on average, we don't necessarily see significant drops, but there are drops, no doubt about it.

It's also playing out in the quality of fish, as dealers report it, that there are significant numbers of poor-quality fish and very few high-quality fish when you look at either fat or oil content. And there are also, although hidden in these numbers, plenty of examples of where fish have been sold for one or two dollars.

That low quality apparently has been putting those fish more in competition with bigeye versus say the more traditional bluefin tuna markets, and whether or not it warrants

exporting those fish.

So very quick run through the data. So kind of what we hear as you sit on this side of the fence is that, you know, it is continuing to be important that the United States uses its entire quota, whether that be swordfish or bluefin.

Again, I take a lot of credit, I think as Margo does as well as the last two years, we've pretty much harvested our entire bluefin tuna quota. And so that continues to be kind of one of our objectives, is to capitalize on what the United States has available to it.

Some of the other dynamics and, you know, the image in the lower right kind of tries to get at some of the feedback we get. And I think most folks around the table are accustomed to this. Do or do not, and then insert whatever variable you want, is a lot of the feedback that we get.

So set the retention limits high early. Catch the quota when it's there, because you don't know when the fish will leave. Set the limits high because we want to do offshore trips.

Okay, well if those fish are inshore and you have those high limits, you start to experience what we did there in August as well as in July. Folks that want to have low limits early because they think the quality of the fish is going to improve throughout the year, so save the harvest for later in the year.

So those kind of opposing suggestions that we field of, oh, I never thought I would have heard it, bring back restricted fishing days. I suspect that is from folks that are new to the fishery, since we actually had restricted fishing days. Set up limits -- more weekly limits. Like how do you ultimately get at slowing down the catch rates?

And then, you know, coming to the last point there is ensuring that there still is a December quota, given how things had played out in 2016. And then the flip side of the coin is preserve more of the traditional fisheries. So this constant tug of war of how do you strike the balance to piss you all off equally.

And so kind of segueing back to some of the same feedback we get with the Harpoon

category, we've heard this more loudly this year than ever, is we should eliminate harpoon as a gear type in the General category. They should have their own category.

In the Harpoon category, we should have the large medium numbers set the same as the General. Again, an equity-type argument. And then, we should be extending fishing opportunities for harpooners. And again, you know, we did that and again catch rates there have dropped off.

So I question sometimes why they ask for it. But we did it all the same, and then that quota can be moved further. So somebody had captured one of my quotes as I kind of talk with all those folks through social media and what have you that are experts in managing this fishery.

And if anybody wants to buy me a crystal ball from Brookstone that it will allow me to do a better job, I appreciate that offer, as long it's under \$20. But, you now, it's -- again, it's a quick summary. The take-home message is it's bluefin tuna fishing. It's a bluefin tuna fishery.

Be damned if any of us know really what's going to take place from one year to the next. We adapt to the best of our ability. We take all the feedback and observations and years of expertise into consideration.

But sure enough, you know, we are a federal agency. We are very responsive, but things take time, and, you know, we will continue to adapt to meet all of the objectives as we try to manage this fishery. And with that, I think I'll wrap up.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay, thanks Brad. I've got a couple of folks in the queue already. George and then over to Jason.

MEMBER PURMONT: Thank you. Brad, first of all, thank you very much for an excellent presentation. And by extension, thank you to Sarah.

A question -- couple of questions or an observation, 138.2 metric tons from the Purse Seine went into the Reserve. Was that all of the existing Purse Seine or was there Purse Seine that was leased? And would you explain the lease

procedure to the longliners? Thank you. And then I've got another one.

MR. MCHALE: Okay. So real quickly, that transfer from the Purse Seine category to the reserve was not all of the Purse Seine quota. In amendment 7, we set up a metric so where there was always a minimal amount, 25 percent of the baseline Purse Seine quota would remain with those five historical participants. And so essentially that's 75 percent of the quota has transferred over.

As far as where the allocations associated with each of those give entities have gone, I'd have to go back and look to see where the leases may or may not have taken place. I don't have that information readily available, but it was there for those five purse seine fishing participants to lease quota either amongst themselves or to longline -- Atlantic Tuna Longline permit holders.

And the lease process there is whether it's from a purse seine participant to a longliner, or identical to longliner to longliner. They're all part of the IBQ. Their quota's in the system.

And then where the private business deals are managed out, that allocation can move from one account to the next. So there really aren't significant differences whether it's a longline participant versus a purse seine participant when it comes to that leasing dynamic.

MEMBER PURMONT: A continuation of questions. In regard to the purse seine again, there are five vessels. White Dove Too has been reflagged and has been fishing in Ecuador for quite some time. Bruce Pat is a pelagic fisherman up in Maine. The Avila family, I'm sure the Genovese family, have absolutely no intent of ever reentering our fishery.

The recent sale of Harbor Blue's fishing boats to another entity without the ability to transfer the grandfather concession means essentially that there are no seiners left.

I know that there's an allegiance occasionally paid to history, but I'm wondering at what point in time does this allegiance surrender itself and the purse seine quota

5

actually go to the whole disposal of national fisheries.

MR. MCHALE: So when it comes to that, there are still some issues that surround, you know, the purse seine fishery. And permit ownership I think is a -- still a rather significant one of whether or not permits are transferrable, are they not. Were the permits issued to families, individuals or the entities, the companies, that ran the vessels.

So I think that's still kind of under consideration in light of the recent sales, not necessarily in the Genovese and Avilla-type situations. But, you know, if sales are authorized in some shape or form, that obviously ripples into there.

When it comes to say managing that fishery as a whole, that becomes a much more significant undertaking if all of the sudden you're looking at reallocation and/or the prohibiting a fishery or -- those sort of dynamics are kind of on the FMP amendment scale and would need to be properly vetted through EISes and the like.

And so I don't think we're there quite yet. That may mean we may not get there, but that's kind of something that I think once ripe, and it might be approaching that, that we'll be discussing around this table for some time exactly what are the pros and cons of those sort of approaches.

MEMBER PURMONT: Thank you very much.

MEMBER ADRIANCE: Thanks, Brad. When
you get that good crystal ball, let me know how
it works. My state-issued one seems to issue
more caveats than predictions.

On Slide 11 in the compliance rates, are those compliance rates based on reporting within the first 24 hours or just fish that were never reported?

MR. MCHALE: The latter, so this isn't even getting at the timeliness aspect. We all right? Did someone take a digger? All right.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: How are Pat's

cookies?

PARTICIPANT: Nick seems very calm,

but okay.

MR. MCHALE: Yes. Yes. So Jason, to

get back to your question, yes, these are just compliance rates period, you know, which kind of exemplifies the need for better outreach, however effective that may need to be through the different means.

One other item I guess I wanted to share back -- and I don't know if Steve's next in the queue, but Steve you had had a question earlier regarding the breakout of the mobile application versus the Web application. And our staff up at headquarters were able to tease out some of the numbers that -- at least so far for this year.

Out of all the Web-based reports, that about 57 percent are still coming through the Web, 29 percent are coming through the Web -- the phone application and about 14 percent are still kind of picking up the phone and calling to somebody in the customer service during business hours. So --

FACILITATOR BROOKS: I've got Andrew, Steve, Rick and then Mike. So Andrew, you're up.

MEMBER MARSHALL: Thanks. Just a more of a comment I guess than a question. We talked about a little bit earlier this -- when you do drop the retention limits, we're seeing a kind of a herd mentality right now.

And you're seeing some people, you know, safety issues, people out fishing in weather they shouldn't be out in right now. And I think that's really driving up the catch rate right now. We're seeing really small boats out there right now, and I'm sure you know that. So just a quick comment.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Rick? Oh sorry, Steve.

MEMBER IWICKI: Steve Iwicki. So first off, I'll tell you about 30 percent for that app for the first year, that's great. That's really a great statistic to know. If you can go to pull up Slide 4 a second, I just had a question.

So the numbers in red there for this year just are like statistically off the charts for the first half of the year. So I'm just of wondering, is that due to -- you think to a much better reporting or is that much better catch? Because I'll tell you, I don't know what Rick

would say, but for South Jersey, bluefin wasn't that great this year for us through June.

So I'm just wondering is there any geospatial correlation of where you think those reports are coming from or do you see a spike in the reporting? Because statistically, that's a very big difference. Doesn't mean you're going to blow through it, but compare that to ever year for that point in time, that's a big delta.

MR. MCHALE: I haven't had a chance to tease these numbers apart to kind of get at the geospatial aspect. What I do think is that there is an improvement in the recreational reporting.

Because I know that not just the agency, but a lot of the folks around this table and a lot of the associations have been kind of beating that drum of, you know, the better data the agency has, the better it can manage versus the 1-800-CLOSE-ME mentality. That, and I think that there will be certain geographic areas that the fish were available.

One thing I didn't mention, and I know we're kind of -- I'm getting long-winded here, but one thing that came out of the commercial data is that every single day in July and every single day in August, there were multiple commercial fish landings, which means every single day for both those two months was a fishable day.

And it wasn't just coming into Gloucester in one port -- that there were multiple ports. So I suspect that those weather patterns, the fish being relatively inshore, bait availability inshore kind of will drive up some of those catch rates as well. But I just need to kind of dissect those numbers as well as see if that trend continues in through July.

MEMBER IWICKI: I would just add, when you tease the numbers, if you look at it at -- the permit number is the reference point to see how many first-time reports or how many -- they may have done one in the past and they did three this year or something like that.

Because I don't think the numbers are that crazy, that they're off. It's just a matter -- I think the reporting's that much better. So I'll be curious to see how that comes out.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Rick,

then Mike, then David, then Marty.

MEMBER BELLAVANCE: Thanks, Brad. Same slide, I had a couple of questions as well. I'm curious if you might be able to get to any data from like 2003, 2004, 2005 with those same classes of fish to see what the recreational fishery looked like back then.

That's -- in my head, what I remember being like a good robust recreational fishery, and I'm curious to see what those numbers might look like as far as numbers of those small school tuna compared to the 739 that we've landed so far.

Just trying to see if we're getting back to that level of fishing or not. I also noticed that the number of small/medium seems to be dropping a little bit, so maybe those fish are getting out of the fishery and the overall weight metric tons might be a little bit more leveled off because we're catching smaller fish -- more of them, but they're small as opposed to those bigger ones, so that's kind of good news.

And then on my last question, our request would be to try to vet out that small school bluefin tuna, the 27 to 47 inch, into modes so that we can see if there was any effect on increasing the Charter/Headboat retention to three fish, if that was where some of the extra landings came from or if it was strictly on the private angling side or if it was a combination of both, just for future reference when we start to think about those regulations for next year. Thanks.

MR. MCHALE: The quick answer's yes. We can kind of go to the web-based LPS querying tool and probably have some of those answers before the end of the meeting tomorrow.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Great, thank you.

David?

MEMBER SCHALIT: This is more in the form of a comment or comments, not questions. I think at ABTA what we learned this year was that if you're -- with regard to Atlantic bluefin tuna, if your expectations are zero, your expectations will always be met.

There was no way we could anticipate the volume of fish that we were dealing with, especially given the fact that in the month of

June, as Brad pointed out, we landed only eight fish. That was it.

And I think this -- the most landings we had in any one day occurred on the 4th of July, if I'm not mistaken. It was either the first or the second-highest day. And from then on, it was -- what would you call it -- a living -- that sort of being in the seven editions of hell. You didn't -- there were so -- the volume, the pace of landings was hard to keep track of.

And one of the things that we learned in this process was that toggling bag limits, raising and lowering bag limits, as a method for increasing or decreasing the pace of landings, doesn't always work in all conditions. And that's what we learned in this year.

We found that -- I mean, it was completely counterintuitive in the sense that -- let us say from the end of June through the -- through early August, we had a four-fish bag limit and we were landing, according to our statistics, 4.5 metric tons per day in the northeast.

Beginning the 3rd of August to the 15th, we dropped the bag limit from four fish to two, and we were landing over 8 metric tons per day. So it seems that there was nothing we could do to lower the -- what was -- to slow down what was going on on the water.

It was kind of a perfect storm of various conditions that we're not even really sure about now because we don't have enough statistics, as was mentioned a few minutes ago. The idea of new entrants has been bantered about a lot. Well, we don't know if that's real or not. But we'll be able to get to find out by looking at the data, but that's going to take a little while.

So right now I think our objective is to find the best possible way to get through the end of the season -- to get through the season. And I think that's the challenge for now. Thanks very much, Brad. Appreciate it.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Marty?

MEMBER SCANLON: Yes. Once again, you know, our concern in the pelagic longline industry here, you know, is the compliance issue here. You know, once again you've got better

5

than half of the General category basically refuse to comply with the -- reporting with compliance like they're supposed to.

You know, I hear about, you know, they want to -- you know, ways to keep the category open, transfers, all of this stuff. However, you know, you have to, you know, show compliance in order to be rewarded.

We continue to reward a category that is better than 50 percent noncompliant with the regulations. So, you know, how do you expect you, Brad -- to be fair to you, how do you expect you to regulate it properly when you're not compliant with the regulations to report? You know?

So, you know, all of a sudden, what's going to happen? You know, you do a transfer, and then what happens if there's 100 percent compliance? What happens to the quota then? And when does it get to the point where, you know, like you say, we're into the three-year review and now we're just going to start giving these guys fines?

Well in a longline industry if every logbook that I'm supposed to have filled every single page has to be correct, every single line on that page has to be correct or I'm not getting a permit, how come that's not the case here?

These guys that don't comply should not be reissued permits the next year, period. And if that means that the guys that are in the category and that are compliant gets double the amount of fish to land next year, so be it.

I'm not saying don't let the legal fisherman go fish. But we have to put a stop to the people that think they're better than the compliance. This is nonsense to come in here -- it's insulting to me and the rest of the guys that fish with me to have to sit here and look at this year after year. And it's consistent.

The numbers here are consistent from 2016 to 2017. The same people don't think they have to comply and you have not made them comply, period.

So is it -- would it be fair to just say, "Well listen, we're not going to give you the entire category anymore -- transfers unless they comply?" That wouldn't be fair to the guys

that are complying, and I wouldn't want to see that.

But these guys that refuse to comply are making it nothing but more difficult for all of us to manage this fishery, you know, correctly. So it's time to stop playing games with them.

These guys don't comply this year, pull their damn permits and let the rest of the guys that are compliant catch double the fish next year. Believe me, they'll comply.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Marty. Thanks Marty. Mike, you want back in?

MEMBER PIERDINOCK: Sure. You know, our observations up in Massachusetts, you could say from the Chatham area on north, western gulf of Maine, so on, I think one thing that's contributed to these increase in landings is that in the past, you know, you're either rec charter or even commercial guys got to go off the Georges Bank or the Hague Line or certain areas like that in order to land these giants. But this year, it's been completely different. I mean, you go to Chatham, they're right there, you know, 100 yards offshore going crazy.

You're 15, 20 miles offshore where you have a quick and easier access to these areas that I think that it's contributed to the fact that we have more landings. You know, we had that great year class back in 2008 where we were running and gunning and chasing those guys and they're getting bigger and to the point of what we have now, and I think it's reflective of that.

You know, one thing I think maybe that needs to be taken into consideration -- and I don't know if this is up for discussion tomorrow, but there seems to be a lot of fish out there, a lot of bluefin, and do we need to push for our quota increase at ICCAT for us to have more landings, which would be fair to the North Carolina guys and down south? Because they've seen plenty of them down there, we're seeing plenty of them up here.

Otherwise, you know, everything's going to remain the same with, you know, just adjusting daily quotas and bag limits. But getting back to your crystal ball, this year we're seeing them right next to shore. We're

seeing them close. Next year, they may be 50 to 100 miles off, which adds to the difficulty.

And then people say, as they did a few years ago, there's no fish and they want to make an ESA designation for bluefin. Well they were 50 to 100 miles offshore. They weren't coming close to the shore. So that's part of the difficulties with fishery management. They move with the food, with the forage fish and temperature and so on.

This year, they're all near shore. They've increased their landings. And I think as a result of that too, you get a lot of the weekend warriors that were able to hook up more because there are a lot more of them and are a lot closer to shore.

So I just want to throw that observation out there because I think that contributed greatly to those increased landings up our neck of the woods.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Brad, any closing observations you want to make? Is your card back up?

MEMBER SCANLON: Yes, I do. And I do have one more question here, is that I don't see anywhere we've even discussed -- and I haven't -- since I've been here over the past three years in this review, there's never been a number given on what the number of reported discards is in the General category. Are there any? Have there been any? And if not, why haven't there been? What is that number?

MR. MCHALE: We'll get to that number. I suspect it's pretty round and not a whole lot of straight lines associated with it.

MEMBER SCANLON: Well we've been hearing "We're going to get to that number" for three years and I haven't heard it yet.

MR. MCHALE: We'll get that. It's not that hard to tease that number apart. The initial year, there were issues with that data where some entries had been made with inches of fish versus numbers of fish. That kind of blew the numbers apart, but we can get you those estimates

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Yes, please.

MEMBER SCHALIT: I'm in agreement with
what you're saying, Marty. I believe that we

wish -- we should be as fully compliant as possible in this reporting.

And we actually -- ABTA actually made a push to get people to work on this. Because today, as of this year, we have an iPhone and an Android app that we can use which makes it a total no-brainer. You know what I'm saying?

Remind you, I don't want to -- well, this is also a requirement for recreational fishermen as well, right? So it's not only a General category that has to comply on this. So I absolutely agree with you 150 percent, and I will -- and ABTA will do whatever it can do to bring this compliance up to where it needs to be.

But I think your question in connection with bycatch to Brad is really dependent upon that kind of response that we're looking for. I mean, otherwise, we're just talking about, you know, approximations. You know?

MEMBER SCANLON: No, I'm not blaming ABTA at all. I'm not blaming anybody at this table. You know, I mean, you guys are -- you know, you're as frustrated as we are, I'm sure of it.

MEMBER SCHALIT: I think that the -look, it's like what we need is a -- we need a
concerted effort on the part of the agency to do
outreach on this one singular issue. Okay?

But I believe that the -- bycatch, the question of bycatch in the General category -- okay, I should say in the General category, I would characterize bycatch in general, in the General category, as being negligible. Okay? But that's -- you know, that's an anecdotal observation on my part, right? I don't see this as a big screaming problem.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: I'm going to jump in and let you guys take -- continue this at the happy hour. I want to go to Pat and then over to Jeff, and I saw you, Rich. Yes.

MEMBER AUGUSTINE: Yes, thank you. You know, back to Marty's point, he raised a concern. Again, we've listened for three years about this non-reporting issue, Brad. And I'm not sure what you can do -- not you specifically, but we can do -- to force them to report.

And I think he's right, the same way

with recreational fishermen who are out doing HMS fishing. We know they're catching them, but they're not reporting them. But sooner or later, we have to put our foot down and say, "Hey, you got to report or no tickie." It's that's simple.

And it just seems to me that maybe this is the year that an option goes out to them saying, "You don't report this year, you don't get your permit next year." And what would it take to make that statement to go on your Web site -- or our Web site saying, "You are required by law to make that report. If you do not report, you will not be receiving your" -- Margo, do you want to address that, or --

MEMBER SCHULZE-HAUGEN: So one of the situations that we have in the current regulations is under our electronic dealer reporting where permits are not, you know, not ever issued, but they are deemed incomplete applications until all the reports are received.

And so that's rulemaking in order to establish those kinds of provisions, but that would be one potential model. So it's not you don't ever get your permit. It's you could submit it and then move on.

That has been something we have found to be effective in getting reports on an annual cycle. So it's not necessarily, you know, particularly timely because of the annual issue and stuff with permits. So that is one option.

MEMBER AUGUSTINE: Yes, but is that enough teeth? Do you have enough teeth to push harder or insist for those that don't? I mean --

MEMBER SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Well it works when people want their permit, and then sometimes you have to wait another year to get their reports for the next permit.

MEMBER AUGUSTINE: That's good.
MEMBER SCHULZE-HAUGEN: And one point

I'd like to make is that, you know, we've highlighted on this slide reporting compliance on one issue for one category. This is not a holistic review of all requirements across all categories, and so that might show a different story.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: All right, I want to get a couple people into this and then we should be pushing to our public comment. So

Jeff?

MEMBER ODEN: Thanks, Jeff Oden.
Again, David, I heard you say you and ABTA would work towards this effort. I mean, this isn't your fight. This is an agency who is -- not to be redundant and more or less mirror essentially Marty's or mine -- my previous of the last AP meeting.

I mean, we -- I have to dot ever T -- or dot every I and cross every T. And, I mean, I'm routinely getting logbooks sent back to me to redo if they're not right.

And again, you know, it's frustrating to come home and be in the process having to fill out a logbook and then having to go back and redo one I may have missed something. And yet the agency has continued down this road and allowed this to go on.

All you've got to do is again make these reports mandatory to get that permit. You will get the desired effect quickly, and enough said.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Rich?

MEMBER RUAIS: First, I want to
apologize for being absent for a bit there. I
have a little emergency going on at home. But I
wanted to give Marty credit and Jeff credit for
at least acknowledging that ABTA has I think been
as -- has been quite cooperative in trying to
improve this. And we agree 100 percent that we
should be up to snuff.

I would point out a couple of things. One is there's a duplicity of mechanisms that the agency knows how much fish we're catching and landing in the General category, and that includes the Japanese market, that includes the former daily reporting requirements and the improvements that ABTA has supported, including the initial phone effort which was again over a three-year period.

I believe that Blue Water got -- and I want to give you a lot of credit for the amount of work that you guys put in to approve all of the reporting that you guys done.

But I would point out it took you a little bit more than three years to straighten out the fleet of about 180 boats whereas I believe we have -- David, we got 3,000-plus boats

in the General category alone and then a party boat, Charter/Headboat adds more to that.

I'd also suggest that trying to compare -- and I don't mean this in a derogatory, insulting way, but trying to compare a fishery that's using a rod and reel and one or two fish at a time, if someone happens to get lucky enough to hook up two fish at a time and bringing them to the boat right away as -- not as fast as possible, but is trying to maintain quality, balancing the quality issue but -- plus getting the fish safely to the boat and inside your boat is -- you know, it's an easier thing to do.

And if you make a mistake, if you've caught a short, the stress on that fish -- I think this has been vindicated, verified by plenty of people -- that survival is -- might be a bit higher than hanging -- you know, than a longline-caught fish for the most part.

But it's a problem that we will continue to work with the agency on and do everything we can. We constantly plead with the dealers to keep things up.

I just was in court. I was subpoenaed by an attorney for -- I don't know if it was NOAA that subpoenaed me. But I had to testify between a bluefin dealer and a longline operation on a crime that took place about three or four years ago.

So I'm not saying that our fishery is lily white either. Money's involved, and whenever this kind of money is involved, things can take place.

But I think -- you know, I think in a -- the vehemence of the attack -- or not the attack but the protest, is there. And we recognize it, and we've talked about this for the three years that you're talking about, and we'll talk about it longer till we get it fixed.

And have we ever not cooperated in trying to do something that would improve the system? I think we've been right there at the forefront. And we've talked about it in our mailings with our board, with our dealers and everybody else.

So anyway, so I just wanted to add that to it. And again I apologize for being out of the room.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks. Katie?

MEMBER WESTFALL: Yes, I'm just
curious if we're able to get those same
statistics for the private Angling category and
just curious how those would stack up.

MR. MCHALE: It's a little more difficult to tease them out in the same fashion for the recreational fishery because you don't have the dealer data to use as a control to compare back to.

And there have been times where we've looked at folks that have been intercepted by the large pelagic survey and then you compare that back. But which one's the control, it becomes much more burdensome to tease out a genuine compliance rate without having a control data.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: All right. I'll take two more comments and then we'll take public comment. Dewey and then over to Rom.

MEMBER HEMILWRIGHT: Yes, I think a few meetings ago I said one way to fix this when it first come out was to have the person that's -- has to give the dealer a number, a call-in number or something.

And also, you know, refresh your memory a little bit, in amendment A7, and I'll use myself as a poster child there, I sent my logbooks in late. I didn't take an observer seven years prior and you denied me access.

But I avoided bluefin tunas, and you denied me access for five months and I think three years to fish off my coast in North Carolina because I sent my logbooks in late.

And so, you know, the easy way to fix this is you don't issue the person a permit the next year and they simply can't go fishing. But I expect that we'll be here again next year looking at the same compliance rate, and it's an easy way to fix it.

If you don't report, you don't get to go fishing. That's what you did on the commercial end, on the pelagic longline industry, even though you avoided bluefin. So what's good for one should be good for the other. It's real simple.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay. Thanks, Dewey. And obviously we're hearing a very strong call for -- from some around the table for

dealing with this compliance issue in a very sort of straight, if-you-don't-comply-don't-get-a-permit way.

Rom, you get the last word here.

MEMBER WHITAKER: Okay. And I want to
ask you, first of all if you look at Page 4 in
the report -- and I think I'm looking at it
right.

But if you look at in the very first column down at the bottom left corner, 739, and these are 27 to 47-inch bluefins. And I'm assuming these are caught up Mike's way or somewhere up in the northeast. But that to me is a great indicator of the fishery is obviously -- not only are the big ones -- were filling the quota, but there is some small fish coming behind it.

So I've got to take that as a very positive sign for the management of the fishery. And Brad and Margo or the whole staff, I take my hat off to you that you do listen. And I know you're not going to make everybody happy, but we do appreciate your efforts. Thank you.

MR. MCHALE: Thanks, Rom. Can you just tell my girlfriend that same statement, I do listen, I would be greatly appreciative.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay. Well I know this isn't the last time we're going to be chewing on this topic, but a lot of ideas here to be thinking about and no doubt coming back to tomorrow a bit.

At this point, I would like to go to public comment. I think we had just two, is that right? So if you would come up to the table and find a mike, would be great. If you go next to Terri, would be good. Thanks. And if you would start by just stating your name and any affiliation, that would be helpful.

MR. KANE: Yes, good afternoon, commission, AP members. I appreciate the opportunity to address what the Fisherman's Alliance is looking for in the way of an EFP.

I want to thank --

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Sir, can you just state your name?

MR. KANE: Raymond Kane, I'm sorry.
I want to thank Dr. Sissenwine for bringing in -it up earlier today, and if he could open it up

to discussion or a few people have questions about this application, we had submitted it to John Bullard the first part of April.

And then I have a follow-up letter from the Alliance back to your division here, July. But there seem to be questions in the audience or with the AP about this EFP that we're looking for.

I mean, we were one of the first organizations on the East Coast to go to sectors, and they're well managed. And a number of the commercial fishermen within the sector who have always had HMS bluefin tuna permits would like the opportunity on a groundfish trip to land bluefin tuna.

Because these vessels I'm talking about are fishing eastern Georges for codfish, and that's roughly 100 miles from port. And if it so happens that they encounter bluefin tuna, they would like the opportunity to catch whatever the daily trip limit is.

So if we could open it up to discussion, I know Patsy Augustine had questions earlier and George Purmont and Michael Pierdinock.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Yes.

MEMBER SCHULZE-HAUGEN: Maybe what could do, Ray, is give us a synopsis and then we could take the discussion offline.

MR. KANE: Well which synopsis would you like? I have a 15-page synopsis for John Bullard, so --

FACILITATOR BROOKS: The two-to-three-minute synopsis would be perfect.

MR. KANE: All right. Basically these are commercial fishermen who ply the northwest Atlantic on a 12-month basis. They harvest fish, different species, 12 months of the year.

And what they're looking for is an EFP while engaged in electronic monitoring. These three vessels all have cameras onboard. They've had them onboard for the groundfish industry.

So it's a no-brainer. These harvesters want the opportunity to harvest bluefin tuna on a groundfish trip. I think it's only right, as I said. They ply the northwest Atlantic 12 months of the year harvesting different species.

They are true commercial fishermen. They belong to sectors. And they're looking for an EFP in conjunction with electronic monitoring. Those cameras will be on -- turned on from the 12 our own office, we have a sector manager and upon request she will review a video. you. 21 MEMBER CARR: I have a response. 22 23 24 and forth here. clarify it that way. All right.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

13 14

15

16 17

18 19

20

25

26 27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38 39

40 41

42 43

44

45

46

47

48

time they leave the dock until they return so everything will be photographed. SMAST is involved in cleaning the And a number of the electronic monitoring companies that sell the cameras, they also have protocol and they have to review the We also have sector managers who -- in

So I think that's pretty much it. now that you've gotten through your longline EFP, I would certainly hope you'd look and consider this proposition by commercial fishermen.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks very much. Ben, are you want to -- give a question?

FACILITATOR BROOKS: To the -- well no, it's public comment, so we don't want to -we don't really want a back-and-forth. Let's not -- I don't want get into response back Okay. If there's a clarification, we can talk about it later and

MEMBER PURMONT: Can I ask him a simple question?

Raymond, I'm in favor of it right off the top.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Yes. Actually, you know what, George, I'm going to put a hold --MEMBER PURMONT: The question is whether or not these are people that actually have a permit to catch the fish. And if they have a permit to catch the fish --

FACILITATOR BROOKS: He said they did. MEMBER PURMONT: -- what category and what quota would it come under?

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Let me put that up here.

MR. MCHALE: So building off of what Ray said there to help clarify what's in the request is that all these vessels would have General category permits. They would be catching the bluefin tuna on authorized bluefin gear, rod

and reel, harpoon.

 They just so happen to have groundfish gears onboard the vessel, which runs afoul of our no unauthorized gear onboard requirements.

And because these vessels have electronic monitoring gear associated with the groundfish fishery, this is where they're asking for the exemption, is that we're monitored, you can verify that we're catching it on HMS gear. Please explore. That's kind of it in a nutshell.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Okay. Thanks.

Thanks, Ray.

What I'd like to do is invite -- no, you know what, I really want to sort of keep this in public comment which is public comes up and comments and it's not going to work to have a dialogue back and forth at this juncture.

So Greg, you have a public comment to make? Sorry.

Thank you very much, Ray.

MR. DIDOMENICO: Normally I'd give Ray all my time, but not today.

I know well enough not to get between a group of people who have been sitting down since 9:00 a.m. and happy hour, so I'm honestly just going to say two things, three things. I had a long list, but it's not time for that.

I wanted to of course again, as always, I come here and thank you for your patience and your indulgence with my constant emailing and requests. I am really satisfied at the direction you're going regarding splitting these -- splitting the permits up in such a way.

I do also though want to remind you that my ultimate goal was to ask you to reform your online permitting system. It still exists in such a manner that a private angler who doesn't have a for-hire boat or, you know, for-hire license or any other commercial license can still go on your Web site and get a permit. And in fact, there's 2,000 of them out there.

So that really was my -- that's one part of my goal. I hope you can reform that system. I'm asking you to do that. I think it's going to solve a lot of the problems.

And like I said, I had a bunch of things here, but I am going to just mention one thing. And I made some requests, some informal requests, since you have -- HMS has designed and formulated a video for shark identification. We're really hoping you can extend that to the commercial industry.

And quite frankly, we hope you can extend that to the turtle classes, the dehooking classes. I have to tell you that I have a group of guys who have been unhooking cardboard boxes in -- you know, for a couple -- for a real long time now and also attending shark ID classes that quite frankly I think they could teach. So if you give incentive to the commercial industry, that would really be -- we would really be grateful.

Again, I've got guys who are driving a couple hours to attend these workshops and they're often the only people there besides interested public. And so it's a burden and it takes money and time out of their very busy schedule. So if you could do it by video, I'd really appreciate it.

And I'm going to stick around a little while because perhaps Margo we can talk or maybe some of your other staff regarding some of my other items. Thank you.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Thanks, Greg. Any other public comments at this point? Okay. If not --

MEMBER ODEN: Can I -- I want to speak to Ray's concern that little bit ago.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: Hey Jeff, I -- MEMBER ODEN: I'm public comment. No,

I'm --

FACILITATOR BROOKS: No, you're an AP

member. So --

MEMBER ODEN: Okay.

FACILITATOR BROOKS: -- what I want to

do is --

MEMBER ODEN: Well hey, I'm speaking to versatility in our fisheries, and that to me is essentially what he's asking for. And --

FACILITATOR BROOKS: I hear you. What I would love to do is invite people to continue that conversation informally right now after this. I don't know whether or not it makes sense to pick this back up at any point as an AP discussion or not, and I defer to Margo and Brad whether we want to try to do that at all

tomorrow.

Because I hear the request, I just want to honor the distinction of sort of public comments versus AP conversation. So in the very near term, I absolutely invite people -- I know Ben, you had some comments, Jeff, you do. Take it up informally after we adjourn and then we'll think about whether there's merit in bringing that back to the table tomorrow.

So at this point, I just want to thank folks for putting in a very long day. I think everyone is probably pretty wiped out at this point.

Just remind you that the no host social is downstairs in the lounge on the first floor. I think you all know where that is.

And we will reconvene tomorrow at 8:30. So again we have an early start because we're getting out -- getting you out of here early. And we know several folks who'll have to leave even a little bit earlier than the schedule determined due to weather.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 5:40 p.m.)

Washington DC

A
a.m 1:26 5:2 38:16,17
172:25
A7 168:26
AA 16:4
ability 12:2 13:2 23:36
42:34 43:18,39 46:28
51:27 52:33 107:9 113:21 131:11 136:38
151:12,34 154:28
155:43
able 8:11 9:28,41,44
21:27 22:6 36:40
42:40 47:35 52:3,8,13
56:46 57:7 79:3 83:44
83:47 85:4 91:19,24
93:41,46 100:22
108:24 117:20 124:26
124:43 125:39 141:35
157:11 159:4 160:36
163:14 168:3
aboard 10:41 15:39
16:29
above-entitled 38:15
79:11 114:15 174:23
absent 166:25
absolutely 15:43 21:42
45:45 75:27 125:27
155:39 164:12 174:5
ABTA 152:7 159:42
164:3,13,22 166:3,28
166:38
abundance 9:20 12:1 12:10
abuses 76:26
academic 1:38,42 2:9
5:47
acceptable 101:37
access 11:19 56:20
60:14 120:24 123:45
124:19 126:44,47
127:4 150:47 162:27
168:29,31
accommodate 19:1
21:42
accomplish 43:24
111:4,14
accomplished 84:20
125:45
account 50:31 51:3,10
51:12,40,47 52:2,7,12
52:28 57:24 62:14
120:42 155:28
accountability 4:24
38:24 40:35 41:28
50:28,45,47 51:8,38
51:40 52:1,6,11,20,46
56:45

```
accountable 40:18
accounted 51:4 53:41
accounting 41:29 51:19
 52:19,26,34
accrued 51:3
accurate 142:22
accustomed 153:17
achieve 12:4
achieved 11:43,48
acknowledge 21:24,34
 26:46 46:23 93:17
acknowledging 166:28
acknowledgment 23:5
 26:44 27:13
acrylic 138:19 141:13
act 12:36 33:23 68:30
  74:10 77:16 96:28
  150:31
action 9:19 38:33,34
 42:24 44:17,21 45:39
 46:23,26 99:44
  143:48 148:2
actions 22:34 31:5.29
 32:40 62:27 66:40
 67:43 68:1 104:31
  145:30 147:21 150:39
activated 36:25
active 22:34 54:44
 60:33 61:27,33 68:14
 98:18,19 145:41
actively 115:31 141:11
activities 18:27 26:36
 27:14 67:47 68:16
 69:33 90:37 95:5
 96:18,25,29,32,33
 97:13
Activities/Rulemakin...
 4:16
activity 26:45 27:23
 96:39 97:14,19
  114:35 148:25
actual 12:12 64:40
adapt 145:24 151:34
  154:28,34
adapted 136:4
add 16:15 33:7 39:41
 41:4 47:28 55:4 57:40
 78:25,30 94:40
  111:41 119:17 120:39
  122:47,48 124:4,14
  125:47 158:38 167:46
added 27:29 54:33
 89:12,25 91:7
adding 36:42 37:3
 91:14,18 92:14
  125:31
addition 28:11 36:3
```

```
69:15 82:14.25
  102:14 128:44 133:48
additional 24:8 36:42
  51:45 52:23 91:32
  99:8,22,23 103:44
  109:13 115:23 121:27
  131:6 136:34 148:24
address 9:5,10 33:43
  35:35 36:15 39:12,27
  51:38 60:43 61:3,20
  62:8 63:35 73:10
  98:33 134:34 135:6
  141:23 165:14 169:41
addressed 36:2 46:45
  106:35
addressing 46:39
  120:27
adds 33:11 163:2 167:2
adhered 57:48
adherence 144:19
adjourn 4:41 78:25
  174:7
adjudicated 68:24
adjust 23:36,42
adjusted 23:27,44
 98:29 148:27
adjusting 22:30 162:46
adjustment 22:42 23:39
  80:21
adjustments 86:46 87:2
  87:7.44
administering 61:27
administration 1:6 9:27
administrator 4:14 5:17
  5:20 68:5
admirals 61:17
admit 110:16 131:26
adopted 28:12
Adriance 1:32 6:22,22
  125:30,31 156:33
adult 88:37 89:1,8,25
adults 90:14
advance 52:30 61:34
advanced 19:7
advances 102:10
adverse 101:47 102:3
advice 19:47 43:30
advisement 60:3
advising 31:5
advisor 61:46
advisors 62:38
advisory 1:11,24,43 5:4
  6:6,34 16:36,41 17:3
  19:46 20:4 28:24
  31:25 51:17 72:38
  73:23
Advocates 7:4 73:39
Affairs 28:20
```

affect 51:27,30 94:43 95:1,6 affiliation 169:38 affordable 132:15 afforded 13:2 afoul 172:3 **afraid** 73:40 104:32 112:29 Africa 60:38 65:41,45 65:48 **AFS** 131:2 aftermath 21:28 afternoon 18:32 24:10 114:29 132:40 139:9 145:4 169:39 agencies 15:8 32:11 74:29 80:9 82:36 83:7 83:19,20 95:5 96:31 agency 12:35 13:20,28 14:3 17:14 19:17 29:36 30:41 31:5,38 32:11,38 44:42 54:42 71:9 73:41 75:33 82:47 93:12 102:32 103:15,18 105:40 108:7,39 111:30 112:25,33 131:42 134:10,15 143:20 154:32 158:15,18 164:28 166:5,17,34 167:21 agency's 149:35 agenda 9:9 10:25 18:20 18:21 19:26,31 22:22 31:15,20 58:15 79:23 145:4,10 agent 66:24 141:33,36 142:8 143:47 agents 45:43 67:46 ago 10:45 17:32 34:26 54:15 60:21 93:28 106:21 140:8,11,25 151:6 160:33 163:4 167:29 168:21 173:30 agree 12:16 13:46 14:6 14:23,26 15:26 43:36 93:32 94:4 105:36 127:12 140:42 164:12 166:30 agreed 81:2 agreeing 142:19 agreement 53:19 75:31 163:47 ahead 13:8 17:28 31:21 76:31 78:29 83:45 85:48 113:16,19 114:8 150:42 aids 91:30

42:33 50:40 56:15

aims 81:40 ain't 17:28 aircraft 70:43 Alabama 6:21 Alan 15:46 22:5 **albacore** 22:32 23:42 98:38 107:24 **albeit** 144:9 Alexa 68:21 alive 60:1 101:23 all-inclusive 41:38 allegiance 155:45,47 **Alliance** 3:19 7:35 169:42 170:5 allocated 147:6 allocation 24:13 50:31 50:37 51:1,6,13,14 53:26,27,28,42 155:27 allocations 54:28,43 150:13 155:12 allotment 148:21 allow 11:18 16:23 30:28 39:31 47:35 52:18 54:20 55:15 72:45 108:23 121:44.48 137:30 154:20 allowable 28:7 84:17 allowance 107:21 allowed 34:38 35:5 46:43 47:32 50:47 55:8 107:8.33 109:36 139:30 140:15 166:17 allowing 33:25 49:39 83:8 109:4 **allows** 47:37 48:40 49:11 134:10 137:43 141:44 **alternative** 29:17 50:12 51:48 87:13 100:6.9 alternatives 41:31 44:10,47 45:2 50:10 51:38 52:17,38 53:6 53:13,40,45,48 54:5 58:9 86:45 87:11 90:46 97:37 99:43 100:5 **ALVARADO** 3:3 132:40 134:21,36,46 amendment 19:23 24:14,48 25:3 39:44 56:5 79:41 84:19 85:39,43 86:2,33,36 86:38 87:12,15,30 88:5,5,23,24,31,34,38 88:39 89:30,35,38 90:15,15,31,45 91:6 91:12,13,15,38 94:39

109:44 145:44 146:26 151:37 155:6 156:22 168:26 amendments 28:12 America 82:26 84:45 American 5:36 6:47 61:19 Americans 57:6 amount 9:25 15:17 22:19 26:1 54:31 55:6 55:14 56:10 61:2 71:39,40 73:12 110:47 115:42 126:43 145:34 155:7 161:33 166:42 ample 83:24 amplifying 78:18 analogous 110:5 analyses 92:14,47 95:36 111:1 analysis 67:15 96:3 97:37 100:18,35,37 115:16 117:20 124:14 142:22 analyze 45:1 analyzed 57:5 90:44 99:43 100:47 analyzing 26:11 and/or 139:4 156:20 **ANDRE** 1:38 Andrew 2:13 7:1 45:24 157:21.22 Android 164:6 anecdotal 164:35 **Angel** 2:28 5:40 angler 71:29 118:23 137:29 172:37 anglers 74:14 116:10 118:3 121:38,40 128:18 135:41 142:20 143:2 angling 55:36 69:21 151:39 159:30 168:4 animal 84:12 105:21,24 105:41 animals 75:1 78:17 92:31 **Anna** 1:34 6:27 10:40 12:13 44:37 45:12 47:16 140:45 announced 24:7 announcement 46:15 annual 23:25 25:40 31:24 48:19 50:37,46 applied 42:10 56:17 51:6 52:11,20,45 53:3

53:26,26 67:10 68:28

81:27 99:22 102:44

165:27,29

annualized 27:40 answer 18:4 33:28.29 33:42 36:40 54:36 70:48 97:7 104:10 110:10 126:11 131:48 answer's 159:34 answering 37:8 answers 135:2 159:36 anticipate 25:1,13 27:43 159:46 anticipating 24:27 anticipation 133:9 anybody 11:10 37:22 54:46 91:38 125:19 127:47 131:45 140:28 154:19 164:22 anymore 15:47 72:13 72:22 91:45 95:28 128:2 161:47 anyway 57:33 112:33 167:46 **AP** 7:10 8:7 10:42 20:7 20:44 27:30 30:45 31:4,11,17 37:48 51:18 79:36 80:6 99:14,17 105:13,47 113:5 117:26 118:4,5 133:1,4 166:7 169:40 170:7 173:34,46 174:4 **APAIS** 120:19,41,46 122:41,44,48 123:23 124:1,4,6 apart 158:11 163:40,44 Apex-based 133:15 apologies 67:4 **apologize** 34:5 67:1 166:25 167:47 app 32:25 157:39 164:6 apparent 134:48 152:2 apparently 152:45 appear 41:35 appears 104:48 Appendix 29:7 **applaud** 110:24 apples 106:8,8,20,21 applicant 99:13 100:48 102:12 application 29:22 36:22 98:48 99:7,20,28 151:41 157:10,10,17 170:2 applications 165:20

55:37 62:23 63:16 103:21 142:2 149:32 applying 82:6 appointment 12:20 appreciate 8:23 9:4 10:34 14:29 15:13 20:39 48:34 62:32 75:10 97:6 113:21 132:35 144:32 145:4 154:21 160:43 169:23 169:40 173:21 appreciated 10:8 appreciative 112:33 169:26 apprised 24:18 approach 13:43 25:21 47:9 56:7 81:5 123:13 151:32 approaches 39:26 92:6 156:31 approaching 10:13 156:28 appropriate 9:18 33:44 59:20 60:42 121:9 approval 9:39 **approve** 108:28 166:43 approved 9:12 37:15,16 37:20 approving 108:8 approximately 59:2 98:28 103:35 approximations 164:19 **April** 146:16 170:3 aquiculture 9:30 archival 26:23,26,28 area 4:31 9:11 18:35 22:46 25:31 34:3,18 37:25 58:24,33 61:46 68:31 77:28 87:23 88:33 89:2,7,11,26,42 89:45,48 90:16,19,27 90:39 91:43,45 92:42 93:4,9 94:33 95:10,30 96:26 97:30 98:10,33 98:43,45 99:3,4,5,47 99:48 100:14,15,21 100:25,28,37,46 101:13 102:27,34,35 102:36,38 106:42 108:1,2 112:1,13,14 115:5 127:13,13 140:8 146:28 162:16 areas 9:38 10:12 12:26 12:26,30 40:30,37 85:13 89:33 90:4,10 91:25 92:32,40 93:17 94:19 96:13,16,23,43 96:47 100:28,31,32

135:28

applies 42:14,16,17

47:2 138:41

apply 41:12 42:21

100:36,39,44 101:13 101:20,21 102:9,10 102:41 104:39,46 137:21,24 146:26 158:20 162:21,27 arena 73:3 argue 76:23 argued 140:10 argument 93:48 138:28 140:7 154:7 **Army** 96:30 **arrival** 49:14 arrivals 61:34 arrows 133:29 articulated 50:13 artificials 139:23 asked 16:42 17:1 27:13 30:48 54:36 66:30 85:12 89:40,42 92:19 144:11 asking 16:43 106:37 107:2,40 172:7,44 173:41 aspect 65:6 141:29 147:9 156:42 158:12 aspects 8:39 17:46 65:33 73:27 94:29,36 assertion 11:6 assessment 67:28 99:34,42 119:16 assessments 9:22 27:47 67:16 84:23 92:7 112:32 122:7 136:9 assistant 4:14 5:16,20 68:5 assisting 75:33 associated 26:30 35:46 36:1 51:25 95:3 99:11 101:44 116:22 117:3 123:35 128:26,27 134:31 155:13 163:35 172:6 association 3:15 5:37 6:1,17,45,48 34:38 35:30 36:21 42:38 45:7 associations 62:34 158:16 assume 34:41 83:30 84:18 93:9 94:10 105:19 107:4 assumed 100:41 assuming 43:24 46:37 109:21 169:12 assumption 93:11 94:15 assure 15:30 18:9

at-sea 60:16 Atlantic 1:10 4:36 5:34 6:25,28 11:46 18:38 23:29,34 26:13 27:19 30:13 47:7.18 48:15 48:27 54:29 58:24 77:15 82:31 84:40 98:32,37 99:39 110:30 112:39 114:24 115:4 119:6,7,40,44 120:31 121:1,24 126:8 132:38,41 133:15,17,22 135:42 136:14 140:5 142:5 155:19 159:43 170:37 170:47 **ATMOSPHERIC** 1:6 attached 36:27 60:19 attack 167:35,36 attend 173:16 attendance 103:23 attended 69:29 82:25 attending 173:10 attention 8:44 28:39 74:26 87:40 90:40,41 93:7 99:29 102:43 152:22 attorney 67:3 167:25 audience 97:47 144:44 144:47 150:25 170:7 augmentation 66:35 augmented 24:3 August 23:21 55:47 56:22,36 77:6,44 81:32 102:33 146:34 147:41 148:2.4 149:42 150:8,14,20 153:27 158:26 160:20 160:24 **Augustine** 1:33 5:38,38 36:36,37 37:1,12,17 37:28 129:27 130:28 164:42 165:31,38 170:23 authorities 61:8 authority 27:14 33:20 33:40 97:18 145:43 authorization 34:42 99:21,23 authorize 26:45 82:19 111:9 authorized 24:43 35:19 46:19 80:29 97:33 102:48 103:1,8,9 104:13 106:38,38 111:20 156:15 171:48

automatically 36:28 42:45 135:2 147:30 148:27 auxiliary 70:20,36 78:39,44 availability 51:35 134:9 149:18 158:34 available 23:47 24:8,28 25:22 26:5 29:46 30:7 37:9 52:31 54:46 56:11 95:8 103:14 146:7 148:12 149:48 150:15,22 153:13 155:16 158:21 Avenue 1:25 average 115:46 116:25 116:28,31,35,44 117:2,5 151:22 152:35 averaged 116:10,29,40 averages 152:33 **Avila** 155:38 Avilla-type 156:13 avoid 145:15 avoided 168:30,43 **awarded** 116:29 aware 12:40 32:2 59:26 60:18 90:33 112:27 119:18 143:33,35 awful 129:39 150:31 В

baby 35:47 128:25 back 7:33 10:30 11:28 16:38 18:19,31 19:20 21:37 25:27 30:34 31:30 32:4 33:14 37:33 50:8,24 55:13 56:3,23,47 57:7 64:22 64:39 69:11,12 72:13 72:21,21 77:47 79:19 79:19,20 80:7 81:17 86:10 88:44 92:47 93:14,47 95:31 97:23 104:26,35 109:30 110:21,26,39,41 114:12 123:9 127:20 128:13,33 129:18 131:35 132:18 135:9 137:31,32,38 139:45 140:34 144:25,30 145:19,20 147:14 148:4 152:33 153:34 153:47 155:14 157:1 157:7 159:7,15 162:13,30,47 163:22 164:43 166:11,15 168:10,14 169:30

170:5 171:25 172:17 173:46 174:9 back-and-forth 171:24 backdoor 71:30 background 50:30 80:4 97:35,39 98:9 **backing** 142:26 backup 74:28 99:9 103:10 109:9.9 backwards 140:48 bad 11:1 13:33 14:4 85:3 112:30 123:6 Baertlein 7:28,28 **bag** 71:48 72:18,19,19 97:8 160:12,13,20,25 162:46 **Bahamas** 114:45 **Bahamian** 89:5,23 bait 116:23 117:39 126:11 127:15 135:44 136:22,39 137:5,11 137:28,31,32,33,37 138:27,30,44 139:17 140:32 142:9 158:33 **baits** 139:23 **baked** 79:17 balance 50:48 51:41,44 52:4,9,15,43 153:46 balancing 167:11 ball 154:20 156:34 162:47 ballpark 48:34 ballyhoo 139:36 142:39 ban 33:39 **bands** 33:44 bang-bang 130:34 Bank 6:45 42:37 162:21 bantered 160:34 barracuda 126:27 base 36:45 67:21 98:28 148:16 150:12 based 10:45 19:27 23:26 24:22 27:29 38:48 64:43 87:32,32 89:39 90:2,34,40,42 91:11,32 94:2,15,31 101:19 103:1 104:32 115:40,42 116:36 120:22 133:36 145:46 156:38 baseline 23:42 155:8 basic 9:40 19:28 39:25 67:15 115:44 **basically** 14:19 37:15 37:19 39:25,36 53:40 82:7 87:20 88:8 92:7 94:30 104:43 116:21 117:16 120:11 123:43

automated 133:34,36

automates 134:12

	I	I	1
123:47 132:15 161:1	124:3,39 137:17	Blankinship 3:5 135:15	boat's 43:19
170:35	140:27,30,31 150:37	135:17 141:8,24	boats 6:11 35:43 73:13
basis 27:35 29:46 48:19	154:21 157:3,47,47	143:15,39	78:34 99:7,9 100:40
68:13 87:47 102:40	158:17,18,46 160:48	blatantly 143:34	100:42 103:8,11
170:37	161:10,36	bleach 71:47	110:14 117:12,35,36
Bay 95:16	bewildered 17:14	blessed 73:19	118:11 127:4 144:13
BAYS 28:32 94:26	beyond 15:46 60:32,47	blew 163:43	155:42 157:32 166:47
beard 147:18	102:45	blind 20:47	166:48
beat 123:3	Biannual 52:6	Block 89:17	Bob 5:46 19:43 33:13
beating 158:17	bias 115:17	blow 158:8	33:15 37:34 73:25
Beckwith 1:34 6:27,27	biases 120:27	blue 6:16 102:34	75:13 77:3,47 78:22
11:21,37 45:13 47:17	big 8:43,43 43:19 55:46	115:13 119:5,7,11	91:38 93:1,29,33 94:1
125:17 140:46	69:34,34 72:19 89:11	136:11,31 137:22,24	104:18 112:4 113:43
becoming 110:36	92:27 95:23 113:45	138:1,43 139:25,28	Bob's 108:6 113:25
bed 140:24	115:14 116:13 120:29	139:29,31 140:4,29	bodies 15:8 65:42
began 133:6,7	120:42,48 140:7	141:4,6,10,14 142:24	body 19:48 66:6
beginning 36:48 56:5	141:21 158:7,9	150:4 166:41	BOEM 96:30
68:42 160:24	164:37 169:15	Blue's 155:41	Bogan 1:37 6:29,29,36
Beideman 1:35 5:48,48	bigeye 28:5 107:24	bluefin 4:23,36 5:37	72:6 73:6
12:19 56:39	152:47	6:48 16:16,17 18:38	boils 126:17
believe 9:18 11:31 13:8	bigeyes 34:4	19:22 22:31,35 24:2	bold 131:18
43:2 54:44 64:16,21	bigger 159:22 162:32	25:35,48 26:1 27:27	book 46:20 77:10,39,43
69:26 70:4 84:13	biggest 115:5 140:9	27:48 28:35 34:39,43	95:39
105:5 143:2 162:11	bignose 84:11	38:24 50:28,31,38,40	Booker 10:46
163:48 164:30 166:41	bill 16:9 137:28	52:37,40 53:4,39	books 26:33
166:48	billfish 8:47 102:23	56:48 57:1,4,23 77:17	border 61:4
believing 13:39	107:19 115:24,41	77:18,19,20 86:46	bottom 94:48 133:44
Bellavance 1:36 6:37	121:25 124:47 126:34	88:36,48 89:18 91:2	169:10
6:38 14:27 32:43 33:5	133:9,14 135:12,48	94:25 98:36,43 107:6	bought 71:22
41:45 44:36,38 45:5	136:3,8 137:35	107:21 114:24 122:3	boundaries 87:2,28,30
122:36 159:2	138:42 139:45 141:4	124:46 126:35 127:6	87:45 90:11
bells 35:38 42:34 43:20	billfishes 138:48	129:13 131:38,44	boundary 88:29 89:25
belong 171:2	141:15	145:7,14 146:22	BOUSTANY 1:38
Belvo 63:31	biological 28:41 102:17	147:8 149:27 152:47	box 100:1
Ben 7:46,48 171:20	103:30 121:47 122:1	153:7,10 154:24,25	boxes 47:26 173:8
174:6	biology 82:24	158:1 159:25,43	bracing 21:32
beneficial 54:20	bit 8:18 9:10,44 14:38	162:38 163:5 167:27	Brad 3:21 7:38 22:2,8
benefit 19:43	16:16 18:47 22:14	168:30,43 170:13,15	34:46 40:5 114:23
benefits 58:45 101:41	23:32 24:26 25:28	170:19,45 171:48,48	121:42 144:41 154:38
102:7,16,27 109:46	32:17 34:36 40:41	bluefins 34:4 169:11	154:40 156:33 159:2
115:37 136:35 138:46	41:20 63:34 65:20	bluefish 132:13	160:1,43 161:12
benefitted 56:14	67:34 74:15,21 80:2	board 6:16 25:36 41:31	163:21 164:16,45
Benin 60:46	83:4,20 85:20,37	141:15 167:44	169:20 173:47
BENJAMIN 1:39	94:41 96:38 97:22	boarding 45:43 46:6	brainstorming 62:10
Bennett 1:26,31 48:12	98:4,9,15 99:36 112:9	65:16,27,34	brakes 81:14
80:12 83:35 98:3	119:10 123:4,31	boardings 44:35 58:48	Branch 135:18
104:11 110:27	128:3 135:37 136:5	59:2,5,7	breadth 8:20
Bermuda 140:28	141:30 143:22 144:31	boards 30:47 31:9	break 38:12 59:7
best 10:13,23,42 14:42	145:40 157:25 159:17	boat 6:44,45 34:1 42:38	114:10,11,13 breaking 58:38 148:30
18:11 60:4 65:38 97:42 105:43 117:19	159:19 166:25,46 167:18 168:26 169:31	45:11 47:42,48 70:19	149:39
154:28 160:40	173:30 174:21	72:8,11 73:12 80:20 80:39 83:17 106:12	breakout 18:24 135:23
bet 118:33 145:6	blacknose 84:47,48	106:15 107:3 111:40	141:17 148:43,43
better 5:15 11:29 13:20	blacktip 22:40 23:29	116:23,48 117:5,10	149:25 150:17 151:48
13:29 14:4,16,38	59:44	117:13,13 118:27,34	157:9
15:35 17:18 18:3,9	blaming 164:21,22	125:47 128:7,17,28	breeding 86:19
41:16,18 43:30 82:22	Blankenship 7:40,40	128:30,33 139:27	brewing 5:11
106:18 121:21 123:17	110:41 119:8	167:2,9,12,12 172:38	brief 22:20 38:30 63:30

11			_,_
80:4	cadre 66:35	132:1	106:29 107:4,29,45
briefing 77:9,39,43	calcuttas 118:33,48	careful 126:28 139:40	107:45,48 108:1,18
briefly 9:8 16:34 17:42	calendar 27:20 52:3,5	carefully 71:2 108:7,18	108:22,28,38,46
81:1		128:43	
	calibration 15:28	Caribbean 4:29 5:11	109:11,16 119:43
bright 75:21	130:10,12		121:14,26 125:1
bring 13:3 20:44 33:37	calibrations 122:26	18:33 79:10,24,44	126:23,33,33,42
61:11,16 66:1 73:7,27	call 16:21 23:40 50:6	80:17,20,24,34,35,35	127:6 128:11,12,34
153:34 164:14	63:1 70:30 86:14	80:36,39 81:4 82:17	131:20,45 133:25,31
bringing 73:26 104:21	87:16 105:21 140:17	82:18,32,33,36 83:5	146:2 147:12,25,28
128:10 167:8 169:47	145:27 149:38 160:7	83:17,37,38 84:6,37	147:31,38,38,43,45
174:8	168:48	84:43 85:11,14	147:47 148:14,31
brings 13:16 127:36	call-in 168:23	119:44 122:9,11	149:17,32,47 150:9
broader 30:2	called 26:43 30:43	Caribbean-specific	150:27 152:27 153:22
broke 6:31	81:38 89:48 117:34	80:29	153:39 154:10 157:31
broken 67:33 116:47	132:6	Carlos 35:37	157:47 158:35 162:10
139:12	calling 28:40 74:27	Carlson 131:3	170:20 171:37,38
Brookstone 154:20	127:45 157:18	Carney 3:7 58:18 66:43	catch- 134:11
brought 13:35 31:8	calls 21:3 62:33 125:35	66:44 68:33,35,36	catches 28:7 49:22
47:24 48:9 56:3 72:7	127:48 138:13	71:36 72:37 75:48	82:8 98:34 100:19
72:40 112:38 116:25	calm 123:15 156:46	76:4,8,15,19 77:26	101:12,15,26 102:1
Bruce 155:37	cameras 17:21 36:24	152:11	131:4 145:47 149:20
budget 120:8,43	105:29 170:41 171:4	Carol 82:25	catching 55:16 59:38
build 60:48 65:13,26,37	171:9	Carolina 6:13 7:6 89:11	108:33 113:39 128:31
65:38	Cameroon 60:46	89:21,23 111:46	137:17 148:39,40
building 171:44	Canada 66:4	120:36 124:16 126:45	149:12,31 159:20
built 46:1 138:17	Canadian 66:6	131:16,20 136:48	165:2 166:34 171:47
bulk 19:8	Canaveral 104:25	140:41 162:41 168:33	172:9
Bullard 170:3,32	capability 32:30	Carr 1:39 7:48,48	categories 39:36 44:2
bullet 106:28 109:12	capable 22:8	171:21	55:41 56:13,14 57:31
bulletin 62:3 63:11,33	capacity 60:39 61:1	Carrie 3:30 38:23 50:25	116:47 165:44
bunch 14:30 117:33	65:37	53:12 58:13	category 16:23,24
118:24 172:46	Cape 3:18 6:3 7:34	Carrie's 49:26 50:7	19:22 24:3 27:16,20
buoy 24:41	25:33 34:37 35:29	carried 81:19,36 82:40	27:26 32:45 39:32
burden 44:16 73:20	36:20 37:2,26 60:46	carry 22:31 24:3 72:10 78:35 81:33	42:28,39,46 43:18
105:39 123:19 173:18	capitalize 153:12		48:6,8 49:4 50:37
burdens 63:16	capitalized 131:20 capitalizing 46:2	carrying 23:43,47 82:40 carryover 54:11	55:30,34 57:19 59:18
burdensome 39:9 168:15	caps 120:8	case 35:16 38:12 42:4	69:20 77:24,31 146:1
business 6:38 10:2	captain 6:29,44 17:6,7	61:25,39,39 67:14	148:17,30 149:2 150:13 151:45 154:1
	105:25,35,42 122:44	68:11,16,24 75:18,44	
14:45 51:27 71:19 155:26 157:19	128:27	86:21 90:13 93:22	154:3,4,5 155:4 161:1 161:5,9,32,47 163:30
busy 5:7 18:14 22:33	captain's 105:33	94:47 109:34 112:29	161.5,9,32,47 163.30
22:44 130:19 173:19	134:43	112:29 113:48 161:28	165:42 166:35 167:1
button 5:28 126:6	captains 121:11 123:12	cased 141:13	168:4 171:40,47
127:23 129:3,5	128:5	cases 67:46 69:48	category's 152:5
buttons 129:9	capture 78:7 89:24	76:23 77:13 79:2	caught 8:45 35:10,11
buy 131:19 154:19	92:35 93:12 117:44	89:32 105:39	37:23 49:48 57:22,23
buying 95:19	captured 90:7 92:13	cash 118:48	59:41,41 68:47 69:6
buzzing 70:46	154:15	catch 12:2 14:32 28:36	70:7 77:23 80:30
bycatch 24:32,40 25:6	card 112:44 121:27	32:25 35:5,19 37:22	89:19 95:25 99:26
50:32 99:2 102:22	126:33,42 131:21	38:43,47 39:17,21,39	107:14 109:6,13
107:1,5,10,12,15,16	144:32 163:22	39:47 46:29 51:32	110:31 121:34 128:20
107:19,20,20,30,33	card's 83:34	52:33,37,39 53:4,39	136:20,21 149:28
107:38,42,43 108:17	cardboard 173:8	53:41 55:17,20 57:3,4	152:17 167:15 169:12
108:25,26 164:16,30	cards 16:31 37:31 50:6	57:39 59:48 63:48	cause 11:14 140:36
164:31,33	50:23 85:31 125:1	73:16,19 82:1 97:38	144:26
	126:33 127:8 144:24	99:2 100:27,32,36	caused 93:20
С	care 79:28 131:28	101:11,19 102:8,26	caution 113:25
		·	
••			

caveat 113:34 caveats 156:36 cell 21:2 center 29:43 30:9 42:29 81:23 88:8 103:30,34 110:46 133:8,45 **centers** 88:45 central 84:45 89:12 centralized 133:28.41 centric 48:26.26 certain 13:39 35:46 66:45 67:37 77:27 78:36 89:47 90:39 92:6 95:23 111:4,10 124:15 136:36,37,39 136:39 137:5 141:46 158:20 162:21 certainly 8:36 10:7 17:48 24:20 34:29 45:21 48:7 83:33 92:34 93:21 105:46 112:26 124:48 171:16 certificate 78:37 certification 14:9,21 **certify** 119:46 chair 13:12 **chairs** 28:18 challenge 160:42 challenges 75:19 **chance** 10:25,31 14:40 18:45 20:36 71:16 112:46 141:26 158:10 **chances** 95:48 **change** 17:36 39:28 43:45 47:25 54:42 68:19 74:5 94:12,20 98:34 **changed** 23:15 90:47 94:13 **changes** 21:42 25:2 30:22,37,40 38:35 80:15,16 81:6 88:3,4 88:13,16 98:31,41,42 108:46 changing 62:22,22 138:40 chapter 87:48 characterize 107:43 164:33 characterizing 107:36 charitable 116:41 **Charles** 68:21 Charlie 2:11 5:35 21:35 chart 133:22,35,44 **charter** 6:11,28,38,44 6:45 28:13 30:14 34:1 42:38 45:10,27 47:19 47:20,32,34,42 63:35

63:40 69:20 70:19 78:34 111:40 117:12 117:13,36 125:18,47 140:3 151:39 162:19 charter/headboat 4:21 27:26,29 38:21,31,41 39:6,14,16,20,30,35 39:43 40:9 42:39 45:34 46:9,10,42 47:31,46 58:5 59:8 70:32,35 77:31 121:44 151:48 159:27 167:2 Charter/Headboats 48:16.20 121:1 chartered 117:12 **charts** 157:44 chase 128:47 **chasing** 162:31 chat 21:22 Chatham 162:16,24 **check** 11:5 20:10 48:44 96:5 97:5 144:44 **checked** 144:11 checking 25:4 **chew** 139:7 **chewing** 169:29 **chief** 3:28 68:20,21 131:41 135:18 child 168:27 chime 20:9 45:36 **chirp** 20:9 **choose** 51:29 **chose** 100:26 **Chris** 4:14 5:17,24 10:41 11:21 14:28 15:37 18:13,41 61:16 Christopher 2:23 chunk 30:26 **chunks** 30:23 **circle** 17:24 98:42 110:7,9 135:12,31,41 135:43 136:7,18,21 136:27,33,35 137:2,4 137:9,15,20,23,42,48 138:24,26,34,41,43 138:46 139:42,44 140:30,30 141:31 142:3,9 143:14 144:19 circles 88:42 143:37 citizens 61:8 City 23:11 127:13 clarification 34:36 64:7 64:11 75:44 109:26 109:28 125:18 171:27

clarifications 78:31

clarify 45:39 76:34

119:15.27 171:28.45 clarity 41:2,10,41 42:11 42:21 44:32 47:39 **class** 162:30 classes 159:6 173:6,7 173:10 classify 107:46 clean 41:24 cleanest 45:21 cleaning 10:17 133:6 171:7 clear 13:35 15:31,42 16:45 17:10 40:30 42:15,16 45:42 46:6 46:18 47:9 62:45 82:20 137:8 152:24 clearly 21:27 30:26 35:3,20,23 50:14 77:2 84:30 111:37 112:48 click 45:17 **clients** 122:44 Cliff 33:3 114:26 117:30 119:26,36 122:36 123:30 133:5 CLIFFORD 3:16 **clip** 140:33 clips 82:8 103:28 clock 75:35 **Clorox** 71:47 close 12:26 21:19 22:29 23:24 43:8 94:35 102:43 113:4 127:7 148:1,5 149:7 163:1,7 closed 4:31 9:11 12:27 12:30 18:35 22:46 25:31 29:4.30 37:25 67:27 95:22 97:30 98:10,11,45 99:2,47 100:21,28,36,45 101:13,20 102:9,36 104:46 106:41 107:39 146:27,30,31,33 147:30 148:26 closely 40:6 62:9 75:29 closer 48:11 101:46 132:31 163:16 closes 42:43 43:14 closing 147:29 163:21 **closure** 19:7 22:39 98:13 99:5 148:6 149:38 closures 22:37 131:38 club 76:1 114:42 116:3 116:14,20 141:19 clue 128:9,10,11 129:31 129:37,44 coast 3:20,23 38:35,48

39:18,21,40,48 41:11

42:3.8.15 44:34 45:30 45:42 46:13 47:1 48:21,42 49:7,23,33 49:48 57:42 58:16,24 58:36 60:13 61:11,26 61:42 62:24.36.44 63:24,42 64:12,34,47 65:41 66:6 69:47 70:20,22,31,38 78:37 78:39,43,43 79:4 89:12 92:20,26 93:27 98:10 99:47 110:14 118:13 142:20 146:30 168:32 170:10 coastal 10:12 16:27 22:40 64:14 87:3,4 90:3,27 112:36 136:43 137:2 coastals 22:41 Coasters 142:28 coastline 45:41 coastwide 73:1 cod 3:18 7:34 25:33 34:37 35:29 36:20 37:2,26 128:12,45 codfish 132:12 170:17 coin 153:43 Cole 68:21 collaborating 124:35 collaboration 81:23,38 82:5 colleagues 74:37 **collect** 12:24 84:36 108:10 122:41 127:1 127:8 129:40 collected 110:48 collecting 102:26 119:43 121:9 122:6 **collection** 14:33 15:22 15:29 120:23.30.34 121:48 122:39 124:13 130:37,47 131:27 collections 121:3,27 122:9,15 **collects** 108:35 color 88:34 colored 30:45 column 169:10 combination 16:20 140:9,13 159:30 combinations 135:45 **combined** 96:21,42 100:36 combining 122:47 come 13:9,34 16:41 17:2 18:31 19:11,20 22:17 24:33 28:29 30:40 34:6,12,30 37:6

	I	1	I
50:8,24 54:47 61:31	122:31,34 139:4	160:47 161:3,7,19,37	configuration 100:14
61:35 62:8 69:39	159:41 168:18 172:16	164:14 165:41 168:16	confirm 93:35
73:17 82:15 85:36,37	173:27 174:4,6	168:38 169:1	confirmation 133:31,32
90:40,41 93:30 95:17	commerce 15:32 64:15	compliant 161:14,32	conflicted 145:8
95:44 97:23 98:25	commercially 43:5	162:10 164:1	conflicts 102:1
117:35 122:43 123:4	46:44 135:5	complicated 55:1	confusion 47:34
126:30 127:6 128:8	commercials 40:24	compliment 73:40,48	congratulations 12:20
137:44 140:31 143:12	commission 5:43 6:26	comply 64:2 161:2,29	Congress 11:16
144:30 161:28,37	75:30 81:24 169:40	161:43,43,48 162:3,8	conjunction 171:3
166:14 168:22 169:34	Commissioner 16:5	162:11 164:11	connect 29:11 30:8
171:41 172:29	commit 111:27	complying 49:32 143:8	33:27,34 57:9 113:21
comes 21:41 56:15	commitment 32:6	162:1	connection 65:8,16
			94:25 164:16
71:17 95:9 112:15	committed 103:18	component 45:15	
137:27,32,39 149:2	105:28	108:21 119:29,31	cons 156:30
155:31 156:3,17	committee 1:43 6:6	120:1 138:17,23,27	consensus 19:47 45:8
158:47 172:15	14:1 28:25 31:25	147:7	56:36
comfortable 31:46	120:15 122:18	components 108:15	consequences 58:11
63:13	common 84:44 85:24	composition 82:23	Conservacion 81:38
coming 8:27,27 13:14	92:26 137:34	148:31,37	conservation 5:43
14:28 16:16 26:40	commonly 80:30	compounded 118:10	33:23 35:4,20 53:45
29:22 33:32 44:3	communication 132:47	compromise 151:11	58:10 74:37 75:30
49:38 54:30 59:27	communities 115:37	compromises 151:34	87:37 91:31 99:6
62:12 77:21 89:20	community 101:48	computer 126:1	consider 12:15 30:31
100:24 104:34 110:41	companies 156:10	concentrated 126:46	34:17 35:17 49:41
119:10 122:22 137:21	171:9	concentration 89:4	73:29 81:7 87:9 96:36
138:16 144:43 146:42	comparability 12:37	concept 65:32	125:3 130:42 138:40
146:46 148:13 151:4	comparable 12:46,46	concepts 102:31	171:16
153:40 157:15,16	62:39	concern 12:45 45:13	considerable 108:45
158:5,30 163:6	comparative 100:17	73:41 74:36 84:2	consideration 42:28,36
169:16,30	compare 99:3 124:43	92:34 93:2 94:25,28	43:1,13 70:26,40
Command 58:24	152:16 158:8 167:4,5	108:48 109:22 111:44	73:24 90:32 135:21
commend 104:47 108:6	168:10,13	138:5 160:46 164:44	154:30 156:12 162:35
comment 4:39 12:39	compared 58:29,48	173:30	considerations 9:23
13:45 18:40 19:25	59:30,34 124:48	concerned 83:21 94:6	62:14 97:36 123:21
20:5 22:48 25:41,42	159:12	concerns 12:23,34	135:39
26:19,38 29:3,30	comparing 24:37 90:14	25:46 26:41 51:24	considered 36:41,45
31:22 33:6,6 37:13,14	107:45	63:14 81:16 82:10,47	42:12,42 43:40 45:29
58:10 67:27 83:48	comparison 98:15	102:22 113:2	45:33 81:10 100:4
84:35 87:32 88:44	102:9 152:9	concerted 164:28	107:1,5,29,33 109:10
89:39 99:31,32,33,37	comparisons 136:22	concession 155:43	125:6
101:35 102:19 105:9	compatible 82:45	Conciencia 81:38	considering 26:42
113:8 114:4 130:43	compete 13:4	concluded 29:16	37:11 50:16 61:9 81:6
132:35 144:45,48	competition 102:5	concludes 70:13	101:36 107:42 108:7
157:24,34 159:41	152:46	conclusion 27:42 34:7	123:27
165:48 168:19 169:33	complaint 56:30,30	conclusions 143:12	consistency 15:28
171:23 172:15,18	complete 29:44 99:27	concurrent 61:5	46:47
173:32	134:28	condition 113:35,36,38	consistent 47:8 136:42
commenters 75:12	completed 133:17	conditions 101:36	146:17 150:19 151:10
comments 8:4,6 10:10	completely 138:18,29	103:6,26 109:28	161:40,41
15:40 20:20 23:37	143:43 144:14 160:18	160:15,31	console 42:29
25:43 26:12,35,40,43	162:23	conduct 78:40	consolidated 24:37
32:22,46 33:1 40:11	completing 120:17	conducted 35:31 61:18	constant 147:39 153:45
44:41 46:33 48:47	complex 67:45	100:23 114:37 120:32	172:30
53:10,12,16 58:8 65:8	compliance 24:24,34	136:19 145:30	constantly 167:22
67:37 70:15 80:6 81:1	24:38 25:37 55:21	conducting 120:17	consternation 149:37
83:32 86:39 87:7,43		_	constitutes 48:13
033400390//43	1 12/1.2 20 1/11.20 20		
	134:2,39 141:38,38	123:42	
91:37 102:20,21,25	142:6 152:6,23	confidence 144:18	Constitution 71:8
		_	

62:17.20 83:26 14:11 16:34 17:8.17 57:24 cross 166:10 17:19 18:2 57:45 constraint 53:2 145:21 crucial 108:10,19 constraints 50:42 cookies 79:19 156:45 65:18 110:32 crux 33:38 constricted 89:35,37 **cool** 119:27 **counts** 39:6 77:18,19 crystal 16:45 17:10 consult 96:32,36 Cooper 22:3 77:19,20,33,34,35 154:20 156:34 162:47 consultant 75:17 cooperated 167:40 152:18 **Cuban** 104:30 **Cudney** 3:10 7:30,30 consultation 28:43 cooperative 90:20 **couple** 5:9 7:9 9:5 10:10,28 18:29 19:3 91:30 166:29 85:41 92:1,33 93:39 consultations 28:45 coordinate 61:24 19:21 21:24 22:11 94:14,27 95:34 coordinating 26:12 24:48 33:32 34:26 cumulative 67:12 95:4.13 37:32 38:12,19 40:7 contact 32:45 40:4 53:9 coordination 13:48 curious 32:31,35 44:27 **copies** 63:10 40:16 45:7 48:39 63:11 65:20 70:42,47 71:15 containing 87:23 copy 62:2 67:24 55:28 58:5 60:21 71:34 96:44 119:3 core 46:26 92:40 95:9 61:43 65:8 77:48 contaminated 96:21 123:30 143:5,10,38 contend 147:16 151:8 corner 62:5 79:20 86:11 78:31 79:14,27 83:32 158:47 159:4,10 169:10 88:20,40 95:36 98:25 168:3,5 contending 137:48 corners 20:46 71:7 102:23 106:26 110:44 content 86:43 152:42 current 25:45 39:35,43 contention 138:33 Corps 96:30 111:11 114:19 130:7 42:10 45:48 47:25 **CONTENTS** 4:9 **correct** 34:44 44:15 139:10 147:33 154:38 48:24 56:20 92:4 94:5 context 14:8 15:25 53:43 54:1 64:16 154:44 159:3 165:47 94:9,14 99:5 102:8,26 166:32 173:9,16 35:17 40:41 95:12 71:14 76:4,15 94:13 103:16 108:47 165:16 98:19 97:17 125:27 143:3 course 25:4 72:30 86:7 currently 12:38 13:12 continuation 155:33 161:26.27 86:13,21 88:6 110:20 25:10 26:11 33:20 continue 18:16 27:12 corrected 37:28 110:33 111:41,43 38:42 64:36 65:45 125:48 138:12 172:28 correctly 162:6 67:38 80:27,37,41 46:28 52:41 60:33 69:48 78:16 127:41 correlation 158:4 **court** 167:24 81:19.22 82:44 131:10 132:25,25 correspond 31:16 cover 37:47 114:20 120:13,32 121:16 135:36 145:24 147:17 correspondence 9:16 coverage 17:23 103:5 122:2,41 146:23 148:15 154:33 161:9 corresponding 72:18 103:22,22 105:3 148:23 151:43 152:34 164:39 167:21 173:43 **Cory** 10:46 covered 22:21 34:2 **Curtis** 3:12 7:42,42 38:20,27,28 47:28 continued 11:18 49:19 cost 27:16.18.36 32:44 111:1 117:12 119:32 covering 119:9 125:8 59:19 135:21 147:48 51:33 71:18 127:33 curve 8:23 100:8,11 166:17 125:14,23 132:1,9 customer 67:20 157:19 covers 28:3 **continues** 29:34 31:33 **costing** 117:37 customers 72:23 **CPUE** 106:3 68:30 153:11 158:37 costs 27:40,40 51:25 126:19 **craft** 59:5 continuing 26:34 110:7 101:43,44 116:18,22 cut 5:8 48:1 73:13 136:17 147:20 152:25 116:24,31 117:31,44 crank 36:27 92:22 132:19 134:15 cranked 36:28 153:4 **cutter** 61:11 contour 87:18 council 1:34,47 2:19,25 cranking 147:31 **cutters** 58:45 contract 111:3 5:34 6:9,28,40 9:3 crazy 158:45 162:25 **cutting** 72:31 73:22 **contribute** 20:39 32:3 11:41,46 13:47,48 **create** 39:13 47:39 **cycle** 40:44 94:7 165:28 17:28 30:14,16 47:1,6 80:28 83:42,47 86:47 Cypress 1:25 contributed 149:20 162:18,28 163:19 47:15,18 77:7,44 creates 20:20 35:8 D contributor 119:21 82:37 83:6,18 99:39 97:22 credibility 112:7,11,17 control 26:36 27:14 121:12 **D.C** 8:27 councils 14:2 46:39,43 credit 132:5 153:8 41:47 42:2 168:9,14 daily 145:15 149:14 46:45 47:13,30 62:35 166:27,27,42 168:16 162:46 166:37 170:21 Creel 125:32,38 controversial 9:11,13 62:37 121:4 damage 30:26 Counsel 3:26 7:18 crew 51:34 73:22 controversies 115:35 damn 162:9 convention 28:12 29:8 68:18 77:14 117:37 damned 154:26 count 152:14 conversation 19:19 cries 76:29 dark 117:35 counted 80:25 119:24 20:3,6 21:11,13,15 crime 75:34 167:28 dash 133:34 database 89:15 133:9 58:5 61:44 78:1 79:33 counterintuitive 160:18 criteria 24:14 54:42 55:32,37,43 56:17 79:44 83:31 85:33,39 counterproductive 133:10,11,14,28 97:33,41 113:8,24 11:15 43:16 139:47 date 4:37 18:38 23:8 80:22 84:29,34 135:36 151:4 173:44 **countries** 12:41,43 105:18 86:36 95:7 111:21,23 174:4 33:22 65:11 critical 105:4 129:2 111:26 114:23 143:13 conversations 21:6 country 8:22 13:3,32 Croix 82:29 145:32 148:11

	I	İ	İ
dates 95:32	decided 102:32 114:43	168:31	71:6 119:46 120:2
Dave 79:30	140:11,12	density 87:17	developed 29:43
David 2:23 5:36 41:44	decision 26:15 37:11	depart 51:42 52:36	developing 62:30 91:23
41:45 65:1 93:31	93:15 149:36 150:30	departing 51:9	91:31 120:6
94:21 99:14 159:1,39	decision-making	department 5:41 15:32	development 61:13
166:3,48	104:15	71:44,45 82:43	90:36
day 19:2 32:16 53:46	decisions 32:13 149:47	136:48	deviate 20:34
79:42 85:38 111:29	152:29	depend 121:39 123:24	Dewey 1:47 5:33 16:31
117:32,38,39 118:11	declarations 50:21	124:3 141:37 143:45	16:32 17:41 36:17
123:2,3,6,7 126:12	declare 49:35,44	144:14	40:11,26 46:23,34
146:15 148:10,19	declared 98:32	dependent 16:28 95:46	47:43 48:35 49:24
149:43 151:23 158:25	decline 98:17,22	96:1 106:34 124:10	75:13 77:4,46 118:15
158:26,28,29 160:4,6	101:16,18	164:17	119:2 168:19,47
160:22,27 174:11	declines 101:12	depending 21:39	Dewey's 19:12
Dayboat 99:12,18	decrease 53:3	118:19,24,38 124:27	dialogue 172:17
days 5:9 10:28 13:9	decreasing 124:8	127:10 134:40 137:10	dialogues 20:13
45:7 114:2,40 115:46	160:14	depends 118:27 142:5	Diane 7:19
115:47,48 126:9	dedicate 55:9	deployed 60:40 103:36	DIDOMENICO 3:14
132:6 133:25,38,39	dedicated 67:23 75:40	deploying 26:25	172:21
148:16 151:4,21	deducted 52:42 53:42	deployment 71:3	die 126:29
153:35,37	deemed 165:19	depth 8:21 31:30 33:46	diesel 118:29
dead 50:32,40 52:41	deep 57:35 137:41	deputy 68:5,21	difference 72:43 115:30
101:16,23 103:31,40	138:7	derived 146:38	115:39 140:6 158:7
105:21,24,42 109:7	Deepwater 29:14 34:15	derogatory 167:4	differences 20:26 43:25
113:27,47 119:23,24	34:25 89:16	describes 87:19 88:3	43:32,38 44:8 88:18
139:23 143:4,18	default 146:14	describing 44:10	88:41 101:11 115:27
deadline 52:28 111:32	defaulting 46:14	description 88:2	115:42 155:29
111:34	defend 13:37,40	descriptions 24:39	different 11:41 13:6
deadlines 52:30	defending 13:29 Defense 6:19	87:36,38	15:3,8 23:32 25:21 30:45 31:5 33:33
deal 5:13 12:35 35:24	defer 173:47	descriptive 115:44 deserved 99:29	43:32,48 45:26 48:47
41:9,34 97:1 dealer 19:4 69:24	defined 12:7 47:19	design 120:39 122:27	53:13 57:46 59:8
151:14 152:8 165:17	54:30	122:30 123:21	70:23,23,36 71:38,39
167:27 168:9,23	defining 107:12	designate 86:25 92:38	72:46 73:2 77:37,40
dealers 69:23 151:17	definitely 31:11 59:35	designation 163:5	78:32 79:1 84:5 94:19
151:18,20,24,27	81:4 92:45 119:33	designations 86:24	96:17,38 98:14 100:4
152:39 167:23,44	123:20,26 125:14,14	designed 108:9 173:1	100:6 101:20 115:3
dealing 12:41 21:28	127:25 130:25,25	desired 166:21	115:10 120:9 123:12
77:1 159:47 169:1	definition 14:14,15,24	desperate 21:12	124:10,27 125:15
deals 155:27	142:34	despite 113:40	127:30 132:7 134:1
dealt 127:29	definitions 11:42	detail 36:39 86:41	135:3,3 136:22
death 137:31 143:14	degradation 90:36	87:40 101:9 123:34	139:13,15 143:41
debate 120:38 147:33	degree 35:21 98:23	131:28	144:17 149:3 150:2
debris 10:19	146:25	detailed 87:46 104:4	157:5 162:23 165:44
debt 51:1,3,5,10,13,41	degrees 104:29	details 29:25 34:29	170:38,48
51:45,47 52:2,7,9,12	dehooking 173:6	45:16 47:4 84:37 98:6	differently 11:43 12:8
52:14,28 57:35	Delaware 69:16	103:25,47 137:6	67:34
DEC 69:2	delay 51:46	detect 59:24	differing 20:23
decade 13:6 14:31	delegated 97:12,18	detections 59:30	difficult 12:14 17:47
130:5	delegation 60:34 65:26	detector 144:7	127:38 141:29,32
decades 10:43,44	delineation 89:25 90:1	determination 32:39	142:1,13 147:47
12:27	Delisse 3:24 79:25,26	105:34 136:10 determine 52:21 53:24	150:36 162:4 168:7
decal 47:48 decals 78:47	79:48 85:33 delivery 23:16	81:18 105:23 115:16	difficulties 80:32 129:15 163:8
December 31:27 52:8	Delmarva 69:15,43	124:25 152:28	difficulty 127:9 163:2
55:18 153:42	delta 158:9	determined 24:38	dig 123:31
decent 123:11	denial 61:28	131:36 174:22	digger 156:43
decide 140:12	denied 56:1,32 168:29	develop 14:43 61:39	digging 88:36
330140 1 10.12	22.1102 23.1,02 100.20		
II			•

diligent 104:48 dilution 92:16 direct 26:35 152:8 directed 5:44 11:19 14:13 direction 172:32 directly 31:17 32:10 70:22 149:37 152:19 director 131:42 directors 6:16 disadvantage 56:25 disagree 142:29 disappear 91:46 disappeared 95:27 discarded 101:16,23,23 discards 50:32,41 52:41 101:27,32 143:4,18 163:29 discharge 96:22,42,46 96:47 discrepancy 105:32 discretion 113:26 discuss 34:12 49:30 86:16 discussed 14:3 49:28 50:4.11 121:46 141:30 146:24 163:26 discussing 11:46 41:26 98:4 140:37 156:29 discussion 15:24 19:8 20:14 24:10 65:15 79:40 80:11 83:24 90:32 111:19 131:26 132:36 134:24 136:17 138:10,38 139:3,11 143:40 147:4 162:36 170:1,23,29 173:47 **discussions** 9:46 11:40 14:7 15:19 24:16 31:42 32:4.18 39:24 80:46 90:29 108:37 109:31 110:45 135:22 147:1 151:3 disposal 156:1 disregard 92:5 dissect 158:36 distant 67:40 distinct 81:9 84:1 distinction 111:12 142:13,46 143:25 174:3 distribute 127:1,8 distributed 13:34 54:28 102:39 114:47 **distribution** 9:20 23:14 88:45 94:32 102:37 115:7 distributions 54:34

district 60:26 **DIVER** 89:15 diversifying 26:4 divide 46:27 division 3:4,6,8,11,13 3:17,22,25,28,29,31 4:17 6:13 7:20 16:40 17:2 22:7 32:10 66:30 66:44,47 68:29,36,38 69:31,45 75:24,28,40 140:41 145:41 170:5 division's 68:7 divisions 67:16 dock 36:35 49:36,38,45 49:47 72:24 122:43 123:4 126:21 171:5 docks 127:14 dockside 38:37 47:47 126:18,32 127:30,36 document 25:16 28:36 63:43 67:24,36 68:27 documentation 64:14 64:31 documented 63:41 64:21 95:26 documenting 81:48 documents 24:17 91:15 **Dog** 117:34 doing 11:11 12:25 13:29,30,41 15:36 20:29 22:11 27:8 30:32 31:35,38,39 43:48 44:6,35 47:14 55:12,15 58:30,43 60:31 65:36,45 66:8 66:38 70:2 71:18 76:31 78:18 81:20,24 81:46 85:4 92:7 96:16 96:32 104:47 105:25 107:45 111:47 117:46 117:46 118:46 123:10 123:48 126:36,37 127:35 128:2,16 129:14 130:14,18

139:29 165:1

dollars 118:18,37

dolphin 11:47 101:17

dolphin/wahoo 14:47

15:45 32:8 59:25

domestic 13:23,44

60:11,33 66:23

domestically 13:31

donations 116:40,42

dot 30:43,46,46,46

152:44

136:44

60:7

doozy 28:19

51:20 135:28,31 140:39.39 double 161:32 162:10 doubt 46:24 95:26 152:36 169:30 **Dove** 155:35 download 91:20 downstairs 18:43 174:15 downtown 9:43 dozen 150:46 **DPS** 84:6 Dr 99:14 132:40 134:21 134:36,46 169:47 draft 24:28 86:33,38 87:30 88:4,14,23,30 88:38 89:29,35 90:15 90:45,47 91:6,13 99:33 117:24 145:29 drafting 24:23 **drafts** 24:17 dragging 75:2,18 dramatically 147:25 draw 58:42 dredge 93:46 dredging 94:48 96:17 96:25 dressed 23:48 drilling 95:9 drive 158:34 driven 38:35 **driver** 46:22 driving 157:31 173:15 drone 70:46 78:3 drones 70:43,44 drop 147:17 157:26 dropback 137:25,26 138:1 139:25,32 141:12 dropped 149:15 154:11 160:25 dropping 140:34 147:26 151:2 159:17 drops 152:36,36 drum 158:17 dry 48:1 **Drymon** 1:40 6:20,20 82:5 119:26 dual 74:48 121:11 due 12:32 23:37 26:41 61:30 83:1 89:13 99:15,19 101:42 102:5 115:34 157:46 174:22 dull 147:23 **Duly** 54:7

51:17 166:9.10

dots 30:44,45 31:1

dummy- 134:32 dump 71:48 89:48 duplicity 166:33 duration 103:41 duskies 95:31 104:25 104:32,37 106:11 109:13,18,21 110:37 112:24,25,37 dusky 38:29 44:12 87:3 89:27,45 90:13,26 92:20,25 93:22 101:32 103:39,40,44 105:18 106:14 108:48 109:4,6,22,33,41,48 110:8,29,32 112:15 113:23,27,29,34 duties 145:15 dynamic 147:15,18 155:32 dynamics 51:25,26 52:25 53:1 150:34 151:7,11,12 152:30 153:14 156:22 Ε

EA 86:43 87:41.47 101:6.9 103:48 106:30 eager 20:38 ear 144:28 earlier 15:47 17:44 18:48 32:30 56:12 70:18 72:41 78:32 108:30 109:8 110:42 121:8.43.46 122:16 126:4 128:24 151:36 152:15 157:9,25 169:48 170:24 174:21 early 21:36 38:13 43:9 43:15 54:31 56:43 57:12 59:10 93:37 120:24 123:3 147:40 148:7 153:22,29 160:20 174:18,20 earnings 27:16,18,36 32:44 116:18,35,39 easier 134:5 162:27 167:13 easily 44:30 45:21 105:47 easing 12:1 east 27:48 49:23 58:25 98:10 99:47 146:30 170:10 eastern 23:28,33

170:17 easy 10:36 45:22 57:27 57:29 130:33 134:34

II
168:34,39
echo 15:38 140:46
ecological 90:35
ecology 82:28
economic 27:23 114:34
115:37 117:20,21
economies 16:28
economy 117:22
ecosystem 24:22
Ecuador 155:36
editions 160:8
education 60:28 62:30
74:17 130:48 152:21
educational 45:15
EEZ 65:17 89:5
effect 23:41 29:9 36:44
41:6,39 43:45 49:9
52:39 53:45 54:37
73:14 92:16 121:37
138:30 159:26 166:21
effective 40:42 61:36
138:4 157:4 165:27
effectively 15:35 44:30
effectiveness 29:7 99:4
effects 46:30 91:44
137:1
efficiency 134:7
effort 11:13 26:1 60:29
61:3 66:5 74:3 75:24
94:41 100:12,38,42
100:42,48 101:3
103:2 115:23,26,42
119:43 120:20 121:14
124:26 125:34,35,36
129:1,10,11,16,18
130:20 143:17 147:44
147:46 164:28 166:4
166:39
efforts 14:29 60:7,32,43
61:24,41 65:40 69:31
122:3 130:47 132:47
169:23
EFH 86:17,24,25 87:2
87:36 88:34,35 89:1,9
89:25,36 90:1,2,11,33
91:26,32,46 92:7,36
92:37 93:45 94:3,7,11
95:2,36 96:7,27,37
EFP 9:39 22:45,46
25:31,40,44 27:4
37:26 100:35,38
102:21 103:42 104:44
106:29 169:42 170:7
170:39 171:3,15
EFPs 23:3 25:39 99:28
eight 14:1 17:15 129:12
129:13 140:24 160:1
EISes 156:24
Ī

either 44:1 64:13.41 88:23,28,30 90:34 137:27 142:43 145:14 151:41 152:41 155:18 160:5 162:19 167:31 elaborate 65:20 Elasmobranch 82:26 **elect** 28:17 **electronic** 14:37 19:4 25:36 26:9 27:33 28:33,35 29:41,42,45 30:11 33:9 36:13,23 36:30 102:11,11,15 102:29 103:12,17 121:2,8 125:5,48 165:17 170:40 171:3 171:8 172:6 element 50:3 eliminate 154:2 eliminates 46:12 elimination 96:46 **EM** 103:13 105:28,38 105:38,38 108:14,16 email 9:14 23:14,16 85:46 132:47 145:22 emailing 172:31 emails 62:32 111:45 150:29 embargoed 71:46 embarking 45:39 embedded 67:25 embracing 71:10 emergency 166:26 emerging 62:10 **emphasize** 19:45 88:12 90:16 **employ** 144:7 employed 141:34 encased 138:18,23 139:17 142:31,33,38 **encompass** 100:8,10 139:46 encounter 170:19 encountered 65:22 82:27 121:15 **encourage** 28:24,38 55:38 101:8 encouraged 14:35 **Endangered** 29:8 74:9 ended 149:6 endorsement 14:19 39:42,44,46 44:11 45:17 46:10 63:42 121:36.41 ends 18:1

energies 30:42

enforce 45:22,35 65:43

energy 10:9

139:33.37.38 141:32 141:43 142:1.14 enforceable 44:30 62:13 73:32 enforced 12:33 139:1 143:44 **enforcement** 3:7,9 4:27 11:34 18:30 35:9,13 35:22,23,31,39 44:28 49:8,20,20 58:15,46 60:29,35,39,42,44 61:10,21,46 62:11,13 62:38 65:4,5,13,37 66:23,29,40,43,45,46 66:47 67:16,18,19,43 68:1,4,7,10,18,29 69:32 73:28,44 74:21 74:29 75:28,31 77:8 77:45 81:16 83:1 133:46 141:22,28,33 141:36,41 142:8,24 143:41,47 enforcing 63:36 **engage** 32:12 139:3 engaged 32:2 170:40 engaging 67:48 137:38 Engineers 96:30 **England** 6:8.40 16:25 35:18 47:29 48:26 89:43 enhanced 12:30,33 67:8 102:29 enhancements 42:20 enlighten 53:18 77:22 **ensure** 78:6 **ensured** 60:13 **ensuring** 153:41 entail 123:44 entailed 80:18 **enter** 42:2 entering 42:18 133:7,27 enterprises 76:44 entertaining 65:6 entire 92:38 99:47 149:41 153:6,10 161:47 **entirely** 130:17 entirety 100:3 entities 155:13 156:9 entity 155:42 **entrants** 160:34 **entries** 163:42 entry 61:36 environmental 1:39,41 2:14,27 6:19,19 7:4 7:48 54:3 90:36 99:34 99:42 envision 44:39

EPIRBS 39:4 42:13 equally 153:46 equipment 42:13 equity-type 154:7 equivalent 61:16 **ER** 108:14 error 125:40 128:39 errors 128:26 **ESA** 28:41 29:2 163:5 escaping 138:31 especially 13:31 21:34 33:21 39:10 45:46 70:29 76:28,42 92:27 112:18 145:42 150:28 151:25,32 152:27 159:48 Espinoza 81:36 **ESQ** 3:26 essential 15:43 19:24 79:41 85:40 86:2 94:5 **essentially** 43:26 65:10 87:13 88:35 124:14 146:29 155:10,44 166:6 173:41 establish 41:47 165:22 established 56:6 76:28 78:10 84:30 106:31 129:43 146:17 establishing 80:20 estimate 27:22 81:27 87:23 131:43 150:5 **estimates** 14:32 113:32 117:16 120:9,26 121:14,17,18,21 124:38 130:46 163:45 estimating 129:15 estimation 87:17 112:41 evaluate 99:1,4 121:26 evaluated 90:34 128:22 128:23 evening 10:30 18:41 event 120:26 121:31 125:41 events 35:33 74:22 96:43 116:20,24 eventual 123:41 eventually 122:22,27 everybody 6:32 8:10 18:18,44 35:48 43:17 55:16 62:43 66:20 69:39 76:9 81:2 85:42 86:42 97:38 113:10 113:13 114:29 123:6 125:15 127:24 131:19 147:11 167:45 169:22 everybody's 42:45 80:6 everyone's 59:26

	ı	1	1
everything's 162:44	124:16,24 130:10,36	facilitates 134:12	133:46 154:32
evidence 137:8 143:28	133:10 135:40 141:31	facing 46:40	federal/state 74:48
143:48	154:47	fact 54:10 57:30 81:8	federally 36:4 86:22
evil 140:39	exists 82:39 93:14	87:32 91:47 92:24	97:17
evolve 97:43	172:36	93:28 95:27 108:15	feedback 34:19 43:31
evolved 62:17 127:48	expand 28:31 117:16	113:33 159:48 162:28	59:42 62:33 89:46
evolves 61:25	120:34,38 121:22	172:41	111:37 112:47 136:2
EVTR 35:46 36:10	expanded 88:48 122:28	factors 55:44 90:42	149:34 150:28 153:16
127:24 129:10,16	132:4	98:14	153:19,48 154:29
EVTRs 35:41,41 128:4	expanding 26:9 120:29	facts 112:28	feeding 86:19
129:2	121:26 122:38 123:32	failure 77:17,18,19,20	feeds 151:35
exact 11:27 48:31	expansion 122:23	fair 30:36 93:11 107:36	feel 15:42 31:45 63:13
110:28	130:4,14 134:11	161:12,45,48 162:40	99:29 109:44,46
exactly 31:35 46:20	expect 15:33 27:31	fairly 28:37 31:16 40:46	110:2
57:10 105:30 156:30	54:3 101:7 118:40	41:13 43:46 89:34	feeling 115:35
exam 79:2	161:11,12 168:37	91:4 110:36 127:6	fees 116:21,48 117:4
examinations 38:37	expectations 159:44,45	129:46	118:32,34
examiner 78:42	expected 28:29 101:30	fall 22:14 27:44 29:23	feet 60:19
examiners 60:27 78:45	expedite 15:33	31:26 137:31 139:29	fellow 141:18
example 13:33 14:45	expended 61:3 115:43	145:11,17 148:28,32	felt 88:46 90:9
45:29 48:27,29 56:35	expenditure 117:47	149:33	females 92:27 95:23
75:27 117:32 128:29	118:2	false 13:38	fence 153:4
142:11	expenditures 117:17	familiar 16:2 19:42	Fernandina 104:29
examples 65:40 88:17	118:17	132:45	fewer 52:26
152:43	expenses 116:44 117:1	families 16:27 156:9	field 13:4 16:11 66:34
exams 78:32,40,47	117:3,4,6,11	family 10:2 155:38,39	149:1 153:33
exceeded 28:8,10	experience 8:17,28 44:11 118:41 153:27	famous 75:18 fans 140:9	fifteen 118:37
excellent 10:37 15:45	experienced 145:37	fantastic 110:18	fight 166:5
16:6 105:38 154:42 exception 23:26 114:39	experienced 145.37 experiencing 98:37,39	far 13:21,30 24:35	figure 20:27 46:20 132:22 145:24 147:9
exceptions 24:39	experimental 9:12 37:5	46:31 47:25 49:8	figured 145:18
exciting 108:15,17	expert 16:10	58:42 59:29 69:35	figures 114:31
exclude 114:43	expertise 16:8 154:30	70:4 73:4 74:26 79:20	filed 85:42
excluded 76:33 114:44	experts 154:17	93:14 106:30 110:47	files 91:18,24
exclusively 100:44	explain 13:27 63:34	112:25 126:14 129:1	filet 72:9,18
excuse 8:1 37:37	154:48	129:48 145:34 151:45	fill 15:11 126:5 152:12
executive 28:16 120:15	explore 72:35,38	152:12 155:12 157:12	166:14
122:18	172:10	159:11,13	filled 161:25
exemplifies 157:3	exporting 153:1	fashion 36:6 131:44	filleting 72:12 78:21
exempt 137:22 138:22	exposure 34:31	144:22 168:7	filling 22:4 151:33
138:34 141:47	expressed 51:24	fast 48:37 167:9	169:15
exempted 4:32 18:35	102:22	fat 152:41	fin 33:39 82:7 95:19
25:30 36:21 72:15,27	extend 38:39 151:1	fathom 100:8,11	103:27
78:21 79:39 82:6	173:3,6	fathoms 104:24	final 16:12 19:23 22:30
97:30 98:48	extending 154:8	favor 58:10 102:25	23:40 24:29,32,36
exempting 144:35,36 exemption 25:45 27:2	extension 154:42 extent 35:18 92:38	171:31 fax 132:48	27:39,43 29:2,5 31:26 32:38,41 37:10 40:42
73:5 79:47 137:47	141:38 142:6	feasibilities 132:30	79:40 84:35 85:39,43
140:26,27,48 141:9	extra 55:9 63:10 123:18	feasibility 124:28	86:1,36 87:27 88:4,14
140.20,27,46 141.9	124:26 159:28	feasible 124:24	88:23,30,39 89:30,41
exercise 30:44 31:8	extreme 14:17	feature 131:2	90:15,46,47 91:1,15
51:18 61:19 94:30	extremely 46:6 152:27	featured 67:44	117:24 118:6,7 130:1
95:3 113:26	eye 28:4 78:8 89:19	February 104:26	130:16
exist 11:18 64:36,46	142:39	federal 44:48 55:38	finalization 25:11
92:32	eyes 75:19 113:4	69:24 75:1,32 83:8	finalized 101:38 129:47
existed 147:46		85:44 95:5 96:29,41	145:44
existing 99:5 120:8,38	<u> </u>	96:45 97:3,4 121:39	finalizing 87:12
120:40 122:48 124:13	face 13:24 75:19 150:4	125:9,18,19,20 126:7	finally 25:6 30:33 61:26
	I	I	I

II
129:32 130:11,13 find 25:25 39:12 57:16 57:27 66:36 67:31,32 68:11,23 82:46 86:4 120:33 129:41 143:42 160:36,40 169:35 finding 12:48 22:25 94:38 143:13 findings 94:24 113:5 fine 49:42 71:32,36 76:32 139:33,39 fined 71:23 fines 71:35 77:40 161:23
fingers 69:38 finning 10:47 11:10
13:18
fins 11:14,32 33:21 59:17 72:46
first 9:2 15:38,40 19:45 21:42 29:16 33:36,42 35:39 38:20,26 39:29 44:43 54:26 58:19 59:46 63:8 75:26 79:16 84:26 99:44 110:16 111:42 114:9 114:30 128:30 129:45 131:36 140:4 141:8 141:24 143:15 145:26 146:37 154:41 156:39 157:38,39,45 160:6 166:24 168:22 169:6 169:9 170:3,9 174:15 first-time 158:41 fiscal 58:30,48 67:11,12 67:29
fishable 148:16 158:29
fished 8:46 98:23 Fisher 2:11 21:36
fisheries 5:20,45 6:13 6:23 25 8:19 29 32
6:23,25 8:19,29,32 10:6 11:44 12:7,9,9 12:23,39,42 13:7,24 13:38,44 14:20,24,33 15:2,23 16:14 22:36 22:40 24:22 25:8 29:38,43 30:16,20 46:42 48:41 58:23,32 58:40 59:25 60:33,43 62:7,36 64:47 65:43 66:26 69:24 77:41 79:10 81:22,24,27 82:37 83:6 103:30,34 108:13,19 119:48 121:30 131:16 132:16 136:48 140:41 142:3 147:35,35 150:21,26 153:44 156:2 173:40

fisherman 109:20 112:23 140:3 144:15 155:38 161:35
Fisherman's 169:41
fishermen 12:2,11,40
17:16 26:2 34:41,48 37:27 60:11 76:12,41
76:46 78:14 83:12
143:24 164:10 165:1
170:12,36 171:1,17
Fishermen's 3:18 6:17
7:35 25:34 34:38 35:30 36:21
fishers 16:44 17:3 78:6
fishery's 146:22
fishery- 61:21
fishes 140:28 fit 22:25 25:40 79:44
five 16:46 17:23 41:27
69:17,19 73:18 86:28
90:43 92:7 95:39 96:6
145:38 146:44 151:20
155:9,17,35 168:31 five-year 86:31,34
fix 134:34 168:21,34,39
fixed 55:6 69:9 167:39
flashback 151:5
flavors 43:38
fleet 29:46 36:43 38:46
45:40 54:29,30 99:18 111:47 126:47 146:20
149:31 152:4 166:47
fleets 30:14 124:28
flexibility 51:19,23
52:17,21 54:6,21
56:41 58:12 145:42 flexible 52:46 111:31
flip 46:19 137:30
153:43
flipped 137:38
floor 174:16
Florida 5:42 7:41 21:31 67:5 73:47 74:1 75:29
84:44 89:3,8,12 92:21
92:26 93:27 97:11
98:10 99:47 110:14
124:17 135:19 146:30
flounder 93:46 flow 32:40 133:21,35,44
flowing 60:30
fluke 72:29
flung 9:38
fly 5:26,28,29,29 21:40
48:28 139:7,48 140:29,42 142:29
flyers 114:47
EMD 24:38 156:22

FMP 24:38 156:22

FMPs 24:33

focus 19:9 40:46 58:40 65:7 68:31 focused 15:18 20:13,19 21:14 82:16 **focusing** 132:46 fold 20:7 85:38 folded 95:20 **folding** 24:45 **folks** 5:12 7:9,15 11:9 18:30 19:17 20:21 21:25,33 27:29 29:11 30:5,8 33:27,36 45:6 47:10,15 50:9,19 58:17 63:39 76:32 78:3 79:27,37 83:29 88:7 119:17 122:42 123:16 124:11 137:47 144:29,44 145:13,19 151:28 152:7,21 153:17,28,35 154:16 154:38 158:15 168:12 174:11,20 folks' 19:1 152:22 **follow** 19:12 20:33 27:41 55:45 68:12 75:15 126:40 133:29 **follow-on** 130:29 135:21 **follow-up** 30:19 37:13 41:15 45:5 170:4 followed 49:2 112:7 117:4 following 13:1 32:7 40:5 45:16 54:11 55:47 56:2 78:10 88:2 134:25 food 13:33,33 57:2,4,5 57:41,43,44,45 101:44 117:39 163:9 foot 6:32 42:29 165:4 for- 112:18 125:12 172:38 for-hire 14:34 30:11 33:9 45:40 111:43 121:2,11 125:5,18 146:20 172:38 **for-sale** 46:1,11 48:23 **forage** 163:9 force 164:47 Fordham 1:41 7:3,3 73:38,39 85:8 93:32 forefront 167:43 foreign 12:39 **foremost** 145:26 forget 54:32 92:31 **forgot** 37:35 form 17:27 30:24,28 144:21 148:46 156:15

159:41 formal 102:44 formatting 87:21 formed 129:48 former 166:37 formulaic 56:7 formulated 173:2 forth 15:12 47:24 74:5 85:18 131:27 132:19 135:6 171:26 172:17 Forty 103:4 forward 8:40 11:38 12:4 13:10 15:15 17:37 20:15,27 22:31 23:43 23:47 24:3 34:18 35:26 56:39 65:4 71:1 71:10 73:29 78:4 83:21 87:14 88:38,39 89:37 97:42 102:12 102:31 104:17 106:46 112:34 113:6 125:3 139:3 142:32 found 68:43 69:16 79:17 82:34 85:20 108:26 115:30,39,45 116:17 125:31 128:32 136:31 137:3 160:17 165:26 founder 81:37 **four** 10:43 16:46 40:15 41:27 71:7.41 72:4.26 77:36 90:42 112:42 113:34,35,37,38,40 146:44 147:36 149:36 151:20 160:25 167:28 four-fish 160:20 fourth 39:27 106:28 **FR** 148:4 frame 30:4 121:38 framework 67:19 France 60:48 frankly 8:47 173:5,11 **free** 54:43 55:40 137:30 frequency 104:33,41 frequently 110:31 137:43 Friday 151:30 friend 54:18 front 8:21 9:8 22:45 27:45 28:38 29:15,27 29:35 fronts 29:40 frustrated 164:24 frustrating 166:13 frustration 131:33 132:21,25 fuel 101:44 116:48

117:5,10,14,39

154:3.7 161:1 163:30 145:42 150:28 153:42 34:48 35:15,18 129:7 118:27 127:15 131:19 159:48 163:28 full 37:45 84:19 101:9 164:11,31,32,33,34 170:14,42,45 172:2,7 166:35 167:1 171:47 gives 82:22 90:28 99:46 130:4 142:43,44 groundfishing 128:30 fuller 83:31 85:11,33 generally 20:33 78:43 133:21,35 128:45 group 8:43 15:12 26:14 fully 13:27 15:33 56:29 generated 121:19 **giving** 10:24 53:27 85:44 98:32,35 genetic 84:36 55:22 82:20 111:19 29:27 62:11 76:8 122:27 164:1 genetics 122:7 132:41 161:22 148:33,33 172:24 **Genovese** 155:39 glaringly 152:2 fun 93:45 173:7 function 90:7 **glasses** 97:48 groups 13:25 23:23 156:13 fund 6:19 75:32 gentleman 64:7 78:31 glean 143:11 30:17 46:27 133:43 **funded** 89:16 globally 29:4 **genuine** 168:15 134:1 **Gloucester** 7:39,43 funding 124:3 127:33 geographic 58:33 growth 86:20 100:6 158:20 145:28 150:25 158:31 guarantee 146:1 133:13 fundings 81:47 George 2:18 6:41 7:26 **glove** 130:48 Guard 3:20,23 38:35,48 further 11:35 29:33 33:3,14 46:34 53:16 goal 12:47,47 18:10 39:18,22,40,48 41:11 53:29 151:47 154:39 20:12 31:34 43:35 30:20 49:9 53:8 60:27 42:3,8,15 44:34 45:30 66:16,36 114:33 154:14 170:24 171:34 45:42 46:13 47:2 future 9:22 17:38 33:46 **Georges** 162:20 170:17 172:35,43 48:42 49:7,33 50:1 67:40 71:5 73:36 Georgia 1:25 104:29 goals 43:24 99:6 57:42 58:16,24,36 94:20 159:31 124:22 111:14 60:14 61:11,26,42 geospatial 87:22 158:4 **FY** 68:27 Golet 1:42 7:12,12 38:8 62:24,36,44 63:24 158:12 64:12,34,47 65:41 113:10,13,17,20 G get-together 10:29 gotten 9:15 30:21 62:33 66:6 69:47 70:20,22 getting 11:1 19:13 25:8 65:30 66:12 115:25 70:31,38 78:37,39,43 **gain** 9:35 gallon 118:28,29 32:26 43:38 85:46 78:44 79:4 131:28 171:15 Gambler 6:30 96:1 104:5,7 109:47 government 13:34 quess 14:22 37:22 40:7 game 79:46 110:28 121:40 123:11 14:18.19 28:21 61:14 40:22 53:42 64:27 127:47 132:30 142:23 61:30 71:46 73:6 83:3,28 games 162:6 143:27,31 144:41 government's 61:27 85:19 122:40,46 **gamut** 28:3 Garden 3:14 149:42 151:14 156:42 **grab** 134:16 137:37 135:26 143:30 157:6 **GARFO** 14:47 158:23 159:14.18 **grain** 144:39 157:24 garner 20:16 161:27 162:32,47 grandfather 155:43 guidance 60:5,9 165:27 166:11 167:11 **gas** 116:23 grant 110:23 guidelines 24:15 gathering 85:3 174:19,19 **granted** 146:45 quides 60:15 134:39 **GCES** 68:22 qiant 148:33 graph 150:11 Guinea 65:12 gear 24:41,41,42 25:36 giants 148:39,44 graphs 25:19 gulf 8:46 22:39 23:28 162:22 23:28,29,33,33 30:13 25:47 26:6 29:17 **GRAs** 103:23 **gillnet** 59:38 34:39,44 35:1,5,8,11 grateful 173:14 34:15,21 54:29 59:6 35:12 45:35,43 46:20 girlfriend 169:25 **Graves** 1:43 6:4,4 59:24 65:12 80:26 46:31 50:34 52:33 **qist** 63:14 137:7 gray 40:37 99:46 81:23 89:20 90:17 59:22,38 77:23 94:48 give 9:19,35 12:14 greater 26:12 42:11 92:26 93:27 115:6 17:19 22:20 23:1 43:7 44:32 115:36 119:44 139:22 140:6 98:12,42 100:25 37:39 40:19,20 43:30 142:4,20,27 144:29 102:1 104:23 143:43 121:48 141:46 146:10 154:3 171:48 43:31 48:36 49:11,37 greatly 163:19 169:26 146:31 162:16 172:4,6,9 54:18 58:26 68:33 gunning 162:31 green 24:41 68:21 69:47 79:32 86:2 88:29 91:3 100:15 gear's 94:45 88:17,24 95:32 98:4 gear-centric 45:47 **Greg** 3:14 172:18 gears 94:43 137:39 103:36 117:32 129:37 173:26 habitat 19:24 79:41 135:36,37 139:32 172:3 **Gregg** 1:44 5:42,42 85:40 86:2 87:37 89:22 90:37,38 91:30 general 3:26 7:18 16:22 141:26 144:42 145:11 46:36 47:12 75:8 152:11 155:13 161:46 91:31 94:6,17,34,42 19:22 22:43 27:15,19 97:10 106:25,48 166:27,42 168:23 27:25 32:45 33:1 107:27,41 94:43 95:1,6,8,13 170:28 171:20 172:21 **Gregory** 1:45 6:12,12 habitats 88:14 94:31 39:32 45:8 49:4 55:35 60:44 61:21 68:18 173:12 131:15,15 140:40,40 haddock 128:46 given 17:9 42:8 48:47 **Hague** 162:21 69:19 77:13,30 80:43 grew 8:45 10:15 56:32 72:2 79:36 ground 9:28 19:41,43 88:12,13,28 100:2 hailing 64:22 149:2 150:13 151:39 83:26 93:37 127:11 grounded 88:10 half 32:17 73:13 84:20

groundfish 14:48 26:2

132:19 134:39 144:34

151:45,48 152:4

114:48 117:2 157:45

I			
161:1	153:48 154:2,5 172:1	163:37 168:47	Hill 9:43
hall 22:5	harpooners 154:9	heart 34:28 79:18	hire 112:19 125:13
hammerhead 22:40	Harris 1:46 5:31,31	Heather 7:28	172:39
81:8 84:1,5	harvest 9:29 12:12	heavily 69:46	historical 55:23 91:41
hammerheads 22:42	23:43 74:41 108:38	heavy 28:22	92:13 93:3 101:3
85:17	147:12 149:9 153:31	heck 27:46	103:2 155:9
hamper 131:10	170:37,44	held 16:3 23:8 57:44	history 17:30,31 27:27
hampered 121:30	harvested 109:22	76:45,46	81:43 92:35 133:37
Han 68:20	148:28 153:10	hell 131:43 160:9	155:46
hand 21:21 36:27 97:28	harvester 57:43	hello 6:32 85:41	hit 5:27 19:40 37:36
97:44,48 114:22,26	harvesters 57:23	help 13:20,43 14:38	59:27
130:48	170:44	17:16 18:10 20:26	hitting 136:5
handed 120:13	harvesting 109:40	44:13,34 57:28 60:43	Hogarth 16:9
handful 144:24 146:5	170:47	60:48 69:12 73:2	hold 43:39 171:34
handgear 147:7 152:4	Harvey 21:29	74:15,21,30 99:32	holders 27:26 38:44
handle 36:29 66:26	hash 88:33	109:3 121:37 122:7	42:16 155:20
74:19 75:23	hassle 142:25	122:22 149:46 171:45	holding 125:20
handled 74:45 127:17	hat 144:10 169:21	helped 125:33	holistic 165:43
handling 59:21 60:8	hate 34:9 93:25 127:42	helpful 118:44 133:42	holistically 62:22
67:34 74:40	Hatteras 6:11 34:1	133:48 142:45 169:38	home 10:17 16:17
hands 22:8	47:42 111:40 125:47	helping 10:18 22:5	21:37 32:4 67:7 72:11
hang 11:23 144:10	140:3	32:27 60:42 65:12	126:10 128:10 166:14
145:1	haul 59:48	148:46	166:26
hanging 152:5 167:18	haulback 103:31,40	helps 15:7 134:1	homeland 58:37
Hanke 21:45 81:39 82:5	105:24 109:14	144:31 152:29	honestly 172:25
HAPC 86:45	Hawaiian 142:39	Hemilright 1:47 5:33,33	honor 174:3
HAPCs 86:46,47,48	head 18:15 21:36 72:8	16:33 36:19 40:12,29	hook 9:15 77:26,30
90:32,33 91:2,7	74:6 79:26 84:33	41:14 48:38 77:5,32	103:35 109:47 135:12
haphazardly 41:20	138:18 142:31,33	119:3,22	135:31,41 136:35,39
happen 17:39 30:9	159:8	HEMILWRIGHT 168:20	137:2,15,23,41,42,44
41:36,38 48:41 69:40	headboat 45:28 63:40	herd 157:27	137:48 138:7,24,34
71:4 72:25 76:26	78:34	hey 11:21 165:4 173:31	138:41 140:35 141:31
128:36 138:8 145:16	headquarters 63:24	173:39	142:4,10 143:14
161:17 172:2	66:24 157:11	Hi 7:12 12:19 15:37	144:19 163:14 167:8
happened 17:32 70:11	heads 72:46 79:37	hidden 152:43	hooked 137:42,45
75:3 98:44	140:19 145:23 health 71:44,45	high 11:48 59:4,34 60:35 61:15 65:16,26	138:2 140:31
happening 17:33 22:25 24:17 40:34 104:6,46	hear 5:18,19 12:44	65:34,40,46 66:14	hooking 136:36 138:6,7 hooks 17:24 98:23,42
105:14 139:24	20:18 21:10,22 22:30	74:23 105:2 116:26	101:1,4 103:2,36
happens 36:6,7 43:45	31:43 32:18 33:39	116:30,41 118:30	104:23 110:7,9
104:42 147:3 161:18	38:20,23 40:39 43:36	127:27 147:28 152:28	135:43 136:7,18,22
161:19 167:7 170:19	49:7 58:8 73:43 83:33	153:21,24,26	136:27,33 137:4,9,20
happy 8:11 10:35 25:27	93:25 105:12 113:10	high-level 86:3 104:9	138:26,43,47 139:42
38:28 53:9 58:31	113:13,17 118:44	high-quality 152:41	139:44 140:30,31
63:18 73:43 83:33	142:15 153:3 161:4	high-volume 151:24	hookup 137:3,14 138:4
86:11 95:34 104:10	173:42 174:2	higher 31:12 59:31	hope 9:35,41,43 10:27
145:5 164:40 169:22	heard 9:25 35:45 40:40	80:41 88:19 145:36	10:30 19:18 31:44
172:25	50:17 51:16 62:38	167:18	32:18 33:45 40:3
Harbor 6:11 155:41	63:14,17 86:42 89:44	higher-volume 151:17	112:24,27 117:24
hard 15:5 21:9 54:16	92:6 108:31 110:16	highlight 68:42 78:1	121:36 142:28 171:16
58:39 67:23 93:21	111:42 115:13 126:42	113:28	172:43 173:5
138:28 140:11 141:43	135:33,34 138:9,11	highlighted 69:33	hopeful 66:13 122:29
160:10 163:40	138:12,36 144:33,34	88:41 133:5 165:41	124:33
harder 127:7 165:33	153:34 154:1 163:38	highlights 68:2,39	hopefully 8:30 23:15
hardship 72:20	166:3	113:31	24:6 31:27 34:11 62:2
harmonize 132:27	hearing 10:46 17:37	highly 1:10 3:3,5,10,12	70:39 105:36 108:26
harpoon 55:35 145:48	20:40 21:20 24:30	3:16,21,24,28,30 8:33	112:34 118:5 127:48
148:17,30 151:45	97:41 145:15 152:31	17:45 57:22	hoping 5:14 22:29
	I	I	I

40:41 81:33 122:20 ICCAT 1:43 6:6 12:41 impetus 33:33 45:38 73:46 74:2.13 47:25 13:12 16:5 23:44 173:3 include 59:40 70:32,43 **IMPLAN** 117:21 Horizon 29:14 34:15,25 27:45 28:25 31:24,25 83:39 86:23,23 98:6 implant 27:4 89:16 55:8,19 60:34,37 65:9 120:7 121:24 host 18:42 174:14 65:19,25,28 66:1,3,8 implement 109:33 included 25:43 60:10 66:15 162:39 hosting 11:38 122:28 128:40,43 87:8 89:3 92:44 93:2 hot 85:42 117:34 ICCAT's 28:13 130:38 101:35 121:1 131:3 ice 58:38 72:19 101:44 implementation 24:11 hour 72:11 80:47 includes 16:22 23:27 114:21 129:7 144:45 117:39 127:15 24:24 25:9 29:13,27 55:35 62:4 76:40 145:6 151:9 164:40 **ID** 23:9 60:15 105:39 54:27 119:39 120:2 80:30 98:7 122:5 122:12 128:25 130:4 172:25 134:28 173:10 166:36,36 135:35 137:20 143:29 idea 29:48 80:11 81:26 including 27:36 38:41 hours 36:11 49:5,37 58:34 59:32 72:26,30 82:37,38 83:23 86:3 implemented 19:36 39:3 50:32 51:26,28 88:24 90:28 160:34 26:27 51:7 109:39,43 85:17 102:22 105:2 103:42 128:46 129:4 129:6,8,12,13 156:39 ideas 29:28,31 98:47 136:1 151:37 121:5 138:37 143:17 169:29 implementing 49:31 166:38 157:20 173:16 identical 155:23 85:25 97:43 house 10:20,20 inclusion 90:11 houses 95:18.33 identification 60:16 import 28:28 33:18,31 inclusive 41:24,32 **Hudson** 1:48 5:44,44 64:41 81:43 82:11 importance 12:11 incomplete 112:40 10:41 83:35,36 84:10 83:2 103:27 131:1,9 90:35 108:33 165:19 173:2 important 9:19 13:17 inconsistent 109:45 84:35 95:14,15 96:4 104:20,20 110:27 identified 56:23 82:12 14:41 15:4 16:26 incorporate 120:21 112:36 88:15,30,46 89:2,14 20:42 50:3 54:12 incorporating 44:40 **Hueter** 2:9 5:46,46 90:43 120:12,16 67:17,42 73:24 74:39 96:3 124:41 93:33 94:16,31 95:10 33:15,16,37 75:14,42 131:7 increase 9:29.29 26:1 100:40 128:21 129:16 76:2.5.11.16.22.37 identifier 49:12 43:1 51:34 52:47 53:1 91:39 92:18 93:6 identifiers 50:21 129:43 153:5 54:5 58:11,44 59:3,6 identify 42:2 60:3 70:44 104:43 105:37 importantly 79:16,29 80:40 83:15 101:24 82:8 92:39 94:31,41 **imports** 12:37 28:33 huge 15:17 57:21 61:2 101:28,33 132:9 116:17,33,34,37 108:24 33:20,25 147:45 148:19 162:18 131:10 identifying 64:13 82:1 **imposed** 78:13,14 162:39 impractical 39:9 hull 64:26 89:29 120:8 increased 51:19.23 impressive 119:1 human 60:3 103:5 if-you-don't-comply-... 87:40 101:25,42 125:44 102:17,27 104:33,41 **humane** 74:40 169:2 **improve** 14:32 120:5,25 hundreds 127:14,14 ignorant 76:29 147:39,44 163:12,19 **II** 6:15 29:7 121:21,29 122:9,14 **hurricane** 21:29,32 increases 134:9 illegal 49:21 68:43,45 152:23 153:30 166:30 increasing 48:6 80:18 67:2,5 99:16,19 69:13,35 71:36 74:8 105:2 159:27 160:14 111:25 167:41 hurricanes 21:26 83:27 74:22.31 **improved** 120:22 incredible 75:20 **Hutt** 3:16 33:3 114:26 illegally 34:9 69:18,37 121:45 136:38 incredibly 108:19 114:29 117:45 118:45 74:24 improvement 82:41 incumbent 112:2 119:17,25,30,38 image 153:15 137:8 150:44 152:3 independent 95:45 imaginable 127:42 109:10 122:42 123:19,39 124:45 158:13 125:27,42 126:41 immediately 89:19 improvements 81:20 indicated 31:17 110:46 indication 100:2 129:45 impact 36:41 37:3 108:12 166:38 51:33 53:38 55:2 indicative 113:36 hydraulic 36:26 improves 134:7 79:36 96:37 109:30 hydraulics 36:31 indicator 169:14 improving 81:20 111:25 112:41 124:37 130:46 individual 4:23 19:47 impacted 34:28 in-season 22:34 80:21 30:39 38:24 50:28 lan 7:24 impacts 31:38 34:24,31 inappropriate 74:31 77:33,33,34,35 91:19 52:16,24,32,37,44,48 98:43 113:46 147:2 **IBQ** 50:30,31,35,37,39 inasmuch 34:17 54:3 81:9 99:35 incentive 26:9 173:12 individuals 53:23 70:24 50:46,48 51:9,14,19 51:25,29,35,38,45 100:19 101:25,40,47 inch 64:16 159:25 113:48 156:9 102:3 106:27 114:35 indulgence 172:30 52:18,23,25,29,30,35 inches 163:42 115:37 industry 6:1 49:34 incident 74:24 52:42,43,46,48 53:27 impediments 65:22 **incidental** 83:8,15 71:20 160:47 161:24 53:28 54:28,34,44 55:6,16,25 56:28 impending 67:5 107:22 168:42 170:42 173:4 imperiled 108:20 173:12 103:23 155:24 incidents 60:23 61:22

inevitable 132:17 inference 37:20 influence 8:30 influx 28:45 inform 99:33 149:46 152:29 **informal** 10:29 18:42 172:48 informally 10:32 11:29 18:45 80:47 173:44 174:7 **information** 9:20,21,34 9:36 15:21 19:16,17 24:45 53:8,30 58:27 60:10,23,25 62:3,4,24 63:11,11,18,33 66:9 66:18,37,39 69:47 75:41 81:15,43 85:22 85:47 86:5 88:7 92:28 92:35 95:7 96:34 100:24,27,33 102:26 102:28 103:37 106:19 106:23,39,40,45,46 108:36 109:47,48 115:36 125:21.25 130:26 133:7 134:10 136:6,25 143:18.22 143:36 146:38 149:46 155:16 informed 32:1,2 50:1 78:3 108:37 inaest 137:37 inhabitant 92:26 inherent 128:26 inhumane 75:1 initial 30:1 54:27 163:41 166:39 initially 135:48 136:7 **initiated** 75:4 85:45 86:31 initiating 122:21 125:11 **initiative** 30:12,14 61:20 65:27,35 initiatives 30:18 injuries 113:39 injury 113:37 input 10:7 19:46 24:19 27:30 30:41 31:14,23 31:31,40 32:14 47:5 99:30 130:34 135:22 135:38 inseason 55:30,32,34 145:30 147:20 insert 153:18 inset 89:32 inshore 147:35 150:1 153:25 158:33,34 inside 100:28 108:1

140:19 167:12 insist 165:33 **inspect** 48:44 inspected 42:3 70:19 78:35 **inspection** 47:47,48 65:16,27,34,38 66:10 66:14 70:21,28,32,35 70:41 78:37 inspections 70:23 78:2 78:33 inspectors 78:46 instance 42:37 71:22 96:14 112:24 136:25 141:45 instances 87:33 Institute 6:5 institutionalized 56:26 insulting 161:38 167:5 insurance 27:40 intact 72:46,46 **integrate** 121:13,20 124:38 Integrated 30:11 intend 39:17 43:42 50:2 intended 31:3 135:20 **intends** 38:40 intensive 105:7 intent 37:45 39:7,15 40:27,29 41:46 42:5 49:35.44 62:25 155:40 intentions 47:44 interact 91:24 interacted 112:26 intercept 120:40,46 122:43 intercepted 121:35 168:12 intercepts 124:18 interdiction 59:33 interest 47:6,22 50:14 89:27 146:37 interested 8:27 29:20 30:6 40:17 53:12 57:33 88:2 91:28 145:14 173:18 interesting 8:37,37 9:16 17:34,44 49:6 77:39 interests 29:38 122:14 **interim** 148:6 internal 24:16 30:17 internally 151:8 international 7:4 8:39 12:32 15:44 17:46 27:45 28:20,23,27,34

29:8 32:8 86:26

internet-based 75:34 interpretation 53:43 54:1 113:44 138:25 intersecting 91:26 interview 123:5 128:19 interviewing 128:17 **interviews** 127:31,36 128:18 intro 19:38 introduce 7:9,22,47 8:25 10:25 introduced 32:30 introduction 37:17,19 intuitive 44:5 investigate 81:29 investigation 75:4 investigations 11:5 investment 46:31 invite 58:16 172:13 173:43 174:5 involve 74:13 124:1,8 involved 10:42,43 16:36 17:29 48:23 53:21 63:26 65:15 71:44 74:25 75:17 80:23 103:11 131:32 135:39 167:31,32 171:7 **iPhone** 164:5 Irishman 145:5 Irma 21:32.45 **Island** 6:39 15:1 45:10 69:1 89:48 90:4 islander 140:9 **Islands** 81:28 **issuance** 25:44 26:20 102:21,45 **issue** 9:7 11:10,35 12:10 14:2 15:18,34 20:14 33:38 34:7,43 35:4,7,14,20,22,31,37 36:47 38:32 39:12,27 40:6 43:14 46:37 47:7 50:19 54:12 56:46 57:11,12 61:3,29 62:15,21 69:35 70:34 78:20,40,47 93:23 97:35 99:45 102:32 105:30 124:2,4 129:18 131:10,33 134:35 135:7 138:15 141:22 156:35 160:47 164:29,45 165:29,42 167:11 168:35 169:1 issued 23:3 26:21 37:10 49:12 63:33

119:16 136:10

internet 67:31 75:36

69:26 94:2.2 99:35 102:33,42 111:28 156:9 165:19 issues 4:34 8:21 9:6,9 10:33 13:26 18:16,32 18:33,37 19:30 20:19 32:9 35:46 36:1 37:32 41:1,5,8 50:15,20 58:6 62:8,39 63:27 66:26,27,27 70:27 77:48 78:16 83:46,46 99:10 114:9,22,25 120:43,44 127:41 137:20 156:4 157:29 163:41 issuing 26:43 48:40 100:38 it'd 130:33 it'll 17:34 28:19 67:39 125:22 132:1,14 item 58:15 157:6 items 173:25 **IUU** 33:21 61:30 lwicki 2:10 6:2,2 32:23 117:29,29 118:9 157:37,37 158:38

J 1:40 **J-** 137:40 138:6 **J-hook** 137:2 140:9.21 **J-hooks** 136:21,26,32 137:4,15,16 138:3 139:31,35 140:15 Jack 3:20 63:23 Jackie 7:44 **January** 19:22 23:23 28:30 40:43 41:6 99:32 149:4,11,23 150:14 152:34 **Japanese** 166:36 **Jason** 1:32 6:22 125:28 125:30 154:39 156:48 jaw 137:45 **Jeff** 2:16 7:5 54:8,24 55:10,24 64:5,33 70:16 112:21 164:41 166:1,2,27 173:31 174:6 Jeff's 20:47 55:4 Jen 85:35 **Jennifer** 3:10 7:30 jeopardize 110:3 **Jersey** 6:3 69:42 72:29 146:29,33 158:1 **iob** 13:21,29 16:6 66:38 74:17 104:48 118:21 118:40 123:11 132:7

154:21 jobs 117:22 **jog** 100:10 **John** 1:43 6:4 58:18 66:18,21 68:20 131:3 170:3,31 join 8:11 joint 65:32 66:5 75:31 Jonathan 63:25 **Js** 143:9,34,37 Judith 6:39 **July** 77:10 117:33 146:47 147:37 149:42 153:28 158:25,37 160:5 170:6 jump 11:24 18:19 64:5 75:7 79:24 97:25 110:40 111:16 114:8 135:9 152:15 164:38 jumped 16:31 jumps 46:7 118:22 **juncture** 172:17 June 25:34 29:18 52:8 77:10 146:32 149:41 150:7.19 158:2 160:1 160:19 jurisdiction 61:12 99:41 iustification 90:10

K

iuvenile 12:31 98:34

101:26 107:18

justified 97:9

Kane 3:18 7:34,34 169:39,46,46 170:30 170:35 **Katie** 2:27 3:23 6:18 33:14 41:45 44:24 46:16 58:16,19 63:6 63:32 65:2 106:1 108:4 122:35 123:28 127:19 129:25 130:44 131:13 135:9 168:1 keep 12:25 24:18 55:8 60:31 66:30 92:46 104:38 105:10,43 112:6,11 137:20 146:41,48 160:10 161:5 167:23 172:14 keeping 28:4 66:39 78:3 146:35 Kemmerer 3:20 62:5,47 63:3,23,23 64:9,10,20 78:30 **Kemmerer's** 63:20 kept 101:15,22 138:16 148:18

kernel 87:17 Kerstetter 79:30 99:14 key 14:22 111:2 113:45 120:1 137:46 **Kevs** 42:30 48:29 kick 36:28 kid 132:10 kill 11:31 killing 109:40 kinds 18:16 33:39 76:23,32 165:22 **Kirby** 2:19 6:24 kit 134:38 kits 134:42 Kluck 2:11 5:35,35 21:35 110:12 knew 8:18 knots 139:29 142:38 knowing 66:11 84:15 85:32 147:27,27 knowledge 60:39 known 73:42 110:20 **knows** 5:24 166:34 **kudos** 105:8 108:39 111:38

LA 125:32,38

Lab 33:16 89:17

label 88:22 labeling 14:18 Laboratory 5:47 lack 59:16,20 83:1 131:8 laden 127:26 lag 151:14,17,23 lancha 61:39 land 17:11,17,19,35 30:23,27 37:3 40:24 50:2 57:44 72:45 109:32,36 143:3 161:33 162:22 170:14 landed 30:29 34:9 40:20 80:33 81:44 82:12 98:19,29 135:4 141:40 143:6 144:4 148:11,32 149:23,40 150:9 159:12 160:1 landing 16:35,47 17:11 27:35 30:22 43:4 49:5 109:40 149:26 150:21 160:21,26 166:35 landings 25:19 27:27 28:4 50:32,40 52:40 80:24 81:27,30 98:26 101:43 102:28 119:25 121:23,28 124:46 134:3 143:17,25

149:5 151:31.46 158:27 159:29 160:3 160:10,14 162:18,29 162:40 163:12,19 landlines 127:46 landmarks 89:47 **laptop** 15:10 laptops 150:37 large 9:25 15:41 22:40 22:41 28:45 65:29 87:3 98:27,41 112:36 116:15 121:47 146:38 146:43 148:18,21,22 148:32,39,40,46 149:20 154:6 168:13 largely 95:12,47 101:45 larger 30:26 58:47 148:20,21 larvae 34:25,27,31 **larval** 34:16 lasted 114:40 115:46 146:15 lastly 122:8 146:32 Latchford 86:10 late 56:22 79:42 85:37 104:25 151:21,31 168:28,33 latest 26:17 93:8 105:13 Laughter 108:42 launches 61:29,32 Lauren 86:10.14 law 3:8 60:38,42,44 61:10,21 65:37 67:18 67:19 71:2 73:14,43 74:21,29 77:8,16,45 133:45 165:12 Lawrence 89:21 laws 77:2 **lay** 120:10 **lavers** 46:24 **lb** 141:47 lead 29:13 62:4 101:30 108:12,27 122:23 leader 141:46,46 leadership 4:13 15:32 17:35 67:38 68:19 leads 28:21 lean 144:20 learn 8:29 10:32 112:10 learned 8:42 9:24 66:2 122:29 139:43 140:30 159:42 160:11,16 learning 8:23,40 113:1 **lease** 51:14,29,36,45 52:18,22,25,29,35,46 53:19,21,23 154:48 155:18,21

leased 53:31 154:48 leases 155:15 leash 105:10,43 113:4 leasing 51:25 52:48 53:19,24 155:31 leave 21:36.41.48 48:4 49:36.45 83:28 123:2 153:23 171:5 174:21 **leaves** 17:13 led 97:17 149:37 left 55:18 96:8 128:31 133:24 155:44 169:10 **leftover** 53:26 135:10 legal 33:28 74:4 107:4 107:29 144:4 161:34 legality 71:7 legally 33:34 74:18 99:26 141:40 legislation 33:41,41 lemon 86:47 91:8 length 16:10 82:17 lessons 66:2 122:29 let's 7:32 10:38 33:13 38:12 42:29 46:32 55:10,11 57:37 70:14 83:30 104:18 105:48 114:18.25 127:18 132:37 142:15 171:25 **letter** 27:7 170:4 lettering 64:43 letters 23:4 26:43 27:12 27:32 64:17,30 131:18 level 8:31 11:41 13:4 46:12 51:8 58:40 59:44 61:15 66:31 100:12 101:3,14 102:47 110:34 159:15 leveled 159:19 levels 12:1 102:22 133:46 license 97:13 127:34 172:39,39 licensed 63:44 lie 144:7 lies 33:38 **lieutenant** 66:42,44 68:33,36 75:43 77:29 life 39:3 42:13 81:42 88:37 91:42,47 92:34 95:11 light 156:12 likewise 67:2 lily 167:31 limit 22:41,43 71:25,26 73:16 80:19,21,38,40 80:41,42 83:16 103:42 119:18 146:14

II
146:18 147:41 148:14 148:18,22 149:12,15 150:21 160:21,25 170:21
limitation 141:41 limited 11:19 13:18 15:26 69:38 81:47 100:23,45 138:40
limiting 50:40 limits 22:37 23:31,35 101:37 103:22 145:31 146:21 147:22 148:47
149:5 151:2 153:21 153:24,26,28,37,38 157:26 160:12,13
162:46 line 57:20 60:19 62:47 63:3,4,20 64:8,28 77:26,30 95:24 100:7
103:38 104:29 123:30 126:11 133:34 137:39 139:33,39 161:26 162:21
lines 38:5 44:27 163:35 lingering 113:2 link 29:24 67:33 85:4 91:17
linked 61:48 102:11 linking 108:22 links 25:25 Lisa 1:44 5:42 46:33
97:24 106:1,24,47 108:3 110:42 Lisa's 110:42 list 12:39 23:14 29:2,3
70:5 80:30,34 83:42 83:45 84:8,9,24,26,32 84:48 101:7 172:27 listed 74:9 85:16
listen 32:3 161:46 169:21,26 listened 164:44 listening 9:45 132:33
listing 29:7 32:36 listings 85:26 listserv 25:22 91:16 literally 16:27
literate 126:2 litigation 83:46 little 5:15 8:18 9:44 14:28,38 16:16 17:13
18:47 19:26 22:7 23:32 24:26 25:28 28:36 29:10,33 32:17 34:36 40:18,41 41:20 41:25 48:11 50:8
63:34 65:20 67:34 74:15,21 79:43 85:2

85:20,37 88:32,48
94:41 96:38 97:21
99:36 112:8 116:31
116:45 117:2 119:10
122:47 123:4,31,38 127:7 128:3,3 135:37
136:5 143:22 144:31
145:1,36,40 147:46
157:25 159:17,19
160:38 166:26,46
168:6,26 173:22,30 174:21
live 10:11 103:27
126:29 133:19 138:44
lives 10:16
living 160:7
load 15:43
lobby 18:43 lobster 34:47 35:14
local 70:37 79:4 80:9
91:27
located 96:14 135:18
locations 91:2 96:41
124:10 127:30 logbook 27:19,33 29:42
29:45 40:20 103:12
103:21 121:2 126:1
161:25 166:15
logbooks 30:6 102:11
102:29 121:9 125:5 125:12 166:11 168:28
168:33
logic 55:5
logical 94:19 141:48
logistics 20:28 long 10:35 57:34 69:1
89:48 92:2 93:7 101:7
110:21 126:9 131:35
154:22 172:27 173:9
174:11
long-term 9:33 29:26 29:28 102:7 122:24
long-winded 158:23
longer 16:4 52:19,25,34
78:22 92:9 94:7 98:36
98:39 114:13,40
131:32 140:43 145:1 167:39
longfin 72:16
longline 4:31 9:11
18:34 22:46 29:17
37:25,36,42 49:34
50:34,37,41 52:33,38
55:30,35 56:11,13 57:3 97:30 98:11 99:1
102:4 103:20 107:15
110,20 155,10 20 20

168:42 171:15 longline-caught 167:19 longliner 147:6 155:23 155:23,24 longliners 55:11 155:1 longlines 59:37 look 8:40 13:10 14:11 17:37 26:4 30:22 31:23,26,39 32:1 33:46 40:15 44:35,45 48:10,40 55:33,42,44 56:39 57:21 60:27,34 63:36 65:4 77:38 78:2 78:5 82:17 87:39,48 87:48 88:21 89:31,40 89:42 91:20,25 92:9 92:41 93:3,7,10,38 95:31,35,42,43,44,47 97:21 100:31 113:47 115:25 117:31 118:17 122:20 126:20 128:42 130:35 139:3 146:39 147:21 149:11,15,26 150:3,19,26 151:10 151:13,17,24,47 152:41 155:14 158:39 159:11 161:39 164:27 169:6,9 171:16 looked 69:4 82:27,30 88:45 90:3 97:9 101:2 101:6 106:39 115:20 115:24 124:12 125:44 137:1 152:33 159:7 168:12 looking 5:15 11:37 21:40 25:29 27:34 29:45 30:34 31:21,30 34:18 41:23,32 44:41 48:22,46 49:16 50:16 50:45 51:16,37 52:24 52:32,44 53:28,38 58:32 62:21 71:13 75:36 77:47 78:20 88:25 90:30 91:22,29 92:19,47 104:1 107:48 110:39 112:8 112:18 115:29 116:34 121:13,20,22,43 122:8,14 123:34,40 124:29,40 125:16 136:19 146:6,39 147:10 149:3,4,5 151:16,23 152:23,33 156:20 160:37 164:18 168:38 169:7,42 170:8,39 171:2 looks 9:3 37:14 112:9 147:2

loose 126:25 Loren 3:26 7:17 67:3 lose 76:44 **losing** 116:38 **lost** 56:18,19 72:23 93:5 97:47 **lot** 8:12,35,44,48 9:15 9:21 11:1,2 12:42 13:24,24 15:5,19,24 17:29,30 18:21 21:46 24:16,21 26:39 28:27 29:34,35 41:4,17,20 45:46 48:7 49:17 55:43 57:38 58:8 62:27,43 68:9,15 72:23,44 74:7,13,25 74:36 75:9 80:15,33 81:13 82:10 83:25 85:47 89:22,44,46 90:5,18,21,48 98:44 104:5 105:39 112:10 112:16,48 118:32 123:23 124:19,21,22 124:29,36 126:9 129:39 131:26 132:32 136:2 137:13 139:21 139:43 142:19 147:33 148:25 149:34,37 150:28 153:8,19 158:15,16 160:35 162:37,38 163:13,15 163:16,34 166:42 169:29 172:45 **lots** 12:21 25:15,15 74:18 loud 31:41 loudly 152:31 154:1 **Louisiana** 6:23 125:32 lounge 174:15 love 85:22 173:43 lovely 80:45 **low** 26:32 51:44 52:9 113:32 152:45 153:28 lower 59:30 101:43,44 153:15 160:28 lowering 160:13 **LPS** 114:27 120:17,22 120:32,39,44 121:17 121:17,35 122:21,28 122:38,42,44 123:18 123:32,40,48 124:6 124:43 129:29,34 130:18 159:35 **LT** 3:7 68:35 71:36 72:37 75:48 76:4,8,15 76:19 77:26 luck 12:21 105:43 lucky 10:21,22 167:7

110:29 155:19,20,30

160:46 161:24 167:27

Luke 1:46 5:31 lunch 18:31 19:20 75:13 78:25 79:9 80:47 lure 135:44 137:27 138:21 140:15,17,20 142:33,38 lures 138:16,22 144:37 luring 141:13 **mackerel** 139:36 **MAFAC** 13:11,13 **Magnuson** 27:9 68:30 Magnuson-Stevens 96:28 mahi 11:47,47 47:23 72:41,41,42,42 73:1,1 mail 130:21 132:48 **mailing** 134:15 **mailings** 167:44 main 46:22 120:37 126:41 127:3 Maine 7:13 118:3 120:33 146:33 155:38 162:17 maintain 50:43 51:41 58:39 138:46 167:10 maintaining 9:31,33 105:1 major 5:10 28:3 58:44 58:44 109:23 116:15 majority 38:46 43:3 48:25 76:19 77:36 115:3 149:30 150:20 making 5:6 13:1 26:5 53:23 54:45 71:31 93:34 120:48 122:3 122:25 144:47 162:4 mako 28:2 76:21 makos 76:20,20 **Mammal** 12:36 man 37:18 manage 10:6 97:19

man 37:18
manage 10:6 97:19
108:13 132:16,20,22
134:1 145:35 152:26
154:35 158:18 162:5
managed 12:42 86:22
155:27 170:11
management 3:4,6,11
3:12,17,21,25,29,31
4:29,36 5:34 6:8,40
8:19,32,48 9:23 10:5
14:1 15:25 18:33,39
22:35 23:23 24:23
77:7 79:10,24 80:15
80:17 81:3,6 82:37
83:6 99:6,39 108:28

114:24 119:48 121:10 131:34,46 132:20 133:45 163:8 169:19 manager 58:23 99:18 171:12 managers 134:9 171:11 managing 108:19 150:32 154:17 156:17 mandate 12:4 mandating 33:8 mandatory 30:3 35:48 166:20 manner 172:37 map 88:26 110:33 150:26,33 **mappers** 91:23 maps 86:11 88:21 89:32 91:1,18 March 29:4,18 95:21 104:26 146:31 147:29 149:8,11,16,24 **marched** 147:40 Marcos 21:44 79:29 81:39 82:5,5 Marcus 1:40 6:20 Margo 3:28 19:37 20:26 20:42 21:17 32:21,22 32:23,34,43 33:17 34:14 37:31 44:15,26 83:23 97:21,29,44 98:1 104:13 106:26 108:40 114:7 121:7

125:36 135:29 144:28

153:9 165:13 169:20

Margo's 18:26 79:34

marine 5:47 6:5,13,25

7:13 12:6,36 15:20

63:10,32 71:43 78:46

131:16 136:48 140:41

33:16 58:38 62:3

81:24,39 117:47

Maritime 61:19

marked 88:33

market 52:25 53:1

102:6 166:36

marlin 69:29 101:17

119:5,7,7,11,12

139:25,28,30,31

141:14 142:24

115:14 118:46 119:5

136:11,12,25,30,31

137:22,24 138:1,43

140:5,29 141:4,6,6,10

markets 152:48

MARK 2:21

173:23,47

marinas 123:45

145:34

Marshall 2:13 7:1.1 45:25 157:23 Martin 2:11,22 21:35 Marty 6:14 12:18 19:32 48:36 49:25 104:19 106:1 111:16 159:1 160:44 162:12,13 163:48 166:27 Marty's 164:43 166:7 **Maryland** 1:26 5:40 126:45 **Maryland's** 126:36 **mash** 126:6 Massachusetts 6:44 35:44 70:34 77:21 90:4 109:20 126:36 126:37 127:2,9,29 162:15 massive 116:4,24 144:26 **master** 63:43 match 11:7 matches 80:42 mate 128:30 material 138:19,24,29 139:18 141:13,46 materials 62:30 134:37 math 109:3 matter 38:15 74:44 79:11 114:15 151:39 158:45 174:23 maturity 86:20 maximize 9:28 maximum 23:47 103:1 103:42 106:31 McHALE 3:21 7:38.38 22:2 45:36 48:17 64:33 145:3 155:3 156:3,41,48 158:10 159:34 163:33,39 168:6 169:24 171:44 McLaughlin 145:27 mean 9:37 46:41 49:32 49:33 55:6 65:17 93:11 94:28 95:34 106:7 109:12,16 112:13 116:6,8 117:32,40 118:19 125:11,12 127:13 129:47,48 141:17 156:26 158:7 160:17 162:23 164:18,23 165:33 166:4,9,10 167:4 170:9 meaning 74:33 means 46:31 144:4

147:13 155:44 157:5

158:27 161:31

meant 142:40 measure 11:17 41:47 126:23 measurements 30:25 85:5 measures 4:24 27:48 28:6,14 50:29,45 109:34,39,43 measuring 82:2 meat 76:7 mechanism 134:29 135:1 mechanisms 166:33 media 75:22,37 150:29 154:16 median 115:46 116:11 116:32 medium 148:18,22,32 148:40,47 154:6 mediums 148:21,39 meet 8:24 10:26 15:38 39:2 43:35 51:13 61:14 86:9 119:47 154:34 meeting 1:15 5:5 9:3 10:28 13:11,12,15 17:1 18:19 19:28 20:28 21:6 22:13,15 24:29 25:19 27:17 31:15,25,26 33:46 34:6 37:33.48 38:29 48:9 58:27 63:30.34 65:6 77:44 79:36 80:3 80:7,13,45,46 82:26 84:11 85:16,21 86:15 93:26 99:5 105:13,47 108:31,32 112:4 113:5,22 117:26 129:36 130:23 135:24 138:10,37 145:10 159:37 166:8 meetings 9:42 16:42 31:33 38:33 60:21 134:43 138:14 168:21 members 8:7 20:4,7 30:48 38:4 42:37 43:12 60:14,37 79:37 152:7 169:40 memory 31:20 168:26 mentality 157:27 158:19 mention 14:39 16:13 98:42 99:13 142:2 158:22 172:47 mentioned 18:41 25:30 29:41 31:24 33:17 75:45 83:37 87:42 108:22,30 112:4

126:4 133:41 143:39 144:1 147:21 160:33 merge 124:1,7 **merged** 124:6 merging 133:10 merit 174:8 mess 17:39 message 74:30 113:3 134:5 154:24 messages 134:4 met 1:24 58:21 80:44 86:37 107:31 159:45 method 87:14,18 94:14 160:13 methodically 71:2 methodology 24:32,40 86:43 87:14 methods 15:29 108:47 130:30 144:5 metric 23:45,48 24:5 54:47 55:31,46 148:12,13,31,35 149:13,17,22,40,43 150:8 154:45 155:6 159:19 160:22.26 metrics 151:35 Mexican 61:4,6,14,28 61:31,31 Mexicans 59:27 **Mexico** 8:46 22:39 23:28,28 34:16,21 54:29 59:6,25 61:40 80:26 90:17 104:34 104:37 115:6 119:44 139:22 142:5 146:31 Miami 70:7 110:14 mice 84:41 Michael 2:17,25 129:26 131:24 170:24 Mid 5:34 mid-Atlantic 33:10 47:6 47:29 48:26 59:4,23 77:7,44 115:4 126:8 mid-August 59:1 149:38 mid-July 25:42 mid-October 111:24 migration 104:34 migratory 1:10 3:3,5,10 3:12,16,21,24,29,30 8:33 17:45 57:22 mike 6:7,43 21:20 34:34 35:27 41:44 42:25 43:21 48:5,27 66:19 70:15 96:11 106:1 108:43,44 110:38 118:14 127:19 130:29 134:22 141:1 142:19

142:47 157:22 159:1 162:13 169:35 **Mike's** 169:12 mile 95:24 miles 70:45 95:22 162:26 163:2,6 170:18 Miller 2:14 7:24,24 8:2 38:7 million 116:27,30 131:5 131:6 **millions** 118:13 mimicking 137:31 mimics 138:32 mind 5:19 45:6 80:6 84:15 92:46 104:38 112:15 mindset 12:6 150:45 mine 166:7 minimal 155:7 minimize 50:41 108:26 minimum 30:24,27 51:1 51:9,13,41 52:4,15 106:32,34,35 110:42 115:48 minor 87:44 minute 5:17 23:2 31:30 101:5,39 123:8 170:34 minutes 21:24 38:13 40:8 114:8 123:14 139:6 160:33 mirror 166:6 mishandling 74:8 misidentification 59:43 121:32 131:8 misidentifications 90:24 misinformed 64:46 misled 13:39 64:28 missed 36:47 166:16 misses 137:29 missing 10:2 20:45 34:5 140:3,14 147:3 mission 58:35 59:32 **missions** 58:36 mistake 93:16 142:42 167:14 mistaken 160:5 mistreating 73:47 mistreatment 78:16 misunderstanding mitigation 96:36 mix 18:32 25:28 mixed 107:15,23 MMPA 12:36

mobile 32:24 157:9

model 44:12 88:43 90:8 165:23 models 88:10 89:4 modern 14:36 15:35 **modes** 159:26 modifications 138:45 138.48 modified 26:22 modifying 82:44 121:43 moment 99:15 141:27 momentarily 146:47 **Monday** 151:31 money 69:11,11 76:44 124:7 127:35 132:2 167:32 173:19 money's 127:39 167:31 monitor 134:2 monitored 26:10 172:8 monitoring 17:20 20:10 25:37,38 26:9 28:29 33:18,32 36:23,30 61:33 80:27 102:12 102:15,29 103:17 105:6 170:40 171:3,9 172:6 monkfish 71:26 mono 141:46 month 10:45 27:38 29:10 31:22 52:10

56:35 81:25 146:47 149:41 159:48 months 8:16 15:17 17:23 22:12 30:38 35:46 62:18 73:45 85:16 99:21 102:43 149:10,33 158:28 168:31 170:38,47 **Moore** 3:23 58:16,20 63:9 65:24 morbid 113:47 Morehead 127:13 morning 5:4 8:10,13,24 8:42 18:13,28,46,48 19:39 34:14 37:13 50:27 53:18 58:20 64:10 66:20 110:13 120:24 134:24 145:40 mortality 12:47 26:29 26:31,41 101:29 103:37 109:48 113:32 119:23 135:48 136:26 136:27,32,33 137:9 138:6,47 140:12,36 **MOTE** 5:46 33:16 81:39 mother 10:16 move 7:47 12:4 15:14

30:2 43:47 54:5

129:33 142:32 146:10

155:27 163:8 165:25 moved 56:9 154:14 movement 28:47 moves 104:17 moving 25:12 30:6 43:41 71:1,10 73:29 83:21 105:41 106:46 132:47 145:41,45,48 **MPA** 82:29 MRIP 114:27 119:39,41 119:45 120:14,18,40 121:19,35 122:11,17 122:30 124:44 126:14 126:16,29 127:26 129:30 130:6 **MSA** 10:46 muddy 32:47 multi-species 129:14 multiple 43:39 47:36 62:20 121:15 152:14 158:26,32 multipliers 126:17 Murdy 6:25 muscle 34:28

Ν

mutilated 34:2

NAFO 66:5 name 5:24 20:30 29:16 64:8 66:21 132:7 135:17 169:37,45 name's 6:37 Narragansett 110:29 narrow 40:46 42:23 43:47 narrowed 39:25 **national** 1:6 8:31,31 12:6 24:10,14,25 25:6 25:11 96:45 117:22 156:1 nationally 117:46 nations 61:23 65:29,43 65:48 natural 5:41 82:43 135:44 138:17,23,27 138:30 140:18,32 natural-artificial 135:44 naturally 116:17 nature 53:19 96:31 121:31 122:26 125:1 127:11 natures 124:47 nautical 95:22 Navarro 2:15 5:29,29 139:9 142:35 navigate 73:35 Navy 61:6 **NC** 136:48

near 28:48 29:32 68:13 104:8 163:11 174:5 **nearly** 117:6 necessarily 12:44 40:45 42:23 92:1,5 136:42 145:6 147:23 151:27,30 152:35 156:13 165:28 necessary 45:15 86:18 neck 118:40 163:20 **NECO** 6:30 need 11:11 12:24 13:4 13:28 14:15 18:3,6,14 20:17,18,19 21:3,41 21:43,48 25:45 27:2,4 27:7 31:43 33:11 36:1 43:46 44:34,46 48:10 49:10,25,41,42 52:1 56:33 57:16 62:24 72:27 73:34 75:39 76:23,25,30,32 79:1,4 79:35 81:3,14,14 94:5 97:5,25 105:31 108:36 109:2,25,27 115:36 120:4 121:10 126:12 128:24 129:24 130:47 132:26 135:2 140:46 144:30 156:23 157:3,4 158:35 162:38 164:27,27 needed 23:37 33:41 40:45 41:12 54:19 56:34,41 81:4 92:43 94:8 100:19 104:45 109:33 needing 21:36 25:2 73:28 **Needless** 150:43 needs 42:41 54:23 57:44 58:1 67:15 119:48 120:4 123:14 126:7 146:8,11 147:11 162:35 164:14 negative 34:31 36:41 37:2 136:2 negatively 51:26 negligible 164:34 negotiating 123:24 negotiations 27:48 neighbor 21:13 neighbors 10:18,22 neonate 89:36 90:11 never 8:34 42:30 93:9 134:33 153:33 156:40 163:28 **new** 5:16,39 6:3,8,34,39 9:1 14:42 15:21 16:25 24:45 26:28 27:47

28:16.16 29:16 30:8 33:41 35:17 37:18 38:39 47:29 48:25 58:22 67:28 69:3,41 69:42 72:29.29 75:24 87:8,34 88:6,35 89:43 91:7 97:31 108:11 121:2 122:28 125:5 130:9,13,21,39 139:44 141:18 146:29 146:33 153:35 160:34 news 13:38 67:44 75:37 82:36 112:30 159:22 newsroom 67:41 nexus 96:29 97:3,22 NGOs 74:27 **Nick** 156:46 NICOLAS 3:3 night 84:12 101:33 104:30 120:25 121:33 121:34 nightmares 126:15 nine 139:43 nineteen 92:25 nineties 16:38 26:28 **Ninety** 59:47 Ninety-three 46:3 NMFS 33:7 57:28 63:27 64:23 76:14 102:14 105:10 131:3 138:40 no-brainer 164:7 170:43 no-sale 39:36,38 42:32 44:19 **NOAA** 3:27 4:14 5:19 7:17 44:34 62:7 63:19 63:27 64:23 67:38 74:16 77:13 81:22 85:20 167:25 **NOAA's** 33:20 **NOAA/NMFS** 4:13 non-57:22 115:27 143:23 non-compliance 35:35 non-federal 69:22 non-offset 135:43 non-profit 81:37 non-reporting 164:45 non-response 115:17 non-tournament 143:26 non-transferred 55:48 noncompliant 161:10 **nonsense** 161:37 norm 145:17 normal 22:15 25:40

61:19 89:11,21,22 95:16 98:31,37 104:25,29 111:46 120:35 124:16 126:45 131:15,20 136:47 140:40 146:32 162:16 162:40 168:32 north-south 100:7 northeast 3:8 16:17 22:36 36:33 45:27,46 59:23 64:37 66:43,47 68:29,36,38,40 69:30 69:45 72:43,47 76:3 77:41 88:47 110:28 160:23 169:13 northern 22:32 23:42 90:17 102:35 northwest 170:36,46 **notably** 136:46 **note** 6:33 10:11 18:22 18:47 22:13 23:10 28:28 50:9 79:15,23 112:32 128:4 noted 54:7 92:19 109:8 noteworthy 67:47 notice 15:40 19:7 25:40 25:41 44:4 49:37 61:34 89:10 91:16 noticed 23:15,17 139:10 159:16 notices 25:23 55:39 148:4 noticing 75:10 notification 27:31 notifications 134:13 notified 127:24 **NOVAs** 71:16 November 99:28 148:27 **NPDES** 97:11 **NRDA** 89:15 **nuance** 43:25 **nuances** 62:44 number 5:12 11:4 14:7 21:30,33 22:16 28:14 30:37 31:16,28 40:21 42:2 45:9,10 46:1 49:15 55:7 59:5,47 63:27 64:23,26 65:29 78:36 85:17 87:20 98:13,17,31,40 99:9 101:35 106:31,32,34 106:35 109:10 110:28 110:42 111:4,10,37 116:6,8 120:16 126:47 134:28 145:29 158:40 159:16 163:28

23:46 28:1.2 43:12

163:29,32,33,37,40 168:23,24 170:11 171:8 **numbers** 11:27 12:12 42:18 46:3 48:18,30 56:16 58:47 64:14,16 64:31,32,41 68:11 93:27 101:5 117:22 118:6.7 126:30 127:32 128:15 134:40 146:41,46 149:40 150:18 152:1,16,40 152:43 154:6 157:12 157:43 158:11,36,39 158:44 159:10,11 161:41 163:43,44 numerals 64:30 numerous 16:41 nutshell 87:16 172:10

0 **objective** 96:24 160:39 objectives 50:39 153:12 154:34 obligated 42:1 obligations 10:2 observation 131:31 154:45 163:18 164:36 observations 154:29 162:15 163:22 observed 141:36 **observer** 17:22 60:22 95:47 100:30 103:5 103:22 105:2,20,20 105:22 106:5,16 128:17,19,28,32 168:28 observers 95:48 144:12

obtain 39:31 obtained 133:12 obtaining 102:8,28 obvious 141:20 obviously 5:10 33:30 35:13 54:45 78:22 103:16 125:4 156:15 168:47 169:14 occasionally 34:4

155:46 occasions 16:42 77:37

observes 128:19

observing 151:26

occur 36:12 61:22 102:36 103:45 110:7 136:29

occurred 110:1 133:40

160:4 **occurring** 110:8 119:12 119:14,19 136:12,14

Normally 172:21

north 6:12 7:5 8:17,36

54:40 70:11 79:17 159:21 136:16 over-wintering 104:34 107:31 113:41 128:8 **opposing** 153:32 overages 53:41 occurs 103:38 opposition 25:44 86:44 Ocean 29:27 130:12 138:35 145:17 overall 36:41 81:12 Oceana 11:13 116:1 124:8 147:14 156:27 160:45,48 opt 48:7 oceanic 1:6 29:1,15 one's 168:14 optimal 147:14 159:18 one- 127:22 optimize 50:43 overdue 97:8 32:36 85:18 oceanographic 108:23 one-fish 151:2 Optimizing 120:25 **overfished** 119:11,13 oceanwide 72:48 **one-stop** 41:33 optimum 11:42,42,47 136:11,13,15 one-year 81:34 12:5,7 overfishing 83:3 91:43 October 27:32 29:9 **Oden** 2:16 7:5,5 54:9 one/two 150:21 option 30:7 38:43 39:29 93:22 98:37,39 39:34,41,42 42:27,31 64:6,10,27,48 71:15 ones 26:2 43:7 45:1 101:30 119:12,13,19 69:33 116:4 123:35 43:26 44:18,19 45:8 112:22 166:2,2 136:12,13,15 173:29,32,36,39 123:36 125:9 126:31 45:14,14,19 48:3 overhead 21:46 72:36 123:31 165:7 offer 12:19 32:46 96:33 130:13 159:22 169:15 overlap 30:15 154:21 ongoing 60:7 61:37,41 165:30 overlaps 85:23 offered 125:36 62:31 146:23 options 40:15,16 43:23 overly 39:9 online 28:29,35 31:7 43:33 44:29,40 49:8 office 3:8,26 7:18 14:46 overnight 17:40 75:3 91:23 103:48 74:4 oversight 58:46 22:5 28:20,23 67:18 67:19 68:25 70:38 132:39,42 133:15,18 orange 88:28 overview 4:16 18:27 134:17 141:25 172:36 oranges 106:8,9 73:43 74:16 79:4 19:4 21:17 22:21 open 8:7 9:38 15:9,10 order 18:4 20:33 40:47 38:30 66:29 86:3 98:5 87:36 91:30 95:8 150:25 151:28 171:12 23:22 29:27 38:5 42:24 43:47 44:44 104:9 135:29 officer 3:8 66:35 69:41 63:21 97:7 99:3 51:12 65:28 73:41 owe 142:27 69:42 100:15,31,32,37,39 81:42 85:38 96:41 owner 6:14 officers 62:37 66:46 100:44 101:13,21 100:18 108:36 110:48 owners 11:19 67:46 69:2.2.43.44 102:10,38 107:28,38 111:4.8 143:12.48 ownership 156:6 offices 15:8 118:46 161:6 169:48 144:8 161:8 162:22 Ρ officials 61:10 170:22 165:21 offline 29:20 84:33 **opened** 75:18 organization 5:24 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 170:29 opening 23:35 67:48 81:37 organizations 170:10 offshore 70:45 120:39 operates 67:20 **p.m** 79:12,13 114:16,17 operating 45:41 63:41 123:32,43,47 124:19 organizers 76:6,10,12 174:24 124:23,28 125:31,40 operation 95:20 167:27 organs 103:32 pace 160:10,14 126:47 127:5 147:35 operational 51:33 originate 16:18 **Pacific** 8:17,36 150:1 153:24 162:25 operations 66:24 75:32 originating 120:23 pack 118:19 128:6 114:35 120:14 122:18 162:26 163:6 **Orleans** 141:18 package 61:39 129:30 **ORTIZ** 3:24 80:1 84:4 oftentimes 137:16,37 packaged 129:38 141:39 142:7 144:9 operator 6:15 8:1 37:37 84:25 **packed** 32:16 144:20 38:2,3,10 63:2,4,20 otoliths 122:6 page 77:12 85:21 109:2 **Ohio** 128:7 115:45 116:31 133:23 ought 35:16 119:4 134:17 161:26 oil 29:14 34:31 152:42 133:25 134:13 138:14 **outcomes** 133:33 161:27 169:6 old 71:22 88:34 90:19 operators 44:20 76:6 outfalls 96:42 paid 111:5 155:46 114:38 115:2,18 92:5 outflows 96:22 **painless** 126:13 older 88:25 116:19 133:3,36 outlets 75:38 pair 97:47 134:40 143:19 144:6 **OLE** 11:7 44:34 58:17 **output** 90:8 Panama 23:11 144:21 63:8 64:4 66:48 68:14 outputs 117:21 panel 1:11,24 5:4 6:34 opinion 57:36 74:20 75:4 152:19 outreach 60:28 62:30 16:37,41 17:3 19:46 **OLE's** 63:19 138:5 69:31 74:18 80:8 20:4 21:31 28:17 opinions 28:42 Oliver 4:14 5:17 8:3.9 81:18 82:35 91:11 30:48 38:4 51:17 11:26 12:13 13:45 opportunities 9:32 10:1 72:38 73:10,23 130:48 133:42,47 15:16 17:42 61:16 20:5 50:43 61:5,9 134:37,42 135:1 panels 28:22 154:9 paper 15:11 30:6 36:4,5 onboard 17:21 25:47 157:3 164:29 26:7 34:40 35:1,6,8 **opportunity** 5:19 8:24 outrigger 140:33 36:10,14 46:18 65:32 8:28 9:4 20:20 51:30 35:14 46:7 95:48 outside 13:25 16:1 21:4 132:48 134:14 135:28 63:1 74:35 135:37 105:20,22 112:38 21:14 27:8 65:17 99:3 papers 34:24 82:15,27 169:41 170:14,20,44 108:2 139:38 145:17 170:41,42 172:3,4 93:8 once 10:19 16:3 18:9 **opposed** 26:41 45:10 outspoken 141:19 paragraph 88:3 80:26 102:20 139:35 37:48 49:17,46,47 over-sampling 120:28 parlance 107:16

part 8:15 10:42 15:27
22:18 25:27 26:3
36:30,45 41:22,46
42:5 44:16 48:8,48
49:1 55:46 57:6 59:11
63:37 64:2 72:1 80:18
89:8,13 90:31 94:39
95:2 98:33 115:19
120:45 122:37 124:3
127:45 128:37 129:9
129:9,17 134:37
143:31,32 155:24
163:7 164:28,36
167:19 170:3 172:43
participant 115:8,9
116:44 155:22,30,31
156:46
participants 51:15,24
114:36,48 134:42
155:9,18
participate 10:31 48:14
99:8
participating 29:37
30:16 35:44 69:10
101:41 102:4 115:10
116:5,7,10,45 117:10
121:6 125:48 128:5
147:11
participation 13:48
27:32 30:2
II narticillar 46 23 63 28
particular 46:23 63:28
84:38 86:12 91:25
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 partnerships 66:2
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 partnerships 66:2 parts 32:10 48:39
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 partnerships 66:2
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 partnerships 66:2 parts 32:10 48:39
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 partnerships 66:2 parts 32:10 48:39 party 46:7 61:42 65:25
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 partnerships 66:2 parts 32:10 48:39 party 46:7 61:42 65:25 66:1 69:20 72:8 73:12 73:13 167:1
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 partnerships 66:2 parts 32:10 48:39 party 46:7 61:42 65:25 66:1 69:20 72:8 73:12 73:13 167:1 pass 65:28
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 partnerships 66:2 parts 32:10 48:39 party 46:7 61:42 65:25 66:1 69:20 72:8 73:12 73:13 167:1 pass 65:28 passed 16:9 65:28
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 parts 32:10 48:39 party 46:7 61:42 65:25 66:1 69:20 72:8 73:12 73:13 167:1 pass 65:28 passed 16:9 65:28 passenger 73:8 78:39
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 parts 32:10 48:39 party 46:7 61:42 65:25 66:1 69:20 72:8 73:12 73:13 167:1 pass 65:28 passenger 73:8 78:39 passengers 46:29
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 parts 32:10 48:39 party 46:7 61:42 65:25 66:1 69:20 72:8 73:12 73:13 167:1 pass 65:28 passed 16:9 65:28 passenger 73:8 78:39 passengers 46:29 63:44 78:36
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 parts 32:10 48:39 party 46:7 61:42 65:25 66:1 69:20 72:8 73:12 73:13 167:1 pass 65:28 passed 16:9 65:28 passenger 73:8 78:39 passengers 46:29 63:44 78:36 Pat 36:18,36 79:17,21
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 partnerships 66:2 parts 32:10 48:39 party 46:7 61:42 65:25 66:1 69:20 72:8 73:12 73:13 167:1 pass 65:28 passed 16:9 65:28 passenger 73:8 78:39 passengers 46:29 63:44 78:36 Pat 36:18,36 79:17,21 79:22 127:19 129:25
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 partnerships 66:2 parts 32:10 48:39 party 46:7 61:42 65:25 66:1 69:20 72:8 73:12 73:13 167:1 pass 65:28 passed 16:9 65:28 passenger 73:8 78:39 passengers 46:29 63:44 78:36 Pat 36:18,36 79:17,21 79:22 127:19 129:25 130:42 155:37 164:40
84:38 86:12 91:25 95:18 103:41 147:3 149:4 particularly 13:7 14:34 22:35 66:34 75:2 94:34 106:42 108:15 120:24,27 121:16,32 136:43 141:10 165:29 partner 91:33 partnering 62:29 65:33 partners 60:37,47 69:46 75:32 partnerships 66:2 parts 32:10 48:39 party 46:7 61:42 65:25 66:1 69:20 72:8 73:12 73:13 167:1 pass 65:28 passed 16:9 65:28 passenger 73:8 78:39 passengers 46:29 63:44 78:36 Pat 36:18,36 79:17,21 79:22 127:19 129:25

```
patience 172:30
Patrick 1:33 5:38
patrolling 61:6
patrols 61:6
Patsy 170:23
patterns 150:18 158:33
pause 112:44
pay 28:39 51:34 57:30
 57:32 118:47 126:31
paying 46:29 102:43
PC-compatible 134:7
Pearson 7:36,36
pelagic 4:31 9:11 18:34
  19:34 22:46 29:17
 37:25,36,42 49:34
 50:33 55:11 57:3
 60:22 97:29 98:11
 99:1 102:3 103:20
 107:14 121:47 136:43
  146:38 155:37 160:46
  168:13,42
pelagics 137:2
pen 145:29
penalty 68:23 78:5
pending 69:28 99:22
Peninsula 69:16,43
people 11:2 12:28
  13:39 16:44 20:43
 23:13 26:28 41:43
 44:3.45 45:16 48:47
 56:32.46 57:13.35.38
 58:1 69:10 70:36
 71:32 72:10,31 73:9
 73:16,21 74:3,27
 75:21 76:12 77:38
 79:2 83:27 85:21
 89:44,46 92:6,31
 104:5,14 123:5,9,46
  125:22,24 126:24
  127:45 128:7,27
 129:24 131:32 132:5
 132:17 144:46 157:28
  157:29 161:36,42
  163:3 164:4 165:35
  165:47 167:17 170:1
  171:36 172:24 173:17
  173:43 174:5
people's 63:14 93:6
percent 16:47,47,48,48
 17:22 38:44 43:4,7
 46:3 48:13,16,22 49:3
 55:7,9,10,13,14 58:34
 59:47 87:17,24 98:28
 98:29 103:4,18,21
 104:36 105:28 113:33
 136:26,28,32,33
  149:26 150:14 152:5
  155:7,10 157:15,16
```

```
157:17,38 161:10,18
  164:12 166:30
percentage 48:14 54:22
 57:21 105:3 119:5
  121:40 128:39 148:43
percentile 115:47
perfect 12:23 160:30
 170:34
period 12:39 22:48
 25:42 26:19 29:3.22
  29:30 30:1 31:22
 36:43 52:10,19,26,34
 81:34 98:24 99:32,37
  102:19 103:46 106:18
  157:2 161:30,44
  166:40
periodic 105:46
periodically 20:11
 86:27 96:47
periods 92:2 99:24
 149:3
permit 4:21,32 9:12
  11:19 18:35 25:30
 26:13 27:26 34:43,47
  35:3 36:8,21 38:21,31
  38:44 39:35,37,37,38
  39:43 40:44 41:3 42:1
 42:4,16 43:27,41 44:9
  45:28,34,48 46:8,9,11
  46:17 47:31,32,37,45
  48:24,40 49:12 57:47
 59:16,20 62:23 63:40
 63:47 64:23 69:25
 70:8,30 72:15,28 73:5
  76:24,25,37,39 79:39
 80:20,39,43 82:6
 83:17 95:9 97:4,17,31
 97:32 98:6,48 99:45
  100:20 102:32,42
  110:23 111:3,7,8,28
  121:44 125:20 155:20
  156:5 158:40 161:28
  165:9,24,35,37
  166:20 168:35 169:3
  171:37,38 172:40
permit's 104:13
permits 11:2 23:4,6
 26:21,44 39:32 41:48
 43:39 46:8 47:19.30
 47:35,36 62:22 63:36
 64:39 78:21 94:2
 96:41,46 121:12,12
  125:19 156:7,8
  161:30 162:9 165:18
 165:30 170:13 171:47
 172:33
permitted 11:19 26:25
 27:2 33:10 36:4 42:10
```

47:18 48:20 76:48 97:14 125:25 135:4 **permitting** 76:30,35 78:12 172:36 Perry 21:26 persistent 98:27 person 32:45 53:25 70:37 72:2 78:43 79:2 110:22 128:28 168:22 168:35 personal 10:11 11:33 31:34 45:19 personalities 123:12 personally 11:31 105:12 perspective 8:38,39 45:9 93:4 112:22 133:3 perspectives 20:23 pertains 13:23 **Pete** 21:22 22:3,8 135:16 **Petersburg** 7:31,37,41 135:19 petition 29:1 phase 152:21 philosophy 9:40 phone 3:33 7:16 8:2 9:14 37:38 62:33 113:9 126:11 127:48 138:13 141:25 142:16 142:28 145:22 151:41 157:17,18 166:39 phones 21:2 **photo** 90:25 photographed 171:6 photographs 82:13 103:28 143:45 144:16 phylogenetics 82:31 pick 45:2 173:46 picked 110:22 **picking** 157:18 **picks** 137:32 picture 80:45 82:20,22 138:20 140:16 piece 15:11 46:18 135:28 piecemeal 41:25 **Pierdinock** 2:17 6:43 6:43 35:27,27 42:25 42:26 70:17 96:12,40 97:6,16 108:44,44 109:30 118:16 127:21 129:21 134:23,44 141:3,16 142:48 143:32 162:14 170:25 piggyback 113:24 pilot 17:25 29:41,44

35:44 108:11 122:25 123:41 128:6,16,38 130:8 ping 92:43 pink 88:28,41 piqued 146:37 piss 153:46 placard 20:30 placards 20:34 place 19:14 33:31 35:38 40:42 42:22,24 60:24 62:28 68:22 98:44 110:45 117:34 144:22 145:43 148:45 149:9 149:45 154:27 155:15 167:28,33 places 33:33 91:27,28 124:5 plan 19:28 24:11,14,24 24:28,43,47 25:3,9,11 25:12 51:27 54:41 79:46 119:39 120:6 120:13 122:12,17 129:29,46 planned 79:24 planning 25:15 29:29 30:17 129:28 131:18 plans 85:25 120:2 plastic 140:16,20 platform 66:6 platforms 12:24 71:3 play 11:3 17:31 141:41 146:7 150:6 played 153:42 playing 13:4 152:38 162:6 plays 5:14 plead 167:22 please 20:8,30 21:3,6 21:13,21,43 31:6 37:40 53:7,18 63:5 67:39 69:37 70:3 75:7 96:11 105:44 110:11 112:31 117:28 122:34 163:46 172:10 pleasure 59:5,9 66:22 plenty 22:24 152:43 162:42 43 167:17
96:11 105:44 110:11 112:31 117:28 122:34 163:46 172:10 pleasure 59:5,9 66:22 plenary 18:22

22:10 25:1 30:3 32:24
53:11 55:5 56:9,10
58:14 71:18,31,33
73:33 75:15,26 76:22
85:32,35 87:31 92:36 92:37 93:34 95:35,41
97:33 98:5,16,20
100:40 103:10 104:14
106:22 110:42 111:16
111:26 112:31 113:25
125:17 128:1 130:45
137:46 145:39 146:45 153:41 155:47 158:9
158:40 161:20 162:32
164:43 165:39 166:32
166:45 169:32 173:27
173:46 174:10,13
pointed 140:29 160:1
pointing 66:41 points 55:28 74:39
87:24 89:4,7 90:5,18
90:24,30 94:11,18
111:2,11 126:48
police 71:43
policies 38:35,36 74:5
policy 8:31 24:11,25 71:6 73:1
polled 45:6
pollock 128:45
pollution 58:38 60:23
96:46
polygon 87:25 88:27 polygons 88:35 89:31
polyurethane 139:17
poor 152:31,32
poor-quality 152:40
popped 38:32
popping 140:33 population 81:9 82:30
84:1 94:9,12 110:35
populations 84:14
port 61:28,35,36 64:22
64:41 104:24 158:31
170:18
portion 50:36 portions 13:32 120:46
ports 158:32
posed 98:47
position 8:16,28 58:23
positive 44:21 101:42
103:26 169:19 possess 27:3
possession 70:8,10
possibility 102:46
possible 11:39 24:20
160:40 164:2 167:10
possibly 72:15 91:31

```
post 16:3 93:38.41
  114:2 119:23
post- 136:19
post-release 135:47
  136:27 137:9 138:6
  138:47
posted 64:24 67:11,26
  68:2 75:21,37 103:48
  143:46
poster 30:47 31:9
  168:27
posting 68:15 104:4
posture 61:30
pot 35:14
potential 51:37 52:16
  52:24 60:23 82:4
  99:22,34 101:48
  102:1,2,45 109:32
  113:1 115:17 165:23
potentially 28:6 43:43
  46:38 52:29,48 80:42
  83:15 121:23 150:16
pots 124:7
pound 54:14 71:24,26
pounds 71:25,25
poured 71:47
power 111:1
PowerPoint 125:43
practice 33:22 45:26
practiced 61:24
practices 65:38
pre-storm 58:42
precautionary 81:5
precedent 84:28 142:12
precise 108:27
precision 120:26
predecessor 133:12
predicted 101:14,22,47
predictions 156:36
prefer 25:26 44:46 45:3
preferable 92:29
preference 50:11
preferred 45:8,20 48:4
 87:11 90:46 100:9
pregnant 92:27
preliminary 114:31
  146:46
premature 149:38
prepare 36:3
prepared 99:33
preparing 67:2,4
presence 91:41
present 1:29 3:1 63:8
  66:18 83:7 91:44
  93:41 117:26 118:7
presentation 25:27
  48:32 49:26 50:7
  53:33 64:4 65:3,5
```

77:6 79:33,40 85:9,11 93:36 94:24 118:4 119:9,37 120:10 122:37 125:38,43 133:1,4,5 135:20,29 154:42 presented 32:22 99:38 presenting 66:22 presently 36:3 preserve 153:44 president 74:25 presiding 1:27 press 11:1 14:4 63:5 74:3 129:3,4,8 **presses** 85:42 pressure 13:25 presumably 35:7 pretty 40:3 48:1 58:30 58:43 59:29 60:30 75:5 84:14 105:19 112:9 118:20,39 123:11 130:33 140:23 141:48 150:19 152:31 153:10 163:34 171:14 174:12 prevent 56:43 prevents 56:46 previous 30:38 38:32 57:41 106:43 133:37 145:47 166:7 previously 26:21 93:17 price 51:28 52:22 prices 52:25,29 152:32 **primarily** 60:5 115:19 119:42 145:29 **primary** 68:31 87:35 119:20 120:11 127:9 **prime** 34:17 54:38 **print** 152:10 prior 59:30,34 128:25 168:29 priorities 9:27 67:17,23 67:28 68:17,27 114:28 120:3,7,11 123:26 prioritization 30:44 31:17 **prioritize** 30:41 60:2 81:2,3 122:2 **priority** 15:31 30:46 31:12 120:16,29,48 **private** 27:1 102:13 103:13 120:23 127:4 127:14 146:19 155:26 159:30 168:4 172:37 prizes 116:28,28 proactive 96:25 proactively 96:19

100:20 111:24

probability- 120:21 probably 41:39 48:2 49:3,20 62:18 67:6 72:7 73:13 76:20 79:43 84:19 90:33 117:37 123:17 124:20 130:3 131:18 140:10 140:35 141:20 142:23 142:25 144:30 150:36 150:37,45 159:36 174:12 problem 15:27 35:9,23 54:10 57:36 72:8 73:11 127:3 164:37 167:20 problematic 126:43 **problems** 13:26 83:2 93:19 126:42 132:29 140:22 172:45 procedure 85:45 91:40 92:4 155:1 proceeded 110:4 process 8:41 9:1 10:4 14:33 15:6 19:4 32:35 33:24 35:35 37:42 60:24.30 67:1.8 70:26 74:41 76:30,38 88:9 91:14,40 92:11 93:10 109:24 113:39,46 120:12 121:7 122:30 122:30 123:27.41 124:31 125:3,7 126:2 127:26,44 129:17 130:3,19 155:21 160:12 166:14 processed 67:37 **processes** 10:6 134:8 produce 87:27 121:37 132:19 product 13:3 production 9:30 productive 19:14 **products** 33:21 91:32 profile 74:23 88:19 profit 116:36 profitability 50:44 51:31 program 4:23 8:15 14:18 15:10,21 28:29 28:36,39 29:17 30:3 33:18 50:28,30,39,46 51:14 54:27,44 55:16 55:25 56:28 60:22 61:46 62:1,4 77:16 90:20 98:43 103:23 110:17,19 119:42 120:1 125:33 126:1 126:34 132:3

programs 8:32,48 14:9 14:21 68:6 120:9 134:12 progress 19:18 29:3 30:18 59:35,36 progresses 68:12 prohibit 39:29 prohibited 27:3 39:38 39:46 70:10 80:34,34 81:15 83:38,40,45 84:8,9,16,26,31 131:4 prohibiting 156:21 prohibitive 71:21 prohibitively 71:32 project 29:15,31 35:44 42:6 65:23 81:40 91:11 100:19 105:11 106:4 108:7,10,35 111:14,42 112:9 122:24 130:31 projected 101:12,18,27 101:32 projection 67:15 projects 82:41 proliferation 75:20 prolific 110:36 promise 10:36 promised 12:14 **promises** 130:24 **promoting** 13:21,30 82:48 **prompt** 138:39 **proof** 105:40 134:33 propagate 13:26 proper 30:28 35:12 82:11 properly 75:47 82:8 156:23 161:13 proportion 54:30 proportional 54:28 proposal 35:30 72:6 105:1 proposals 62:12 proposed 4:22 22:28 23:21,25,31,32,35 31:29 33:8 37:43 38:21,25 40:2,11 44:39,40,43,45 45:3 53:7 58:7 100:3 118:28 proposing 23:22 100:16 proposition 171:17 pros 156:30 prosecute 61:41 prosecuted 11:12 prosecution 70:1

protect 94:5 96:16

109:25 111:9 protected 23:9 66:27 74:12,41 78:17 85:13 Protection 12:36 **protest** 167:36 protocol 84:22 85:13 171.10 protocols 65:13 104:4 proven 56:27 provide 25:24 27:12 42:11 44:32 46:46 68:4,7 87:37 96:34 104:45 123:35 134:41 150:47 provided 90:20 134:30 Provider 6:15 provides 42:31 67:18 67:20 **providing** 31:45 65:42 104:1 **provision** 30:30 39:13 46:1 48:24 provisions 33:31 98:7 144:3 165:22 **proxy** 2:11,23 21:35 prudent 11:17 113:44 **PSAT** 88:46 89:13 **PSEs** 127:27.37.41 public 4:39 18:40 19:25 20:5 26:19 29:28 67:27 74:3 86:39,42 87:8.32.43 88:44 89:39 91:32 99:29,31 99:33,37 101:34 102:19,30 123:20 134:6.15 144:45.48 151:5 165:48 168:18 169:33 171:23 172:15 172:15,18 173:18,27 173:32 174:3 publication 86:36 131:3 publicized 74:46 publicly 25:22 publish 85:43 published 22:27 33:8 34:24 67:39 86:32 publishes 24:4 Puerto 21:45 80:10 81:28,45 82:9,35,42 83:20 pull 36:34 157:41 162:9 pulling 19:15 87:21 pump 54:38

171:29.35.40 purpose 27:22 39:11 99:1 111:6 135:47 137:43 purposely 104:21 purposes 63:46 130:11 132:20 purse 56:6 145:46 154:45,47,47 155:4,5 155:8,17,22,30,34,48 156:5 pursuant 33:23 **pursue** 31:5 purview 27:8 push 78:16 97:26 127:23 129:20,24 144:27 162:38 164:4 165:32 **pushing** 165:48 put 9:48 11:4 15:14 20:30 25:40 26:38 30:47 31:1,2 49:41 56:23 65:32 66:5 71:47,48 72:17 74:14 74:33 76:41 81:13 84:24,31 88:37,39 89:37 99:31 101:34 102:12,31 104:22 125:20 130:34 131:21 140:18,21,24 144:31 145:4.5.43 161:35 165:4 166:43 171:34 171:42 putting 87:21 143:36 151:44 152:46 174:11 **PVA** 6:30

QA/QC 87:26 88:9 90:29 qualified 78:42,44,47 quality 152:32,38,45 153:29 167:10,11 quantify 114:34 quantity 53:20 **quarter** 52:3,5 quarterly 51:48 102:40 **quarters** 117:36 querying 159:35 question 10:39,47 11:30 12:15 18:5 32:44 33:28,42,43 35:31 36:38,40 44:39 44:43 46:36 54:40 55:2 63:7 70:42,48 72:36,41 76:16 83:22 84:7 92:19 96:13

purchasing 95:33

Purmont 2:18 6:41,41

34:14,22 48:12,33

155:33 156:32 170:24

53:17,34 154:40

106:2,10 107:1

II	1		1
110:10 114:7 119:27	racks 72:17	reaction 74:2	recognize 79:27 167:37
124:33,40 129:28,34	radar 8:34 15:14	read 31:6 36:38 55:38	recollect 83:41
129:45 139:14 141:9	Rafael 35:37	101:8	recommend 122:47
141:12,16 142:30,43	rafts 39:3 42:13	readily 155:16	123:1
143:16,28 151:47	rail 105:29	reading 122:37 134:48	recommendation
154:12,44 157:1,8,24	Raimundo 81:36	ready 24:18 118:4	123:18
157:42 159:23 163:25	raise 15:18 32:9 33:45	130:18,24 140:27	recommended 73:26
164:15,31 171:20,30	55:7 73:41 74:35,38	real 12:24,31 31:9	90:27
171:35	raised 57:10 111:38	38:30 45:37 47:12	reconsidering 47:23
questionable 144:9	164:43	73:20 74:2,3 113:29	reconvene 38:13 79:9
questions 5:21 8:8	raising 160:13	131:16 138:32 142:25	174:17
10:35 12:14 17:2	ramifications 50:17	143:29 144:15 155:3	record 38:16 79:12
20:25 29:11 32:21	ran 29:18 156:10	160:35 168:44 173:9	114:16 126:24 128:35
37:8 38:22 40:4,8,10	Randy 1:45 3:5 6:12	real- 102:10	174:24
53:10,16 61:43 63:28	7:40 110:39 122:12	real-time 68:13 102:44	recorded 36:34 143:19
70:15 83:10 85:2	129:25 131:14,15	108:28	records 95:26
86:15 91:35,37	135:11,14,17 139:6	realignment 66:25	recover 93:47
104:10,16 105:9	139:10 140:39,40,43	realistic 132:19,28	recovers 94:10
106:13,26 117:28	144:33	reality 21:8 41:7	recovery 94:6 112:24
122:32,33 134:18,20	range 20:13 44:47	realized 10:20	recreation 16:23
135:3 138:39 139:4	92:38 116:14,30,34	reallocating 145:46	117:44
139:13 141:5 154:44	116:37 118:17,25,36	reallocation 156:20	recreational 1:33,36,37
155:34 159:3,41	139:20	reason 17:21 30:31	2:10,15,17,21,26,29
170:1,6,23	ranged 115:48 116:14	33:37 55:43 57:17	4:34 5:30,39 6:3,11
queue 20:30,32 41:43	116:20,26,41	92:18 106:16 107:2	6:28 9:32 11:44,48
154:38 157:8	ranges 117:7	112:15 126:27 136:6 136:18,28 147:3	12:2,8,11 14:32,33
quick 11:25 15:16 18:20 22:2 27:15	ranging 62:34 rapid 74:2	reasonable 11:17 35:25	15:20,23 16:13,21 18:36 36:37 42:42
	rare 90:38 120:26	55:12 132:7,18	
32:44 33:6 36:38 37:12 38:30 41:14,23	121:31 125:41	reasoning 51:22	43:8 47:20 59:15 62:17,41,46 71:17,29
45:37 47:12 50:30	rash 73:46	reasons 18:4,6,7	78:6 81:41 83:13
74:48 79:23,40 96:12	rate 12:47 59:33 100:27	141:20	101:48 108:46 110:6
113:29,30 130:28,34	102:9 106:3 126:3	rebuilding 12:32 14:12	111:44 112:19 114:9
131:16 146:13 153:2	136:26,27 137:17	rebuilt 98:32,35,38	117:47 118:23 119:43
154:23 157:34 159:34	138:4 147:45 157:31	rec 41:3 59:18 114:22	119:48 121:29,45
162:27	168:16,38	114:25 117:31,41	124:37 130:46 131:12
quicker 130:37	rates 78:5 99:2 100:32	162:19	131:27,34,37,38,45
quickly 7:10,23,47	100:36 101:11,19	recall 24:9,23 25:18	131:46 132:16 133:8
14:40 19:29,40 40:47	107:45 108:1 137:9	26:22 30:36 38:34	133:14 134:3,38
41:13,38 42:44 43:47	137:14,15 147:25,28	56:5 76:18 83:41	135:23 139:12 146:9
75:5 80:14 86:17	147:31,38,38,43,47	105:27 141:21	146:12,19 147:9
119:14 155:3 166:21	148:15 149:17,32,47	recap 132:44	158:13 159:6,9 164:9
quietest 21:7	150:9,27 152:27	receive 26:34 50:36	165:1 168:8
quite 8:22,43 21:33	153:39 154:10 156:37	60:25 63:18 87:33	red 15:25,26 59:28
23:18 29:34,35 31:14	156:38 157:2 158:35	134:38	100:1 132:11 142:10
61:15 106:21 118:3	Ray 170:28 171:45	received 25:33,43	157:43
135:30 141:30 147:25	172:12,20,21	30:36 51:20 62:2 80:5	redesign 120:18 122:21
155:37 156:25 166:29	Ray's 173:30	80:7,15 81:1 83:7,12	123:40 129:29,34
173:5,11	Raymond 3:18 7:34	87:7 89:40 99:27	130:6,18,39
quo 39:28 51:39	169:46 171:31	102:20 115:2,9	redesigned 146:26
quota's 155:25	RBS 133:10	135:22,30 136:2	redesigning 120:44
quotas 22:31 23:25,26	re-allocated 56:24 re-estimation 120:18	146:37 165:20	redo 95:39 166:12,15
23:30 24:8 150:27 151:33 162:46	122:21 129:35	receives 53:25	reduce 125:40 135:47 reduced 102:1
quotes 154:15	re-initiation 28:42	receiving 149:35 150:29 165:13	reduces 134:14
quotes 154.15	reach 16:7	recipients 50:36	reduces 134.14 reducing 123:19 138:47
R	reached 28:46	recognition 132:26	reduction 17:25 19:34
racked 149:22	react 75:25	144:37	25:7 37:42 147:42
II			

162:45 redundant 166:6 registering 23:7 76:25 151:40 156:38 157:47 remainder 18:28 55:3 158:6,13 161:2 164:2 reef 80:35 83:38 84:43 133:24 103:46 146:6 165:3,18,41 166:37 142:4 registration 64:14,26 remained 59:33 147:39 reel 137:30,38 167:6 64:31 76:38 115:21 166:44 172:1 116:21.48 117:3 remains 54:40 100:38 reporting's 158:46 reentering 155:40 118:32 132:39,42,46 102:45 131:9 reporting/longline refer 101:8 133:18,22,30 134:8 remarkable 112:23 53:39 reference 65:14 67:31 registrations 118:48 remarks 4:13 19:13 reports 26:25 27:34 **registry** 133:15 remember 57:37 158:40 159:31 28:33 68:7 151:15,29 regrets 67:4 104:36 114:33 118:28 referenced 136:47 157:14 158:5,41 131:29,35,40 135:25 referred 48:5 63:32 regs 30:20 64:47 165:20,27,37 166:20 regular 21:40 103:22 159:8 referring 37:25 94:38 represent 6:5 122:13 refers 86:17 104:1 remembering 85:28 representative 6:21 remind 5:27 62:6 63:39 reflagged 155:36 regularly 96:3 21:27 reflect 31:46 32:14 regulate 161:13 86:41 91:40 164:8 representatives 21:31 regulated 48:15 172:34 174:14 145:20 represented 29:39 reminder 61:38 133:36 reflected 129:10 regulation 30:22 72:9 representing 6:8,30 regulations 12:32,36 remiss 104:21 reflective 162:33 represents 35:21 reform 172:35,43 25:46 26:32 30:37 remotely 113:21 reproductive 103:32 39:2,16 40:23 47:1 remove 90:10,28 refrain 55:22 reps 66:48 49:43 50:20 57:47 removed 26:24 89:7 refresh 31:19 80:5 request 25:34,35 29:28 62:10 64:12,34,35,35 103:45 30:31 34:37 37:2,41 168:25 refuse 161:2 162:3 64:37,45 65:44 73:34 removes 138:29 51:20 74:14 78:1,19 reg 44:45 45:3 64:40 76:29 78:11 82:44,45 Remsberg 3:26 7:17,17 85:28 105:10 134:37 regaining 112:35 84:30 86:28 94:1 95:3 67:3 134:41,45,46 137:21 regard 10:47 12:22 103:21 134:26,30 renegotiation 28:7 138:22 159:24 171:13 74:15 84:4,37 130:29 138:45 139:1 141:39 reopened 148:9,9 171:46 174:2 132:31 155:34 159:43 159:32 161:11,14 reopening 95:38 requested 78:22 99:7 rep 1:32,34,40,44,45,47 regarding 52:17 66:40 165:17 99:20 100:48 102:48 68:15 71:3,6 74:44,48 regulatory 39:13,26 2:19,25,28 7:4 requesting 34:42 86:43 122:38 135:40 68:6 94:29.36 repeat 21:5 108:41 133:42 rehashing 140:23 repeatedly 14:2 148:29 149:35 157:9 requests 26:35 30:21 reinforced 60:15 repeating 20:2 172:32 173:24 30:37,39,47 80:5,14 repetitiously 138:13,36 regardless 45:40 63:47 reinvent 47:14 80:16,23,40 83:12 146:9 **reissued** 161:30 report 14:46,47,48 15:1 87:35 91:33 104:5 reiterated 60:4 15:7 24:46 27:37.44 regards 34:15 131:12 148:48 172:31,48 146:12 148:17 relate 145:31 146:43 49:13,21 55:19 67:10 173:1 related 110:45 138:16 68:28 77:9,12,17,18 Reghi 58:18 66:20,21 require 19:15 28:32 70:13,48 71:14 74:38 141:9,9,10 142:32 77:19,20,40 105:13 43:26 75:24 122:25 75:27 78:26 relates 44:28 146:23 105:33 115:23 117:25 125:19 141:39 required 27:32 39:1 **regimes** 65:38 relating 81:19 133:31,39 143:3,4,24 relationships 82:18 145:18 152:17,39 region 8:18 26:13 45:25 45:44 51:2 60:29 relative 101:28 161:14 164:47 165:5 64:13,23 86:29 80:17,31 81:6,11,19 82:17,19 83:9 84:42 relatively 10:21 158:33 165:8,12,13 168:40 103:43 110:47 111:48 115:23 119:31 124:26 104:24 115:5 120:3 relayed 60:25 169:7 reported 52:41 116:7 120:31,35 121:17 release 32:38 59:21 138:26,44 143:2 116:18 136:7 143:19 60:8 74:19 108:47 122:10,11 129:29 165:11 regional 14:1,46 119:39 113:35,36 114:3 156:40 163:29 requirement 26:24 119:23 136:20 147:12 reporting 14:37 24:32 122:17 30:23,27 66:14 96:28 24:40 27:28 28:31 regions 8:30 14:44 released 59:48 60:20 96:35 103:17 135:32 30:12 32:25,28 33:9 113:42 121:33 126:26 95:29 124:35 135:41,45 136:1,4 143:6 36:13,14 41:5 49:1,4 register 55:39 85:44 137:23,48 138:24,35 119:32 133:37 134:27 releasing 82:2 50:20 52:37,39 53:4 138:41 141:31,44 134:36 relevance 93:4 115:25 121:23,28 142:4 143:23 151:40 124:42 130:30,33 registered 63:45,46 relevant 32:9 164:9 64:25 75:47,48 76:14 **reliable** 123:36 132:39,42 133:19,25 requirements 24:11,36 76:27 114:39,44 rely 69:46 105:33 134:8,12 143:16,17 28:32 32:8 36:33 115:1 116:8 remain 101:24 155:8 143:21 151:9,19,20 38:38,39 39:1,5,8,19

restaurant 69:23 71:31 RICHARD 2:20 roundtable 138:9 39:22.40.48 41:11 routinely 166:11 restoration 29:15,26,29 Rick 1:36 2:26 6:37 42:9,35 44:48 49:2 rows 146:40 7:36 32:42 41:44,45 63:15,37 64:2 76:40 restrict 33:25 43:22 44:36 93:30,43 78:13 134:2,31 restricted 151:3 153:34 **Ruais** 2:20 6:47,47 135:13 151:9,38 153:36 122:34 126:4 127:22 15:37 54:26 55:45 165:43 166:37 172:4 result 35:45 58:47 130:29,31,32 141:2 56:19 166:24 108:47 109:40 127:33 requires 24:33 45:18 142:16,17 157:22,35 rule 4:22 22:28,30 143:30 163:13 157:48 158:48 135:41 23:21,40 24:33,36 rescheduled 23:11 resulted 87:44 Rico 21:45 80:10 81:28 26:27 29:2,5 31:26 rescinded 71:24 results 29:19 31:7 81:45 82:9,36,42 32:38,41 33:8,32 rescue 58:37 67:12 88:43 105:16 83:20 37:43 38:21,25 39:11 133:2 136:42 ride 72:11 40:2,11,42 44:39,40 research 4:31 22:46 23:1,4,5 25:31 26:20 resumed 38:16 79:12 ridiculously 118:30 44:43 53:8 58:7 26:36,47,47,48 27:6,8 114:16 rigor 110:43 144:19 retain 25:35 34:39,42 rigorous 87:26 106:42 rulemaking 19:6 25:2 37:26 80:8 81:14,18 107:34 136:38 106:45 81:35 82:15,39 89:17 40:46 44:48 165:21 retained 103:33 107:17 ripe 156:27 rulemakings 4:19 18:28 96:5 97:30 99:8,45 107:38 **ripple** 46:30 100:2,20,42 102:5 18:29 38:20 106:4 108:10 110:18 retaining 137:18 **ripples** 156:16 rules 11:3 13:2 19:41 retention 22:37,41,43 risk 53:47 111:14 19:43 23:44 26:23 23:31,35 59:16 80:19 road 35:41 42:32 43:9 researched 143:14 42:21 134:25,30 80:21,38,40 83:16 112:35 127:43 166:17 144:3,20 researcher 111:3,13 researchers 108:24 137:14 145:31 146:18 roadmap 24:25 run 6:38 22:10 27:20 reserve 24:2 54:31,33 146:21 147:22,41 Robert 1:37 2:9,15 6:29 76:37,39,44 115:35 54:45 55:23 56:7.9.18 148:21,47 149:5,14 6:34 117:20 125:26 153:2 56:23 145:48 154:46 153:21 157:26 159:27 robust 159:9 running 62:39.40 76:13 155:5 return 93:26 171:5 rock 149:18 110:13 117:13 130:9 **reserves** 150:16 returning 49:47 137:46 **Rockies** 58:25 162:31 resolution 15:33 34:13 revamping 66:38 Rockport 10:15 runoff 96:21 rod 167:6 171:48 resource 55:23 58:34 **revenues** 116:25 **runs** 172:3 59:31 111:9 reverse 18:11 **role** 30:18 RUSSELL 1:48 review 4:36 18:29.38 roll 55:5 resources 5:41 26:5 Rusty 5:44 10:39 13:16 24:36 28:6 35:33 rolled 56:1 58:42 66:27 69:37 83:33,36 85:6 94:22 **Rollie** 16:3 74:12,42 78:17 82:43 48:18 62:12 67:38 95:14 104:18,20 **Rollie's** 16:9 111:27 145:35 86:32,34,38 87:27 110:25 90:44 99:22 102:45 rolling 87:14 130:13,20 respect 113:23 rollout 85:45 133:20 S 105:28,32 113:30 respectful 20:22,24 120:14 122:19 129:32 rollover 55:7,24 respecting 74:41 **S&T** 124:11 130:17 respective 146:25 129:46 144:42 146:8 **Rom** 6:10 33:48 46:33 132:5 respond 17:43 64:19 161:21 163:28 165:43 47:40,41 111:38,39 safe 24:46 58:2 145:6 115:33 147:40 150:40 171:10,13 112:20 125:29.46 safely 167:12 reviewed 86:27 139:8 140:1,2,42 respondents 115:27,28 safety 21:41 38:37 39:2 reviewing 103:18 142:21 168:19 169:4 responding 127:47 39:4,8,18,22 42:9 response 11:25,26 revise 39:15 121:47 169:24 45:35,43 46:20,31 revised 86:28 **ROMULUS** 2:29 15:16 32:26 35:29,40 47:48 50:20 57:42,44 58:39 74:48 126:4 revision 28:13 86:30 **Ron** 33:14 127:22 60:3,27 61:45 62:1,3 141:23 164:17 171:21 roof 64:42 revisions 109:23 62:16,26 63:10,15,25 63:33,37 110:15 171:25 revisit 79:35 83:31 **room** 1:25 5:23 7:23,33 85:32 144:30 9:2,45 15:47 20:46 responses 115:2,7,9 157:29 sailfish 28:5 70:8 98:38 revitalize 16:43 17:4 21:4 79:19 96:48 responsibility 31:13 150:43 152:3 167:48 reward 161:9 101:27 126:25 136:14 77:28 111:13 rewarded 161:8 **Rootes-** 6:24 responsible 119:42 136:37 **ROOTES-MURDY** 2:19 responsibly 108:37 reworked 67:9 sake 144:25 6:24 responsive 151:12 **RFA** 6:30.46 sale 16:23 38:31 39:14 **Rhode** 6:39 14:48 45:10 roughly 48:12,19 154:32 39:30,35,42 42:46 90:4 114:48 170:18 rest 54:41 55:25,26 43:10,18 44:19,21 Rich 6:47 54:25 55:27 round 54:34,43 75:35 56:1 120:30,35 47:32,35 48:8 49:14 164:41 166:23 82:22 114:42 163:34 161:38 162:9 49:29,30 57:43 68:43

Schalit 2:23 5:36.36 145:36 148:7 152:31 68:45 69:35 71:17,37 69:22.36 76:7 160:41.41 155:41 41:46 65:2 94:23 sells 38:40 42:30 **seasons** 103:23 sale/no-sale 42:27 159:40 163:47 164:26 **Senator** 10:46 schedule 18:14 97:27 send 25:21 27:31 66:48 43:11 70:30 second 11:24 35:40 sales 47:18 69:14 114:8 173:20 174:21 37:40 39:34 42:27 sends 67:3 156:12,14 scheduled 79:42 48:2 49:1 54:34,43 **Senegal** 60:46 salinity 94:45 **schedules** 19:1 68:23 67:10 108:6 109:2 Senegalese 60:41 110:30 138:15 141:12 sense 5:23 11:33 20:15 **salt** 144:39 schematic 87:19 saltwater 127:34 Schmittert 16:3 143:31 157:41 20:16 41:48 79:34 sample 82:7 120:25 school 7:13 146:22,42 second-highest 160:6 88:11 104:6 160:18 **Secondly** 141:28 144:1 146:43 159:11,25 173:45 samples 85:4 103:31 SCHULZE-HAUGEN secretary 28:17 sensitivity 90:35 111:5,10 122:1,4,6 section 68:18,19 77:8 **sampling** 81:31 102:17 3:28 21:18 32:37 33:2 sent 77:13 103:29,33 87:41 92:35 120:22 121:38,45 33:12,26,47 34:20,23 114:37,47 166:11 123:23,45 124:5,9 34:45 36:32,46 37:7 sector 14:34 30:45 33:9 168:27,33 37:24,35,39 40:39 45:40 83:13 131:12 132:29 sentiment 140:47 170:12 171:11,12 SAMPSON 2:21 41:37 42:7 43:34 sentiments 15:39 sandbar 86:46 91:3 44:22,31,44 46:48 sectors 46:42 170:10 **separate** 25:41 39:13 110:33 112:40 47:33 55:27 56:4 171:2 44:2 84:2 96:23 secure 57:18 73:25 85:27 94:40 separately 12:8 sandbars 110:37 security 58:38 61:20 separation 41:2 47:39 sandtiger 86:47 91:8 96:27 97:2 98:2 **Sarah** 145:27 154:43 105:27,45 106:14,36 seeing 16:30 24:46 **SEPHIER** 121:7 sat 54:13 122:12 107:13,35,44 109:27 28:47 49:19 56:40 **September** 1:20 23:37 satisfied 172:31 109:42 111:22,34 59:14 75:36 85:31 95:20 148:9 113:12,15,18 165:15 88:10 91:1 110:36 September-October **satisfy** 131:45 **Saturday** 117:33 165:34,39 170:27 145:20 147:28 151:30 104:27 151:30 science 6:5 29:43 81:23 157:26,28,32 162:42 series 18:36 25:19 114:22 119:46 save 72:17 80:13 94:8 83:42,43 88:8,11,44 162:48 163:1 153:30 103:30,34 110:46 **seeking** 19:46,48 26:3 **serious** 41:17 54:9 **savings** 136:29 142:23 133:8.45 53:30 seriously 31:14 32:15 143:29 Sciences 7:14 seen 46:15 73:45 74:7 105:1 **saw** 15:46 54:30 59:10 scientific 23:4 82:15 91:13 93:26 98:16.22 sermon 132:31 84:22 87:27,43 101:31 102:46 111:45 59:31,37 69:5 74:2 served 123:17 118:41 125:42 147:24 84:47 87:29 91:5,6 scientifically 106:29,33 **service** 16:10 29:12 102:7 116:36 118:47 119:47 162:42 157:19 scientist 131:41 **seament** 44:20 81:10 147:37 164:41 **services** 61:35 67:20 scientists 90:22,26 84:2 **sawfish** 74:9,19,24,36 serving 16:4 **segue** 12:34 84:15 session 18:32 135:23 74:44 85:18 **scope** 42:23 43:47 saying 34:46 53:44 **scopes** 100:6 segueing 153:47 141:17 141:6 142:35 161:34 **Scott** 99:17 110:13,20 **seine** 56:6 145:46 sessions 18:24 154:46,47,47 155:4,5 163:48 164:7 165:8 screaming 164:37 set 38:8 59:32 101:1,4 165:11 167:30 screen 8:35 68:3 88:22 155:8,17,22,30,34,48 103:3 106:11 111:8 156:5 **says** 105:42 121:45 134:16 111:20,21,23,26 144:11 screened 29:31 seiners 155:44 120:3 148:46 153:21 seized 71:46 72:3 **SBRM** 24:31 screenshot 68:26 153:23,37 154:6 **SCRS** 119:16 136:9 select 28:16 44:42 scale 99:46 101:28 155:6 selected 27:28,33 sets 87:8,20,34 92:2,10 156:22 se 35:4 sea 61:22 62:23 84:41 scalloped 81:7 83:48 selecting 27:25 96:2 100:17,45 101:1 101:17 102:24 107:20 selection 121:22 84:5 101:4 102:35,37,37 seafood 3:14 6:1 28:28 **self-** 124:41 102:39 103:1,4 105:6 scan 18:15,20 33:17,31 99:12 **Scanlon** 2:22 6:14,14 self-reporting 124:46 106:31 seamless 23:18 **sell** 38:40,43,46 39:5,7 13:16 19:33 49:27 setting 18:19 145:9 search 58:37 39:17,21,33 42:5,40 settled 79:15 106:2 111:17,30 46:4,43 47:44 49:40 160:45 163:24,36 searching 46:21 settlement 72:3 49:42 71:30 107:8,9 settlements 69:27 164:21 seas 60:35 65:17,26,34 **scared** 37:29 65:40,47 66:14 107:28,34 171:9 seven 17:15 118:18 scenes 40:34 62:27 season 23:36 40:43 **selling** 39:39,46 48:8 133:25,38,39 160:8 107:28,37 131:38 scent 138:31 63:48 68:47 69:5,17 168:29

II	1	1	1
sevengill 83:39	shenanigans 49:18	silky 29:6 101:32	slew 123:5
seventies 110:22	Sheraton 1:24	Silva 7:26,26 33:3	slide 31:32 83:37,39
sewer 96:22,42	shift 38:19 58:14 94:12	Silver 1:24,25 7:24,26	92:20 106:3,11,26
sex 82:1	119:37 132:37 144:41	7:44 8:10	119:9 133:21 134:5
Shana 2:14 8:2 38:6	shifted 94:12 107:32	similar 14:20,43 39:43	136:8,24 148:20
shape 91:18,24 156:15	shifts 149:44	44:1,13,27,32 59:12	156:37 157:41 159:3
shaping 27:46	ship 17:6,7	78:12 90:13 98:22	165:41
share 8:8 27:10 29:20	ship's 16:48	102:36 115:7 120:18	slides 88:20
31:46 32:3 50:36	shop 52:18 127:23	123:30	slight 59:6 146:21
65:38 66:9 113:5	shopping 41:33 127:23	similarly 52:6 78:9	slightly 25:20 74:11
157:7	shore 101:46 162:48	141:42	100:5
shared 46:3 48:28	163:7,11,16	SIMP 28:39	slipped 24:26
sharing 25:13,16	short 17:27 33:19	simple 40:36 95:27	slot 148:18
148:36	167:15	109:20 165:5 168:45	slow 126:2 139:27
shark 7:3 10:43,47	shorter 22:14 101:45	171:30	160:28
11:10,14,32 13:18	shortfin 28:1	simply 26:25,45 31:4	slowing 153:39
		100:13 120:38 168:36	_
19:6 22:28,38 23:1,5	shortly 85:46 113:30 147:37	single 55:40 57:38	slowly 71:11
23:9,20,22 26:20,47	shout 22:2	71:37 88:1 105:13	small 42:28,43,47 71:40
30:25 31:21,27 33:21			80:20,39 83:17 87:4
33:22,23,39 39:44	show 43:2 65:32,36 66:36 84:34 86:11	158:25,26,28 161:26 161:26	89:34 96:1 101:29
59:44,45 60:8,15			116:3,14 128:34
68:46,46,46,47 70:10	88:18 101:12 112:28 125:38 128:26 150:11	singular 164:29 sink 114:1	157:32 159:11,21,24
70:10 73:39 74:13			169:16
75:2,18,44 76:1,17	161:7 165:44	sinking 113:41 sir 38:3,10 46:7 63:4	small/medium 159:16
80:16,19,21,24,25,29	showcase 66:3	,	smaller 39:10 159:20
80:30,36 82:23,48	showed 34:27 131:4	64:11 169:44	smalltooth 74:8
83:8,15,38 84:12	140:16	Sissenwine 2:25 6:7,7	smartphone 15:21
86:47 87:5 89:28	showing 34:30 91:1	34:35 35:2 53:37 54:4	134:6
90:14 91:3,8 92:20,25	shown 91:9 136:35,41	131:25 169:47	SMAST 171:7
93:22 95:19 102:18	shows 49:3 82:32	sit 6:16,39 72:24 153:3	smoothhound 87:4
105:18 107:37 109:22	101:10	161:39	smoothhounds 23:30
109:48 112:37 113:23	shut 112:14	site 81:29 93:36 104:8	snap 69:38 150:44
113:29,38,46 121:29	shy 149:12,22	151:42 165:11,11	snapper 15:25,26 59:28
121:36,38,41 126:25	sick 58:1	172:40	132:12 142:11
131:5,9 173:2,10	side 10:32 11:29,36	sites 120:24 123:46	snappy 57:29
shark's 82:1	21:6 29:36 39:27	124:19,22 126:44,47	snapshot 102:47
shark- 103:25	64:15,32,42 68:3 75:2	127:4 143:46	145:11 150:34
shark-specific 103:6	88:22 93:45,48 98:17	sitting 12:28 20:47	snuff 166:31
sharking 128:48	98:30,41,46,46	172:24 situation 18:1 36:13	soak 103:42
sharks 16:39 26:18,37	111:44 112:19 125:34		social 18:43 75:22,37
27:3 29:6 34:3 38:29	130:36 133:24,35	55:44 67:5 69:9 71:42	150:29 154:16 174:15
44:12 59:47 60:6,20	151:5 153:3,43	83:11 137:36,40	Society 82:26
69:6 73:47 81:8,21,44	159:30	situations 137:18	socioeconomic 101:40
82:7,9,11,16,18,21,28	sidebar 11:8	156:14 165:16 six 62:18 72:11 80:43	106:27
82:32 85:17,18,24,26	sight 113:41		software 14:37 117:21
87:3,4 89:45 90:26	sign 42:46 43:9,17	99:7 103:8,9,10	sold 38:45 71:39 99:26
96:15 101:33 102:24	169:19	109:11 110:34 128:6	99:26 135:5 152:44
103:27,31,39,40,45	signal 31:4	128:7	solid 149:18 150:5
104:30 108:48 109:4	signals 31:11	six-52:9 118:18	Soltanoff 3:30 38:23
109:6 110:8,31	significance 59:3	sixties 92:25	50:26 53:14,22 54:2
112:15 113:34,40	significant 59:47 78:7	size 30:24,27 64:43,44	solution 59:35
115:31,33 120:27	94:25,28,37 115:30	sizeable 25:48 56:10	solve 172:45
121:33 129:8 130:46	115:41 116:24 152:3	sizes 120:25	somebody 35:14,33
131:12	152:36,40 155:29	skeptical 110:17	48:28 57:9 69:36 70:2
sharp 38:14	156:7,19	skew 116:13,33	97:47 144:26 154:14
sharpnose 80:35,36	significantly 98:14	skewed 117:8	157:19
82:32,33 83:38 84:38	115:32 116:11	skyrocketing 150:10	someone's 78:7
84:40 110:30 112:39	silent 21:3	slap 71:29	someplace 57:15
II	I	I	I

specific 24:20 26:18,47 staffing 66:25 151:27 somewhat 16:2 115:32 124:13,16,21,27,35 34:20 61:22 68:1 72:2 **stage** 88:37 91:42,48 118:22 134:23 124:36 126:39,43 95:11 130:17 **Sonja** 1:41 7:3 73:37,38 80:28 87:2 103:26,39 153:5,13 141:14.43 75:8 85:7 93:30 stakeholder 10:7 stating 25:44 169:37 **Sonja's** 75:16 specifically 11:45 **stamp** 14:19 statistic 157:40 stand 37:28 73:21 soon 24:4 36:34 37:46 21:44 23:20 26:37 statistical 110:43 130:41 150:12 40:3 123:8 129:47 37:34 65:7 66:45 115:41 132:29 148:43 69:16 71:42 81:21 standalone 26:19 sooner 41:41 114:14 statistically 102:8 84:6 108:14 131:40 standard 24:15 157:44 158:6 150:31 165:3 **sorry** 36:46 54:14 64:8 137:1 164:46 standardized 24:31.40 statisticians 132:23 standards 14:43 57:44 85:27 97:46 113:20 specifications 22:28 **statistics** 43:2 115:44 76:46 105:2 113:22 132:31 157:36 23:21 117:19 148:11,29 169:46 172:19 specificity 87:38 standpoint 96:20 160:22,33 168:4 141:33 sort 12:3,6 13:25 18:18 specified 30:24 status 19:35 27:11 18:42 19:12 35:8 stands 56:26 33:19 34:16 39:28 specs 31:21,27 **speed** 122:30 139:26 starboard 64:42 38:34 39:28 53:30 51:39 98:35 119:6 start 5:26 7:10,23 18:26 58:6 73:46 81:42 speeds 139:37 129:41 133:2 136:6,8 spend 9:41,44 10:3,9 18:46,47 41:1,31,43 89:48 90:29 94:37 stay 18:22 20:18 21:14 97:36 98:8 103:10,24 14:28 31:18 79:43 50:35 66:19 70:16 25:17 28:25 40:2 53:7 132:8,18 144:47 97:40 114:21 132:1 78:19 82:40 111:18 67:39 97:27 150:41 spent 10:14,16 14:30 111:29,32 112:34 151:13 156:21,30 steering 120:15 122:18 160:8 169:1 172:14 116:23 114:13,25 122:20 **Stellwagen** 6:45 42:37 174:3 **spike** 158:5 129:38 130:12,13,18 **step** 13:40 21:4,13 **sorted** 87:15 spill 29:14 139:7 142:18 147:34 30:33 32:35,41 55:39 149:36,42 151:32 sound 68:37 119:47 spirit 9:40 60:36 65:31.33 94:20 **sounds** 37:32 129:39 **split** 39:34 142:44 153:26 159:31 161:22 117:15 129:33 130:14 **splitting** 172:32,33 141:47 169:37 174:18 132:18 source 16:8 **spoke** 16:34 63:31 started 21:23 22:1 step-wise 41:1 57:14 59:14 73:15 south 6:27 11:45 21:31 78:32 82:42 110:13 **Stephen** 2:10 7:19,19 23:46 24:1 28:1,2 **spool** 137:30 81:25,32 86:33 99:32 32:22 30:13 47:7.17 57:15 **sport** 8:38 111:21 117:31 132:46 steps 35:47 80:12 84:44 89:3 99:39 **spot** 20:47 92:21 140:43 146:14 147:36 83:11 91:10 120:4 118:11 104:29 115:4 126:7 starting 27:18 29:47 122:16 128:25 129:28 142:5 158:1 162:41 **spots** 118:12 51:7 147:24 Steve 6:2 117:29 157:8 southeast 14:46 28:44 spreadsheet 152:11 state 1:32.40.44.45 157:22,36,37 29:42 30:10,11 59:23 **spring** 1:25,26 6:31 2:28 3:14 6:21 14:48 **Steve's** 157:7 7:25,27,45 8:11 22:14 **Stewie** 152:14 64:37 66:48 68:40 21:26 46:17 63:45 69:31 70:6,9,12 72:44 24:9,20,28 25:14 64:13,25,26,31 69:3 stick 24:41 41:3 173:22 72:44 74:17 75:28 26:39 27:17,30 29:31 69:46 73:1,34 74:1,47 sticker 78:40 81:22 103:29.33 30:35 31:31 51:18 77:21 82:36 83:6.19 **sticky** 140:38,39 133:8,45 135:18 79:36 80:3,7,13,45 83:20 86:23,23 95:21 stock 9:22 14:14 36:42 83:28 85:29,33 118:5 53:47 98:30,34,46 southern 89:43 90:4 96:14,33 97:11,11,13 125:37 129:36 130:16 146:28,29,33 97:15,19,19 123:16 101:25,29 109:23,25 **space** 93:47 102:40 130:23 125:10,21,24,26 109:37,37 110:3 spring's 117:26 119:6,16 122:7 136:5 **span** 93:7 126:7,18,38 127:2,11 spanned 92:2 **Springs** 95:16 127:38,39,46 133:46 136.8 **squad** 75:35 137:1 144:3 148:48 stocks 14:12 86:7 spatial 82:28 **SPAW** 85:12,26 **squeeze** 19:31 169:45 129:41 St 7:30,36,41 82:29 **stomachs** 103:32 **spawning** 34:18 86:19 state-based 96:39 speak 5:27 9:8 33:1 89:21 135:18 state-issued 156:35 **stop** 15:9 33:20 48:44 47:3,11 141:26 stack 168:5 127:23 161:35 162:6 **stated** 96:24 142:29 173:29 stacked 146:40 statement 53:38 165:10 stopping 54:43 stacking 43:27 44:9 **stories** 67:45 speakers 50:18 169:25 **speaking** 66:45 111:43 staff 4:17 7:20 8:43 states 6:25 10:48 13:22 **storm** 5:10,14 10:13 86:16 96:43 160:30 173:39 15:41,45 20:14,27,43 16:18 72:44 81:24 spearfishing 24:41 63:26 82:43 121:5 storm's 79:36 84:31 96:36 97:12 special 66:24 112:1 150:24 157:11 169:20 114:46 120:45,45 **storms** 58:41 173:24 specially 85:13 121:27 123:10,22 **stormwater** 96:21,42

story 14:4,16,38 165:45 straight 47:46 100:7 113:41 114:1 163:35 straighten 166:46 straightforward 40:31 straightforwardness 40:35 strain 144:26 Straits 89:8 strata 120:40 Strategy 25:7 stratrum 125:31 stratum 122:48 123:32 123:43 124:15 stream 123:36 124:42 **streamline** 15:6 70:26 70:40 78:2 streams 124:43,44 **stress** 167:15 stressed 94:34 stressing 90:37 strict 105:19 strictly 106:20 119:28 159:29 strident 31:42 strike 138:3 153:45 **strikes** 137:28 stringent 40:23 109:38 strong 82:47 84:14 113:3 144:37 168:47 structure 82:31 struggling 35:17 **studies** 34:17,30 122:25 123:41 130:8 136:19,34,41 study 27:16,19 81:25 81:26 100:23,28 106:43 107:43,44 109:35 112:26 113:29 114:34 118:8 136:31 136:46 137:6 studying 112:8 stuff 13:18 17:26 40:33 41:29 84:36,45 95:32 117:30 119:27 123:18 123:39 125:2,2 131:21,32 161:6 165:30 stupid 143:35,35 sub-quotas 151:33 subcomponent 117:48 subgroups 121:6 subject 39:18,21,40,47 83:24 135:30,38 subjectivity 46:13 submission 103:13 submissions 87:43

submit 26:24 36:5 87:26 165:25 submittal 36:16 submitted 26:46 36:11 122:17 129:30 170:2 submitting 151:29 **subpoenaed** 167:24,26 subsequent 32:40 37:48 51:6 **subsets** 90:33 subspecies 84:40 substantial 88:13 149:9 substrate 86:18 subtracted 51:5 success 55:17 56:27 137:17 successful 137:3,14 138:4 143:28 148:38 149:27 successfully 139:44 succinct 20:19 sudden 46:6 151:29 156:19 161:16 **suffers** 55:26 sufficient 90:9 92:24 110:48 suggest 97:21 167:3 **suggested** 84:11 87:6 **suggesting** 65:10 76:35 89:47 suggestions 86:43 153:32 suit 126:40 **suits** 39:4 **summaries** 67:14,45 68:8,16,24 105:14 summarizes 136:24 **summary** 63:30 68:5 69:26 72:3 80:48 101:14,40 106:27 135:27 154:23 summer 22:3,33,44 27:44 67:26,30 149:33 summer/fall 147:34 **Sunday** 151:31 Supervisory 3:7 **support** 20:16 21:48 26:40 28:20 30:17 81:12 83:7,14 86:44 91:47 93:19 95:4,13 104:44 112:48 122:7 144:35,36 supported 68:20 83:18 83:19 93:18 102:25

117:22 166:38

supporting 122:23

supportive 26:3

suppose 14:18 **supposed** 6:31 23:18 33:24 161:3,25 supposedly 76:13 **surge** 52:29 **surprise** 83:4 115:14 **surprised** 31:37 104:42 surrender 155:48 surround 156:4 survey 27:39 32:44 110:29 112:37 113:1 114:27,32,37,43 115:8 117:47 120:19 120:20 121:48 122:28 122:38,41,42,45 125:13 126:18,19 130:9,10,21,21 131:21,37 133:9,14 146:39 168:13 surveyed 133:3 surveys 112:42 114:45 115:45 119:47 120:40 120:47 121:15,19,35 126:18,33 survival 39:4 136:20 167:17 survive 114:1 **survived** 113:42 **survives** 113:46 **suspect** 43:6 118:25 145:33 153:35 158:32 163:34 suspicious 90:23 sustainability 9:33 53:47 sustainable 14:14,25 66:26 sustainably 13:22,31 **sustained** 5:45 113:39 **sweet** 33:19 swing 104:23 sword 112:35 **swordfish** 9:25,26 12:29,31 16:34 17:8 17:36 19:10 22:32,43 23:46 24:1 28:1 30:30 39:32 80:17,37,43 98:20,26,32 101:22 101:43 102:23.27 107:3,5,6,18,26 108:34,38 124:47 126:34 153:6 swordfishermen 104:22 **synopsis** 146:13 170:28,30,31,34

supports 136:6 143:13

synthetic 138:19,29 139:18 system 23:16 28:34 52:42 54:38 96:46 102:12,13,15 103:13 130:33 132:39,43,45 133:16,18,23,27 134:17 155:25 167:42 172:36,44 systems 17:20

Т **T** 166:9.10 tab 67:23,41 table 5:25 10:39 12:29 13:6 15:39 16:44 18:24 19:18,29 20:3,6 20:36,41 21:10 31:48 50:19 73:30 141:30 142:20 144:35,38 145:22 146:24 147:1 150:24 153:17 156:29 158:15 164:23 168:48 169:34 174:9 tablet 15:9 134:6 tabletop 61:19 tabs 146:35,41,48 tabulating 108:18 tag 26:23 27:4 72:17,18 tagged 112:38 tagging 26:21 74:24 82:2 90:19,20 tags 26:26,28 81:48 104:37 128:2 tails 145:23 take-home 134:4,4 154:23 taken 27:38 54:33 62:14,27 67:36 110:45 120:5,46 123:23 149:9 155:15 162:35 takes 41:25 42:1,28 152:10 173:19 talent 15:48 talk 10:31 11:8,9,28,35 14:17 18:16,37,45 19:4,5,21,23 22:45 25:31 31:29 73:31,35 84:33 86:12 103:6 106:28 112:44 114:23 114:26,30 123:8,37 126:24 142:30 154:15 167:39 171:27 173:23 talked 26:39 27:17

synthesized 135:27

30:34 48:3 86:37

121:7,42 128:24

157:24 167:37,43

II
talking 13:5,8,10,13 19:10 22:17,23 36:47 37:1 38:28 48:15 49:29,32,39 50:27 57:41,42 75:16 89:29 89:33 107:37 109:43 113:43 117:40 119:38 121:42 124:11 130:30 139:15 145:7 151:36 152:14 164:19 167:38 170:16 Tampa 95:16 tangential 58:6 target 50:33,42 51:31 51:32 52:32 53:2 56:48 107:18,25 108:17,29 115:12,33 116:9 targeted 107:11 115:20 115:31,40 119:4,34 120:30,34 121:38 123:45 targeting 27:35 107:3 129:13 targets 107:15 Tarpon 95:16 task 17:28 tautog 15:1 Taylor 99:17 teach 173:11 team 19:34 91:34 117:5 117:11 120:14 122:13 122:18 129:30 145:28 teams 17:25 115:10
teach 173:11 team 19:34 91:34 117:5
tease 48:30 147:47 157:11 158:11,39 163:40 168:7,15 teased 151:44
technical 99:9 technically 64:1 84:41 114:45 119:30 technique 137:34 138:2 139:16 141:34
techniques 136:37 138:43 142:36 technologies 14:36,42 15:22 108:11
technology 15:35 130:36 teeth 12:48 165:32,32 teleconference 7:8
20:8 38:2 78:29 142:46 143:1 tell 8:20 12:43 14:3,38 17:3 45:26 74:3 105:26 106:30 126:22

400 4 440 7 457 00
130:1 143:7 157:38
157:48 169:25 173:7
telling 143:9
temperature 94:44
163:10
temporal 81:29
temporary 22:4 23:40
ten 64:16 118:18,37
137:19 138:12 139:43
140:7,11,24 145:38
tend 90:26 121:30
tended 59:15 92:9
tent 95:20
term 28:48 29:33 78:23
104:8 117:41 174:5
terminal 143:42
terms 11:34 15:22
20:28 24:27 25:16
33:33 41:4 43:45
44:28 59:38 62:25,29
62:40 74:18 80:16,37
88:14,48 91:4 94:28
97:42 100:48 101:35
103:6,26 105:46
109:28 116:18
Terri 1:35 5:48 12:17
56:38 58:3 169:36
territorial 82:44
territories 82:24
10111101100 02.2 1
test 141:47
test 141:47 testify 167:26
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24.38 11:20 12:13
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24.38 11:20 12:13
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23 48:11,33,38 50:26
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23 48:11,33,38 50:26 53:21,34,37 56:37
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23 48:11,33,38 50:26 53:21,34,37 56:37 58:13 62:42 64:33
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23 48:11,33,38 50:26 53:21,34,37 56:37 58:13 62:42 64:33 65:2 68:35 72:34
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23 48:11,33,38 50:26 53:21,34,37 56:37 58:13 62:42 64:33 65:2 68:35 72:34 73:38 74:37,38 77:5
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23 48:11,33,38 50:26 53:21,34,37 56:37 58:13 62:42 64:33 65:2 68:35 72:34 73:38 74:37,38 77:5 77:24,45 78:26 79:22
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23 48:11,33,38 50:26 53:21,34,37 56:37 58:13 62:42 64:33 65:2 68:35 72:34 73:38 74:37,38 77:5 77:24,45 78:26 79:22 79:22 80:1 83:35
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23 48:11,33,38 50:26 53:21,34,37 56:37 58:13 62:42 64:33 65:2 68:35 72:34 73:38 74:37,38 77:5 77:24,45 78:26 79:22 79:22 80:1 83:35 84:24 85:5,8,8,26,33
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23 48:11,33,38 50:26 53:21,34,37 56:37 58:13 62:42 64:33 65:2 68:35 72:34 73:38 74:37,38 77:5 77:24,45 78:26 79:22 79:22 80:1 83:35
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23 48:11,33,38 50:26 53:21,34,37 56:37 58:13 62:42 64:33 65:2 68:35 72:34 73:38 74:37,38 77:5 77:24,45 78:26 79:22 79:22 80:1 83:35 84:24 85:5,8,8,26,33 93:32,34 94:23 95:14
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23 48:11,33,38 50:26 53:21,34,37 56:37 58:13 62:42 64:33 65:2 68:35 72:34 73:38 74:37,38 77:5 77:24,45 78:26 79:22 79:22 80:1 83:35 84:24 85:5,8,8,26,33 93:32,34 94:23 95:14 106:25 110:12,24,27
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23 48:11,33,38 50:26 53:21,34,37 56:37 58:13 62:42 64:33 65:2 68:35 72:34 73:38 74:37,38 77:5 77:24,45 78:26 79:22 79:22 80:1 83:35 84:24 85:5,8,8,26,33 93:32,34 94:23 95:14 106:25 110:12,24,27 110:37 112:19 114:5
test 141:47 testify 167:26 tests 144:7 Texas 10:15 21:27 118:3 120:36 text 44:45 45:3 64:40 87:36,38 88:2 texture 138:31 thank 5:6 6:36 8:9 9:47 10:24,38 11:20 12:13 13:14 14:27,27 15:15 16:33 17:40 18:12 22:8 32:34 33:12,15 34:13,35 35:26 36:16 36:19,36 38:7,10,11 38:27 40:12 41:36 42:25 44:25 45:23 48:11,33,38 50:26 53:21,34,37 56:37 58:13 62:42 64:33 65:2 68:35 72:34 73:38 74:37,38 77:5 77:24,45 78:26 79:22 79:22 80:1 83:35 84:24 85:5,8,8,26,33 93:32,34 94:23 95:14 106:25 110:12,24,27

```
127:21 129:27 131:23
  131:25 134:21 140:37
  154:40,41,42 155:1
  156:32 159:38 164:42
  169:23,43,47 171:17
  172:20,29 173:25
  174:10
thanks 7:8 12:17 17:41
  18:17,18 32:20,33,43
  37:31 38:8,14 43:20
  43:21 45:12 47:27
  49:24 50:23 54:24
  58:3,20 64:48 66:17
  72:5 73:25 75:6,11,42
  77:3,46 79:7,10 85:6
  85:30 91:36,39 93:29
  96:10 97:9 104:12
  105:48 106:24 108:3
  108:40 109:26 110:25
  110:38 111:37 112:20
  112:47 113:7 114:6
  117:27 122:36 123:28
  125:30 127:18 129:19
  129:22,23 130:27,42
  131:13 132:35 134:19
  135:11,14,15 139:6
  139:10,48 142:45
  144:23,40,48 145:2
  154:37 156:33 157:23
  157:35 158:48 159:2
  159:33 160:42,44
  162:12,13 166:2
  168:1,46 169:24,36
  171:19 172:11,12
  173:26
theirs 10:18
they'd 43:9 52:8 101:46
  128:12
things 8:26 9:24 13:14
  13:19,40 14:37 17:29
  17:32,45,47 20:48
  22:16,17,18,21,22,24
  25:23 27:41 28:37
  29:32,33 31:12,16
  33:40 35:28 37:11
  41:18 42:18,18 43:38
  43:40 44:1,35 49:27
  49:33 62:7 78:17
  79:15 94:20,41 96:30
  97:43 98:7,17,30
  103:24 104:3 107:17
  110:44 111:47 112:16
  114:42 115:29 122:5
  122:26 125:1,12,15
  125:39,47 128:35
  129:2 136:23 139:2
  139:10 141:40 142:2
  142:3,31 143:47
```

145:16 153:42 154:33 160:11 166:32 167:23 167:32 172:26,26,47 **thinks** 31:48 third 39:41 48:5 110:31 **Thirty** 71:24 thought 5:22 8:18 9:2 25:24,28 31:11 64:29 74:35 118:13 126:37 135:8 140:24 153:33 thoughtful 111:38 thoughtfully 108:9 thoughtfulness 112:48 thoughts 8:8 31:46 97:42 thousand 118:18,37 thousands 16:27 threatened 81:10 three 38:4 39:25 43:28 43:43 44:19,29 45:14 54:13,15 72:26 73:15 73:16 78:24 99:43 100:5,9 103:40,44 105:16 106:11 109:4 109:13 112:45 115:46 117:36 130:10,32 147:24 149:29 158:42 159:28 163:27,38 164:44 166:46 167:28 167:38 168:32 170:41 172:26 three-fish 149:12 three-quarter 151:23 three-year 161:21 166:40 thresher 29:6 threshold 19:7 throat 137:44 throw 11:14,32 20:48 126:21 127:40 128:13 163:17 throwing 128:33 thrown 34:10 thumb 140:34 tickie 165:5 tied 50:15 103:13 110:30 ties 43:13 134:23 tiger 96:15 tight 40:46 105:10,43 113:4 137:39 tighten 49:17 till 18:25 55:47 150:3 167:39 timeline 37:44 129:35 129:48 130:1,16 131:17 **timelines** 129:43

II	1	1	i
timeliness 36:9,15	148:20	146:3	135:6 145:11,23,24
156:42	touched 104:39 145:40	trash 71:47	150:4,41 151:1
timely 36:5 60:30	tough 22:26	travel 19:1 21:9,43	154:34 159:24 173:48
123:37 131:44 165:29	tour 22:4	116:48 117:4	trying 11:16 14:31
timer 109:47	tournament 68:46,47	trawl 35:15	19:11,30 22:20 42:8
timers 103:35	68:48 69:5,6,12 75:44	treatment 75:1	42:20 43:44 44:2,33
times 12:43 13:24	75:46 76:6,9,10,13,14	trees 10:19	46:5 47:38 54:37 57:9
52:26 98:25 104:33	76:27,38,39 114:27	treetop 66:31	59:27 60:48 65:26
108:31 109:5 110:34	114:31,34,35,38,42	tremendous 15:44 44:8	82:38 106:45 123:5
112:13 117:38 146:3	114:48 115:18 116:15	132:8	124:1,25 128:38
151:14,17 168:11	116:16,19 117:10,30	tremendously 125:33	129:40 132:16 139:22
timing 19:28 24:27	118:19,24,38,47	132:4	148:44 150:40 151:10
51:28 52:17,46 93:40	119:28,30 132:38,42	trend 18:11 67:15	151:13 152:21,26,28
tiny 92:21	133:15,18,22,24,26	147:17 149:30 158:37	159:14 166:29 167:3
tired 123:7 tissue 122:6	133:30,37 134:2,11 134:13,17,39 135:13	trends 66:46 108:25 Trial 21:26	167:5,10,41
Tobey 3:12 7:42 38:20	138:14 139:30,38,39	tried 25:20 57:28	tug 153:45 tuna 4:36 5:37 6:48
38:26,27 44:25 47:27	141:35,39 143:19,21	147:40 152:6	8:46 18:38 19:22
82:25	143:24,26 144:6,20	tries 153:15	22:32,35 24:2 25:35
today 8:11 9:42,44	144:21	triggers 28:6	25:48 27:19,48 30:22
13:15 18:23,26 19:38	tournaments 23:7	trip 27:34 51:10,11,42	34:3 38:24 39:31
21:45 32:24 49:21	69:30 70:11 76:24,26	51:43,46 52:36 57:25	50:32 53:39 55:17
66:42 67:1 79:34	76:35,43 78:9,12	71:24,26,27 72:25	71:40,41 72:16 77:15
97:34 104:14 132:16	114:40 115:1,3,11,13	106:12 109:15 112:41	77:17,18,19,20 78:21
144:35 146:25 152:15	115:22,24,26,31,43	116:45 121:45 128:32	88:36 89:19 91:2
164:5 169:48 172:22	115:45 116:2,3,7,9,35	128:44 170:14,21,45	98:36,43 107:7,14,21
today's 66:29,36	116:42 117:17,42	trip- 51:7	114:24 115:14,40
toggling 160:12	118:33 119:28 120:28	trip-level 51:39 52:20	121:18 122:3,4
Togo 60:46	121:23,24,25 133:38	52:45 53:3 56:45	124:47 127:6 128:47
told 20:48 139:14	133:39 134:25 135:32	trips 26:5 27:35,38	128:47 131:44 136:45
Tom 53:9	135:42 138:42 141:5	72:21 101:45 103:14	145:7,14 146:22
tomorrow 9:44 18:23	141:31 143:1,16	120:23,35 121:33,34 123:47 125:21,22,25	147:8 152:48 153:11
18:25,46,48 19:19 79:42 85:39,44	144:2,2,12,18 track 21:39 113:4	149:26,28 153:24	154:24,25 155:20 159:12,25,44 170:13
159:37 162:36 169:31	160:10	trivial 5:8 40:30	170:15,19,45 171:48
174:1,9,17	tracking 52:38,40 53:5	trolled 137:27 139:19	tunas 28:32 30:24,32
tons 23:45,48 24:5	53:40 97:43 152:13	trolling 137:22,23	48:27 101:16 126:35
54:32,47 55:31,46	tracks 89:18	141:11 142:37 144:36	168:30
148:12,13,31,35	trade 28:27,34 29:8	trophies 116:28	tuned 25:17 28:25 40:2
149:13,17,23,40,43	tradeoffs 123:35	trophy 42:42 43:8,14	53:7 67:39
150:9 154:45 159:19	traditional 16:21,29	48:6 50:16 146:23	turn 5:28 62:48 68:32
160:22,26	32:27 121:19 152:47	trouble 21:20 74:32	69:39 104:10
tool 15:7 159:36	153:44	109:38	turned 69:4 116:36
tools 87:22	train 60:42 65:42	true 21:38 31:34 44:23	126:25 171:4
top 37:18 62:5 67:22	training 8:15	117:31 171:1	turns 22:3
84:33 92:15 115:12	transfer 55:32 56:12,44	truly 45:18	turtle 59:21 173:6
171:32	133:13 148:36 155:4	trust 66:2	turtles 101:17 102:24
topic 19:9 74:11 97:28 97:31 129:25 130:41	155:43 161:17 transferrable 156:8	Trustee 29:27	107:20 tweaking 19:27
132:37 169:29	transferred 55:32	truth 139:13 try 11:28 14:42 19:38	tweaking 19.27
topics 19:3,21 114:19	148:23 155:11	20:25 21:19 31:6	twenty 118:18
total 28:7 36:45 53:30	transfers 22:36 55:29	33:29 41:4 47:3 57:18	twice 70:12
55:20 109:18 116:6	55:34 56:6 145:31	60:2 62:8 66:9,30	Twitter 68:15 73:44
116:44 117:16,21	161:6,47	73:3 79:46 81:18 86:2	two 8:16 10:43 12:27
130:4 150:7 164:7	transit 129:3	92:34,39 99:4 106:40	15:17 35:28 38:3
totally 11:15 93:15	transitioned 152:20	113:12 114:12 120:39	43:28 44:1,18 45:9,14
touch 22:23 28:26	transmit 61:40	121:20 122:8 123:17	45:19 48:3 50:12
33:35 46:16 86:7	transpired 145:12	130:22,37 134:32,34	54:15 58:48 61:23
	I	I	l

102:23 107:6 95:40 104:1 105:46 Verde 60:46 63:7 69:19.20.44 105:47 112:4 verification 144:8,10,13 70:23,23 75:12 79:1 understand 10:29 **upgrade** 133:13 80:41 81:34 82:27 11:17,30 18:4,6,10 verified 90:21,25 87:13 95:17,18,33 20:25,43 24:21 35:10 **uptick** 146:21 167:16 99:23 100:4,5,7,13 62:43 93:15 97:35 **UPV** 78:40 verify 83:44 96:5,5 105:9,29 112:45 104:15 105:5 106:37 **upwards** 130:5 144:15 172:9 113:30 115:47 129:4 123:11 126:39 128:39 **usage** 78:3 93:44 versatility 173:40 use 14:45 15:7 20:22 129:6,8 133:20,23 131:11 version 88:25,26 understandably 8:44 26:5 35:48 36:22 61:7 versus 41:2,24 44:10 137:20 139:13,15 141:5 142:31 144:48 understanding 36:32 71:7 74:20 84:9 89:47 48:27 64:47 101:13 98:11 100:26,30 146:3,40 149:29,31 45:18 47:29,43 97:2 105:42 148:33,47,48 109:32 119:21 132:28 102:10 106:3,5,8,18 149:46 151:45,48 151:23 152:44 153:9 158:28 160:26 167:6 understood 45:22 106:22 132:27 134:6 152:47 155:30 157:10 134:14 135:43 136:35 158:18 163:43 174:4 167:8 168:18 169:33 142:41 172:26 undertaking 156:19 137:2,15 139:30 vertebrae 103:32 two-fish 147:41 underway 121:3 140:15,30 143:14,37 vessel 6:15 7:2 17:20 143:47 148:44 164:6 two-month 99:37 unenforceable 143:44 27:40 36:4 38:37,40 unfortunately 73:17 168:9.27 42:12,29 46:7 47:47 two-to-three- 170:33 type 17:25 40:32 47:31 99:15 106:41 useful 9:22 110:1 51:8,44 52:21,35 unharvested 9:26 18:1 user 46:27 87:36 60:26 61:34,45 62:1 56:43 58:26 59:45 133:43 134:1 63:47 70:30 76:1 18:8 62:16,26 63:24,37,42 104:38 108:36 114:42 unhooking 173:8 users 44:5 55:23 56:11 63:45 64:1,15,40,44 124:41 137:10,11 uniformed 66:35 56:24 69:21 70:7 71:23 73:8 138:20,29 143:42 uninspected 78:38 uses 153:5 77:34,34,35,36 78:33 78:42,45 103:41,45 unique 16:16 49:11 usual 5:18 18:42 22:14 146:10 154:3 types 24:42 94:48 **United** 10:48 13:22 usually 126:17 141:35 109:5,14 113:35,48 136:23,40 137:5 16:18 114:46 153:5 146:1 115:25 146:15 148:10 Typhoon 7:2 153:13 **USVI** 80:9 151:40 152:16,17 typical 128:44 units 49:31 utilization 89:22 147:13 172:3 typically 8:7 58:26 universe 42:10 48:31 utilize 15:35 85:4 **vessel's** 52:43 107:16 University 7:13 130:38 vessels 25:35.47 26:48 unlimited 148:33 utilized 54:14 56:28,29 27:1.6 33:10 36:42 U unreal 17:27 utilizing 48:23 37:3 38:38,41,42,44 **U.S** 3:20,23 5:48 6:6 unreported 49:22 39:1,3,10,10,15,16,19 V 9:26 13:34 17:16.18 unscathed 10:21 39:20,23,30,31,45 unsustainable 33:22 55:20 56:11,18 58:16 vaguely 97:27 41:12 42:9,11 43:3,4 untouched 55:48 45:44 46:2 47:35 60:47 61:7,27,30,42 valid 41:9 92:33 102:8 unused 55:48 56:6 48:13,44 49:31 50:47 81:3,28 85:25 98:26 106:29,33 101:24 108:33,38 upcoming 4:19 18:29 valuable 103:37 51:2,13,40 52:1,18 **UAV/UAS** 71:3 19:6 22:18 31:28 value 60:16 59:13 61:28.31.32 **UCI** 83:19 38:19 58:41 82:27 variability 81:30 116:2 63:35 64:12,21,25,29 133:38 116:17 118:31 64:38 69:17,19,20,20 **ultimate** 172:35 update 4:29,32 18:33 variable 153:19 77:33 78:35,39,48 ultimately 96:22 108:8 18:34 19:34 23:1 variables 150:3.41 81:42 95:17 98:18 108:12,26 127:36 128:38 145:23 147:14 27:15 28:44 32:25 variance 137:13 99:11 101:42 102:4 34:16 37:41 38:33 147:29 148:1,8,34 variation 137:10 109:5,9,9 116:4,5,6,8 60:8 68:33 79:9,25,39 146:19 148:38 149:28 149:6,21 150:11,40 varies 47:2 127:10 151:35 153:38 80:2 86:29 97:29 variety 127:27 151:38 155:35 156:10 114:27,30 132:38,41 170:16,41 171:46 unauthorized 25:36.47 various 8:48 14:9,20 26:6 34:39,44,48 135:12 18:6,7 21:26 93:18 172:5 updated 24:13 38:36,48 vet 159:24 35:11 172:4 121:6,35 133:43 39:18 66:39 86:35 vetted 29:32 156:23 uncertainty 51:35 160:31 87:33 vice 74:25 93:40 vary 47:1 55:44 **updates** 4:27 18:30 unchanged 91:4,5 vast 38:45 43:2 48:25 video 25:37 36:33 19:5 21:40 24:12 103:19 105:5,32,33 underage 55:8 56:26 149:30 150:20 25:20,30 26:17 28:28 underharvest 23:27 105:41 143:45 171:13 vehemence 167:35 98:27 28:41 58:15 67:43 **venture** 48:43 173:2,20 68:17 80:8 86:1 87:31 videos 35:32,34 60:14 undersized 59:12,17 **venue** 31:45

wants 20:31 142:17,47 Weber 2:26 43:22.23 68:16 143:46 171:8 43:20 93:44 142:18.41 Whitaker 2:29 6:10,10 171:11 154:19 33:48,48 47:41,41 view 11:33 65:12 99:21 war 153:45 webinar 21:22 99:38 111:39,39 125:46,46 107:25 113:25 **warrants** 152:48 webpage 11:8 67:7,22 viewed 26:8 Warren 53:9 67:25,33 74:44 127:12 140:2,2 169:5 viewing 35:21 **warriors** 163:14 website 44:3 67:27 white 22:48 26:18,20,37 viewpoint 45:20 wasn't 23:18 28:15 68:22 91:12,15,17 27:3 101:17 115:13 57:18 74:4 75:14 **websites** 66:39 views 20:13 32:5 45:30 118:46 119:5,7,12 vindicated 167:16 76:11 92:4 93:45 **WEDNESDAY** 1:19 136:12,25,30 141:6 violation 11:35 129:14 135:32 158:1 week 5:9 9:10 10:14,16 155:35 167:31 11:38 22:30 23:12 violations 59:10,15,19 whiter 147:19 158:30 waste 54:17 24:7 61:18 74:43 whitetip 29:1 32:36 59:22,24 75:20 76:36 77:17 78:6 152:12,24 watch 13:36 17:8 54:16 86:16 133:20 whitetips 85:19 weekend 118:12 163:14 Virgin 81:28 watching 142:8 **whopping** 149:40 Virginia 6:4 69:44 71:43 water 12:1 43:46 48:45 weekends 151:25 wide 9:38 127:27 49:46 66:11 94:44 weekly 66:40 67:43 71:43,44,45 82:34 widely 117:8 141:34 142:7 148:45 68:2,4,13 125:35 120:33 wiggle 96:48 149:45 160:29 166:41 153:37 wildlife 5:43 6:23 29:12 visited 67:7 visually 52:45 82:13 waters 6:16 32:47 weeks 9:17 91:21 75:30 85:14 35:37 65:46 86:18,23 111:23 148:26 149:16 Willey 2:28 5:40,40 **VMS** 49:31 86:23,26 89:23 95:21 weigh 20:21,36 47:16 voices 21:9 31:41 willing 123:25 144:38 96:14 99:40 121:39 126:23 142:17 Wilmington 127:13 volume 53:31 87:17 125:10.26 weighed 50:10 Wilson 7:44,44 159:47 160:9 wave 21:21 146:37 weighing 102:30 wind 120:43 121:40 voluntary 29:46 30:1 way 7:33 15:11 16:37 142:47 123:42 141:37 142:6 19:11,13 26:4,10 weight 24:1 159:18 windows 149:19 150:2 35:26 39:12 40:35 volunteers 76:10 weighting 124:15 winners 116:29 vote 31:4 41:10,19 44:9 55:12 Weiner 2:23 winning 144:7 welcome 5:4 6:35 8:10 VTR 36:10 49:14 55:24 56:40 58:27 winter 25:14 93:46 10:41 15:39 16:29 VTRs 36:4,5 61:20,23,24 62:23 117:25 145:45 147:24 vulnerability 83:2 69:40 72:12.37 78:20 58:22 86:13 147:32 149:10.21 Welcome/Introductio... 82:33,34 84:45 93:14 wiped 174:12 W 104:26 105:7 107:36 4:11 wise 63:42 wish 10:13,23 39:20,32 well-established 75:46 **wahoo** 136:44 108:12 110:12 120:33 Wendland 63:25 wait 16:31 54:47 55:47 123:43 127:25,28 69:38 141:17 164:1 128:15 130:35 131:43 went 38:16 73:14 79:12 64:5 111:27 165:36 within- 131:37 132:14,15,22,27 81:17 88:7 109:31 within-season 131:46 waited 56:22 72:31 135:6 138:25,41 witnessed 112:23 waiting 25:10 56:21 114:16 118:45 122:38 130:39 140:5 144:14,15 125:43 127:44 131:42 wonder 92:28 walk 85:48 152:24,28 159:46 148:3 154:46 174:24 wondered 105:19 walked 9:2 160:40 164:48 167:5 weren't 90:5 93:45 wondering 32:24 36:20 walking 123:5 168:21,34,39 169:3 131:7 143:33 163:6 40:14 70:46 72:14,32 169:12,42 171:28 wall 30:48 west 28:1 92:20 100:10 77:22 84:21,46 Walt 7:11,12 38:6 113:8 172:33 123:33 155:46 157:46 104:23 136:14 ways 14:31 20:15,27 113:16 114:6 western 22:39 23:28,33 158:3 woods 118:41 163:20 **WALTER** 1:42 43:48 49:16 78:2,15 98:36 127:45 162:16 121:13,20,26,28 word 40:22 46:34 48:36 wanted 9:5 14:23 15:14 Westfall 2:27 6:18,18 15:38,41 16:12,15 139:15,44 143:41 32:34 44:25 108:5 48:37 49:25 111:17 144:17 161:5 21:23,34 22:2 26:16 123:29 124:32 130:45 131:24 169:4 weather 57:8 149:19 168:2 words 37:19 137:26 27:10 29:21 30:5,40 150:1 157:30 158:32 work 13:21 14:11,35,41 31:19 33:7 41:40 whacks 137:28 174:22 48:34 57:40 62:6,42 whale 17:25 85:17 15:5,43 19:38,44 62:44 63:9 73:4 74:14 web 67:11 68:2 134:17 whatever's 32:39 29:35 36:29 40:16 143:46 151:41 157:10 wheel 36:27 47:14 62:9 66:33 68:10 85:48 87:9 89:24 157:16,16 165:10,11 wheels 36:26 73:31 75:9,28,40 79:3 106:22 110:40 113:24 172:40 whispering 144:28 114:4 135:36 157:6 81:40 105:38 123:44 web-based 157:14 166:27 167:46 172:28 whispers 21:8 126:35 127:16 129:39

whistles 35:38 42:34

159:35

wanting 44:20 51:23

132:24 141:48 152:6

I	1	1	,
152:21,25 160:15	132:32 135:35 137:19	170:18	104:22
164:4 166:4,43	138:13,36 139:43	100,000 116:26,38	2003 140:43 159:5
167:21 172:16	140:8,11,25 145:38	104 115:10	2004 159:5
worked 60:45 110:21	146:18,44 147:16,34	108 54:47 55:46 56:2,15	2005 159:5
132:8 150:23	148:5,37 150:46	149:22	2006 24:43
working 24:44,47 26:13	151:6 153:9 154:29	11 51:20 58:36 77:18,20	2008 100:23,27 106:4
28:46 29:5 32:31 37:8	163:4,27,38 164:44	77:34,35 146:34	106:21 135:46 162:30
37:43,45 41:7 60:34	166:46 167:28,38	156:37	2009 86:30 98:33
60:36,41 62:11,19	168:29,32	111 4:34	2010 33:24 100:24,27
63:26 65:11 66:4,7,10	yellowfin 28:5 59:12	112,000 117:38	106:4,21 132:45
66:15 67:47 72:33	72:16 78:21 107:14	118 4:37	2011 132:46 133:1
74:12 75:35 104:7	107:24 115:14 122:4	12 49:37 99:21 102:42	2012 67:24 133:2
117:18 118:1 119:40	136:44	170:38,47	2013 100:30 106:6,17
119:46 124:37 130:31	yellowfins 34:3	12-month 99:23 103:46	146:40
152:19	yesterday 148:34	170:37	2014 86:32 133:6
workload 28:22 41:17	yield 11:42,43,47 12:5,7	12:04 79:12	2015 50:46 51:4 52:12
works 126:34,38	147:14	123 148:12,16	86:32 98:21 100:31
156:35 165:34	yielded 133:4	123 146.12,16 128 116:12	106:6 110:28 112:36
workshop 103:23	yielding 133:4	13 77:12 99:32 133:2	2016 38:36 51:7 67:13
	York 5:39 69:3,41 72:29	130 90:25	
workshops 23:9,10 173:16	young 89:36 90:12	130 ,90.25 130,000 71:23	98:29 114:36,39 115:11 133:12 153:43
1	young 69.36 90.12	130,000 7 1.23	
world 21:8 140:10 worms 97:8		138.2 154:45	161:42 2017 1:20 4:37 29:29
	zero 12:47 148:39		
worst 113:36		14 106:11 157:17	36:44 48:18 67:24
worth 20:2 140:47	159:44	15 55:33,43 56:17	77:10,11 114:23
142:25	zone 5:30 59:11	103:35 106:17 114:2	133:17 146:6,41
wouldn't 14:25 39:39	0	133:6 139:6 145:32	161:42
41:37,39 43:9 52:39		148:15 150:46 162:26	2018 22:28 23:20 24:29
54:3,4 84:15 85:3	0 63:5 136:33	15-page 170:31	27:21 28:30 29:22,47
107:38 110:3 126:39		150 164:12	36:44 42:22 67:29
142:12 161:48 162:1	1	156 24:4	109:25 121:37
wow 9:2	1-800-CLOSE-ME	15th 160:25	2019 27:41,44
wrap 58:4 154:36	158:19	16 68:27 104:36 148:27	2020 24:34 29:29
wrist 71:29	1,080 101:1	152:34	2022 67:29
writeup 74:43	1,500 72:2 117:38	169 4:39	21 23:38 42:29
writing 74:34	1,706 112:40	17 77:17,33 148:2	22 23:22
wrong 37:21 126:31	1.2 131:5	152:17,18,34	22,000 116:37
wrote 37:21	1.7 136:28	17.5 131:6	228 116:10
Wynn 3:7 58:18 66:18	1:30 79:9	174 4:41	23,000 117:6
66:43 77:5 152:11	1:31 79:13	18 4:17 109:5,6	24 36:11 49:5 89:18
	10 16:40 19:23 43:3	180 166:47	156:39
X	55:7,10 58:33 66:8	181 112:37	24- 151:8
	69:10 79:41 85:39,43	19 25:34	24/7 36:35
Υ	86:36,38 87:30 88:5	1992 132:3	240 102:35,37
yards 162:25	89:35 90:15,15 91:12	1998 148:5	25 16:38 23:34 114:7
year's 51:6 53:42	91:38 93:13 102:33		155:7
133:37 145:47	103:42 106:26 114:2	2	250 119:18,22
years 8:17 13:47 16:37	114:40 115:48 128:14	2 148:18	263 23:8
16:38,40,46 17:15,32	139:6	2,000 172:41	27 8:17 23:8 159:25
24:48 29:29 34:26	10-inch 64:30	2,500 116:15,33	169:11
38:45 41:27,39 54:13	10:10 38:16	2:54 114:16	28 63:37 64:2
54:15,41 59:1,31,34	10:30 38:13	20 16:37 17:32 55:9,13	29 115:10 157:16
65:42 66:8 70:18	10:32 38:17	72:10 73:9 104:36	
86:28 92:8 93:13,28	100 17:22 57:3,3 70:45	114:2 146:31 148:5	3
95:37,39 96:7 105:16	100:8,11 103:18,21	151:6 154:22 162:26	3 18:25 19:26 60:19
119:45 120:47 122:22	104:24 105:28 117:35	20,000 116:46	83:37 109:5,17,17
122:24 124:30 125:4	141:47 161:18 162:24	200 104:24	119:4
130:2,7,10,32,32	163:2,6 166:30	2001 98:11 100:22	3,000 117:6
	l	l	l

П	
3,000-plus 166:48 3,300 23:48 3,500 48:19 3:15 19:26 114:12,14 3:22 114:17 3:30 18:25 30 35:43 36:42 37:3 54:32 55:14 72:10 73:9 128:5,13,14 147:29 149:8 157:38 30,000 116:32,40 300 59:2 71:24,25 116:4 31 55:18 77:10 104:29 148:12 312 112:37 31st 147:30 324 150:8 32 5150:8 33 23:3 116:9 34 55:31 98:28 35 16:48 136:26 36 109:18,19,21,36 367 112:39 38 4:22 39 98:28 3rd 160:24	57 157:15 58 4:27 589 127:30 5B 39:44 109:44 6 6 1:20 73:8 87:48 99:28 109:5 116:14 139:29 6.7 136:32 60 16:46 600 101:4 103:2 658 23:45 7 7 38:44 48:13,14,16,22 56:5 77:19,34 106:3 139:20 145:44 146:26 146:32 151:37 155:6 70 149:13 720 101:3 103:1 739 159:12 169:10 75 24:1 115:3 117:38 118:11 155:10 750 71:37 101:1 79 4:29
4 4 29:9 116:4,30 118:29 147:37 157:41 169:6 4,000 117:5 4,800 71:25,26 4.5 160:22 40 54:32 128:13,14 149:17 40.1 148:35 41 16:47 43 116:7 45 23:34 30:39,47 55:31 152:5 46 16:47 46,000 116:29 47 159:25 47-inch 169:11 4th 160:4 5 5 4:11 23:5 83:39 93:13 113:33 116:4,26 5,600 23:13 5:30 18:40 144:46 5:40 174:24 5:45 18:41 50 4:24 23:33 49:3 70:45 93:28 104:22 161:10 163:1,6 500 11:4 102:20 118:37 50th 115:47	8 8 4:13 90:24 139:19,20 142:37 148:4,13 149:40,43 160:26 8:30 18:47 174:18 8:45 1:26 8:56 5:2 800,000 116:39 850,000 116:41 8777 1:25 88 112:38 9 9 95:22,24 9-knot 139:20 9:00 172:25 90 43:6 92 95:21 93 150:14 95 87:17,24 97 4:32 95:21

<u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Highly Migratory Species Panel

Before: NOAA

Date: 09-06-17

Place: Silver Spring, MD

was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Court Reporter

near Nous &