U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION (NOAA)

+ + + + +

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE (NMFS)

ATLANTIC HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES ADVISORY PANEL

+ + + + +

VIRTUAL PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY MAY 26, 2021

+ + + + +

The Panel met via webinar at 9:00 a.m. EDT, Bennett Brooks, facilitating.

MEMBERS PRESENT

JASON ADRIANCE, Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries PATRICK AUGUSTINE ANNA BECKWITH, South Atlantic Fishery Management Council RICK BELLAVANCE, New England Fishery Management Council ANDREW COX, Shimano North America MARCUS DRYMON, Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant; State Representative for Alabama MEAGAN DUNPHY-DALY, Duke University Nicholas School of the Environment RAIMUNDO ESPINOZA, Conservaci¢n ConCiencia Inc. STEVE GETTO, American Bluefin Tuna Association

WALTER GOLET, University of Maine School of Marine Sciences and Gulf of Maine Research

> Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc. Washington DC

Institute

JOHN GRAVES, Virginia Institute of Marine Science

YAMITZA RODRIGUEZ FERRER, Puerto Rico DNER, Recreational and Sport Fisheries Division SONJA FORDHAM, Shark Advocates International

KRISTIN FOSS, Florida Fish and Wildlife

Conservation Commission

MARCOS HANKE, Caribbean Fishery Management Council

LUKE HARRIS, Pure Harvest Seafood

DEWEY HEMILRIGHT, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council

GREG HINKS, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection

EVAN HIPSLEY

RUSSELL HUDSON, Directed Sustainable Fisheries, Inc.

ROBERT HUETER, Center for Shark Research, Mote Marine Laboratory

BOB HUMPHREY, Sport-Ventures Charters and Casco Bay Bluefin Bonanza

STEPHEN IWICKI

WALLACE JENKINS, South Carolina Department of Resources

DAVID KERSTETTER, Nova Southeastern University Oceanographic Center

SHANA MILLER, The Ocean Foundation

ROBERT NAVARRO, Fly Zone Fishing

JEFF ODEN, F/V Sea Bound

TIM PICKETT, Lindgren-Pitman, Inc.

MICHAEL PIERDINOCK, CPF Charters

"Perseverance"; Recreational Fishing Alliance

STEVE POLAND, North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries

GEORGE PURMONT

KIRBY ROOTES-MURDY, Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

MARK SAMPSON, Ocean City Charterboat Captains Association

MARTIN SCANLON, F/V Provider II

DAVID SCHALIT, American Bluefin Tuna Association

GREGORY SKOMAL, Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries

PERRY TRIAL, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

CHRISTINA VAETH, present on behalf of Dave Campo

RICK WEBER, South Jersey Marina
ALAN WEISS, Blue Water Fishing Tackle
Company

KATIE WESTFALL, Environmental Defense Fund ANGEL WILLEY, Maryland Department of Natural Resources

NOAA NMFS STAFF PRESENT

RANDY BLANKINSHIP, Division Chief, Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Management Division KARYL BREWSTER-GEISZ, HQ Fish Branch Chief, Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Management Division

JENNIFER CUDNEY, Atlantic Highly Migratory
Species Management Division
PETE COOPER, Branch Chief, Atlantic Highly
Migratory Species Management Division
KELLY DENIT, Director, Office of Sustainable
Fisheries

GUY DUBECK, Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Management Division

ADRIENNE LOHE, Office of Protected Resources

BRAD MCHALE, Northeast Branch Chief, HMS
Recreational Coordinator, Atlantic Highly
Migratory Species Management Division
DELISSE ORTIZ, Atlantic Highly Migratory Species
Management Division

LARRY REDD, JR., Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Management Division

CARRIE SOLTANOFF, Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Management Division

TOM WARREN, Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Management Division

CONTENTS

Welcome/Recap	5
Shark Update	
Shark Review (SHARE))
Shark and Swordfish Retention Final Rule	3
90-Day Finding on a Petition to List the	
Shortfin Mako Shark as Threatened or	
Endangered Under the Endangered Species Act 59	5
HMS Best Scientific Information Available	
Framework Document Development Update	1
Electronic Technologies and Electronic	
Monitoring Updates	3
Public Comment	L

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 9:02 a.m.

MR. BROOKS: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to day 2 of the AP meeting. We'll have a three-day AP meeting so another full day tomorrow, and then on Friday there will be a Recreational Roundtable conversation, a discussion of the Large Pelagics Survey. That is an open meeting. That is more of a public workshop, not a formal AP meeting itself. So we hope to see all of you there as well.

We had a good full day yesterday, a lot of conversations, a lot of really helpful feedback from all of you so thank you as always for being so focused and attentive, and sharing your thoughts. It's really helpful.

Today we have another busy day. We're going to focus in the morning, several presentations and discussions related to shark fisheries. We'll start with the shark review and update you on the comprehensive review of the shark fishery known as SHARE.

After a break we will have a presentation on the Shark and Swordfish Retention Final Rule. And then we'll have a brief conversation and discussion on the petition to list shortfin make shark as threatened or endangered.

We will break for lunch at 11:30, and we'll have a lunch break from 11:30 to 1 so as I mentioned yesterday that is the big chunk of time that we encourage you if there's a call you've got to take or work you've got to do, that's the best place to focus it. It's a pretty reliable 90 minutes that you can grab and not to have to sort of share your attention between this conversation and other things that I know are on all of our desks. So please focus up there.

After lunch we'll come back and we'll hear about a new national initiative that's focused on best scientific information available. And sort of bring you up to speed on what this is and where that's heading over the coming months and years.

And then after another break we will hear about the electronic technology implementation plan, sort of both a look back and a look forward.

We will take public comment today at 3 o'clock. So from 3 to 3:30 we have a half hour set aside for public comment. So for members of the public who are here that will be the moment and the chance for you to weigh in with any perspectives and thoughts that you would like the agency to hear.

I do want to welcome Christina Vaeth who is sitting in for Dave Campo today. So thanks, Christina, for joining us and good to have you in the mix. I think that's the only new AP member we have. And again, I think we've got a pretty good turnout today based on my AP sheet here so thanks everybody.

To remind us of the ground rules because we've got some AP members who haven't been in the mix before, and always some public members who aren't here. Just our usual ground rules that we ask you to sort of abide by or to contribute so we can hear from you to share time so we can hear from everyone, really listen hard to each other, listen to the agency, ask questions, try to integrate across different things you're hearing.

This is not a consensus-seeking body, but it's always helpful to hear where people are landing and why, to see where there's overlap, see where there's divergence, and understand that because that really helps the agency do its best decision-making.

As always we ask everyone to engage in a spirit that is collaborative, and constructive, and ask you to do that again today.

For members of the public again as I mentioned we have public comment at the end of the day. That's because this is a meeting among the advisory panel itself and so the conversation really is among the AP members. We're glad you're here and listening in, and again, if there are things that come up for you during the day just keep a piece of paper and a pen handy, and jot down a question or a comment so you can fold it in later in the day.

Just because we're in this odd virtual world still, just want to remind folks who are new. The way this works is everyone is muted and off camera for most of the time we're on the phone on this call.

When someone wants to get in all you need to do is raise your virtual hand which I know you are all good at at this point. But you'll find it next to your name. If that doesn't work just throw something in the chat saying hey, trying to raise my hand, can't do it, and we will bring you in. It seemed to work pretty well yesterday.

If you are supportive of something that was said, or have a comment you can throw that in the chat. The chat just goes to HMS staff and myself. But as happened yesterday Delisse and Heather will grab comments that come in and then reflect it back out to the full group, assuming it's something substantive we'll send that back and around.

As I said yesterday I do recommend people minimize the use of the chat. I think actually it was used very well yesterday. It was helpful with some quick comments. But if there's too much of a running commentary there it does take away and I think people wind up not paying attention to the actual conversation and presentations that are happening. So just use that with care and caution.

I will run the queue just the way I did yesterday, generally taking hands in the order in which they come up, but also trying to deviate a little bit from that if we need a conversation, or if -- trying to bring in voices that we haven't heard from.

I do ask folks when it comes to you I know that many of you will have lots of questions. Just out of respect for each other what I would say is ask what's the most pertinent question or two, and then let others come in, and then we can circle back to you. I just want to make sure we really are creating space for everyone to weigh in. So that just requires everyone to sort of play by that rule. And I would ask you all to do so.

If you have any technical issues at all during the meeting just chat or email Pete, chat or email Nic, throw something in the chat and we will make sure to bring you in. For anyone who's new today we had a couple of questions yesterday from people saying I can't see the attendee list and that is right. You

cannot see the attendee list.

Unfortunately that's just sort of a quirk of the Webex events where we're unable to make that visible. So apologies, but just know that you're not missing a button. There's just no way to show that to you.

And lastly, just a reminder that we are recording these meetings so Pete, if that hasn't been pushed yet this would be a good time to do it. And I think that's it on what I wanted to say. Pete or Randy, anything that either of you care to add in?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: I'll just offer a quick welcome back this morning and we're really glad to be back here together with you again to continue the discussions. And yesterday certainly was a day of really good input and lively discussion. It was very valuable to hear the things that we heard. We're looking forward to another day of productive discussions today on other topics and a diverse range of topics today.

And I also just wanted to thank everybody for working through, being patient, working through technical issues that you may be having. I know it can be frustrating sometimes when your microphone doesn't pick you up and we've got to say that you're breaking up, but thanks for working through those and all that. I know sometimes it feels like you're going the extra mile, but in this setting it's -- we just appreciate the extra effort because we want to hear from you.

I also want to just mention and kind of echo some of the sentiments that Bennett shared which is -- and that is to encourage all of you, if you have thoughts or input to share is please do share it with the AP in our discussion. I think everybody benefits from being able to hear the different perspectives. And I know the agency does, but I think it also helps others to see the range of comments that are coming in from the AP as well. So please feel free and feel empowered to make those comments either verbally or in the chat. Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Pete, anything from your end?

MR. COOPER: Nothing to add. You guys got it covered very well. I'll be in the

background helping out, so if you guys run into tech problems or anything feel free to email or send something up in the chat. Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: Perfect. Thanks, Pete. And any questions from the AP before we start up here? Looking at the list I'm not seeing any hands raised. Okay. All right.

Then let me just note since we started up here we've had a few more AP members come in and our environmental representation is now full up so I think we've got a good balance of folks here which is great.

All right. Then let's -- oh wait, Tim Donaldson, I see your hand raised. No. Okay. All right. Let's jump in then. Let me hand it off to Guy DuBeck to start us off with an update on SHARE. Guy, over to you.

MR. DUBECK: Well, thank you, Bennett. Can everyone see my screen okay?

MR. BROOKS: Yes, we can.

MR. DUBECK: Perfect. Good morning. My name is Guy Dubeck. I'm here talking about the shark fishery review.

So here's a quick overview of the presentation. I'd like to start with what SHARE is followed by a description of the fishery. This is where we will focus on the four main parts of SHARE which is commercial fishery, recreational fishery, shark depredation, and any outside factors.

I'll give a brief overview of the data review from states, areas of success and concerns for each of the four main parts. Since it's only a brief overview it does not cover all the aspects and details described in the SHARE document. And then lastly I'll provide some potential ways forward and next steps.

Over the past few years NOAA has observed significant changes to the commercial and recreational shark fisheries. Thus we decided to do a complete review of the fishery and with our own review, SHARE.

SHARE focuses on recent years of data, so '14 through 2019. In some sections we also looked at historical data, or data, 2020 data for reference. We start with 2014 since this was the first year of data not used in Amendment 6, which was the last review of the commercial shark

fishery. And it was the first full year of data for the industry. Areas of success along with concerns in the fishery. Identify ways to improve the fishery.

So the first section is the commercial fishery. In SHARE we reviewed all the commercial permits. So we're going to talk about the federal limited access and open access permits, state water permits, and dealer permits. We looked at who was targeting and retaining sharks, along with the number of trips taken by the permit holders and the years used.

SHARE shows shark landings by shark management group along with where the dealers are reporting sharks and the percentage of annual landings. Lastly we reviewed the ex-vessel prices and revenue in the fishery.

So currently the number of active permits and trips landing and targeting sharks (audio interference). As I will show in a few slides, landings are at an all-time low and this decline in the shark fishery has led to drops in prices due to revenue for fishermen.

So the first slide here is the number of active limited access permits by region. So in the figure we have the directed permits on the left-hand side and then incidental permits on the right-hand side. You have the number of permits on the y axis, years on the x axis, and then the Atlantic permits are kind of the orange/red color, and the Gulf of Mexico permits on the bottom are a teal color.

As you can see there's been a decline in the number of active permits from 2014 through 2019, and then also the majority of the permits are in the Atlantic region.

So this slide shows the landings in relation to quota for two different shark management groups. On the left-hand side you have the Atlantic aggregated large coastal quota and landings, and then you've got the Gulf of Mexico non-blacknose small coastal on the right-hand side.

In both figures you have the quota in the gold line, you have the landings in the blue, the y axis is the landings in pounds dressed weights. I also want to note that the scales are different between the two figures, and also it

5

does not go all the way down to zero. And then the years are on the x.

For the Atlantic aggregated large coastal landings you can see they were kind of consistent for '14 through '16 before a dropoff in 2019 with only 40 percent reported being harvested. In the Gulf of Mexico non-blacknose small coastal figure landings have stayed well below the quota once the current quota was established in '96, and that was in 2015.

So moving on to areas of success and concern. So regarding successes, you know, management measures have created a year-round fishery and added stability to the picture. Quotas have not been exceeded since 2015 and based on recent stock assessments, some shark populations are increasing. In addition, a number of our quotas are being under-harvested, which could be helping to rebuild shark stocks back up faster.

Areas of concerns: the fishery has declined over time. Some management measures have had a greater effect than intended, and fishermen are only in the fishery when they are unable to fish for higher revenue fisheries. It appears very few fishermen are focusing on sharks.

Moving on to the recreational fishery. We reviewed the shark endorsement permits, the directed and non-directed fishing efforts, survey data, and tournament landings.

The current state. Right now non-directed trips are catching and releasing most of the sharks. In recent years there has been an increased effort by state water and shore-based fishermen. Small coastal sharks and smooth dogfish account for the majority of the harvested sharks. And shortfin make regulations have caused a decline in the directed, targeted pelagic shark trips and tournament landings.

So this slide shows the percentage of sharks harvested and released in the Atlantic region. You see the left pie chart has the number of harvested sharks. I want to point to -- everyone will see this in the figure. We're talking about 240,000 sharks that were harvested.

Over 50 percent of those sharks were small coastal sharks, so the light green color.

About 30 percent are smooth dogfish. That's the dark green color. And unidentified sharks are about 12 percent of the harvest. That's in the blue color.

So compared to the left-hand which on the left-hand side we're talking about harvested number of sharks, we have on the right-hand side the number of released sharks. And we're talking about 13 million sharks. So that's a big difference. I just want to point that out.

With that, 50 percent are reported as unidentified sharks in the blue color. Smooth dogfish and small coastal sharks are the highest released shark species, while pelagic sharks are less than 1 percent.

So here is a slide, the recent number of shortfin make sharks kept which are in the green color, and then released which are more of the blue color. The y axis is landings in number of sharks, and years is on the x axis in the bottom. As a reminder the shortfin make shark regulations were implemented in 2018 which explains the low harvest numbers and higher release numbers from '18 to '19.

Before the regulations the highest number of shortfin make sharks were released in 2015.

So again moving on to areas of success and concern of the recreational fishery. For successes, most permits are getting the shark endorsement and viewing the educational materials. Management measures have successfully met its target shortfin make reductions with 85 percent in the recreational fishery. Even though there's been a decrease in reported harvest of identified sharks, the real reason is hard to say. It could be because of angler behavior change, or improved identification by the interviewers.

As for concerns there's some differences between federal and state regulations that has led to some confusion for some anglers. And some sharks below 54 inches are being landed. Shark identification and HMS regulations or techniques are not known to some non-HMS anglers.

And then as I said earlier, 50 percent of the released sharks are unidentified, which is a large number of sharks. And the adage if you

don't know, let it go applies as good practice for the angler. However, sharks are often difficult to identify and survey data on released fish can suffer as a result of inaccurate identification.

So, moving on to shark depredation which has been a popular topic recently. We reviewed -- so we reviewed the comments received by NOAA staff to map out the initial extent of the depredation. We also looked at depredation mitigation techniques, shark populations, ongoing research, and future research avenues.

So as most of you know shark depredation reports are on the increase. And as Randy mentioned in the overview slide yesterday NOAA has a congressional directive to review the conflicts between dolphins, sharks, and commercial and recreational fishermen in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic.

Based on the data there's been a stable trend in depredation in the pelagic longline fishery, and an upward trend in the Gulf of Mexico reef fish fisheries. Since there is little or no market value for the damaged fish, and repairing or replacing fishing gear can be expensive, fishermen are experiencing loss of revenue.

So here's a map of the comments received by NOAA on the shark species and affected fisheries or species. As you can see in the northeast I see like five shark species are affecting striped bass, groundfish, and bluefin tuna fisheries.

In the Mid-Atlantic region it's sandbar and dusky sharks seem to be affecting the tuna fishery. In the southeast and the Gulf of Mexico it seems that the large coastal species are affecting the reef fish, mackerel, and shrimp species.

So here are some areas of success and concern about shark depredation. Due to all the increased social media posts and pictures citizen science has improved along with an increase in data collection and research.

As shown in previous slides shark depredation has increased engagement across all stakeholders. However, the lack of data on shark species causing depredation and the full extent

of the issue is a concern. There's a lack of methods to deter this event, and also reduced efforts in the shark fishery are not helping.

So, moving on to the last section. We're talking about outside factors and other factors affecting the shark fishery. We reviewed the other fisheries the shark fishery participate in. We looked at state regulations, so fin bans and international regulations, ICCAT and CITES.

Based on our review shark fishermen appear to be prioritizing fishing in other fisheries due to their timing or higher revenue. Ninety percent of the shark directed permit holders hold at least one other non-HMS permit. State and international regulations are affecting the landing and transportation of shark products.

State and shark fin bans have created confusion and uncertainty in the fishery. And internationally U.S. fishermen are doing their part to help rebuild stocks worldwide.

So moving to areas of success and concern with the other fisheries -- other factors, excuse me. One success is that outside factors are assisting with the rebuilding of shark stocks. In addition, some fishermen and dealers are able to navigate these outside factors and continue to participate in the fishery.

Concerns are that the other outside factors are beyond HMS management authority. State shark fin bans are having direct and indirect impacts as shown by the decline in commercial landings, especially with the 2019 western gulf large coastal landings.

And lastly, U.S. fishermen are feeling the burden of international regulations.

So after going through all the sections, reviewing all the current data and areas of success and concerns we've come up with a few potential modifications to the fishery.

The first one on the list is to potentially change -- make changes to the vessel permit structure. One option is to consider changing the incidental permits to open access permits with some restrictions.

Secondly, we could update the large coastal blacknose and other commercial retention limits to better reflect the current state of the

fishery.

 Another option is to potentially revise the regional and sub-regional quotas based on current fishing efforts. And lastly, we could update recreational size limits to better reflect size at maturity, and consider increasing the bag limit for some shark species.

So all those are -- those potential modifications are really changes that involve some sort of type of rulemaking. Beyond the rulemaking changes NOAA fisheries can consider other options.

One is to improve communication within and outside the shark fishery. Outside the fishery we can better educate the public about the sustainability of the shark fishery. As Randy mentioned in the overview slide yesterday this summer we're doing that shark communication campaign using the hash tag #KnowSharksBetter.

We can continue to support U.S. shark fishermen domestically or internationally. And then lastly, we will need to work with fishermen to come up with better practices to mitigate shark depredation events.

So as for next steps, we are planning to release the draft document and have public webinars in the coming months. After we review the comments and potential suggestions of other areas to review, we'll plan to release a final version in 2022.

Any potential rulemaking that results from SHARE would be separate from the current actions that are ongoing right now. Right now we're talking about Amendment 14, the Shark ABC Control Rule, or the Amendment 14 follow-on rule which would be establishing quotas for the shark season. Thank you, everyone, for listening and we'll take your comments and questions.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Thanks very much, Guy. So let's invite folks in. Again, raise your hand and again I'll ask folks to just if you have a whole bunch of questions just start with a couple, let others talk, and then we'll circle back around. Let's start with Sonja, and then over to Kirby, and then Jason.

MS. FORDHAM: I'm not sure if it worked out well from yesterday but I'll take the first up. Yes, thank you for the presentation.

I'm afraid I quite am generally concerned that the program, or at least this presentation, I mean perhaps by design but it's not really specifically stated, it's completely overlooking the concerns to the conservation community and a decent portion of the public. And the status reviews a few shark species and the slides don't even include the current population status.

I'm interested to learn whether the concern columns listed on the slides are perceived as those of industry, or the agency, or both. And I'm particularly struck by the characterization of international and state obligations as other, and outside factors. I don't think this is helpful.

Specifically, I don't think it's useful to characterize CITES as some outside force. Just a reminder, the U.S. is a party to CITES that in the past has been an actual leader from the beginning in listing (audio interference) ranks under the CITES appendices. And in fact, not just the U.S. but the National Marine Fisheries Service that led the way to -- was a clear intention to promote sustainability of sharks by listing them specifically on Appendix II.

And I'll just note that well managed fisheries can give the U.S. a competitive advantage with respect to their national trade in listed species.

There's this bit about the U.S. has been doing their part to rebuild sharks worldwide, and that statement plus some of the graphs are just leading -- sort of suggesting to me that this is about make sharks. lot -- we've talked a lot about makes in the past, and certainly specifically now at the ICCAT intersessional I will just mention that I think it's great that the U.S. has significantly reduced make mortality, but unfortunately the dire state of the population has led scientists to advise a complete North Atlantic retention ban through ICCAT and that's just a starting point, and the U.S. has been a major obstacle to the adoption of that scientific advice which has led to continued overfishing on the ocean scale.

And rather than discussing how fishermen have or can navigate outside factors,

5

I'd really like to see the agency work to integrate the factors, including U.S. obligations under international treaties, and not divide them and sort of contribute to an "us versus them" mentality.

For the record, I am not someone who supported fin bans, but I have to just say that the groups and the concerned citizens behind them were also stakeholders with a say in how U.S. resources were used, and their concerns and the reasons for them wanting to have these bans don't appear to be covered in this program at all.

And similarly I also think that it would be useful to explore generally sort of consumer concerns that factor into these kind of efforts, but also general market demand and changes in tastes.

So in a nutshell I don't find this approach constructive. I would like to see instead an integration of relevant factors and stakeholder concerns rather than what I see as division. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Sonja. Let's go to Kirby --

MR. BLANKINSHIP: I'd like to -- if I could step in just real quickly just to comment. Sonja, thanks for the points. They're well taken. I want to point out as Guy has already, what we have here is a presentation that is an overview of an extensive document that conducts analysis -- that document will be coming out in the coming weeks.

I encourage you, and I know you will, take a look at that when it comes out. We'll be looking forward to getting feedback on that.

And that more information will be included in that document that we certainly weren't able to dive into in this overview presentation.

I did want to just kind of circle back a little bit on the comment related to international efforts related to shortfin mako shark. And while this -- what we're discussing certainly at this AP that is relevant, and we are concentrating on domestic efforts to a great extent. And not wanting to chase down discussions that let's say are appropriate at the ICCAT Advisory Committee level and for U.S.

position setting for their involvement at ICCAT.

We can talk a little bit about the U.S. approach. I understand your point there, and your point being the U.S. has been an obstacle to adoption of scientific advice related to no retention. However, I wanted to point out that the United States approach in negotiations internationally have been broad, in their approach at looking at fishing mortality reduction, and trying to accomplish what is consistent with scientific advice for rebuilding.

And those international discussions continue. And the United States is an active participant in those, working with its own proposal that is consistent with scientific advice. And I just wanted to kind of provide a little bit more perspective there related to that, and that there is a range of scientific advice available that the United States certainly is in keeping with, and is taking seriously. So thanks for the opportunity to comment a little bit further.

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: And Bennett, if I could also jump in.

MR. BROOKS: Go ahead, Karyl.

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: Thanks. So, Sonja, thank you so much for your comments. I wanted to weigh in on the "them versus us" factor, and that was not what we were trying to do with this presentation.

We are trying to look at the fishery as a whole which is why we did not focus on the status of the stocks because this is looking at what is happening in the fishery outside of the status of the stocks. We already have the stock assessment process. It goes on to give us that information.

We're looking more at the whole thing. We're not trying to make it a "them versus us" by saying "outside factors". We meant outside of the commercial fishery, outside of the recreational fishery. The document as a whole does bring it all together, it does integrate it. Sorry that the presentation did not bring that across. We are not trying to make it as a "them versus us". We are trying to just look at it through the other things.

The other question you had is whether

the concerns were from the agency or the industry. All of this document, both the concerns and what we see as the successes come from us. It does not come from the industry. So I hope that answers some of your questions.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Karyl. That's helpful. We've got about seven people who want to get into this conversation so let's go next to Kirby Rootes-Murdy, and then we'll go to Jason Adriance. Kirby.

MR. ROOTES-MURDY: Good morning. Can you hear me okay?

MR. BROOKS: You're quite faint, actually. If there's any way you can get closer to your microphone or speak louder that would be helpful. And if you're speaking now, Kirby, we can't hear you at all.

MR. ROOTES-MURDY: No.

MR. BROOKS: Try again?

MR. ROOTES-MURDY: Can you hear me

now?

 MR. BROOKS: Yes, that's better.

Thank you.

MR. ROOTES-MURDY: Okay, great. Sorry about that. In the presentation there was a note about a mismatch, or differences between federal and state regulations. And I was hoping that could be drawn out a little bit more, just from the Commission standpoint as you guys know, the complimentary fishery management plan in much of the last few years has been trying to ensure that there is consistency across state and federal (audio interference). So it would be great to hear some more about those differences.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Does someone want to respond to that?

MR. DUBECK: Yes, I can. Yes, thanks Kirby. So it's just more looking at our regulations are 54 inches for one shark, for everything.

However, some states, you know Florida minimum size limits for -- have lower or minimum size limits for some species, but they also have higher minimum size limits. Or, you know, prohibited from landing some of the species. So that's what the differences is and some confusion for some fishermen who are not always familiar with the shark regulations and that there's a

difference between federal and state regulations.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Let's go to

Jason Adriance, and then to Peter Chaibongsai.

Jason.

MR. ADRIANCE: Thanks, Bennett. And, Guy, thanks for the presentation. I'm glad to see you mention Amendment 14 in here, and I'm going to jump on my blacktip and bull shark soapbox so bear with me.

I think that's important for this depredation issue is getting that true harvest -- sustainably harvested amount of blacktip that can be taken out of the Gulf of Mexico, and hopefully those new quotas and specifications will deal with that.

I'm going to beg to differ on status of stock being important, not necessarily in the sense that Sonja mentioned, but I think until an assessment of bull sharks in the Gulf of Mexico is completed and you have some idea of what can be harvested in the Gulf of Mexico I think you're going to have continuing issues. That stock is likely very healthy, but I haven't seen any movement to address an assessment of that stock for the years I've mentioned it, and I think that's an important thing to consider here. That's all I have. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Anyone want to jump in on that? Okay. All right. Thanks, Jason. Let's go to Peter.

MR. CHAIBONGSAI: Good morning, can you hear me?

MR. BROOKS: We can, Peter, welcome. Good morning.

MR. CHAIBONGSAI: Thank you. I just have a couple of questions. I know that I believe Randy was saying and Guy were saying that obviously what I'm hearing is that it's coming out probably early 2022.

And I want to ask specifically about the shark depredation slides that you had talked about during the presentation. Specifically, what was some of the -- or what are some of the ongoing research that's happening right now in regards to shark depredation as well as -- because a lot of our constituents are dealing with this. Could you provide some of us an earlier sense, before this comes out, some of the

mitigation techniques that we can help spread to our constituency as well?

And then last but not least is I saw, I believe it was slide 18 or 17 stating the fact that there are improvements in citizen science. I'd love to know a little bit more about that as well as once again what's the data collection that's happening right now and the ongoing research that you had mentioned as a success. Thank you very much.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Thanks, Peter.
MR. DUBECK: Thanks, Peter. Yes, so
to just correct you, we actually plan to have
this out very soon as Randy mentioned, in the
next couple of weeks, months, definitely before
the summer. And we are just -- again, this is
the draft stage, and the final stage will come
out later in the year, and the final stage will
be more what things didn't we look at or what the
constituents want us to look at, or what areas we
want more information on and things like that.

As for mitigation techniques there are people working on this where they're trying to -- is it the time of the year or location of where the shark depredation events occur. Is it the type of gear they're using. Is it the way they're revving their engines. Some folks have discussed kind of like when you bring the engine or rev it it's probably the dinner bell for some shark species.

But those are some of the things we are mentioning in SHARE and that should be coming out in the next couple of months.

MR. BROOKS: Okay.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: So, just to jump in a little bit on some of the other things that Peter mentioned. I don't have a list of research projects available related to depredation. It has been highlighted as a topic for management research as a priority. And I know that there have been -- there's been a lot of attention to that through some of the federal research and project funding sources that are available.

And anticipate that through that process hopefully there will be some additional work that will be done. And I think we can definitely look forward to reporting out to you all about what some of those projects are in the

future. We can work on synthesizing potentially a list of those that we're aware of similar to what we've done for other HMS research projects through federal funding sources. We can think about doing that as well that might help.

To my knowledge thus far a lot of the work that's been done has been towards looking at ways to collect better information about the species that are involved, and in depredation, and working towards allowing that to inform consideration of the issue, to frame it, and then also to start to think about what potentially could be done to help address that through various methods some of which Guy has already mentioned, and certainly best practices is a big part of that.

We're open to discussions with various partners, inside the agency and outside the agency about how we might be able to approach getting that kind of information and disseminating it to allow for constituents and fishermen to be able to deal with the issue as best they can.

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: And to add on to what Randy was saying you had also asked about the citizen science. I know that on some of the apps where you can report your fish they also include whether or not the fish experienced depredation and what you did with it. So that is one of the aspects of improving citizen science. We are still working with those apps in terms of trying to find better ways to report that because as the congressional directive shows there's also marine mammal depredation, not just shark depredation that we're looking at.

In the report to Congress that we're pulling together we will also have the list of research that's going on. So it's not just going to be in SHARE. And there are -- if you listen in on the roundtable that Florida had just last week, two weeks ago that Kristin Foss mentioned you can listen to that on the Florida channel.

It goes through some of the research that is also being done in terms of trying to find ways to both avoid sharks along with making sure that sharks don't even want to come to your fishing gear. There was somebody there who was talking about -- I'm having a senior moment at

the moment -- avoiding sharks. Shark deterrent devices. That was the word I was looking for.

So there's a lot of research being done both genetically to determine what species, but also work on the gears and ways of avoiding it.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Karyl. I've got about eight people in the queue here. We've got about a half hour for conversation so I think we're good but let's try to work through it. And once you've spoken if you could again lower your hand. So Peter and Kirby, if you wouldn't mind lowering your hand that would be great. Let's go to Katie Westfall, and then we'll go to Dewey, and then Bob Hueter. Katie Westfall.

MS. WESTFALL: Hi, good morning. Thanks so much for the presentation, Guy. I first wanted to second Sonja's comments about shortfin makos, and then I had two quick questions.

On slide 11 where it shows the 50 percent of sharks that are released are unidentified, I'm wondering if that's a snapshot, or if there's a way to see that trend over time, and get any indication as to how the agency's educational efforts on identification are working.

I guess I'll ask my second question and then you can tackle both of them. The other one relates to the rec sector. I'm wondering if you looked at directed targeting of prohibited sharks and the associated post-release mortality on some of those more vulnerable species. There was a really good paper on this topic a few years ago in AFS that included John Carlson as a co-author that shed some light on this.

I'm wondering if this trend is increasing or decreasing, and again, if the agency's educational efforts with the shark endorsement are helping to really decrease the direct targeting of prohibited sharks in the recreational fishery.

And I of course want to mention that collaboration with the states on this is incredibly important as some of this fishing occurs in state waters.

MR. BROOKS: Are you on mute, Guy? MR. DUBECK: I am on mute. Sorry

about that.

 MR. BROOKS: No worries.

MR. DUBECK: Your first portion about the trend of unidentified sharks being released, that is actually in the report in more detail. So when it comes out you can read through it and we can have some more discussions on that.

And then as you were saying about the portion on prohibited species. They are rarely reported as targeted in the MRIP data. So, again, the most commonly reported one is sandbar sharks. Some state waters, some fishermen are landing -- or not landing, excuse me, interacting with them.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Let's go to Dewey and then to Bob Hueter.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Can you hear me? MR. BROOKS: I can, Dewey. Good

morning.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Can you go to slide
-- I guess it's page 8? I've got a few questions
and some comments. So on page 8. Under
concerns. Some measures have had greater effect
than intended. And could you tell me what
measures have had a greater effect than you
intended them to?

MR. DUBECK: Again, that's just kind of a broad one, but one of the ones that (audio interference) is we have the (audio interference) retention limit of eight right now. And some of the landings have -- are much lower than the quota so that could be one of the ones that it's had a greater effect than intended.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Okay. How about on slide 12? In 2014, I take this numbers here in 2014 of shortfin make kept at around 2,800 or something like that. And this is for the total U.S. Atlantic recreational fishery, correct?

MR. DUBECK: Correct.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: How is it that we reported to ICCAT for U.S. recreational fisheries for make I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong, just a little bit under 800 metric tons. And if I do the math of 2,800 into 800 metric tons it's a pretty big shark. And I'm just wondering what's the mix-up here, or what am I missing on that. And then I have a comment also.

MR. DUBECK: Dewey, these are the

numbers that we are reporting to ICCAT. I don't know what the average weights of the make sharks are, but these are the numbers that are reported.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Well, before we get finished -- because I don't believe it. I believe there's a difference of looking at the numbers of what we reported to ICCAT in 2014. I don't believe. So if we could get a clarification on that would be good before maybe the webinar gets over. And I'm sure you all have got access to look up quick what we reported to ICCAT.

My second thing on the shark in your presentation. National Marine Fisheries Service, when you all do regulations and put things in place, the magnitude of the effect has been ever expanding throughout the years to where it basically gives very little shark fishing left or shark fishermen.

And there's a part of me that just kind of chuckles when I see these types of presentations because you all get about 50 percent of it, and then 50 percent of it the presentation is clueless to the effect that has happened over the years.

The U.S. has reduced the mortality of any interaction with sharks, whether it be gear, So either there's a seasons, persons, a lot. black hole swallowing all the sharks, or there's And so the U.S. fishermen has done more sharks. the sacrifice, particularly the shortfin make of implementing circle hooks, the mono size. done the reductions. And so when I look at these presentations I just wish they would take the magnitude of what's happened over the years because obviously there's a disconnect between the fishers and what you all's view of the fishery is. And that was my comments.

But if you could definitely check on this 2014 number because I believe there's a big difference between 800 metric tons and 2,800 sharks that you all are reporting here according to the ICCAT website and what I've seen before the U.S. report up to date. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Thanks, Dewey. And I've captured that as a next step. We'll see if that's something that can be run to ground. Let's go to Bob --

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: Yes, we're working on it.

MR. BROOKS: Okay, great. Thanks. Let's go to Bob Hueter, and then to Marcus Drymon. And again, I've got about six folks still trying to get into this conversation so if folks can be succinct in their comments that would be great. Bob.

MR. HUETER: Okay, thanks, Bennett. If Dewey's numbers are correct, if what he's quoting is correct, then my calculation is that's about 630 pounds per mako. That's unrealistic. So there's something amiss there.

I look forward to seeing the whole report. Guy, thanks for the summary. I'm sure it was a tough job to summarize this report. And I do appreciate the five-year focus to look at what's happening now.

But I would emphasize that this process has a 30-year history, more than a 30-year history, beginning in the early nineties. And I hope that the document captures that entire history, and looks at the -- what I would call the successes versus the failures of the history of management of sharks here domestically in the U.S.

This is the problem I think in large part with the depredation issue is that most fishermen haven't been fishing for more than 30 years, and if they started 30 years ago they saw the bottom of the situation, the least number of sharks. So we've been rebuilding since then and the impression is that sharks are out of control. In fact, we're trying to get back to what I call the old normal.

But to be blunt I would summarize the successes of this process to be that NOAA has used a precautionary approach over the years. We have rebuilt a number of sharks stocks back to sustainability with more coming.

I would say the public education component has been largely successful in explaining to people the value of sharks. We still have a problem with species ID as was pointed out.

And that the U.S. is perceived, with the emphasis on the word perceived, as a bright spot now for shark conservation. And I think

that's largely true when you look at the rest of the world.

The failures though, I would go beyond concern and talk about the failures and confront those, is that this management approach over these decades has been reactive and not proactive. That we do things like continue to add species to the prohibited list.

I think the program that Guy rolled out this morning is more of the reactive kind of approach of tweaking a quota, or tweaking a size limit, or a retention limit. We're not -- we didn't do what was necessary 25 years ago to start directing fishermen toward the more sustainable stocks like blacktip and that's resulted now in a commercial fishery that's completely marginalized and basically hurtling on fumes.

Where we have landings dropping, well, the populations are rebounding. So that's a failure if you look at it from strictly a fishery management standpoint I think.

There's no question that the disinformation campaign by the fin ban supporters, no matter the fact that they have good intentions has really confused the issue and hurt the U.S. situation. And I'm sorry about that. And I've done what I can to try to clear that up.

I'll leave it with one question for Guy, and that is you mentioned the smooth dogfish landings which in some ways is at this point is our only really successful commercial shark fishery. Are there numbers reported in the report, and I'd like to see the numbers of what we're landing in terms of smooth dogfish and what the history of that fishery is, and why that's worked when these others are still struggling to be sustainable from a fishery standpoint. Thank you.

MR. DUBECK: Thanks, Bob. To answer your smooth dogfish question. So in the document we do go through the whole management of dogfish. Again, we focus in on years of data from '14 to '19. So there's a couple of years of HMS management of smoothhound sharks.

We do go into detail about the HMS landings too. So it's a lot more detail in

there. But I'll leave it at that. There's a lot in there.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Thanks. Let's go to Marcus Drymon, and then we'll go to Rusty. Marcus.

MR. DRYMON: Thanks, Bennett. Just briefly, I wanted to address Peter's questions about current research regarding depredation. I know it's been a long time coming. I know personally we've been applying for depredation research funds for a long time, and we're finally in a good spot to where we have some money to move forward.

So briefly, for the Gulf of Mexico we currently have a NOAA RESTORE Project where we're collecting and just starting with this basic characterization of depredation. Because when I think about depredation with sharks and marine mammals it starts with characterization before the mitigation. And we're still at that characterization phase.

So the first part of this RESTORE planning grant will characterize and synthesize available data. Ben Duffin did a really great job at a recent AP synthesizing what's known from reef fish and pelagic longlines. So we're going to start with efforts just like that, put all that together.

We're going to interview a lot of different commercial and recreational anglers to learn what they know about depredation that's not captured in our synthesis. And then we're going to build these mental models with Mandy Karnauskas in terms of an ecosystem type assessment where she can start to model how fishermen are seeing depredation in ways that we don't. So that's one thing that we've got going in the Gulf of Mexico.

We also have a currently funded Gulf of Mexico project where we're looking at depredation species and rates on descender devices. So, if we're encouraging folks to use descenders can we ensure then that they're -- the fish they release isn't going to be eaten by a shark or a dolphin. And so we're currently doing that, using some of the genetics Karyl mentioned, but also some cameras and things like that.

And then finally we have a recently

funded CRP where we're working with HMS, we're working with Cliff Hutt to better -- again, just characterize the specifics of this problem.

We'll be working with that Facebook group,

Sportsmen Fighting for Marine Balance because there's a wealth of information there on social media. That gets to kind of some of those social media aspects that Guy mentioned in the presentation.

So we're really going to be capitalizing on all of that information that's already out there. And then once we get to that, once we better understand that, then we can move forward with some of the mitigation.

And to that end we're working with a deterrent company, a company called Sharkbanz that makes something called the Zeppelin which is specifically designed to mitigate these types of interactions. And that's something that we've got ongoing.

So, all of that is to say there is actual research going for this moving forward. I'm really happy that that's finally happening. And I'd love to give maybe even a presentation at the AP at the next meeting with a brief summary of some of these results to date so that you guys can see what's actually happening finally. Thanks a lot.

MR. BROOKS: That's great. Thank you very much. Let's go to Rusty and then to Scott Taylor. Rusty, you're up.

MR. HUDSON: I am now, I hope.

MR. BROOKS: Yes, we hear you.

MR. HUDSON: Thank you. Karyl, thank you for bringing up the FWC (phonetic) May 12 meeting on the depredation. Of course there's a lot of issue there. In the state of Florida, of course our state waters aren't really relevant to the commercial landings of shark for two reasons. One, longline was banned in '92. Then the second reason was gillnet had the constitutional ban put the gillnet shark fishermen out of state waters.

On our east coast that's three miles. On the west coast that's out to 10 miles. So all in that area has been benefitting, and most of the interaction is with the recreational. Most of the species that are found in those near-shore state waters and just outside of the state waters

are going to be your black tip, your spinner, and your bull sharks, and some lemon. We've had some awful big lemons here lately.

But that and all your small coastals, the blacknose, the bonnet head, the blacknose. There's plenty of catch there. They're doing a lot of catch and release with their blacktips because they have in most states minimum sizes, but in Florida we don't with the blacktip. But the spinners are look-alikes.

Spinner, just like Jason brought up about the lemon and the bull. We have some research needs over here. There's landing trends that has been used with lemon as an example to show that it's not going extinct. Bull sharks extremely healthy over here on our coast as well as spinners. A lot of the guys will tarpon fish out of St. Augustine, do a chum line and sometimes they get into the spinners and so do the tarp. That's been a thing going on for 30, 40 years with the wrecks up that way.

What you all need to do is take a look at your percentage of lemon, bull, and spinner, and compare it to your two other large coastals, the blacktip and the, you know, as far as the landings trend there because the blacktip has been thoroughly the predominant catch because you have eliminated the sandbar except for a research fishery. And so the sandbar is a small component compared to what it could be if that allowable catch went up to receive an optimal yield.

That being said let me get back to that near-shore component of species I just mentioned. Our next component --

MR. BROOKS: And, Rusty, I just wanted to ask you to be focusing the comments because we have another seven people still hoping to get in on this --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. HUDSON: That's what I'm trying to do, yes. And the reef fish, the 20 to 45 range or 15 to 45 range, that is predominantly sandbars and duskies destroying a lot of our fisheries up and down the coast. You get outside of that we have not had since 2000 a longline fishery offshore of Florida. So that whole pelagic region is attacking a lot of the recreational catch, sailfish, stuff like that. I keep hearing

about that.

I hear about it from the headboats up there in Georgia and stuff like that, the sandbar and dusky problem. That's been going on for several years.

How to achieve fullest utilization has always been my motto, to eliminate the shark fin sales that's a partial utilization that is thrown away. That doesn't work. And so just sort of trying to wrap this up I've been heavily involved with a lot of a lot of CITES things because as vice president of World Conservation Trust I am in charge of marine species, particularly sharks. And there's a lot of stuff that's going on unfortunately with the animal rights people in academia. And they don't want us feeding people. So thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Okay, thanks, Rusty. Let's go to Scott Taylor, then we'll go to Mike Pierdinock. Scott.

MR. TAYLOR: Just a couple of things that kind of stuck out with me and from Sonja's comments this morning about how people's tastes have changed.

I don't think that it's really that issue at all. I think that in the absence of any public outreach. The only public outreach that's gone on has been really the conservation side of this thing. And so in the absence of any real marketing for this, and the loss of the sharkfin sales, the commercial viability of this industry is minimal or none.

There is really no utilization in any real sense of the word of this fishery. It's continued to decline in basically every single one of the sectors. And this depredation issue that you're talking about is only going to get dealt with in one way, and it's not going to be with your mitigation, it's not going to be with anything else. It's going to be with responsible balanced harvests at sustainable levels on this product and a resurgence of a marketing campaign that isn't going to be driven solely by the misinformation of some of the sharkfin issues and the conservationists.

One final comment was about the agency's inability in terms of things that are outside of their scope. This isn't a little

problem. This is an absolutely huge problem that we have in terms of that this is a federally regulated species that is still covered under Magnuson-Stevens that should have maximum utilization at sustainable levels for the commercial side. I mean, NMFS and the organization still is last time I checked under the Commerce Department and there's a mandate not only to have these fisheries maintained at responsible levels, but also to maximize commercial value out of the fisheries.

And somehow we better figure out a way to address outside of this agency what's going on at the state level because it's physically impossible to move this product across state lines in some cases. You'd have to be insane right now to be a sharkfin exporter given the attention and what went on with Mark Harrison. And I'll limit my comments to that.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Scott. Let's go to Mike Pierdinock, and then Walt Golet, and then to Shana. Mike?

MR. PIERDINOCK: Thank you, Bennett. Good morning. I would just like to comment on slides 12 and 13 concerning shortfin mako. United States has led the way with post release mortality reductions in achieving the 85 percent reduction target for shortfin mako dating back to Morocco. That's our recreational as well as our commercial fishery that's done that.

I'm glad the United States is conservation minded and leads the way with that conservation effort. And we continue to achieve those goals. That's the positive aspect of it.

But one of the concerns that has not been listed is how that's impacted tournaments as well as the economy, or the blue water economy. There's a number of tournaments up and down the east coast. As a result of those size limits and measures are no longer going in business or have been significantly reduced.

And as you know with those tournaments there's an economic -- it economically stimulates the entire waterfront area or the blue economy, and now that's been lost. Tackle shops, boats, the whole cross-section. So, I did not see that concern listed, but the facts speak for itself.

We continue to be proactive. We

continue to achieve those measures, and I'm proud that the United States continues to lead the way with that 85 percent reduction. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Mike. Walt Golet, why don't you jump in here. And if I can ask the folks who have already weighed in to just lower your hands.

MR. GOLET: All right. Thanks,
Bennett. I'll keep this really quick. So, I
just wanted to say I certainly appreciate the
agency focusing on this. I welcomed Marcus's
comments. It's good to hear that this research
is going on.

I just wanted to add, in addition to the fishery aspect sort of implications for product quality and things like that this, and I mentioned this before. This is also starting to affect the science. We are finding it difficult to go certain places, for example, and to try to conduct scientific work which is also a high priority for NOAA for other species. So I just wanted to emphasize that. Guy, great presentation and thank you for the time.

MR. BROOKS: Great, thanks. Let's go to Shana Miller and then Christina Vaeth. Shana.

MS. MILLER: Yes, and I'll be brief as well. I appreciate this effort and it will be good to see the full document, kind of look at the full picture. But just to give a little -- a voice of caution. This needs to be looked at very carefully. The pendulum can swing back very quickly and so any movement to release the restrictions on catch need to be done carefully.

We also need to not set the baseline of what an appropriately sized shark population are as when many of these species were severely depleted. I don't think any species are over populated. If we look to pre-fishing levels we need to think about what a natural shark population, what the abundance really does look like, and just not get caught in that trap of shifting baselines on this because it can work both ways. It can't be argued that these populations are overpopulated. I don't any science has suggested that. So we just need to be really careful with this effort. I'll hold that comment until we can see the full document. Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Shana. Let's go to Christina, and then to Jeff Oden. And I'll just note we are just about at time. I'm going to let this go about five minutes long. We'll see, try to get as many other folks in. But we may not get to everybody. But Christina.

MS. VAETH: Thank you for the opportunity to participate today. I'm sorry Dave couldn't be here and I just hope to accurately share his thoughts with you.

I wanted to thank Guy for the overall presentation of the fishery and recognizing that there is a decline in participation, and a decline in -- that the quotas have not met -- recently the allowable, sustainable quotas have not been met.

You recognize that the fishery, the participants have moved into other more valuable fisheries, and that is true which means that those fishermen are fishing shorter periods of time. They have shorter windows in which to fish and so the retention limits at the moment would be what would affect that. Because when you're fishing a short period of time, and having those restrictions it makes the quota difficult to acquire.

One suggestion Dave had made was maybe having a separate blacktip retention. That might help. Also, he -- as part of your success he recognized that it's been a year-round fishery which offers stability. He would want to maybe try to maintain that.

And we talked about some of the hurdles and obstacles that we face. And retention limits would definitely be a reactive, immediate solution, but everything kind of led back to how each fisherman has navigated their own outside factors.

And they know their market. They know their fishery. And so a more proactive alternative might be something through like an IFQ because then each fisherman is responsible for their own fishery.

But thank you, and if you have any questions I'm -- I might be able to answer them, but thank you for giving me the opportunity today.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Christina. Let's

go to Jeff Oden.

directed shark.

5

MR. ODEN: Hello?

MR. BROOKS: Yes. Hi there, Jeff.

MR. ODEN: Can you hear me now?

MR. BROOKS: Yes, we can, Jeff.

MR. ODEN: Good deal, I'm sorry. I've been two days trying to get on. Anyhow, it's recently come to my attention that I guess at the advent of the smoothhound fishery that vessels that had that permit and also had a federal permit, be it a general cat or whatever, were disallowed from fishing and catching smoothhounds without actually having an incidental shark, or

And my question is, and then I have a discussion item. My question to the agency is what's being done to address this, or are we just going to create another discard fishery?

MR. BROOKS: Anybody want to jump in on that briefly, HMS folks?

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: I'll jump into this one. So, for those of you who are unfamiliar with this issue, if you have a Smoothhound Shark permit, a federal Smoothhound Shark permit, you are not allowed to fish for or land large coastal sharks or small coastal sharks unless you also have a federal directed or incidental permit.

If you have an HMS Charter/Headboat permit you are restricted to follow the federal regulations even when you are fishing in state waters unless the state has more restrictive measures. There are some people who have the Smoothhound permit, and then some other HMS permit, or something, and they want to be able to fish in state waters for large coastal or small coastal sharks.

And the answer I would say to them is you do not need a federal Smoothhound permit in order to fish for smoothhounds in state waters. If you are fishing just in state waters you don't need a federal permit.

If you do have that Charter/Headboat permit you have to abide by it so then it makes sense for you to get -- if you want to fish for sharks, the relevant commercial shark permits. I don't know if that answers your question, Jeff, but that is the status of things.

MR. ODEN: It still creates a discard in on-shore fisheries for these guys. It just seems absurd. But secondly, I have one real quick question and then I want to comment.

What percentage of large coastals are caught in state waters versus federal?

MR. BROOKS: And Jeff, why don't you jump in with your comment as well right now just for sake of time.

MR. ODEN: Okay. And secondly, secondly, it was mentioned yesterday that the NEFSEC survey is ongoing as we speak and actually Eagle Eye is offshore here right now, or was a day or so ago. I saw them on the AIS which it should be phenomenal. I mean, from what we see inland, in-shore here it can't be anything but a lot of sharks caught.

Speaking to that, and I know I sound like a broken record because every time I come here I bring this up. The survey goes back to 1986. That's almost 35 years and anyhow, the last -- three of the last four have been all-time highs of abundance across the board, and the only reason the last one which was 2018 wasn't an all-time high was because the previous one was a 56 percent increase over the previous all-time high which was 2012.

So, to the point that they're seeing so much concern out there for these species the depredation going on is not an illusion. It's a fact, and it's based in real concern from everybody who actually lives on the water and spends a day there. Anyway, that's all I'd like to comment on.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Thanks.

MR. DUBECK: Sorry, just real quick, Bennett. So, Jeff, that's actually -- that percentage you're looking for is in the document. We're looking for it right now but it will be in the document.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. I am going to take one more commenter here, and then I think we're going to need to go to break because we are starting to get a bit late and already bouncing pretty far into break. Alan Weiss, I'll give you a moment. And then there's about four folks or so who wanted to get in or get back in. I would just invite you to please throw your comment or

question into the chat and if we have time later we'll get back to that. But at least we'll be able to see whatever it is you wanted to throw in, and we'll put that around to the full group. Go ahead, Alan.

MR. WEISS: Thanks, Bennett. Two things I wanted to mention. One is echoing some earlier comments that National Standard 1 has another part other than conservation, and that is the requirement to attain the optimum yield for each species on a continuing basis.

So, under that standard it's just as important for the fishery service to try to find a way to attain the optimum yield from these species as it has been to rebuild them to sustainable levels.

The other thing I wanted to mention is that in an earlier comment Sonja characterized or I think mischaracterized the United States effort at ICCAT on makes as being an impediment. That's really offensive to our delegation, our commissioners, and I think flies in the face of the facts.

We saw the documentation of the huge decrease in landings that the United States has taken since the make issue came to the forefront, and the thing that is the true impediment is that we've yet to see from other nations compliance with the agreements that have already been reached at ICCAT.

It just would be ridiculous for the United States to try to squeeze more out of what little is being landed here now in advance of seeing any substantial movement from the other participants in this fishery elsewhere in the ocean. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Okay, thanks. Thank you all for the feedback. A lot there for the agency to take in. I think a number of the comments sort of got to the context and the big picture which you haven't had a chance to see the report when that comes out. I think we're hearing a little bit more of that, but clearly several different calls on sort of making sure that context, the history, or the broader sweep of both the challenges and actions already taken, and a number of very specific questions and suggestions around outreach and maximizing

utilization, thinking about blacktip, et cetera.

So let's get you all to break. I'm going to try to keep us pretty close to on schedule here. So let's come back at 25 of sharp which will mean we're about 5 minutes off schedule but I'm confident we can make that up either in the discussions or grab a little bit from lunch time.

So again, from those of you who were not able to get back in here on this last piece just please, I encourage you to use the chat to get back in. So thanks. We'll start up again in about nine minutes.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Bennett, if I can. Just before we take off, I just wanted to just take a moment to just similar to yesterday I made kind of a comment about not calling out names and that was related to directing comments to the agency.

But in this particular case I just want to mention a little bit of a caution that if folks could as they make comments, certainly if they're addressing a comment and the substance of a comment of a previous commenter I think that is okay. I would just ask that you probably not call out individual names again to just keep things cordial and polite along those lines again. Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Thanks. Thanks, Randy. Okay. We'll see you back here at 25 of. Thanks, everyone. Thanks, Guy.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:28 a.m. and resumed at 10:37 a.m.)

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Let's jump back in here. I want to hand it off to Delisse Ortiz who's going to talk to us about the shark and swordfish retention plan a little.

We have 30 minutes for this conversation so we'll see how many questions and comments there are on this. Delisse, over to you.

MS. ORTIZ: Can you hear me now?

MR. BROOKS: Yes, perfectly. Thanks.

MS. ORTIZ: Okay.

MR. BROOKS: And we are seeing your

screen.

MS. ORTIZ: All right, great. All

right, well, good morning everybody. Thank you for being here. And we're going to lead you to the exciting world of the final management measures for the swordfish and shark retention limit rule.

Just a little overview. We're going to go just give you a little background on what we had proposed back in April of last year. Some of the comments that we received and then some of the changes from the proposal to the final measures. And lastly, what current outreach effort we're doing to sort of complement this rule and help with some of the concerns relating to some of the shark identification and catch and release efforts.

So, just overall to start. What was the purpose of this rule. What sort of initiated it. In part it was to allow for increased fishing opportunities for shark and swordfish, primarily in three open access permits. That's the Swordfish General Commercial permit, the HMS Charter/Headboat permit, and the HMS Commercial Caribbean Small Boat permits.

And the second objective was to streamline and consolidate the regulatory procedures for this retention limit adjustment. So that means that some of the permits, for example, the Swordfish General Commercial permit had already an in season adjustment authorization criteria so that the retention limits can be changed during the season, whereas some of the swordfish retention limits and the shark retention limits under the Commercial Caribbean Small Boat permit did not. They were based under a framework adjustment which can be more time consuming and not as efficient.

So, for the proposed rule we created three management options. So the first one again was changing and consolidating and streamlining the in season adjustment of retention limits under the Caribbean permit, and then the other two options were related to making changes in the retention limits for swordfish, and then the other one was changing the retention limit for sharks under the Commercial Caribbean Small Boat permit.

And those -- the measures that we proposed for changing the swordfish retention

limits and the Caribbean Small Boat permits specifically for swordfish, we proposed limits that went from the no action, so leaving status quo, all the way to increasing their retention limit up to 18 swordfish per vessel per trip.

And for the sharks Caribbean Small Boat permit we looked at things like leaving the existing retention limit which was set at zero to increasing that all the way up to six sharks per vessel per trip.

So, we submitted our proposed rule last year. We were able to hold two public webinars and present the proposal during the advisory panel. And we received a total of 29 comments. We finalized the regulations just exactly a year later. And I'm just going to go over some of the summary of the public comments that we received for those three management options.

So for the first one, the in season adjustment of retention limits, for the most part the majority of the commenters supported the proposed changes to those procedures.

For the second, alternative B, changing the swordfish retention limits there was general support for increasing the swordfish retention limit up to 18 swordfish per vessel per trip. That's the higher range of the retention limit alternatives that we proposed. We got it from zero to 6 to potentially 18. So there's support for the higher range.

There was some opposition to increasing the existing swordfish retention limit because of a variety of reasons, concerns over sustainability of the swordfish fishery, crew safety, more specifically from the smaller vessels in the Caribbean because the Commercial Caribbean Small Boat permit is limited to vessels that are less than 45 feet in size, the lack of accurate commercial landings data, and lack of law enforcement presence in the Caribbean region.

And the third was there was a lot of requests for additional outreach and education on permit requirements under the Commercial Caribbean Small Boat permit, and that included topics such as doing more focused work on shark species identification, catch and release, and a lot of additional education on what permits are

required, what gears to use, what species can be retained limits, and so forth.

And lastly, management option C which looks at the retention limits alternatives for sharks in the Caribbean Small Boat permit. Some support the no action alternative to prevent overfishing of sharks. Some comments opposed mostly not all sharks, but specific sharks such as oceanic whitetip, shortfin make, hammerhead sharks.

And others supported a combination of some of the alternatives that we presented where we had limits between zero, we had three, we had six. And so they wanted a combination of a limit of six with only specific sharks being able to be harvested.

And lastly, the request for extensive outreach and education of fishermen and government agencies on species identification and permits in the Caribbean.

So what were the changes from the proposed to the final? So for the first one the in season adjustments we said there was generally a lot of support so we didn't change these. And there were two preferred alternatives under this management option.

So the first one was to adopt the Swordfish General Commercial permit in season adjustment criteria to the Commercial Small Boat permit. Like I said, both the Commercial Small Boat permit allows retention of sharks and swordfish, but they're done -- any changes in those limits are done on the framework adjustment. So we basically are using the Swordfish General Commercial permit criteria, adopting that into the Commercial Small Boat permit for swordfish retention limits, and then using the shark in season trip limit adjustment authorization criteria to adjust in shark limits under the Small Boat permit.

For management option B, so I'll just go over this table. So in the shaded area, the first column, you have the limits in the region. So the first one is the retention limit range that we proposed and what we went with in the final.

And then following those you have the different regions that are covered by the

5

Swordfish General Commercial permit. So you have north Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. Then there's the Florida swordfish management area limit, and then there's the U.S. Caribbean limit.

In the second one that's what we proposed for changing the swordfish retention limits under those three permits that I mentioned, Swordfish General Commercial, the HMS Charter/Headboats with the commercial sales endorsement, and the Caribbean Small Boat permit.

So what we propose was to have a retention limit up to zero to six with the regions except for the Florida swordfish management area limit which stays at zero going up to six. And the default would be starting the season at six. Right now it defers by region. The Caribbean is set at two, the northwest Atlantic Gulf of Mexico is set at three, and usually we have to bump it up to six. So the proposal is like well, let's just have it at six and have that be the range.

Well, based on the objectives of the rule, trying to offer more fishing opportunities for swordfish as well as what we heard from commenters we -- for the final measure we went with the higher limit of 18 swordfish per vessel per trip for all permits. So we have a range where we can adjust that season from zero to 18, but we went final with the defaults, so starting the season at 18 for all the regions, for all three permits, except for the Florida swordfish management area limit which stays at zero.

The reason for the change like I already kind of mentioned was to -- one of the things we wanted to do was align the regional retention limits of these three permits, especially in the Caribbean where all three permits exist, and all had different in season adjustment regulatory procedures, and all had different retention limits. So we opted to have all the same limit to provide additional swordfish fishing opportunities as the stock can support higher removal within the established quotas and without jeopardizing the sustainability of the stock. I want to remind you we're not changing quotas, we're just changing the limits.

In terms of concerns over crew safety

the agency always defers to captain's vessel operators for carry -- capacity designs and leaves that at the discretion of the captains.

In order to improve compliance in landings information this hopefully creates an incentive for folks to get the permit. The more people that have the permit, the more people who report the data, the more data we have, we have more landings information, and more people fall into compliance.

Lastly, to streamline and increase the efficiencies in the in season adjustments because again all of them will have the same retention limit and we can now have regulatory procedures in place that are all the same, or we can change if needed that limit up or down as necessary.

The third management option, so C, looks at changing those retention limit alternatives for sharks under the Caribbean Small Boat permit. So, I'll start with the table. It's just -- briefly describe the first column talks about -- this is again focused, it's just Caribbean, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands where this permit only applies.

And we have the retention limit range. So we propose zero to three. Just to remind folks the status quo was at zero. We're proposing a range of zero to three sharks per vessel per trip. And a default retention limit, so starting that season was three smoothhounds or tiger sharks combined per vessel per trip. And we had selected -- prefer that because we heard that those were some of the most commonly targeted species in Puerto Rico and the USVI.

But with the final rule we left retention limit at zero to three which is the third column per vessel per trip. We limited the retention of these sharks to specific sharks which are listed there. So basically the retention, we took out based on comments the retention of hammerhead sharks, all hammerhead sharks, any of the pelagic sharks, blacknose, silky, sandbar, and dusky sharks. So those species were not allowed to be retained under this Commercial Caribbean Small Boat permit.

The default was to be set at three and that's a three combined. So any combination of one tiger, two blacktip, but just three combined

total.

And so what was the rationale for this change. Well, one of the goals was to allow for additional fishing opportunities to harvest sustainably managed sharks. We also wanted to take into consideration public comment, and we wanted to avoid the over-harvest of sharks, specifically prohibited, pelagic, silky, sandbar, and hammerhead sharks. So that's why we specifically just left it to a specific subset of sharks that are allowed to be harvested under that permit.

And then also to improve catch and landings data in the U.S. Caribbean shark fishery by encouraging the adoption of the permit because now the Caribbean Small Boat permit will have not only the additional opportunity to land more swordfish as needed, but also the ability to land sharks which are not targeted in the Caribbean, but landed incidentally when catching other species.

And the last thing I wanted to talk about which was another comments that we received from the public which was the need for outreach. It was very much stressed that we needed to do a lot more education down there which we have in previous years.

One big effort that we're doing with this rule is creating educational placards and videos. So similar to the picture that I have there for shark identification ID in the recreational fishery we're doing one specifically for the Caribbean Small Boat permit holders in Spanish that can be easily understood and that identifies these specific species with their distinctive characteristics so that fishermen can have them available on the boat and help them characterize the sharks they're able to harvest.

In addition to that we're working with our territorial partners to create a series of educational videos in Spanish that will highlight specifically some of the key issues that we need more outreach. So the first one, shark identification, techniques for better catch and release to increase the survivorship of sharks, and then again, like I said, the third one would be just understanding what the regulations are. There's still a lot of confusion about that in

Puerto Rico, and specifically concerning these permits and what can they fish for, what are the limits.

And then the second one is fostering partnerships with state partners and local organizations. I've been doing workshops and educating folks in the Department of Natural Resources. I've been working with Puerto Rico Sea Grant. I have a plan to do a workshop with the local law enforcement, the rangers down there, to educate them as well on the new regulations that are going to be effective June 1 of this year.

And then lastly, distribute information over social media, websites. So we expect this effort to be coming soon. It's ongoing. It's at full force, summer and fall of this year. And with that I thank you for your time and if you have any questions or comments let me know. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Thanks, Delisse. Let's see if there are any questions or comments on this rule. I've got Marcos and Alan Weiss in the queue, and Walt Golet, I think your hand is leftover from before. So if it is if you would just lower that. Let's start off with Marcos, please.

MR. HANKE: Thank you, Delisse, for a great presentation. I'm very happy to see a lot of work being on the screen here with things that I think are a significant part of the fishery in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Caribbean.

Fishermen stress to me how heard they felt having access to the new fishing opportunity with swordfish. That's something that is slowly but surely growing in Puerto Rico.

I also want to say that remote is promoting compliance. That is many people are asking about how to do it and how they can follow up with the Caribbean's Small Boat permit, thoughts on loopholes that was being well addressed at this time.

It was very bad in our area. Thank you for that. Thank you so much for that. I have been hearing great feedback from people that was not expecting those changes. It was a positive tone and responsible to the resources.

And thanks for the aggressive

initiative for educational materials and shark ID that was coming out. I'm aware that it is already taking place with Sea Grant and different others. Thank you for the agency to be visionary and proactive on that part.

And I have a question just to make sure I understand because one of the sharks that are mostly caught on the deep water is (audio interference) fishery incidentally (audio interference). The question to the list is the fishermen can keep the three smoothhound in the trip or have to be combined with another species? That's the question that I keep receiving. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Marcos.

MS. ORTIZ: You know, the limit is for three sharks total. So if they just happen to be smoothhounds then they can retain the three smoothhounds. So they're not limited by how many of each species they can catch, but rather by the total number of sharks they can catch per vessel per trip.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Let's get a few more folks in here. Let's see. Raimundo Espinoza, I'll bring you in next because I don't think we've had a chance to hear from you at all. So let's bring you in.

MR. ESPINOZA: Hello? Can you hear me?

MR. BROOKS: We can. Yes, Raimundo, we hear you. Go ahead. Raimundo, are you there? We had you a moment ago. Can you try to take yourself off mute again, Raimundo? All right. Let me go to somebody else and if someone can chat Raimundo maybe we can figure out how to -- what's happening there.

MR. ESPINOZA: Okay. Hello?
MR. BROOKS: Oh, there you are.
Raimundo, go ahead.

MR. ESPINOZA: Okay, great. Just for some reason I got disconnected. So thank you very much, Bennett, for cutting me in and thanks, Delisse, for the presentation. It's a lot of great information. I have a couple of questions on some of the details.

For example, just a question, there was a couple of things. For example, blacknose were included in the prohibited species as well

5

as -- and then fine tooth sharks were allowed. So I was just wondering what data was used, or what information, or how species composition went into the decision-making and to what the species were called.

Also, I saw on the list of things to do it said that to collaborate with local organizations. I mean, you only mentioned the government organizations. So, I was wondering when that would be reached out to the rest of the organizations, non-profit, academia, which are actually the ones that are doing any of the shark work in Puerto Rico because local government is not actually doing any of that work. hopefully through your collaboration can get them up to speed. But that's one of the things I'd like to know just because for the past four or five years it's non-profits that have been doing all the shark work. So it was mentioned that it was mostly working with enforcement, Sea Grant, and the local government. So I was just wondering what that process was to engage with the folks that are actually working with sharks in Puerto Rico. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Delisse, why don't you jump in.

MS. ORTIZ: Yes. So to answer your first question what was the criteria used to limit the species that were allowed to be harvested under the Caribbean Small Boat permit.

So, specifically for blacknose. one thing to keep in mind is the shark quota for the Caribbean, so the overall shark quota, not the limit, is part of the Gulf of Mexico shark And in the Gulf of Mexico we don't allow the retention of blacknose. So the Caribbean is managed under that Gulf of Mexico region. part of that to be consistent we're not allowing the retention of blacknose sharks in terms of Sandbars are not allowed to be sandbars. retained unless you're in the shark research There's concerns of scalloped fishery. hammerhead is threatened under the distinct population segment in the Caribbean so we, you know, that's why we removed the all hammerhead sharks.

There was also a concern about oceanic whitetip and mako. So that kind of goes in the

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

pelagics. So we removed those as well. And then there's concerns about dusky. So basically it's species that are more vulnerable. And there's concerns about minimizing their over-harvest. So those are the ones that we sort of removed from that equation in the Caribbean.

And then to answer your second question not limited to the agencies. That's just where we started. The list is really long. So right now I'm reaching out to as many folks as possible, and I have probably a list of 10, 10 different groups. That's just more where the conversation started, but I am planning on working with a lot of the NGOs and I believe you might have a voicemail message from me in your box, in your inbox, so check that as well.

But we are open to working on this. Like I said, the rule published and we've just been trying to focus on the creation of the educational videos and hoping for Sea Grant in collaboration with the council to help out in that endeavor.

But our main goal is to get the message across. I've also actually worked with some of the graduate students at the University of Puerto Rico that are part of Little Women -- I'm trying to remember the name of their organization. But they're a group of women in Puerto Rico that study sharks and they're helping out in this effort as well.

MR. ESPINOZA: So you have reached out to other sectors, because I mean that's -- those are two folks. Because there's other women that are not part of that group. There's students at Interamericana, and Bayamon that are studying sharks. There's another person doing their master's in UPR Puerto Rico and Rio Piedras.

So I would suggest making sure that when you reach out you don't focus in because it's something that -- I mean, from what I'm hearing and working on this for the past several years, I'll check my voicemail. Beyond that it's something that needs to be a lot further open.

It's one of these things that we need to make sure we reach out because concerning some of this data, for example, that you mentioned, some of the things that are applying to the Gulf for the blacknose and other things doesn't apply

for scallops and the other hammerheads, but we are applying it here.

So I'm just saying that some of these things need to be consistent because when we're talking about what's not allowed in the Gulf and then what -- so where we're getting -- we're getting in the Caribbean which again, it goes to applying some of the suggestions that were made earlier as well in previous conversations about the Caribbean being managed separately from the Gulf. Because right now hammerheads are going to be prohibited, but that's not the case in the Gulf. But yet some of the ones that are being prohibited in the Gulf are prohibited in the Caribbean.

If you look at the data, you won't see a dusky reported since forever in Puerto Rico. So it's one of those things that it's great that it's prohibited, but it's like prohibiting sawfish in Puerto Rico. It's not going to make a difference because we don't see any. So it's one of those things.

However, blacknose is one of the ones that are caught every once in a while and we don't see them quite often. So it's one of those things that could be part of that one in three, but we need to make sure that we don't -- when we're doing the outreach to the fishing community it's not going to be received well when we say that it's because we're replicating from what's in the Gulf because they've heard that with lobster, and they've heard it with other species that the seasons and the dynamics here are very different than the mainland U.S.

So it's one of those things that -- I think this is a really great move, and a step in the right direction. And I think the measure with hammerheads, even though in the Gulf it's different and over there the retention is allowed, I don't think in the Caribbean it should be. And I think it's in the right direction. And that's a decision that was made solely based on the information from the Caribbean. So it's really important to continue that trend of what's good for the Caribbean based on the Caribbean data, not just what's --

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: If I could jump in just to help clarify things. So while Delisse

5

is correct that blacknose is prohibited in the Gulf and the Gulf quotas extend to the Caribbean under our management, I will also say that in terms of blacknose the stock information we have is that overfishing is occurring and they are overfished. So they are extremely limited throughout the U.S., not just in the Gulf and in the Caribbean north of I want to say 34 degrees you are also not allowed to keep them, and you are only allowed a very small amount per trip off of Florida and Georgia when you are fishing. blacknose in particular we have a lot of It's not just that we willy-nilly concerns. decided to apply blacknose and say no landings in the Caribbean.

MR. ESPINOZA: No, no, we understand. We understand that. And again, it's a good measure. It's a good step in the right direction. And I think that they're overfished in general. That's exactly the reason why. We understand that.

But we want to make sure -- for example, fine tooth. We haven't had a report for fine tooth in fisheries data in the landings in forever. So there's other things. I think we need to continue the collaboration.

We're really excited that these measures are really positive in general for both the fisheries and for the --

MR. BROOKS: Raimundo?

MR. ESPINOZA: Yes.

MR. BROOKS: Sorry. I wanted to jump in just because we have several people wanting to get into the queue and we are almost out of time here. Actually we're five minutes beyond time. Is that okay?

MR. ESPINOZA: Of course.

MR. BROOKS: Okay, thanks. Let's go to Greg Hinks. Greg.

MR. HINKS: Hi, can you hear me?

MR. BROOKS: Yes, we can.

MR. HINKS: Great, thank you. I was just -- I was interested in your mentioning of foreign partnerships, whether they're states and organizations. I understand these issues being addressed here are -- that they're big changes for the Caribbean specifically. But I'm just curious what sort of partnerships you're talking

about forming, and what the goals of those partnerships are, and the problems being addressed.

MS. ORTIZ: Yes, hi. So the fostering partnerships relates to the outreach effort specifically. So any materials that we create for the Caribbean that they review that they help with, for example, these educational videos that we want to make. I'm trying to work with agencies like Puerto Rico Sea Grant, and the Council, and get the input from national resources, from academics to try and make sure that these videos kind of reach out to folks, make sense, are available, can be distributed, and that any other needs that they identify that are crucial to educating folks in the Caribbean, that we can meet, that we can provide more outreach as needed. So those are the type of partnerships that I'm referring to.

MR. HINKS: Okay. So, materials in my mind that maybe the other states perhaps take for granted that's been traditionally lacking down there?

MS. ORTIZ: I think we have partnerships and relationships, but in terms of creating the work together. There's additional barriers. There's cultural, language, and geographical barriers. So it's trying to foster more of those partnerships, especially with this role that will make some significant changes in that region.

MR. HINKS: Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: All right. I've got about four people left in the queue. I'm going to need to jump topics here in about three minutes, so if folks can be fairly focused in their comments we might get through everyone. Let's go to Marty Scanlon, and then Mike Pierdinock.

MR. SCANLON: Yes. It's good to see that NMFS is focusing on trying to help the U.S. catch its U.S. swordfish quota. However, it's continually disappointed us that none of these efforts pertain to the pelagic longline industry which is the directed fishery here. I don't see anything on this agenda here for this entire meeting on spatial management would have given us that opportunity. Just a continual insult to the

industry here.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Marty. Mike Pierdinock.

MR. PIERDINOCK: Thank you. Just a quick question. If I go to page 10. Once again, I agree it's good to see that we're having increased limits to try to use up the quota. But maybe I'm just not up to date on this. I don't see any corresponding increases for recreational swordfishing. Because I think this is only just for commercial. Could somebody address that? Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Does anyone want to jump in on that?

MS. ORTIZ: So, this mostly is for three open access permits. So it includes the Charter/Headboats, but only with the commercial -- with the commercial sales endorsement on an permit. So it doesn't really go into any effects, any of the other recreational permits that we have.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Right. And to build off of Delisse's response there, Mike, a few years ago we did work on a rulemaking that increased the retention limit recreational -- in fact, several years now. So, I'm understanding your question perhaps to be a comment along the lines of seeking an increase in the recreational retention limit. Is that what you're getting at?

MR. PIERDINOCK: Yes, certainly. Ar especially since we need to use this quota and provide opportunities also for the recreational sector. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Okay, thanks. Bob Hueter, could you come in with a brief comment or question?

MR. HUETER: Yes, just real quick. Puerto Rico is a tropical island environment. U.S. Gulf of Mexico is a temperate continental environment. Let's please stop coupling Puerto Rico with the Gulf of Mexico. It would be like managing Hawaii's fisheries using the rules in Alaska. So let's get away from that. This is force fed.

Secondly, Ray is too humble because he's been working on the shark fisheries of Puerto Rico for the last three years. And I hope that all the reports that we've filed over those

last three years have been used because I see a mismatch between the species list here and what's happening down in Puerto Rico and what Ray has actually documented.

And last, I don't believe I heard anything about the Caribbean reef shark. Delisse, is that also going to be on the prohibited list?

MS. ORTIZ: That is currently under the prohibited list. Not on the list that we're not allowing the retention, but under like part of the listed species of sharks that are prohibited.

MR. HUETER: So when this rule comes out in Puerto Rico it will be clarified that that's still a prohibited species. It cannot be part of this retention. Okay. I just ask that you be very clear because obviously the rules in the last decade or two have been very muddled, and the fishermen are asking for clarity in the rulemaking. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Bob. Alan, I give you a last very quick word here.

MR. WEISS: Thanks, Bennett. I just noted that earlier in the presentation there was a mention that people had expressed concern over the sustainability of the swordfish fishery. That really shocked me. So I'd say evidently some better way to impart to the constituents the facts of the matter of the swordfish stock condition is needed because I don't know how people would come with that concern when we have a scientifically determined sustainable quota, and we -- in recent years we're generally not able to catch one-third of it. Last year we caught just over 26 percent of it.

So (audio interference) some better way of imparting this information to the constituents that are reviewing this stuff would be helpful. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Alan. I know we want to go next to an update on the listing status of shortfin make shark, but before we do that, Randy, I think did you want to jump in with some answers in responses to the earlier SHARE conversation?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Yes, sure. Before I do that just real quickly to the previous

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

comment that was made there about swordfish stock. Some of those expressions of concern were I think, I'll just characterize some of them as being more locally concerned in particular, and what, for instance, a lack of information perhaps in questioning whether there were specific aggregations of swordfish that could be in and around the Caribbean.

And there's not a lot of information specifically available about that. And then questions about how that increased harvest might have impacted.

But the comment is very good related to the fact of the matter being is that swordfish, north Atlantic swordfish is managed in the north Atlantic basin-wide, it's an international fishery, and the stock is healthy.

So I wanted to circle back to a couple of questions from the SHARE presentation. Dewey had a question about the graph that Guy showed that showed trends in recreational landings and releases, I believe. And so I wanted to come back to that and point out that that graph is showing only Large Pelagics Survey information, and it was showing that in order to demonstrate the trend in that data source.

It does not show all of the data sources that go into the reports of landings and discards to ICCAT. And so that explains the discrepancy there, that there might appear to be. But I just want to point out that that is just the Large Pelagic Survey showing that trend a little bit more effectively.

And then the other one, Jeff Oden had a question about the percentage of large coastal shark landings between state waters and federal waters. And for the Atlantic large coastal shark landings the state water permit holders account for about 35 percent of the landings. And there's a range there over the years. The range is about 25 percent to 46 percent. But overall it's about 35 percent.

And so I hope that answers the question. That information as well as the percentages for the Gulf of Mexico are in the SHARE report once that comes out in a few weeks so I encourage everybody to look for that when it becomes available. Thanks.

5

MR. BROOKS: Great, thanks. Thanks. I'll also note there were a couple of comments put in the chat at the end of that discussion as well so I encourage people to scroll back and take a look at that.

At this point I want to hand off to Adrienne Lohe with NOAA's Fisheries Office of Protected Resources to catch the advisory panel up on the status of the petition to list shortfin make shark. So, Adrienne, I will hand it off to you and let you put up your presentation. And I know we're slated to end at 11:30 but obviously if we need to run a little long we can do that. If you have the time.

MS. LOHE: Okay, yes. No problem.

MR. BROOKS: Okay, great. Thanks.

MS. LOHE: Okay, are you seeing the

slides?

MR. BROOKS: We're seeing presenter view right now.

MS. LOHE: Okay. Let me switch that.

MR. BROOKS: There you go. Perfect.

MS. LOHE: Better? Okay.

MR. BROOKS: You're all set. Yes.

MS. LOHE: Great. So I'm Adrienne

Lohe. I'm from NOAA Fisheries Office of Protected Resources.

MR. BROOKS: Adrienne, there is some -- there's a big gray block in the middle of your presentation that we're seeing. I don't know why that is.

MS. LOHE: Is that better?

MR. BROOKS: There you go. Good.

MS. LOHE: Okay. So, I'm going to be talking today about the Endangered Species Act listing process and the shortfin make shark.

So, I will walk through the ESA listing process, the different steps that are involved, talk a little bit about the effects of listing a species under the Endangered Species Act, talk about the recent positive 90-day finding that came out on shortfin make shark, walk through how the public can comment or provide information in response to that 90-day finding. And I have some resources at the end and we can have questions at that point.

I will start by walking through the process of listing a species under the Endangered

Species Act as either threatened or endangered. This is a really helpful chart that we have on our OPR website, Office of Protected Resources website. And so I'll just walk through the different steps and point out later on where we are with shortfin make in this process.

So, to start the process starts when we either receive a petition to list a species from an individual or an organization, or we can self-initiate the process of a status review as well.

In the case that we are petitioned to list a species which is the most common we review the petition and to the maximum extent practicable within 90 days of receipt of the petition we make a finding on whether the petition presents substantial scientific or commercial information that listing the species may be warranted.

And substantial information is defined in our regulations as the amount of information that would lead a reasonable person conducting an impartial scientific review to conclude that the action proposed in the petition may be warranted.

So this decision at this stage is based on an evaluation of the information that's contained and cited in the petition in the context of other readily available information in our agency files.

So, at this stage we do not conduct additional research. We don't solicit information from parties outside the agency to help us evaluate the petition. It's really just based on what is presented in the petition and what we have available to us in our files at that time.

So, if we make a negative 90-day finding, going off to the left here, that arrow you see, if we make a negative 90-day finding we are concluding that the petition does not present substantial scientific or commercial information indicating that listing may be warranted. And that's the end of the process for that species at that time. It's not reviewed any further.

In the case of a positive 90-day finding, meaning that the petition was found to present substantial scientific or commercial information that listing may be warranted we open

up a public comment period that helps us compile the best available science on the species to make a determination as to whether listing is actually warranted or not.

So moving along, the next step after a positive 90-day finding is to conduct a status review of the species. So in this stage we compile and synthesize the best available science on the species status which includes its life history, demographic trends, and susceptibility to threats. And then we evaluate the extinction risk to the species. So the end result, the status review report is a peer reviewed document to ensure that it cites the best available information.

And within 12 months of the petition receipt date is when the conclusions of that status review. We publish a determination which we call a 12-month finding on whether listing as threatened or endangered is warranted or not. So that's kind of the next branch off here in that chart.

If we find that listing is not warranted we publish a negative 12-month finding which is the end product. No further review for that species at that time.

If we do find that listing as either threatened or endangered is warranted we publish the positive 12-month finding as a rule proposing to list the species as either threatened or endangered. And at this stage there is another public comment period.

So usually one year after the proposed rule we will publish a final determination to list the species. So those are the different steps, but what happens after a species is listed? That depends on whether the species is listed as threatened or endangered.

So just to go through the definitions. An endangered species is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range. A threatened species is likely to become endangered throughout all or a significant portion of its range in the foreseeable future. So as you can see the main difference here is that a threatened species is not currently in danger of extinction, but it is likely to become so in the foreseeable future.

So, if a species is listed as endangered certain prohibitions are automatically applied to that species. So I'll just go through them quickly. It is illegal for any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to import it or export it out of the U.S., to take the species within the U.S., the territorial seas of the U.S., U.S. EEZ, or upon the high seas, possess, sell, deliver, carry, transport, or ship any endangered wildlife that has been taken illegally, or to sell, offer for sale, deliver, receive, carry, transport, or ship that species in interstate or foreign commerce.

So, those are the prohibitions that are automatically applied to an endangered species. And just to clarify the term "take" here in the second prohibition includes to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt any of these actions.

So for a threatened species if a species is listed that way these prohibitions are not automatically applied. If deemed necessary and advisable for the conservation of the species we can apply prohibitions through a special rule called a 4(d) rule. So if NMFS adopts a 4(d) rule for a threatened species we can offer any or all of the above protections.

And in issuing a 4(d) rule we consider the species biology, conservation needs, and threats, and then determine which activities need to be regulated or prohibited in order to conserve the species.

And listing under the ESA also triggers the section 7 consultation requirement where federal agencies must consult to ensure that any action authorized, funded, or carried out by that agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species, or to result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat.

And so I won't get into too much about -- in too much detail about consultation because I don't work on section 7 specifically, but an example would be if the shortfin make did end up getting listed that means that in sustainable fisheries would have to consult with NMFS Office

of Protected Resources under section 7 to make sure that the fishery isn't jeopardizing the continued existence of the species.

So, as you probably have all heard we recently published a positive 90-day finding on the shortfin make shark petition that we received in January, meaning that we concluded that the petition presented substantial information indicating that listing may be warranted.

So the petition and 90-day finding are both available on our website, and I've linked that in the last slide of my presentation so you can go find it easily. But I briefly just wanted to discuss our determination here.

As you know, the species has a global distribution across all temperate and tropical ocean waters, and is highly migratory. It's a late maturing, slow growing species with moderately high longevity and low annual fecundity which gives it overall low productivity.

Looking at the status in abundance trends that were presented in the petition there were declines in abundance indicated across its global range by both stock assessments, CPUE data. The South Pacific is the one exception that we noted where there was some evidence of population increases.

And we were looking at the trends for the species as a whole across its global range, not just one region. And then we talked about the main threat to the species being overfishing through incidental catch in commercial fisheries and opportunistic retention when bycaught due to high-value meat and fins.

Overall based on that information that was cited in the petition we found that listing as a threatened or endangered species may be warranted.

So, going back to that flow chart that I walked through in the beginning, I've just highlighted where we are now with the make shark, the shortfin make. We've made a positive 90-day finding in April, and the public comment period is open now. And we are right in the middle of compiling information to conduct a status review of the species now.

So, by publishing the positive 90-day

finding we've opened up a 60-day public comment period. So people can submit information for us to use in the status review of the species. We're specifically soliciting comments on the historical and current abundance, the population trends, distribution, and population structure, the condition of habitat, data on threats including bycatch and trade, and information on management, regulatory, or conservation programs for the species that mitigate threats.

So, any member of the public can submit comments or information by going to regulations.gov and then searching for the docket number that I've highlighted here. It's NOAA-NMFS-2021-0028. That's also found right in the 90-day finding.

And then once you search for that docket number on regulations.gov you'll see this image that I've put up here, and you'll just click the blue comment button and you can submit attachments, you can write something up. And that's how you would submit that to our agency.

So the comment period closes on June 14. So, if you have any data or information that would help us in our review of the species status I encourage you to share that with us through the comment process.

So, just to conclude, until the status review is complete there has been no determination on whether the shortfin make shark is going to be listed as either threatened or endangered, or listed at all. If the species does become listed the ultimate goal of the ESA is recovery, and we aim to recover a listed species so that they are no longer at risk of extinction.

NMFS does this through developing and implementing recovery plans for listed species, conducting interagency consultations under section 7, and coordinating and providing grants to states to carry out recovery actions.

And stakeholder input and involvement is essential along the way from compiling the best available information for the status review to implementing recovery actions if a species is listed.

So it was great to be able to come today. Thanks for inviting me to share this

information with you, and I encourage all of you if you want to to share any relevant information with us to use in our determination.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Thanks, Adrienne. (Simultaneous speaking.)

MS. LOHE: I just have some resources here and my email address if you want to reach out to me.

MR. BROOKS: Okay, great. Maybe you can just leave that up for right now. So, let's see if there's a few AP comments or questions for you before we go to break. Rick Weber, I see your hand up, and I think Marcos, and Marty, and Raimundo, I think those are all leftover from the previous conversation so if you would lower your hands that would be great. Let's go to Rick Weber and then we'll go to Rick Bellavance.

MR. WEBER: Hi, Adrienne. We spoke a couple of weeks ago. Same presentation and I think it's clear. I fully understand and even support why you've found a positive 90. As I've told you I think you're going to have a very difficult time -- not that anyone is trying to. I know you're trying to get to the facts. I do not think the facts are going to lay out that there is a future in which make sharks do not exist basin wide or North Atlantic wide. I think the threshold is very high.

My question today is last time we spoke you mentioned DPS and there was some reference even this time in DPS. Who makes that DPS? Does the DPS already have to be created before your assessment, or can you determine that there is a distinct population segment during your analysis?

If you'd go from there and I'll see if it spurs anything secondary. Thank you.

MS. LOHE: Sure. Yes, so that is done during the status review. We're going to -- once we collect, and synthesize, and kind of walk through all the available data we're going to bring a team together to assess the extinction risk.

And part of the process that the team will go through is doing a DPS analysis to see if there are any distinct population segments that meet the two criteria for our policy, the discreteness and the significance criteria, and

see if listing as a DPS is needed for the management of the species I guess I would say.

MR. WEBER: Understood. Okay, thank you. And as I've said I think you will have -- again, from a fairness. I don't think anyone's trying to do this. I think the bar is so high to say that it does not exist.

My next question then would be if you don't find a DPS and you guys agree with ICCAT that this is a North Atlantic wide stock how would you go about determining threatened? Again, I think you're going to have a hard time saying there is a chance that make will not exist at all basin wide. Now I'm trying to figure out what your threshold would be and what things you would be looking at so that we can provide helpful data. Because I think there are people in this conference that have helpful data.

But how does a highly migratory species that is basin wide in my opinion become threatened? If you can give us any idea what you would be looking for to determine that something like that was threatened.

It's so simple when something lives in a particular pond, or a particular forest. I get it. We can have that discussion. When something is basin wide I don't know how -- I don't know what factors you're looking at. I don't know what data this group should provide to you.

MS. LOHE: Well, I guess if we didn't -- so you're asking if we didn't find any DPSs. If we were looking at the species in its global range. We would want kind of the things that I mentioned, abundance data, past abundance trends, historical distribution, threats data.

And so for threatened we're going to also be determining what the foreseeable future is for the species. And that's a species-specific thing. And that's determined on a case-by-case basis for different species.

And then seeing how far out we could project the threats into that foreseeable future to see if the species meets the criteria for a threatened species, and what the extinction risk is over that foreseeable future.

MR. WEBER: Understood. I believe it can fall, but I don't believe it can fall to the point that it no longer exists. So, with that,

thank you very much. Bennett, you may mute me again. MR. BROOKS: I would never do that to you, but someone else will. Rick Bellavance, come on in. MR. BELLAVANCE: Thank you, Bennett. Thank you, Adrienne, for the presentation. just had a quick clarifying question regarding the timeline. If I understood it right, I just want to make sure I get it. If there is a 12-month finding in the later part of the process and a proposed rule is published, did you say that there was another year between the published rule and the final -the proposed rule being published and the final rule? So it's a 24-month period there? want to get that right. MS. LOHE: Yes. So, we have to -we'll be publishing our 12-month finding 12 months from the receipt of the petition date 21 which was January 25 of this year. And then if 22 we do issue a proposed rule we will issue the 23 final rule within 12 months if that. 24 MR. BELLAVANCE: So it's within, not necessarily 12 months, but within 12 months. MS. LOHE: Within 12 months. some room for extension, but it's typically around 12 months. MR. BELLAVANCE: Okay. the clarification. 31 MS. LOHE: No problem. 33 hearing you right now. Thank you. MR. BROOKS: Can we take Dewey off mute? Dewey. MR. HEMILRIGHT: hear me? MR. BROOKS: 41 MR. HEMILRIGHT:

Thank you for PARTICIPANT: Bennett, we're not MR. BROOKS: Can you hear me now? PARTICIPANT: Gotcha now. Let's go to Thank you. Can you We can, Dewey. Thanks for the presentation, and my comments are for clarification. What kind of data are you looking for, and what does the scientific and commercial data mean? So that's kind of clarification. I've also got a comment after that, please. Thank you. MS. LOHE: Yes, sure. So, scientific Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

25

26

27

28

29

30

32

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

There is

and commercial information basically refers to obviously scientific information, studies, that kind of thing, data. But the commercial information side means that we can take information from commercial fisheries. So log books, or catch data, that kind of thing. It doesn't mean economic information. That kind of stuff can't be taken into account during the listing process. So it's more focused on the status of the species. That's what that means.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Well, that leads me to kind of my next question is what data did you gather to make your assumption on the finding, and what other data would there be out there that you haven't seen or used or something? I'm kind of a little confused. You had to use something to make your determination. What data, scientific or commercial data, did you use already?

MS. LOHE: Yes. So we were basing our 90-day finding determination on the citations in literature that were cited in the petition that was submitted to us which is available online. So all those citations are there for people to check out.

But we're just casting a wider net of things that may not have been cited in that petition, basically anything indicating anything about the threats, the abundance, any regulatory measures, management measures, that apply to the species. So it's more of a comprehensive review of everything about the species, where the petition just cites certain studies and articles that are making the case for listing what they're requesting in the petition. We're basically reviewing everything we can get our hands on that is appropriate to review for the status of the species at this point.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: So, one last thing here. Basically when you have a review of -- that was sent in to ask for a determination you only review what the people put in that thing. You don't go -- so they can cherry-pick and put whatever they want to in there, and then that's the only thing you make your decision on instead of going outside and then if others to process. Is that kind of correct? And cherry-pick was my word in there because you said that it was

information that was in there. It don't appear like you went further beyond that yet.

MS. LOHE: Right. So we are required to not go beyond that. That's what the 90-day finding stage is for. We're required to not do extra research and look into other sources at that point. We're doing a review based on what we have in our agency files and what we know, and kind of seeing if the information cited in the petition stands up to what we know an impartial reviewer, what they would say.

So yes, at that stage it is only -it's mainly focused on what's found in the
petition, and also what we have in our agency
files already. But we're not really allowed to
look outside of that at that stage. That's what
the status review is for.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: My last comment would be that the greatest impediment for the mortality of make sharks is a wire leader and a J hook that are used by many other international CPCs in ICCAT, and the fact that the U.S. fishermen are using circle hooks and lighter mone for numerous years should be taken -- hopefully will be taken into your account of the way it's fished here. So I appreciate it. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Dewey. We're at 20 of. I want to let this go for five more minutes. So let's see if we can be focused in the comments. We've got five or six people. I don't think we'll get to all of you, but we'll do our best to get to as many of you in the next five minutes. Tim Pickett, jump in, and then Scott Taylor.

MR. PICKETT: Yes, this is just kind of building on Dewey's last comment there. I think you need to seriously take into consideration the change in the dynamic of our domestic fishery, and of the fishery kind of worldwide.

A lot changes fishing tactic-wise both in the longline industry and in the -- even the recreational industry in a short period of time the way people are doing things.

You know, like Dewey said, circle hook and monofilament leaders. Deep set fishing on the longline side of things. Just a general U.S. reduction in fishing effort too over the last

several years with the Amendment 7 stuff, and closed areas and everything. I mean, it's a very dynamic thing that we need to look at.

Fishing effort is not necessarily fishing effort because like I said, the way people fish changes. To adapt to different situations and regulations and stuff like that. So I think that's something we need to be very sensitive to.

And that's the same way on the recreational side of things. The way guys fish and fishing pressure is something that we need to definitely consider. I mean, we can't be looking at -- and this is a broader brush that is talking about all the stuff we talk about. We're looking at data that could be 20 years old, 30 years old, or something like that. The way they did things then and the way we do things now are apples and oranges. So that's my general comment.

MR. BROOKS: Thank you, Tim. Scott Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: So on and so forth. Me getting into a position of owning a boat and doing business like that.

MR. BROOKS: Scott, are you there? All right. Let's go to --

MR. TAYLOR: Can you hear me?

MR. BROOKS: Yes.
MR. TAYLOR: Yes. I was just -- it

was a question that I had. In our past discussion over this make issue in the past there was a great deal of discussion about the lack of international reporting, and the data that was reported to ICCAT, and then ultimately the U.S.'s -- the way that the U.S. dealt with this with the camera systems and with everything else.

So my question is in this process, and I don't mean to sound ignorant, are we required to essentially discount the fact that there's a lot of people that believe that there's real deficiencies in this international reporting and then reach our own conclusions on this listing?

Or are we sort of boxed in to the findings and the data that has come out of ICCAT in terms of the overall stock assessment?

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Scott.

MS. LOHE: I guess what I would say is that we're required to rely upon the best

available data. And so even if the data is incomplete, or unreliable, if that's the only data that we have that's what we have to use. And we do certainly take into account the uncertainty in the different data sources that we use.

MR. TAYLOR: Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: Mike Pierdinock, you've got 30 seconds, then we're going to go to break.

MR. PIERDINOCK: Oh my. I wish I had five minutes. Nice seeing you again, Adrienne. I'm surprised there's been no discussion about what our observations have been on the waters.

Since 2017 we've implemented the ICCAT mortality reduction measures. For recreational for-hire or the commercial fleet I'll say for New England we see greater numbers, greater sizes as a result of those measures. So it's consistent with those conservation measures.

My question is that a few things. We're supposed to provide recommendations and I wonder whether one of the recommendations is that ICCAT puts greater -- the U.S. puts greater pressure on ICCAT contracting parties who have not met the fishing mortality reduction goal, and whether that could take place.

There's also another approach that could be taken that we could take action under section 301 under the Trade Act to force those countries that make efforts -- that will force those countries to make efforts to reduce make mortality.

So are those acceptable comments that could then be utilized to address or get the international community to step to the plate and achieve these 85 percent mortality reduction measures that the United States continues to lead the way with the rest of the world being conservation minded to achieve those goals? Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Mike.

MS. LOHE: I think more of the international outreach to ICCAT and the international community is done not by our office or our team, but possibly through HMS and through the NOAA Fisheries International Affairs Group. So, it wouldn't really be the Office of Protected Resources taking that on necessarily.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Adrienne. Thanks, everyone, for the good discussion. I know there's a couple of folks still in the queue, but we really need to get folks to break. And I again, invite whoever didn't get a chance to either pose a question or a comment to throw it in the chat as well. On the slide right now is Adrienne's contact information so obviously you should feel free to reach out to Adrienne with any additional questions or thoughts you might have.

So with that let's go to a break. Pete or Randy, is there anything you want to say before we go to break?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: No. I don't really have anything else to say besides have a good one.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Then just we will reconvene at 1 o'clock sharp with a conversation on HMS best scientific information available framework document. So, all right. Thanks, everyone, and Adrienne, thanks so much for the presentation. Talk to you all in a little more than an hour. Thanks, bye.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 11:49 a.m. and resumed at 1:02 p.m.)

MR. BROOKS: Okay, I'm going to hand it off to Jen Cudney to talk to us about the Atlantic HMS Best Scientific Information Available Framework. And then after a break we'll hear from Brad McHale and others on electronic technologies and electronic monitoring. Following that, we'll take public comment and then we'll aim to wrap up around I will also note, Jeff Oden, when you were having all your technological issues yesterday you had been hoping to comment on A13 and didn't get an opportunity. So after the two presentations, assuming we have time, and I'm assuming we will have time we will do our darnedest to create an opportunity for you to share your thoughts since you did not get to do that yesterday.

With that unless Pete or Randy, you have anything to add I think I'm just going to hand it off to Jen. So Jen, it's all yours.

MS. CUDNEY: All right. Hi,

everybody. I hope you had a good lunch, or at least something that was as good as the bacon, spinach, and feta omelet that my husband and I just enjoyed.

I am going to be giving this presentation to give the AP an introduction to best scientific information available, or a BSIA framework that's being developed by our division.

So this presentation is going to refresh our memories on what BSIA is and how it's been integrated into the Magnuson-Stevens Act and regulations, and then consider how it applies to HMS management in the context of an upcoming procedural directive.

All right. So, we manage our nation's fisheries according to a set of principles or national standards that are intended to ensure sustainable and responsible fishery management. So the subject of this presentation is related to National Standard 2 of our Magnuson-Stevens Act.

And that national standard says that conservation and management measures shall be based on the best scientific information available, or BSIA.

So, in other words this is saying that fishery conservation and management requires high-quality and timely scientific information to effectively conserve and manage our nation's resources.

The successful fishery management depends in part on the thorough analysis of this scientific information, including the evaluation of potential impacts that conservation and management measures will have on living marine resources and things like EFH, our ecosystems, participants, fishing communities, and the nation.

BSIA is also intended to identify areas where additional management measures are needed.

Note that this statement is very broad. So, sometimes we need guidance to understand exactly what does and does not constitute BSIA under different circumstances.

We can get that guidance through rulemaking and policies that are developed by NOAA fisheries. National standard 2 guidelines were updated last through a 2013 rulemaking that

provided guidance on four new things. That was guidance on what exactly constitutes BSIA for effective conservation and management of fisheries, standards for peer review under the BSIA umbrella, the role of scientific and statistical committees, and the relationship of those SSCs to the peer review process, and finally, clarifications on the content and purpose of our stock assessment and fishery evaluation, or SAFE reports.

So why did they decide to finalize this rulemaking? Well, it was to ensure that the scientific information that's used for management and conservation of fisheries has been verified and validated to the extent possible, is subject to peer review, is transparent, and is used appropriately.

The next few slides are going to review some of this updated guidance in a little bit greater detail to give you a better idea of what it means.

So, what is BSIA? I said before it's broad. It can include, but is not limited to factual input, data, models, analyses, technical information, scientific assessments. It can include information or data that's compiled directly from surveys or sampling programs, and from models that are considered to be mathematical representations of reality constructed with primary scientific data.

Scientific information includes both established and emergent scientific information. And so what this means is established science is considered knowledge that's derived and verified through a standard scientific process and is generally agreed upon and is less controversial.

What we call emergent science is relatively new knowledge that is still evolving and being verified. So it could have additional uncertainty or controversiality associated with it, and in general should be considered more thoroughly when looking at it for science and management purposes.

One thing here that is very important is that scientific data is not static. Science is not static. It's a dynamic process. So the information that we base or that we use for our management decisions is going to also change.

And finally, there's a great deal of language in these National Standard 2 guidelines concerning uncertainty. So, the scientific information that informs our management process should include an evaluation of uncertainty and identifying gaps in the information.

So, in conclusion BSIA can mean a lot of different things. So again, it's important to remember the scale and scope and context when we're discussing BSIA so that we can manage expectations.

Now, the National Research Council in 2004 developed a criteria for evaluating BSIA. And this was later adopted in that 2013 rulemaking.

The revised guidelines don't necessarily provide a static definition of BSIA because science is a dynamic process involving continuous improvement. But they do recommend that these things listed on this slide are considered. And if you're interested the green sort of box that's on the lower right corner of the screen has a shortened link to this report. So feel free to go ahead and access it if you'd like to take a look at it.

So, those criteria that can be considered when you're evaluating whether something is BSIA includes relevance. So is this information pertinent to the current questions or the management decisions that are being considered. Is it representative of the fishery being managed.

Inclusiveness. So this refers to whether a range -- a relevant range of scientific disciplines and information are consulted to reasonably encompass the scope of potential impacts. So are we considering alternative points of view sufficiently, and also this folds in whether relevant local ecological knowledge is obtained and considered as well.

Objectivity. Scientific information should be accurate with a known degree of precision, no addressable biases, and presented in an accurate, clear, complete, and balanced manner. So what we're really trying to avoid here is undue non-scientific influences and considerations.

Transparency and openness. So of

course Magnuson requires us to make scientific information used in the process available to the public along with descriptions of how that information is collected, and how it's analyzed, whether there is that uncertainty that I spoke of earlier, and ultimately how that information is being used.

So we want to make sure that all of that is available to the public in some form or fashion, whether it's in our rulemaking documents, in our guidance documents, or in metadata.

Timeliness. So as I said, science is dynamic. It's ongoing. So, this part of the National Standard 2 guideline speaks to temporal aspects of data, and the extent that timing issues with regards to the availability of information should affect the management process.

So what does that mean? It means that mandatory management actions should not be delayed due to limitations in the scientific information or the promise of future data collection. So, we can always say that we need more information, but at some point we need to draw a line in the sand and say well, these interim results are better than no information at all, or as is the case with management, we have opportunities in the future to evaluate new information as it comes available.

And then also regarding timeliness, we also want to think about historical information. So, historical information can be very important. It can be highly relevant. But we need to think about how it's informing the current situation. So, some species life history characteristics might not change over time. However, there are other, certainly other examples where historical data that's providing time series information might indicate changes in populations or fishery participation or effort that would then inform management decisions.

Finally, we get to verification and validation, meaning that we want scientific information that's verified and validated to the extent possible, with verification meaning that results are reproducible and validation meaning that procedures are tested basically for soundness.

And then finally peer review as I said is a pretty important part of the National Standard 2 guidelines. We want to make sure that we're using a process that ensures the quality and credibility of the scientific information and methods that we're using meet the standards of the scientific and technical committee.

So the scientific information that supports conservation and management measures should be peer reviewed.

All right. So, that kind of wraps us through what is BSIA. Now, there are -- as I said, there's a heavy emphasis on peer review, so another part of that update from 2013 focused on standards for peer review.

And so specifically this is -- these are quality standards. They want to emphasize the importance of qualifications of those that are involved. We want to make sure there's a balanced knowledge and perspective representation, lack of conflicts of interest of course, and then we want to make sure that this process is transparent.

And as I said, there has been some guidance also passed on SSC member involvement in the peer review process.

So, the Magnuson Act provides that the Secretary and the councils can establish a peer review process for that council for scientific information that's used in management, mainly to advise the council.

These formally established processes are noticed in the Federal Register and they're considered to meet the requirements for Information Quality Act and OMB standards, and are considered to be consistent with National Standard 2 guidance.

So when we have these types of publications such as the 2016 Notice of Regional Peer Review Processes these are affirmations that those processes are consistent with all those rules that I just mentioned.

And these types of publications are going to thoroughly describe the process, provide terms of reference, and other information all in the interest of transparency.

So, as I said, there is another part of the update concerning the role of SSCs

clarifying those roles and responsibilities for SSC members in determining BSIA as scientific advisors and peer reviewers. It does clarify that those SSC members can participate in the peer review process, but we have to remember that HMS does not have an SSC.

And then finally, this 2013 guidance conveyed some new guidance on what needs to be included in the SAFE reports. So the SAFE reports are intended to periodically summarize the best available scientific information on a fishery. And this is going to include the biological condition of the stocks and the complexes that are being managed, information on things like OFL and ABCs, the stock status, fishing mortality, essential fish habitat, social and economic data, bycatch information, and thorough documentation of management actions.

So, the information presented within the SAFE report is done with the expectation that it can be used to inform the decision-making process. So for these reasons you often see cross references in our rulemaking documents back to a recent SAFE report. And you may also see particularly relevant information pulled from a SAFE report into our NEPA analyses, or in, for example, a lot of our EISs and EIAs have a chapter on the description of the affected environment. So the data that's presented in the SAFE report is a very rich resource to inform that background for these rulemaking documents.

We do take great pains to ensure that our SAFE reports are publicly available on our website. So if you ever have trouble finding it please do let us know. We will make sure that you have that information.

And I just want to also mention that our SAFE report does fully meet these National Standard 2 guidelines.

So, now that I've given you sort of the legislative context for how scientific information is used in management, what BSIA is, we have guidelines that are intentionally not too prescriptive regarding how you determine whether something is BSIA. So that raises the question of how are we operationalizing these guidelines that are presented in the regulatory text.

Well, NOAA Fisheries leadership

establishes policies to determine how natural resources are managed, and procedural directives are also developed which provide guidance for how to apply these policies.

So in 2019 NOAA Fisheries finalized a procedural directive that described a framework for determining that stock status determinations and catch specifications are based on best scientific information available.

So this national framework is intended to increase transparency in how BSIA determinations are made, to clarify the rules and responsibilities of the agency and all the managing partners in the fishery management process, and it is intended to be a reflection of status quo processes and roles, not to create new ones. So this is really, really important to remember. We are not recreating the wheel, we are just reflecting the wheel as it's currently designed.

And again, I want to remind everybody that while National Standard 2 covers many things, the scope of this framework is very specific to stock status determinations and catch specifications. So there are other policy and procedure documents, and regulatory language that provide guidance for other management programs and processes which require the use of BSIA. But right now we are just focusing on how is BSIA integrated into stock status determinations, catch specifications, and ultimately the rulemakings that come from those metrics for management.

So this National BSIA Framework essentially provides a recipe for operationalizing these guidelines. So what we have on the left of this slide is the national framework, and a very simplified schematic that says okay, we're going to create a regional framework that reflects how each region is applying this sort of overarching national BSIA framework to ensure within a region that management decisions are based on BSIA.

In general this NOAA Fisheries BSIA framework is going to include six broad steps, again, with a lot of flexibility for how these sort of steps are accomplished within a region. And that's going to include the stock assessment

process, peer review, revision, any specific rules and steps that are assigned to SSCs and NOAA Fisheries, the development of catch specifications, and finally, NOAA Fisheries approval.

And the schematic on this slide is from a presentation that NOAA Fisheries staff gave to the North Pacific Fisheries Management Council on the draft framework. It describes the process for those council managed fisheries that have an SSC, but since there is no SSC or Council for HMS management our process is going to look pretty different. And so this again speaks to that need for regional flexibility.

So, how does this translate to an HMS BSIA process? So, our marching orders were to create this regional framework for Atlantic HMS fisheries within three years of publication of the policy. And it was published in May of 2019 so we are coming up on the two-year anniversary this month.

So our HMS framework has to concisely describe how the different stock assessment processes are used, how they're peer reviewed, and revised if necessary, what steps are taken by the agency to implement any sort of catch specifications or in the case of HMS speak quota rules that would change management in accordance with the results of these stock assessments.

So, our framework when it's going to be developed is going to focus on three different stock assessment processes. So we are going to try to for the ICCAT process, the SEDAR stock assessment process, and for some external assessments that we occasionally are made aware of try to describe how these six framework steps are applied through each of these processes.

And again, remember we're not trying to create something new. We're just trying to transparently describe what is already done.

So, the next three slides I'm going to quickly walk us through what each of these three processes are that are going to be included in our BSIA framework. The ICCAT assessments of course are going to include tunas, swordfish, billfish, and pelagic sharks.

If you're interested in them or checking out some of the recent assessments, or

the assessment schedule go to the website. That's on the second bullet here, and you'll find that information.

Assessments are generally completed by the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics, or SCRS. We do not have this as part of that noticed Federal Register process. And some of the ongoing and recent assessments that are included are listed on this slide.

The second stock assessment process that our HMS BSIA framework will include is this SEDAR process, or the Southeast Data Assessment and Review Process. This is for domestically managed sharks. The website is SEDARweb.org so go ahead and check that out if you're interested for more information on some recent stock assessments that have been completed.

The SEDAR process includes a variety of participants including the Councils, Commissions, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, SERO, HMS Management Division, our SEDAR Pool, and also it features numerous opportunities for public comment. And again, that 2016 notice of the peer review processes that I spoke about affirms that consistency with the National Standard 2 guidelines.

And then I have a couple of examples of some of the ongoing and recent Atlantic HMS assessments that were completed through the SEDAR process at the bottom of the slide. There have been 11 HMS assessments that have been completed since 2005 using this process.

And then every once in a while NOAA Fisheries has been made aware of an external or third party assessment that might be appropriate for use in management. And typically this is for our domestically managed sharks.

These assessments usually fill a data gap for a low-priority species. However, they are not typically conducted as part of a process that's affirmed via the FORWARD notice as consistent with National Standard 2.

So in the interest of transparency we want to kind of nail down this procedure for how the BSIA is determined related to these assessments.

They may or may not include NOAA scientists at various stages of development. If

you go back and look in the literature there are two that we have either used for management, or that we are keeping an eye on. One was the scalloped hammerhead assessment from 2009, and more recently there has been a lemon shark assessment that we are looking at.

So, next steps. I talked an awful lot about National Standard 2, and that national framework, and our regional HMS framework. And we are in the development of that draft Atlantic HMS BSIA framework.

So, we are hoping that we will have something for you to look at by the next advisory panel meeting. So this summer we're in the drafting stage. We're consulting with numerous entities within the agency like International Affairs and the Southeast Science Center. And hopefully we'll have a document for you to look at by that fall AP meeting.

This winter and possibly early next spring we'll be looking at finalizing our draft framework in time to meet the deadline for that procedural directive which is May 2022.

So, next I guess I'll take some questions, but first I'm going to flip past this slide to a useful references slide because there's a lot of information that I referenced here, including our national standard guidelines, that national BSIA framework, the regional peer review processes, and three different stock assessment processes. So if you're interested please feel free to look for information on all of these things at these websites. So if you have any questions, and this will be the last slide in your copy of the presentation, but if you have any questions please let me know and/or Pete. So that's it for me.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Thanks so much, Jen. Lots of background and context there. Obviously this is something that will be coming back in the fall, but it would be great to hear what questions folks have for Jen, or any thoughts you might want to be sharing at this point. Tim Pickett, I think I see your hand up. Would you like to jump in here?

MR. PICKETT: Yes. Great presentation. It helps -- I keep going back to thinking about what the general public can see,

and what the general public has access to. I've sat through a lot of these meetings and still myself am coming up to speed with how decisions are made, and how stocks are assessed and things like that. I mean, it's a tremendous amount of information, and it's a tremendous amount of just trying to understand the process. I still struggle with that.

It's even more difficult for the general public to understand how the decision-making process happens. The biggest example I have is the shark depredation issue that we deal with here in south Florida. It's completely out of control and people have a difficult time understanding how these stocks are assessed, why it makes no sense to them versus what they're seeing on the water, and it makes them distrustful of the process that happens with this decision-making.

So, I mean maybe some more public outreach as to how these numbers are formulated. I mean, the public is inherently distrustful of what they're seeing on the water versus what they're being told in terms of -- it's an amazing thing I've seen down here. People down here are begging for -- people that you would never hear, Billfish Foundation, all these tournament organizers for billfish tournaments are begging for commercial longline fishing of sharks to happen in south Florida right now because of what they're seeing on the water. And the general public can't understand or wrap their head around why this isn't allowed.

And so I understand the need for best available science, and my segue into this is I think the best way of getting best available science is to have more science, not try and keep (audio interference) around as to what we currently have and what we currently have access to. We just need more of it. That's the best way. Have a study.

I mean, that's the best way to get the best available science is to -- let's have some guys go fishing. Let's collect some more data, rather than interpolating data from 20 years ago or something like that. That's my comment.

But great presentation. It helps me understand the way this works. And like I said,

something condensed and that would allow the public to understand the decision-making process would be a good thing.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Thanks, Tim. David Schalit, why don't you jump in here.

MR. SCHALIT: I'm jumping in.

Jennifer, what can one say about this
presentation. It was beautiful. I have a couple
of questions and then I have a comment.

The first question is given that HMS has no SSC does peer review in this context reference outside peer review?

MS. CUDNEY: So peer review, it means different things under these three different And so it can reference outside peer processes. Certainly when we have those external review. An external assessment that's been assessments. peer reviewed makes a strong argument for inclusion and management because it has been through that process of being dissected by experts and returned to a hopefully prestigious journal that has its own publication standard. So by the time that we look at it. And of course we would do our own internal process of review. It's information that's already been kind of thrown out to the scientific community and kind of tested in some way from a logical sense.

Under the SEDAR process, for example, there are other mechanisms for peer review. So, and then ICCAT has its own procedures that we're going to be documenting in this framework to the best that we can.

MR. SCHALIT: Okay. My next question is relating to external assessment. My understanding of external assessment, I'll give you an example.

The RFMOs. WCPFC actually farm out their assessment on bigeye, for example, to -- in other words their process is very different than the SCRS's. Is that what you're referencing? In other words a group of people who would be commissioned to do an assessment who are outside the organization? Is that the idea?

MS. CUDNEY: So it can include that. Some external assessments, not necessarily for HMS fisheries, but I know that there have been some that -- one of the documents actually that I didn't focus on too much -- hang on just a second

-- is this Implementing a Next Generation Stock Assessment Enterprise. It's basically a stock assessment improvement plan. That speaks a little bit to external assessments. And it specifically says that in some cases an external assessment can be contracted out by say a group that's interested in maybe an alternative analysis than what's being done.

But typically what we're talking about here in regards to these external assessments for HMS to date has included things that are published in the peer reviewed literature that we've found out about after the fact.

I don't want to too narrowly define it because there's some inherent flexibility here in what that could mean though.

MR. SCHALIT: Okay. Bennett, are we still good? Can I continue for another minute?

MR. BROOKS: Grab another minute.

Then after that I'll let you cycle back if you have more.

MR. SCHALIT: That's very generous of you. Okay. I'm typically thinking about dolphin fish, mahi mahi which is a very important species for HMS fishermen even though it is not HMS managed. It is an epipelagic species and it is a species of interest to ICCAT. It's on their species of interest list.

But it is managed by the South Atlantic Fishermen Council. And you mentioned SEDAR. Well, I should preface this by saying that dolphin fish in the context of best available science, dolphin fish has never been assessed. It has never had a peer reviewed assessment ever. It has had a four-page introductory paper written by Praeger in the year 2000, but it has virtually never been assessed.

And I've spoken with the SEDAR committee and asked them would they -- is it possible that this fish could be put on their to-do list. You know they have a to-do list of assessments? And they refused. They basically said ICCAT should do this. It's a little odd situation.

In HMS is there any interface between SEDAR and HMS where we can actually have a conduit for dialogue I'm referencing, something like that?

MS. CUDNEY: So, we do have folks that are pretty tightly wrapped into SEDAR assessments. And Karyl is our best resource for that. So I can't necessarily speak very well to the mahi assessments or lack thereof. Not my area of expertise.

But you should know that we do have a pretty strong working relationship between HMS and the folks doing SEDAR.

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: And I'm just going to jump in since Jen mentioned me. I sit on the SEDAR steering committee and this committee meets twice a year, and we go through all the different requests from all the councils. There are three councils plus ASMFC, plus the Gulf Commission, all that meet during these meetings to decide what assessments are going to get done and what kind of resources we have. And it is a very interesting meeting twice a year with a lot of different competing interests.

MR. SCHALIT: I've attended that meeting in the past and I'm wondering, I mean just in a listening mode so to speak. But the problem here is I'm looking for a mechanism by which HMS is somehow connected to SEDAR. I've seen the Gulf Council and New England, the Mid-Atlantic, et cetera.

But there really doesn't seem to be any place where this interaction can occur. And I'm wondering maybe you have some advice on that.

MS. BREWSTER-GEISZ: I am the one who sits on that committee for HMS.

MR. SCHALIT: Oh you do. Then we need to have this conversation offline I guess. Okay. Okay that's great, Karyl. I appreciate that.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: And just to be clear, David, of course as Karyl is mentioning the SEDAR process involves and considers domestic shark management, well assessments for domestically managed sharks in the mix of the species that are assessed.

But related to mahi or dolphin fish is that that is of course as you stated, it is not an HMS, not defined that way under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. So just keep that in mind. Even though it is important for a lot of our fishermen there is that overlap.

MR. SCHALIT: Duly noted. Thanks. I

appreciate that, Randy.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. I'll note Anna Beckwith is on if we want to talk about the mahi assessment in particular, but I had a sense that David's question was more sort of generic about SEDAR-HMS connections. I think I will push on. But if anyone wants us to double back down we can do so.

Let's bring in Dewey, and then Sonja.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: How about now? Can
you hear me?

MR. BROOKS: Yes, we can.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: A very good analysis on the best available information. I had a couple of questions. Is there anything new to this, or is this just giving us an awareness or something? And I've got a couple of more questions after that.

MS. CUDNEY: Sure. So, the newness here. I mean, yes, we did talk about a lot of stuff from 2013 and 2016. The newness is the direction that HMS got, HMS Management Division got to create a regional BSIA framework. So we have to take these national guidelines and create a document that is publicly available and transparent that describes how BSIA is achieved through the stock assessment process and in setting catch metrics.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Let me also ask you a couple -- these aren't hypothetical questions. These are reality questions that I've experienced over the last couple of years. One of them is with your all's SAFE report, and particularly to sharks, the sections on sharks, recreational, some commercial.

It's at best misleading, and it doesn't give a complete picture of the landings of sharks based on what we've reported to ICCAT. And I've raised this question before and it just seems not to gain no traction.

My second question is how would this be treated. I serve on the Mid-Atlantic Council and a liaison to South Atlantic Council, familiar with HMS. And it seems like everybody's got different policies of how they deal with MRIP and the EFCs associated with MRIP.

Particularly, and I'll use the HMS here experience. Particularly the shortfin

makos, and I'm reporting to ICCAT. There is no like data workshop. Like for instance in January and February of 2019 (Wave 1) there was two intercepts that produced 100 metric tons of catch.

Now, the methodology might be the best available, but what it spit out clearly wasn't best available to think that it was 100 metric tons of make sharks caught recreationally in January and February off North Carolina.

So how do we clean that type of stuff up? When you have PFCs that are 50, 75 and 80 percent, 95 percent, but yet we went ahead and used make landings that really in best available methodology, but it produced something nobody believed. How do we clean that up? Because all the councils are experiencing the same thing with MRIP, and nobody's got an answer to fix. They always kind of, very broadness of how it works.

And not only are they affecting in some cases allocation issues, it's also affecting credibility part. You know, suppose other countries went through the MRIP process of accounting their rec fishery. Hell, all of a sudden their landings would increase to magnitudes of ungodly amounts.

So how do we --

MR. BROOKS: Hey, Dewey? Let's let Jen respond. Go ahead.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you.

MS. CUDNEY: Sure. So, there's a lot to unpack with MRIP of course. A lot of the -- so, let me back up. The purpose of this framework is to kind of provide a sort of high-level overview and description of these processes.

So, the questions that you have are kind of on a different scale entirely. Like you're really digging down into the particulars for a single data source that contributes to these processes which is a totally valid concern and question, and a lot of times those types of questions and concerns are going to be handled in the sort of throes of the data assessment, the stock assessment itself.

So, the folks that set up the terms of reference, that are actually looking at these individual data sources are going to be looking

at various concerns concerning things like MRIP.

I'm hearing you that there's a lot of issues with MRIP. And that jives with my understanding of the strengths and weaknesses for that particular data source as a whole. But I'm unfortunately not able to speak to the sort of -- I guess the golden answer to your question. So I don't know if some of our MRIP people, or if Randy, or anybody else would like to weigh in here. But that is a little bit more fine scale than what we're aiming for here.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I apologize for asking. And it wasn't a golden question, it's just a reality experience that's happening. Thank you.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: And I appreciate, Dewey, you mentioning the things you mentioned there. I do want to kind of circle back to your mentioning there about the SAFE report.

And we've heard your comments over the last couple of years related to the SAFE report, and have understood that one of the things that you were looking for in some of that was a better description of the data tables that are in the SAFE so that -- easier to understand what the sources of information are, where they're reported in different places in the SAFE that might provide a little bit more context around helping to understand what those are related to what's reported to ICCAT.

And so we're still -- we have those things in mind as well as we continue to move forward with each annual SAFE report that's produced.

Related to the MRIP, Bob, I saw that Brad came on and I think that that -- and he may want to build off this or not, but we could punt this discussion somewhat to Friday where we have the recreational roundtable discussion. Some of the MRIP discussion, while it is associated with the surveys that take place outside of the Large Pelagics Survey, it also encompasses part of the discussion related to Large Pelagics Survey which is the subject of the workshop on Friday.

And so I think rather than dig into this a whole lot further we can probably put that off until Friday to talk a little bit more about it. I'm sure it will come up there anyway.

PARTICIPANT: Hey Bennett, we're not hearing you.

MR. BROOKS: Got it, thank you. Sonja, why don't you jump on in here.

MS. FORDHAM: Yes, thank you. Thanks, Jennifer, for your presentation. Based on what we talked about yesterday in terms of concerns about so many shark species being classified as unknown it does kind of make me think that the external assessment route might be an important option to get at that unknown status.

I'm just curious about when you say that it's for domestically managed sharks only, is that based on what's happening currently, or what's possible, or what we actually need ideally? The example for that, I'm thinking of common thresher. So, does a pelagic shark I guess gain if ICCAT doesn't have any limits or any plans to limit it, or is this more about longer term what would be ideal?

And then similarly like if ICCAT has a ban or a partial ban like they have for silkies and a ban for oceanic whitetips, does that count as internationally managed even if it's not really active management. They don't do any follow-up.

And then the last thing I'm just trying to figure out and it's not urgent, but are there any other external options for getting a status that might be short of a full traditional stock assessment and might not necessarily be used for management in the way that you're talking about, but could just get at clearing up some of, again, the obvious examples of oceanic whitetip being listed as unknown. I just, you know, it would just be nice to get the right message across to the public. So is there an external way to do that, or does this have to be all about management? Thanks.

MS. CUDNEY: So the scope and context of this was pretty specific, but when you're talking about external assessments there's a variety of different tools, processes that could be used here.

So we didn't want to be too super prescriptive in saying it can only be an assessment that's published in a peer reviewed journal, for example, Fisheries, or North

American Journal of Fisheries Management, or Fishery Bulletin, or something like that. So there are other vehicles that these assessments could be completed through. What we've presented has largely been based on our experience to date. So thus far it has been just the more domestically managed sharks that have been assessed and so that's what we've put in here.

But certainly like I said, our intent is to not be too prescriptive in terms of what this could entail. So we're trying to kind of thread a needle between giving the public guidelines around what they could expect versus what we've experienced to date.

Certainly there are other tools for -like the citizen support tools that are out there
for management. One that we've become recently
aware of is called Fishpath. We are looking at
that as -- for some assistance with regards to
decision support analyses and future rulemaking,
but we haven't really even scratched the surface
of that yet. So as things like that come to our
attention we would certainly give them due
diligence. I hope that answered your questions.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Jen. I had a quick follow-up question just on the external assessments. Do you imagine that there will be more criteria outlined around sort of what type of external assessments, or what kind of circumstances they will be used? Will the BSIA framework choice speak to that, or will it again stay at a higher level?

MS. CUDNEY: So, it is going to be at a somewhat high level, but we have some capability to -- I'm kind of being wishy-washy here. We have some capability to be prescriptive. We can basically provide some detail here. And when we present this to the AP if you feel that we need more detail then we can certainly go back and take a look at that. That's part of the reason why we would want to get everybody's feedback on it.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Thanks. I'm just hearing a bunch of comments sort of circling around that topic, just kind of wondering. Scott Taylor, and then David Schalit, are you wanting to be back in the queue or is that a leftover hand? Scott Taylor, why don't you jump in.

MR. TAYLOR: Appreciate the presentation and doing my best to absorb it. I kind of wanted to echo Tim Pickett's comment, though, and elaborate that a little bit because the mistrust of this process isn't limited just to what the Billfish Foundation, or recreational sector sees. It's clearly been echoed as well from the commercial side as well.

And whether or not we're talking about dusky sharks, and Jeff, and Dewey, or sandbars, or makes for that matter there seems to be a substantial disconnect in terms of a lot of this data that winds up getting presented to us in terms of the science.

And I'm certainly not a scientist and do the best I can to try to absorb the science and understand it in these meetings. It's difficult at best. I've been doing this for the better part of 50 years and I've always struggled with the disconnect between observation that we see out there on the water and what the science tells us.

And I'm not being critical of the best available science and what you have to work with. I guess my comment is much more along the process. We understand this is not a consensus body, but (audio interference).

MR. BROOKS: Scott, you just cut out on us.

MR. TAYLOR: So many of these decisions get made sort of I don't want to say behind closed doors, but without really necessarily full access or inclusiveness with the people that are trying to understand, their livelihood depends upon it, where the information really ultimately needs to be disseminated down to.

And I know I've raised this point before that this seems to be a place where observation does not nearly have the same level of credibility as a slide rule, and tables, and formulation. And I guess what I'm asking for from the agency because we've seen this time after time with this is that -- to be cognizant of just how much mistrust that's out there in the process, and what a disconnect that we're seeing in a lot of this data, and how maybe that we could work together to try and take care of that

5

void. We have a few voices here (audio
interference).

MR. BROOKS: Cut out again, Scott.
MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry. But you know,
when the recreational people and everybody starts
screaming about depredation and some of these
other issues there's going to be a little
different political wind from the standpoint of
outcry. And not saying that the agency is driven
by that, but this is a really in my opinion, from
my constituency and from the sport fish side
systemic problem in the disconnect.

And this always necessarily seems to more lean much more towards the environmental and the conservation side than it does towards balancing what the economics are if that makes any sense.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Thanks, Scott.
MS. CUDNEY: Bennett, I did want to
mention, actually Karyl reminded me that we've
accepted the Canadian porbeagle assessment in the
past before the ICCAT assessments were I guess -well, in the past we've accepted the Canadian
porbeagle assessment. So that would be another
avenue for looking at stock assessments.

MR. BROOKS: Got it. Thanks. I'm not seeing other hands at this time I don't think. So unless somebody wants to jump in maybe this would be a good moment before we go to the break. Jen, unless you have anything else to fold in to invite Jeff Oden to share his thoughts on A13 which he was unable to do yesterday due to the technical snag.

MS. CUDNEY: I yield the floor to Jeff.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Then let's bring Jeff off of mute if we can.

MR. ODEN: Can you hear me?
MR. BROOKS: We've got you, Jeff. Go

MR. ODEN: I'm sorry I wasn't born in the computer age. Yesterday it was the screen I lost. Today I only got about the last five minutes of the shark presentation because of audio. Thankfully I had a friend come by and help me out. But anyway.

To that point all I've got to say is -- well, I've got a lot to say. I'm sorry.

ahead.

Anyway. It may take a while. You may want me to go over into public comment.

But when I saw the plan, Amendment 13 as proposed by the agency all I can say is having been a part of Blue Water, being a part of, you know, buying into that plan I think most of us in the industry felt like we were on a good path, and we felt like you all were partners in that.

And last night I walked out on the porch and a big full moon was sitting up there, and I'm questioning my rationale for still being a part of this because I'm missing some good fishing, same as Marty. And it seems like everything we've done has been overlooked in this whole process.

I mean, you all came to terms with your own ideas and we've got to live with it or so it seems.

Yesterday there was a discussion, for instance, on RFDs and the General category restricted fishing days. And that was utilized to optimize the yield. You know, that was one of the ideas behind it.

Conversely, here we are being told that we need to optimize our yield and not seek value. So in other words now in the past when I've got a small juvenile yellowfin, instead of releasing it I would tag it and send Walt the tag. Now what do I do? I stack them high. You know.

So, on one hand you want to maximize one fishery, and on the other hand you're trying to minimize this. And just to keep us able to fish. In other words, if we don't seek volume now I'll probably never mahi fish again for the simple fact they're not included in this. And that's been a valuable part of our fishery.

So it seems like at every opportunity you try to minimize us. And here we have a quota. I mean, you have a golden opportunity to make us whole. Just as actually I might say you did a couple of years back under the previous administration when they asked us for input which we all gave, Scott, Marty, myself, perhaps Blue Water and I'm sure many others.

And I would truthfully like an answer on what did you all do on any of those suggestions that we made? I would like that, for

somebody to respond to that first. Can somebody, maybe Randy respond to that? Was anything done that we suggested then?

MR. BROOKS: Jeff, what are you -- I'm wondering if you can just be a bit more specific about which request were you thinking of.

MR. ODEN: I'm specific about the suggestion, the previous administration gave us the opportunity to seek flexibility with you all. And I don't believe anything was ever followed through on all the suggestions we made. Just pretty much similar to what we're going through here now.

We as an industry came up with a plan and you totally ignored it and moved on with your own plan. So anyway, I've got a few other things.

I would hope somebody would tell me if anything was done. It was March of 2018. That was part of the HMS process. The previous administration asked for input and I don't believe anything was moved forward that was offered.

Scott I know was talking about the Bump. Nothing has been done. Again, another opportunity squandered there as here.

But for perspective and speaking of the RFDs a little bit before, yesterday before the Council meeting I asked Craig to get me some info. And Tim spoke yesterday of the value of our fishery.

The HMS fishery is valued at \$34.5 million overall. Of that the General category fishery is 25 percent or \$8.6 million, and ideally they would send every ounce to Japan given the possibility.

In our case we are valued at almost \$21 million, the PLL fleet, or 60 percent of the value of this fishery. And we are being totally overlooked in the reallocation process of this amendment.

And you know, I heard Marty yesterday -- well, let me think here. I heard Marty yesterday ask what are we supposed to do when we run out of quota. That is a good question. I mean, because are we supposed to quit fishing? I recently had a friend, he ended up having a disaster set. He had to dig in his pocket this

winter with one of the harshest winters fishing in memory. I mean, very little opportunity.

He had to dig in his pocket. And anyway, what does he do in the future if this happens? So, you know, with no quota (audio interference) there is, you know, one can only wonder where this is heading. I mean, are we ducks in a shooting gallery? Are we just going to be picked off? Do we have to stop fishing in the middle of the year, or maybe even skipping two years if we're going way over? I mean, how do we address this?

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Jeff.

MR. ODEN: I'm not done, I'm not done.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. BROOKS: Hey, Jeff, let me just ask you to kind of wind it down here just so we can start to get to the next one --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. BROOKS: Yes, go ahead.

MR. ODEN: Okay. My friend, for instance, was also as compromised as he was with the having to dig into his pocket for quota. He also now has a deep hole trying to find a crew because he's compromised having found himself in the situation where he had to dig himself out of that hole. Nobody wants to work for nothing, and half the people coming looking for a job. I mean, it's hard enough for us to get crew now.

So anyway, just give us the opportunity to make it through the year. And anyway, at the very least, speaking to one other thing that Marty said yesterday, where we're heading is end of the year accountability. There's no other way. Because if you're not giving us any quota to doggone fall back on, to buy or whatever, or if we're just going to have to tie our boats up we have no future.

And anyway, we've simply got to come to terms with the fact is I asked for another data request today and I've yet to get it. I don't know what we have utilized as an industry in the last 10 years, what we've left on the table. But that, you know, considering that, instead of -- we've got the IBQ. At the very least we as an industry at the end of the year should be allowed the flexibility to settle up.

And I'm not trying to offer a --

frankly I thought Blue Water had a good plan. But right now I'm just trying to address what we've got laid at our feet which isn't very pretty from our perspective. And the only way we're going to be allowed -- I see any -- envision any hope is having the flexibility at the end of the year as an industry as a whole to see what's left over and hopefully we can pay our bills.

Again, I would hope I can get that data acquisition I asked for and find out exactly what we have left, and see where it will leave us. Anyway, there's a couple that I'd like to address. One is the Paperwork Reduction Act.

MR. BROOKS: Jeff, I'm going to ask you to pause here just because we do need to push on with our topic, and I want to make sure we can do that.

MR. ODEN: Okay, but I --

MR. BROOKS: If we need to come back later we can, okay? I just want to make sure -MR. ODEN: I definitely want to come back.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Let's -- I just want to see if Randy has anything he wants to say in reaction to your comments, and then hand it off.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Sure, thanks. So related to the data request, Jeff, we do have that. I'm aware that that's being worked on. So stay tuned on that issue.

And then also I think that you were making some comments about Amendment 13, and then I think you kind of moved over to making some comments in relation to the agency's request for ideas for management measures in the previous administration which there were a couple of those, and ideas for streamlining regulations in particular, and relieving regulations.

And so the agency had run a couple of initiatives to collect this information and we certainly took a lot of those into account, some of which were actually manifested in some rulemakings that we accomplished. But some of them are still not lost because we still have some of those ideas in mind. So I'll just mention that.

And then also once again like

yesterday I'll encourage you to as with everybody is to go in and take a look at the draft Environmental Impact Statement for Amendment 13 and take a look at the different alternatives that are there, the analysis that was conducted, and think about it, and provide your comments back to us. Because we are definitely open and want the comments on that DEIS and the proposed rule that will help inform agency's decision.

As you know, as was just earlier described with the presentation for the swordfish and shark retention limit rule, the final rule, the presentation that Delisse made, there were two changes that were made from proposed to final based upon public comment. That's a great example of the fact that we can and do consider public comment and can make some changes within the scope of what's proposed.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Thanks, Randy. All right. Let's get to our break. We're about five minutes off the mark here. Let's take about a 10-minute break and we will come back at 2:15 and then hand it over to Brad so we can talk about Electronic Technologies Implementation Plan. So, thanks all.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:07 p.m. and resumed at 2:16 p.m.)

MR. BROOKS: All right. So just as folks are getting settled, just a reminder the rest of the afternoon I'm going to hand it off to Brad here in a second to talk about the Electronic Technologies Implementation Plan. After that we will shift to public comment at 3 o'clock and we will be looking to wrap up at 3:30. So, with that, Brad, I'll hand it off to you to walk us through your presentation.

MR. MCHALE: Thank you, Bennett. Good afternoon, everyone. Let me just pull up my PowerPoint here. And I'm assuming that it's showing on both screens.

PARTICIPANT: It is.

MR. MCHALE: All right. So, good afternoon. Thank you all for the dialogue -MR. BROOKS: Brad, you just have a big gray box sitting sort of to the right side of your presentation. That's better. Okay, go.
MR. MCHALE: All right. So thank you

all for the good discussion over the past couple of days. I always find it easier to have some of these more heated and debated conversations. At least we're in the same space. I appreciate you all taking the time to do it here virtually for these last few meetings.

For those of you that had joined us in December of last year I gave a pretty cursory overview of an effort the agency is currently taking across all the various regions to update or to develop an Electronic Technologies Implementation Plan.

And those plans are still kind of currently having the final i's dotted, the t's crossed. But given the timing I figured I'd present on it today, and then hopefully those plans will hit the street sometime within the next week.

All right. So, just a little bit of background here. These plans had originally started about five years ago where each region is tasked. When we're referring to electronic technologies we're really referring to electronic monitoring as well as an electronic reporting. Both subject matters that we are all very familiar with regardless of what aspect of the fishery you are either interested or involved in.

As I mentioned all the various regional plans, it will be northeast, southeast regions as well as the Caribbean, as well as west coast, Alaska, they're all going to be rolled out. So the HMS plan will be rolled out to all of those. And I would highly encourage folks to not just focus on the highly migratory species one, but also pay some close attention to the northeast and the southeast plans because there's such immense overlap between our different permit holders and burdens that they have to incur when it comes to say reporting.

Essentially what this plan is trying to set up is to be kind of essentially a cornerstone to allow not just you all as Advisory Panel members, but also those stakeholders and partners in the fishery to have an ongoing dialogue of how various technologies can be used to meet the goals of the fishery, whether that be from resource monitoring perspective, whether it's social or economic dynamics of the fishery,

5

but really to kind of keep those channels open to explore ways that either technologies can be leveraged, or whether or not the cost effectiveness may not be there.

The intent of updating those plans here for 2021 is also from a monetary perspective, trying to tie in so that those plans can then be used and as various funding proposals or funding sources can be made available. So whether those sources are fishery information systems, whether it's electronic technology working groups, catch share programs, or even sometimes external funding sources like NFWF.

And then it allows for the continuity of an applicant to then say here's a priority that HMS or the northeast region has put forward, and carry that through the whole proposal to help support it again in the goal of trying to ascertain funds for whatever that ET program may be.

So essentially what you'll find when they do release these reports is a pretty cursory recap of how the last five years went, what went right, what didn't, what have we learned. of that will be discussed during these meetings prior. Tom Warren touched on some of these aspects regarding the electronic monitoring program in the pelagic longline fishery as part of that three-year review as well as even that was brought up on yesterday's discussion as well as today of different kind of reporting requirements in general. And this consistent effort to move away from having stovepipes that vessel owner and operators then need to report multiple times for a single trip. And what efficiencies can be made there.

But also what are some of the consequences of trying to build in those efficiencies.

This document is also just trying to lay out a vision of where we see some of our time and effort being spent as we not only look backward, but as we look forward for five years, especially as some of these technologies continue to evolve, as some of our agency partners continue to evolve their respective programs to be more inclusive of being able to collect HMS related information as well as then exploring

what are the priorities that we could see electronic technologies coming to bear in our fisheries.

And so we're actually putting our limited time, energy, resources, to those discussions that are going to have the biggest benefit for the fishery as a whole.

And kind of as I mentioned, this whole efficiency and streamlining across regional programs which I'll come back to in the slide in just a second.

And then the last objective for this implementation plan is to not belittle the challenges and the changing needs that come with these implementation of electronic technology programs, whether they be reporting or monitoring. Again, something that has been discussed for a number of years across the table amongst ourselves. None of these are new, but just to kind of highlight some of the overarching challenges.

What are the scopes of the various programs that we're doing. What sort of data are they collecting. Are we just collecting landings information. We're collecting landings and release information. How is that information being distilled by various partners in the agency. Are all permit holders doing it, or just some subset.

For example, above and beyond reporting when you look at some of the monitoring Some folks like to think electronic monitoring is always replicating what an at-sea observer is able to try to collect, but that isn't necessarily always the case. A prime example is the BOEM program that was essentially put forward to help verify data that's being collected through other pathways, whether it be logbook, whether it be an estimate. In fact, we're even looking at some electronic monitoring in a pilot program to look at silt times as it relates to some of our bottom longline fisheries and shark post-release mortality as well as protected resources.

As well as kind of how we share data amongst the different parts of the agency that the right hand knows what the left hand is doing so we don't necessarily have different sets of

numbers that can be -- being used for different purposes.

And this has always kind of been a challenge for HMS where the scope of our fisheries do overlap, not only the northeast or GARFO regional fisheries in the northeast, but also those in the southeast. The Gulf Council, the Caribbean, not to mention all the states, as well as Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. So, there's significant overlap in the different authorities that can be applied to those that are fishing for highly migratory species. And so we need to be constantly vigilant in working with our partners to make sure that all that data is trying to be integrated, and being kept up to speed so we don't necessarily fall back into more of a stovepipe model that has historically been so prevalent in the agency's data collection methodologies.

Last but not least, cost. It's long been discussed that maybe electronic technologies are a cost-effective tool to get at data collection. That hasn't always played out in practice. I think that's why we currently don't see these sort of programs in every single fishery up and down the eastern seaboard.

And so when it comes to the potential value of the data that can be collected through these methodologies it also equally needs to be weighted in that the cost to actually implement, who's bearing those costs needs to be part of that discussion as well. So again, it's a more fully fleshed out discussion.

With the HMS kind of programs here in general what I've done is tried to highlight a number of those programs that we have that are directly associated with the vessel side of the house. And then the next slide will deal more with the dealer side of the house.

So as I mentioned that we had the pelagic longline, electronic monitoring program, we have instituted our HMS automated landing reporting system. So this is our General category tuna vessels, Harpoon category vessel, Angling, Charter/Headboat that's then collecting bluefin tuna, catch information, as well as some of our swordfish and billfish landings.

But then we quickly segue into that efficiency discussion that we were talking about. There are other regional programs that we know HMS fishermen are -- have the opportunity to report through, some of them being eTrips which is a reporting application, some by ACCSP as well as the vessel trip reports as mandated by GARFO, or the Southeast For-Hire Electronic Reporting So these are all avenues that fishermen are reporting information to the agency that HMS staff is on a regular basis collaborating with the individuals that own those programs or applications to help ensure that HMS data elements are being designed to those, again to reduce the number of times an individual has to report their information to the agency.

And a number of my staff are multiple times a week engaging in these conversations and trying to make sure that we're trying in any way, shape, or form to build in a streamlined pathway to collect our information.

But I think as Rick Bellavance had mentioned yesterday there is a flip side of that coin, because as we try to marry up all of those different reporting requirements that we sometimes end up having to answer more questions than we once did. And so therefore there's a lot of time and effort being expended there.

Some of the other ones just to mention is the HMS tournament registration reporting. That all went electronic and went online. You had the VMS programs that have been in place for a number of years as well as our third party kind of proprietary software that is available to the overall community if it makes sense for their particular fishing practices to use that as a method to report information back up to the agency.

When we start to get more shoreside, looking at some of the dealer electronic technology programs that the HMS division as well as those stakeholders are involved in we have the HMS e-dealer program. So primarily our electronic data collection dealing with our non-bluefin tuna species. That takes a lot of time and effort both on the dealer side as well as the administrative side to work through.

We have the bluefin tuna dealer

reporting. There is biweekly reporting both at the international level for the ICCAT, electronic bluefin tuna catch documentation system, but we also have those requirements domestic. Actually I think that tournament was just a leftover in a cut and paste error. And then third party proprietary software once again.

So as we start to look forward to expand or refine some of the programs we have in place some of these same things are just going to kind of repeat themselves. It's building in efficiency, reducing redundancy. Ensuring that any modifications in our partner's programs are inclusive of HMS elements that are for reducing the number of times things need to be reported, or different systems folks need to engage in, and making sure those lines of communication both internally and externally are wide open. only are we hearing from you all what's working, what's not, but we're also then having those collaborations with our partners to ensure that there's consistency regardless of what system somebody is electing to use, that it's still going to meet the purposes so we don't run into any sort of compliance related issues.

As well as trying to figure out how electronic technologies can be used to help and aid in challenges that we don't necessarily see coming down the pike. 2020 was a prime example when it came to some of the data collection processes when at-sea observers was a challenge with some of the travel limitations we had.

And then lastly, kind of some of the examples as we're looking forward. As I mentioned in a previous slide looking at our shark research fishery and some of the sensors that are more commonly associated with the electronic monitoring programs to help refine our information and data collection regarding stovepipes as it relates to post-release mortality of some of our more sensitive shark species like dusky, and sharpnose, and hammerheads, as well as to those protected resources that might be interacted with during these fisheries.

We have a collaboration currently ongoing with the Greater Atlantic Regional Fishery Office as it relates to trying to

ascertain whether or not electronic technologies can help shed some light on what gear types HMS are being caught on and whether or not a longstanding regulation that states that no unauthorized gears can be onboard a vessel when bluefin tuna are onboard.

In years past I've used -- if you happen to have a lobster trap, or a crab pot on your boat technically those are not authorized for HMS and therefore you couldn't have a bluefin tuna while that trap was onboard.

Are there ways that we can dial that in to be more refined versus that broad brush stroke approach that we've done historically.

Whether or not there's technological gains as far as building in VMS units or EM units or reporting units. As technology continues to grow exponentially are we able to kind of make these systems easier and more cost effective to use, and serve multiple purposes simultaneously so it's not one more system that needs to be placed on a vessel with one more technician to help troubleshoot.

And then lastly, continue to collaborate with our regional fishery management organizations in trying to figure out at that international level how we can bring our experiences to bear to help inform some of the potential decisions being made from the international management perspectives.

So as far as the next steps. Pretty much this is going to be a living document, and the conversations, the dialogue is going to be ongoing. This isn't necessarily a milestone that just kind of gets placed in the sand and then we move on.

And to that same thing we're going to continue to collaborate with all of our regional, national, and international partners as well as all of you and folks that you represent that are participating in these fisheries, or those that have interest in the management and the sustainability of these fisheries to help troubleshoot some of the challenges that are associated with capitalizing on these technologies, but also making sure they're being used to the best benefit of both the biological, the social, and the economic aspects of the

fisheries as a whole.

And continue to evolve so we don't necessarily get too static and all of a sudden we're realizing that the systems that we were once using that were innovative are now better placed for some electronic technologies in a museum to sit beside a Commodore 64 or an Apple IIE as a prime example which also then has its own challenges. How do you stay on top of the speed that these technologies are advancing at when sometimes the regulatory speed can't necessarily keep pace.

So, to summarize here that the plan should be out within the next few weeks. We fully anticipate that the dialogue will be ongoing and continuous through whether it be advisory panel meetings, public hearings, or just direct conversations amongst ourselves.

As it relates to the HMS plan feel free to reach out to myself directly. I'll be the point of contact. But if you have some overarching, more national questions or cross regional questions you can come to me as well, but also Brett and Laura here are also good resources. And with that I will conclude the -- I will conclude I guess at that point.

MR. BROOKS: I think Brad has concluded. All right, thanks, Brad. That was really interesting. Let us see if there are questions for you about this plan, or any observations or perspectives people want to share. Just please raise a hand if you do. Rick Bellavance, why don't you come in first.

MR. BELLAVANCE: Thanks, Bennett. Thanks, Brad, for your presentation. I really think you hit it spot on with some of your comments in particular relating to your bullet point about allowing AP member stakeholder and partner to continue to offer input in the process as we engage in improving these electronic technologies overall.

I think that's a critical component. We've established a lot of these programs and the foundation of the different systems and done a lot of work trying to coordinate across regions like you mentioned. And through that process some little snags will come up along the way, and making sure to get that input from the industry

and other partners is huge to moving forward.

And I actually think it's a priority really because the one thing I fear is as these

programs get more complicated, especially for multi-regional permit holders, that there's going to be a disincentive created for people to actually report it. It's too cumbersome and too burdensome. So, definitely listening to industry and other partners to try to look to -- for any possible way to streamline reporting would be good to continue that. So I really appreciate your thoughts there.

Another thing I was thinking about was if at some point it would be possible to develop a document that kind of clearly articulates each data element's purpose in either management or the assessment process, for stakeholders to be able to read and say hey look, I don't know why I have to -- I'm looking at my eVTR right now and under bluefin tuna why do I have to put the time that I hooked the bluefin tuna in my report. do I have to put the fight time. Why do I have to put what kind of bait I used. Why is that. Right now I just say I'll do it because I have to, the line is red, but at the same time I say well, is that something that gets used anywhere, or is it something that just goes into a box and disappears. So it would be good to have the answers to those questions.

And that goes for all of the regions too.

And then my last input would be under your thoughts on expanding electronic technologies one of the things that we're all up here in the northeast anyway and it will eventually work its way around the country is the expanding wind farm technologies that are being proposed all over. It's pretty front and center here in the northeast so it's on my radar.

And there's definitely a lack of information on the temporal and spatial footprints of the different fisheries, whether they're commercial, for-hire, or recreational. So using some of these technologies for -- I'm not saying mandating VMS for anybody, but if there are folks that are voluntarily want to track their trips or be part of a data collection program that helps to define the footprint of the different fisheries, and using the electronic

5

technologies to get that data for use in understanding potential impacts from these projects would also be super helpful.

So those are the three thoughts I had regarding your presentation. And again I really appreciate it. I think you did a great job. Thanks.

MR. MCHALE: Thanks, Rick. Appreciate that. Yes. These conversations are going to continue because again as we kind of minimize the stovepipes to bring together you're right, folks are all of a sudden going to see things pop up. And just as you articulated why is this question being asked. And I think it's apparent not just in the HMS context, but across the agency that for -- that that explanation is going to be essential for folks to understand the value of how that data is being used.

Prime example is that fight time. Well, maybe the scientists in the center are using that to help determine an indices to a stock assessment that could then influence quota allocations downstream. Instead of just one more question folks would have the context to then understand how important that may be, not necessarily there in the moment, but if that's going to help inform the health of a particular species and potentially allocation issues then it's good for folks to be able to connect those dots.

MR. BELLAVANCE: I think that would be helpful. Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: I'll just note in the chat that Anna Beckwith strongly endorsed the -your concept, Rick, around having some sort of
document that articulates the use of the data,
that that would be very helpful, particularly as
she says the more data you collect kind of the
less accurate it becomes. So anything that can
help people understand the rationale seems like a
good thing. David Schalit, why don't you jump in
here.

MR. SCHALIT: Okay. Hi, Brad. What can I say, I'm assuming that you and Jen collaborated on how to clearly present complex issues. Very good presentation.

And actually I wasn't planning on mentioning this, but because Rick mentioned it I

think it's worth emphasizing a little bit. I'm in complete agreement with him regarding his comments having to do with data elements.

This winter we had a great many meetings, technical working groups. These are SCRS working groups looking at -- each group looking at a different index of abundance for bluefin tuna. And we did this with the Japanese and the Canadians, and found that there were certain data elements that the Canadians and the U.S. that were using that are really not actually needed.

So I like the idea of what Rick suggested, this notion that we would review these data elements with the scientists, with our scientists, to see if we can -- if everything we're asking for is precisely what is needed.

But that was -- my question has to do with page 6. I think I know the answer to my question, but I thought that would be a stupid idea. Why don't I ask Brad to elaborate on it. So, if we can go to page 6, I think it's the second item. Let me see. From memory it's the second item on page 6 having to do with -- actually having to do with data elements as well.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. MCHALE: So just so I don't break the system I'll read that bullet and make sure we have it accurate. So I was referring to potential -- the plan articulating potential expanding, refining electronic technologies for Atlantic highly migratory species.

And the second bullet was ensure highly migratory species data elements are included in all application developments. And so what that bullet there is really referring to is a lot of the collaborations we're doing say as it relates to vessel trip reports, whether it's eTrips, whether it be SEFHEIR, what other authorities the agency is asking fishermen to report data on we are fully supportive of one stop reporting.

And so we're collaborating with those partners and making sure they are aware of what those HMS data elements are to minimize multiple applications needed for one trip.

MR. SCHALIT: Okay. I follow you. Thanks very much.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, David. I will also note that Bob Humphrey weighed in in the chat again. It comes up for Rick's comment about tracking to better assess potential impacts of wind development. So another endorsement there. Marty Scanlon, I think your hand is up.

MR. SCANLON: Yes. It seems to us, we talk about EM, especially the EM units here. We always look to expand the use of the EM on us. But it's never to our advantage. I mean, we're the incidental fishery on bluefin tuna fish and we're here (audio interference). Got a directed category that I'm sure if we were to get an update from enforcement I'm sure they're still -- the majority of them boats are still non-compliant with the full regulations that they're under. They have no EM.

And it's probably -- when is the intent to put the EMs on them? And if you want to expand the use of EMs or the use of -- to utilize the EMs on the pelagic longline industry (audio interference) utilize those EM units to give us better access to these closed areas, like through spatial management which is not on the table it seems anymore.

I mean, every time you get a chance you seem to always want to be looking for more and more oversight on us, and you don't want to pass it on to anybody else. When are these cameras going to go on? When it came to the directed sword fishery the answer for me, to me two years back was the reason why we have the VMS units, why we've got the observer coverage, why we had the turtle schools, why we had all these rules and regulations put on top of us was because we were the directed fishery.

Now we go to the bluefin tunas. We have one group that's basically non-compliant. I mean, the pelagic longline industry is 100 percent compliant. We're 100 percent -- we're totally accountable for our bluefin interactions, yet we get an amendment proposal where we get no increase in our quota, and a non-compliant group gets an increase. How is that possible? How can that be rewarded with additional bluefin tuna fish when they're not 100 percent compliant in the regulations as they stand?

We're talking about now Delisse puts

out a great presentation on how to increase our catching our swordfish with sustainable
fishery. And here she goes, she's going to go
from zero to 3 swordfish to 18 swordfish, but
there's no talk on any increase in oversight,
accountability, VMS, reporting, none of that's on
the table. Just give them 18 fish.

There's nothing here at all that we've heard so far that's going to increase our ability to harvest our targeted species. Yet I'm sure as we go on here we're looking to expand. Everyone wants to expand the use. They want more of EM use of our footage. They want us to put -- they want to put booms on our boats now which is a dangerous sea, a safety at sea issue. They want to put mats on the thing. We want more and more oversight on the pelagic longline industry constantly. That's the only thing we get out of this is more and more oversight, and we get less and less from everybody else.

I mean if you want to know what's going on with the fish and these guys are harvesting fish, we just start selling fish, they should all have VMS units on the boat. You want a simple way to collect the data one step process? The pelagic longline units have VMS units on there within 12 hours of every haul back we need to report whether we caught those bluefins.

We answer all the same questions that these guys are complaining about that it's too hard for them to answer. Well, I've got a list of things on my boat every morning. When I wake up I have a list of things on my log sheet. I'll read them off to you. I've got to make sure my (audio interference) make sure that my logs are done at the end of every day.

And I've got to make sure I report my bluefin tuna report every single day. I mean, that's on a daily basis. On my way to the dock I have to declare where I'm coming into and when I'm coming into it. When I leave the dock I have to declare when I'm leaving, where I'm going, and what I'm fishing for. So I mean, you want to know what the hell's going on and you want to get better data, well how about passing some of the responsibility of the collecting of the development some of this data off to some of

these other categories.

And as far as the use of these EMs we just -- don't we have an executive order issued by this new President there to look at climate change and its effect on HMS fisheries? I was very surprised that we haven't looked at anything to -- we have this static closures which create black holes, and the collection and the development of this data that would answer that exact question, yet we have -- at this AP meeting we haven't addressed that at all. And I'd like to hear some answers from Randy of why not.

MR. MCHALE: Maybe before we see whether or not Randy wants to take any of that up now, or at a later date. I always appreciate the insight you bring to the table here, Marty, from the fishery, and I hear that frustration.

And I have throughout the entire development of Amendment 7. I think we as a division have maintained the scope as we've talked about it in the Amendment 7 process. We have not allowed any encroachment on that, and we've also made commitments to other parts of the agency that we're not doing any sort of scope discussions without clear transparent dialogue with the regulated community because that's the commitment we made to you during that Amendment 7 process.

As far as benefits that have been derived from EM I would agree they're not as prevalent as we would like to see, but they're not absent. We have gear restricted areas and prior closed areas that have been converted to monitoring areas to determine whether or not those areas are still warranted. That does get to yours as well as Blue Water's commentary on static area management for highly migratory species as compounded by potential environmental changes.

So it's slow. I'll be the first to acknowledge that. But those efforts are underway. And they're there.

As far as kind of the equity across different fishery segments, we all need to recognize that there are different biological (audio interference) that apply to different gear types, that not every single gear is the same, and not every single fishery is going to be

managed the same.

But that does not dilute the desire of Randy and his staff and the predecessors in the division to try to strike balances of what are the needs biologically with what are those needs of those that are prosecuted these fisheries. And that will continue to be the case.

So, I look forward to more dialogue, and refinement of our understanding of trying to find middle ground, and finding places where we can agree to disagree. That's the only way any of this stuff is going to move forward. And I guess I'll just stop at that point then.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Brad. Randy, do you want to weigh in at all?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Yes, thank you, Brad. I think you articulated things very well. And I'll just add in because Marty was specifically talking some about spatial management and that initiative, that that initiative has not disappeared. I touched on it very briefly in the overview presentation as something that we have going -- on an ongoing basis, something that we would love for it to move faster, but it is on a process. And we intend for it to move forward.

Amongst all of the other things that we have going on and keeping in mind priorities that we have to keep in mind. So, that process is not lost.

And I'll also just mention that I noticed that there was a question I think, and I'm not sure if it was to everybody or not. I don't think it was actually. But I got wind of kind of a follow-up when I mentioned in one of my comments to Jeff Oden about suggestions that had been made in the past couple of years of ideas before the agency.

And that some of those had been incorporated, and that some of them are just not lost and still within the realm of consideration. And I will mention that spatial management is one of those.

And then we have other initiatives that we have undertaken recently that are in that deregulation realm, or idea, or streamline. GRA-Weak Hook Final Rule being one of them.

Swordfish and shark retention limit final rule

 that was presented earlier being one of them.

And so we have not lost the other ideas specifically that Jeff Oden had mentioned previously related to that associated with commercial species lists that allow for some other gears to be used in non-pelagic longline, that that idea is not lost even if we don't have a rulemaking active on it. So I just want to touch on that a little bit because it kind of falls into the overall group of some things here that between what we're hearing from Jeff and

what we're hearing from Marty.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Randy. And I want to just fold in, if you folks haven't seen it in the chat, is a comment from Katie Westfall endorsing a couple of the ideas that Rick put forward, and also folding in a -- I think a new thought in this conversation around the importance of using performance standards in regulations as opposed to sort of prescriptive technical requirements. And it was just I think a thought that hasn't come up yet in this conversation. And she put a link to a paper that EDF put out on that.

Thanks.

I'm going to bring two more folks into this conversation and then we should probably be moving to public comment. Shana Miller, why don't you jump in here.

MS. MILLER: Yes, thanks. And thanks, Brad. I think it's great you guys are working on this to really kind of streamline the different efforts that are going on. It does -- the programs you presented are for multiple different fleets, and as it should be.

I guess I would just mention at this point that as you probably know ICCAT is undertaking some EM development and it will just be important for you all to be active in that to make sure that the U.S. program standards get reflected in the ICCAT program. So U.S. fishermen don't have to change their approaches. Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Shana. Alan

MR. WEISS: Thanks, Bennett. I want to echo what was just said about ultimately ICCAT initiatives in this regard being hopefully brought along to the same standards that the

Weiss.

United States has already pioneered and the fishermen are living under.

I also want to get back to something that Marty said a few minutes ago. His discussion somewhat drifted away from this particular presentation, but I think it was very important nonetheless.

We all have to recognize that there's a lot of work to be done in a lot of different areas, and the work takes time and all that stuff. But I want to emphasize again something that I've said before which is that the -- at this point the pelagic longline fishery is largely populated by people in their mid-fifties to mid-sixties.

We don't have much time for things to come along to rescue and preserve this fishery going forward for the future, and hopefully it won't die out by attrition and just the aging of the participants before some relief comes from the National Marine Fisheries Service, particularly in regard to the area or spatial management issues that are so important.

And really, if you look at the trends in the fishery, and I'm not talking about the trends of what's being caught, but the trends of the fishery itself, if you did a stock assessment on pelagic longline fishermen it would be a resource emergency.

So, I'm just trying to give you all possible urging and encouragement to move along on these issues while we still have a window for them to make an important difference. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Alan. David Schalit, I'm assuming your hand is leftover from earlier, is that right?

MR. SCHALIT: Yes.

MR. BROOKS: Good. Okay. I think then, Brad, I'm not seeing any other questions or comments coming your way so thanks very much for the presentation. Do you have any final thoughts you want to share before we shift to public comment?

MR. MCHALE: No, just communication lines are perpetually open.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Great. All right then. At this point I want to shift to public comment. We do have a number of members on the

call and we'll see how many are interested in weighing in here.

So just as folks are sort of shifting to this a couple of reminders for the public. One, if you do want to get into the queue here if you could raise your virtual hand which you can find by sort of having your -- looking at the attendee list, or hovering over your name. If that doesn't work for you please just throw something in the chat letting us know that you would like to be getting into the conversation. We'll make sure to bring you in.

We do ask folks to kind of limit their remarks to three minutes or so, particularly if we have a number of people who want to get in. We'll see what that is.

And then just remind people that this is an opportunity for you all to share your thoughts with the agency. It's not really intended to be a dialogue back and forth with the agency, or with AP members. But again, an opportunity for you all to share your thoughts, and then if there's a narrow fact question, a clarification that can be helpful manage that too. We'll take public comments. With that, Glenn Delaney, I see your hand up so why don't we open up your line.

MR. DELANEY: Okay. I assume you can hear me.

MR. BROOKS: Yes, we can, Glenn.

Good.

 MR. DELANEY: Yes, I am Glenn Delaney, Blue Water Fishermen's Association. I also have the privilege of currently serving as an alternate U.S. commissioner to ICCAT. And I mention that because I would just like to address myself briefly to the questions raised during your meeting about shortfin make situation at ICCAT, and particularly the U.S. commitment to make conservation in that forum.

I won't take time to restate all the excellent substantive points made by Randy Blankinship to clarify the facts along with some of the AP members which apparently I'm discouraged to mention by name, but hopefully I can say that I agree with those statements and appreciate all their efforts to set the record straight.

In fact, the U.S. has achieved the highest standard of shortfin make conservation of any ICCAT nation pursuant to ICCAT scientific advice and 85 percent reduction in fishing mortality in both the U.S. commercial and recreational fisheries.

And it has issued the most aggressive conservation proposal of any nation this year that would advance a broad suite of measures, and importantly place the binding obligation on all ICCAT nations to achieve that 85 percent fishing mortality reduction.

Under that U.S. proposal only if and when other nations do achieve -- and I stress maintain that 85 percent reduction would they allow retention of make as documented by observer or electronic monitoring of those fish already dead when brought alongside the vessel.

So, it's important for folks to understand what's in those documents and what the U.S. stance has been, and to correctly characterize those. And I'd be glad to share that U.S. proposal with anyone who asks. Just send me an email.

So I just wanted to take this opportunity to assure the HMS AP community that the U.S. ICCAT team is dead serious about mako conservation and looks forward to other nations stepping up to do the same, including Canada and the EU who for some reason have been identified by some as being the paradigm of mako conservation proposals which is just not the case.

I in addition just want to make a brief comment on the proposed ESA listing for mako. The perverse reality is that despite all the U.S. has achieved in its mortality reduction by 85 percent and the fact that all the other nations for this same species have not achieved that degree of conservation it will only be the U.S. and its fishermen that will be held accountable and potentially subject to more restrictions under an ESA listing.

ESA only applies to us. Given the mortality reductions we have already achieved a listing will do nothing meaningful or even measurable to stop overfishing, or to rebuild the shortfin make population because it simply has no

application to all the other fishing nations.

In my view having participated in the ICCAT process for 40 years this will serve to weaken our hand in negotiations to advance make conservation in ICCAT. Our multilateral efforts will be preempted by our domestic regime.

One would think that we might have learned that by now, that other nations are simply not moved to take action with respect to their fisheries when the U.S. commits itself to yet another unilateral self-sacrifice. That doesn't get them going. Trust me on that.

So, that's what I have to say about mako. I was going to give my overall observation on this meeting so far, but I think Jeff Oden and Marty and others really captured and expressed from their hearts the new and different direction we fear things seem to be heading.

I mean, the Amendment 13 proposed rule is a real stunner in that respect, as is the radio silence we are hearing on spatial management at this meeting. It's like all those meetings we had for years. I mean, I have documents going back to 2017 on this, and '18 and '19, and presentations in our meetings in Silver Spring and at our annual meetings. It's like they never happened, and all those documents and comments we submitted never existed.

It's apparent to me now that we should have had those meetings up in Gloucester instead so Tom Warren could have had our direct inputs. It's like they never were heard.

So I just hope that we're all wrong in this perception and that things have not gone off track, or just stalled in place. We've got a lot more work to do and progress to make.

For those of us and this whole community that are concerned about conservation, believe me when I say the best place for internationally managed fish to be caught is by a U.S. fishing vessel. Shutting down our fisheries and having those fish caught by other nations is the worst conservation move we can make. That's what I had to say today. I'm sure I'll have more to say tomorrow. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks very much. I believe Captain Johnny Johnson is wanting to jump in here. Captain Johnson, I think your line is

open. Are you hearing me, Captain Johnson? Are you able to take yourself off mute at your end? Captain Johnson, are you hearing me or no? I'm afraid we're not hearing you if you're trying to speak. I wonder if anyone from the AP HMS staff is able to shoot him a text and do any kind of troubleshooting from afar.

PARTICIPANT: It seems like we can hear him typing or something.

MR. BROOKS: I'm hearing movement, I agree.

PARTICIPANT: Can you hear me? MR. BROOKS: Yes, we can.

PARTICIPANT: Hi. He wanted to be on today, and he got an unexpected call so I will take my hand down at the moment.

MR. BROOKS: Okay, great. Thanks very much.

PARTICIPANT: Thank you so much. MR. BROOKS: Okay. No worries. let me just see if there's any other members of the public who would like to be commenting and haven't had a chance to do so. I am only seeing an AP member hand at this moment. So all right. We've got about 15 minutes left or so. I know, Jeff, you wanted to come back in, and I know Stephen Iwicki, you wanted to come back in as well.

So, Stephen, why don't we go to you, and then we'll go back to you, Jeff.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. BROOKS: Yes, I just ask both of you to be fairly focused in your comments just because this is intended to be much more of a conversation and a dialogue.

MR. IWICKI: I'll be real quick. I wanted to go back to yesterday when we were talking about the zones for the trophy for bluefin for recreational.

One of the comments I got a lot of feedback last night from various forums I'm in. The biggest thing it came back to is the idea is welcomed very much as a chance to give people that are typically in a closed zone before they ever get a chance to get the fish.

But the main comment that kept coming back though was when I put this in the chat yesterday, consider moving the live harbor down

to Ocean City because by the time the southern zone closes the fish are still south of Ocean City, usually out of range, and Ocean City, Maryland through south Jersey never really gets a shot either.

I think the rule is being looked at in order to give everybody a fair shot, so we just ask that in addition to the way you've got it just consider moving that southern line down a little bit further south so that it achieves that overall goal and everybody gets a shot at a trophy fish, the maybe once in a lifetime kind of deal. That's it. Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Thank you, Steve. Dewey, I see your hand up. I'm going to go to you before I go back to Jeff.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Yes. I'd like to ask that -- I recently had to take place, took part in the turtle classes where you have to get every five or three years get finalized to (audio interference) turtle certificate.

I was wondering if there's any way possible we could get that done every five years instead of every three years. It seems like it just seems repetitious for us and nothing really changes. And I just wonder if that's a possible thing, that we could do it every -- have renewals every five years instead of three years. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: This is on the turtle certification you said, right?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Turtle certification. I noticed -- I was reading And one other thing. the South Atlantic updates, and there it's mandatory I believe that charter vessels and maybe commercial vessel or snapper/grouper permits have to have this gear. But it makes no And I was curious, if mention of turtle classes. you're made mandatory to have the gear why wouldn't you want the folks to be able to know how to use it. And I was wondering if there's any consultation with the South Atlantic with HMS particularly to this rule of why that wouldn't be appropriate. If you're made to mandatory to have the gear would it not be good to learn how to use it. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Anyone from HMS want to jump in on either of those points?

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

MR. BLANKINSHIP: I'll say that,
Dewey, I appreciate the comment there about
flexibility on the length and time of the
validity of the workshops. I've thought about
that from time to time and it's outside the realm
of possibility of continuing to think about that.
It is the case that some information can change
from time to time, for instance addition of new
species to the curriculum and things along those
lines.

And certainly extending out the period of time between when those workshops are taken, that might mean that fishermen aren't quite as informed.

But I will also say that we are actively working towards some additional flexibility about the ability to take the workshops through an online capability. And we hope before too long to be able to share some of that information out as well which will be helpful.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Randy.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Yes. And related to South Atlantic requirements for bycatch mitigation gears we're certainly open to discussion with what might be appropriate between programs. But I'm not off the top of my head familiar enough with the requirements under the South Atlantic to be able to speak to the applicability of that. But I take the suggestion though. Thank you.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Hey can I have another question?

MR. BROOKS: Just quickly because I think we have Captain Johnson back in.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: These turtle classes are mandatory for a reason. And I just think it would be good if -- to know how to use the gear if you're not familiar with it. And it would be really good if we could also, like you talked about, maybe have some type of webinar instead of having to attend class. That would be a lot helpful at somebody's time. Like you had to go look at a video or do something for any updates. It would help us on the time and travel, and just giving a day up of volunteerism to participate. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Dewey. It's a

good thought. Captain Johnson, are you back there now?

CAPT JOHNSON: Yes, sir. Can you hear

MR. BROOKS: I can. Welcome.

CAPT JOHNSON: Thank you. I have a couple of things to say. I think -- I've been a tuna boat captain, this is my 35th season. I've also been a longline captain for 15 years out of Honolulu.

The first thing I'd like to say is that we want this to work for everybody, not just the longline guys, not just the commercial guys, not just the weekenders, not just the tournament guys, but we want to see a solution obviously which is obviously very hard to do. We want to see it work for everybody.

And I'm for anybody that is involved in the industry, no matter if they've been here for a year or 2 years, or 10 years, or 50 years. And I want to make that clear that I'm not just commenting on what I do.

I was a commercial fisherman for 23 of those years. I did not charter at all. And it came to a point where we just couldn't make a living commercial fishing anymore. I went to school, got an architecture degree and got hooked on bluefin tuna fishing, and yellowfin fishing, bigeye fishing when I was 17 years old. Been doing this my whole life.

It's a business. It's how I support my family. It's how I feed my family. And we run hard. We run 7 days a week, 30 days a month. I'm very fortunate, very blessed to have a solid group of people that charter with me every year. We run 120 plus trips every year.

A lot of my customers are two and three-day trips. Not necessarily saying we're staying out overnight, but a lot of those guys, they fly in from Dallas, and Atlanta, and all over the country for that matter. They fish with me three or four days.

And for us to get the information that you're going to close down Tuesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays a week before the season opens is going to completely devastate my entire business. And it will not just mine, but most of all the charter captains.

me?

I mean, I start booking and we do a thing for Christmas where people buy tuna trips for their husband, or their family. And by February or March I'm 40 percent booked. By the end of April I'm 80 percent booked. So I've got guys coming in from all over the country that have already bought plane tickets, already got reservations at motels. And they're spending a lot of money to come bluefin fishing. And now we're hearing that we can't harvest the fish on Tuesdays, Fridays, and Saturdays.

It's going to bankrupt us. Probably, you know, for the guys like me it's going to bankrupt us. It's going to literally put me out of business.

Even the fact that we figure out a way to catch and release those fish, it's just not the same. It just isn't.

I want to take care of our species as much as anybody. I want to take care of our ocean as much as anybody that's here today, I promise you that, I do. I care about it greatly. But it's going to be -- for us to get this information a week before the season starts, it's just going to be devastating. And not only to the charter boat guys and commercial guys, but to the communities up and down the coast that depend on this money. The hotel owners, and the restaurant owners, and -- I mean the chamber of commerce in Gloucester says that for every 100 charters we bring to Gloucester, \$750,000 to the That's their math. local economy.

And if you add it up it makes sense. And I can go through that formula some other time, but it makes sense. And if you think about all these guys that are going to have to cancel these charters, I'm going to lose those guys that I've spent years building the relationship with. I'm going to lose those customers.

And yes, I'd rather lose some customers than devastate our bluefin population, but we all know that there's more bluefin swimming around right now than there's been in a long time. I mean, we all know that. I mean, the population is healthy.

The other thing that I'd like to say is that we're hearing the word on the street that the reason this is happening is to kind of

control the sale of the bluefin to help the price come up. And that couldn't be further from the truth.

I mean, that makes absolutely no common sense at all. If you don't fish on Friday and Saturday what's going to happen Sunday? Every single boat in the fleet that can make it to the grounds is going to be out there. again, I'm not against weekend guys at all. not against anybody, but there's a lot of folks who don't know how to properly take care of their They get out one day a week, maybe two days a month, and that Sunday opens up and the whole entire fleet is sitting on the grounds, and we have so many fish come in on that Sunday that the price goes down. The fish aren't bled properly, they're towed in behind the boats, and it's just on and on and on.

If anything it drops the price of the quality bluefin. Here we are supposedly the Boston bluefin is the number one tuna in the world. And we're not getting the price of a yellowfin for our bluefin.

I have 50 some pieces last year. I can show you my average price. And I know how to take care of my fish. And my average price is less than \$5 a pound. You get \$2 fish because of the subpar quality and the gluttony in the market.

And it just doesn't make sense. I don't understand why we can't keep it simple and do one or two fish a day, and fish until the quota runs out, and when it runs out let us catch and release so we can still charter, feed our families, and then go back.

Now, I don't want to hurt the harpoon guys, but I can remember when you all were letting the harpoon guys get whatever they needed. They had a quota, let them meet it. I think we need to really reexamine the closure dates, and the economic impact it's going to have on our industry.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Captain Johnson. Appreciate it. All right. We've got about just a few minutes left here. I think there are two AP members who want to come back in. Jeff Oden and David Schalit. If we can -- we'll need to do this in no more than five minutes. So Jeff, I'll

let you take first bite for two minutes or so, then over to David Schalit.

MR. ODEN: I've got three topics I'd really like to touch. I don't see where time is that big a problem with us, but anyway, if it is.

With rebuilding bluefin population, this is the last comment on A13. Without a quota set-aside there is nothing but increasing the headwinds in our sails in our industry. I just can't understand, fathom how you all are excluding us in this process.

There's two other things I want to talk to. One, you all just touched on, protected species workshops.

The other day I was going to one. A friend not too long ago had to go all the way to Houston to one, fly there. But the one I went to the other day when I told a friend who worked at Newport News ship building, he refuels nuclear carriers, and his job is to prevent the next seagoing Chernobyl. He laughed when I told him we had to go every two years to this workshop. He said heck, five years maybe. I mean, so I just need to throw that out there. We are certainly the most sustainable fishery in the world.

And so my last comment was the Paperwork Reduction Act. And I did miss that yesterday. The IBQ cost recovery concerns me. I mean, we've got enough going on with log books. I've got four different log books and that's just in this fishery. The economic -- I've been asked four years in a row to do an economic survey which is supposed to be a 20 percent random sample.

And I don't know how I can be that unlucky, but four years running, seriously? And anyway, is there going to be additional paperwork with IBQ cost recovery if that comes down the road? That's a question. And that's all I really have.

MR. BROOKS: All right, thanks. Thanks, Jeff. Appreciate it. Before I hand it off to David Schalit for the last comment here I'll also -- just a comment from the chat. A comment from Rick Weber suggests perhaps Trophy lines should have odd years and even years. Moving the line to south of Ocean City would

likely deprive north Jersey of what was a good and successful season this year.

And then a comment from Anna Beckwith just regarding the online class. A comment is that it would make sense to wrap that requirement into the South Atlantic Fisheries Management Commission. Sorry, that just moved here. Otherwise she says it would stand now our number of permits would likely overwhelm the system for in-person classes.

So, and then another one just came in from Marty which I haven't digested yet so I think I'll let David Schalit make the last public comment and then I'll take a look at what Marty has in there in the chat. So David, over to you for the last comment.

MR. SCHALIT: Thanks. I wanted to say something about the Endangered Species Act and shortfin make earlier but didn't have the chance.

The Endangered Species Act is a Nixonera law in the United States, and it has nothing to do with any countries outside the United States. If an ESA listing will be based on a determination made by scientists, and they're going to be looking at the status of the stock, and making a determination using that criteria, scientific criteria, for determining this.

It's not going to be very successful. We're not going to be very successful arguing other elements other than scientific elements in this.

And I just want to remind everyone that Endangered Species Act may work quite well for the blue footed warbler that lives only in the Rocky Mountains. Some species that exist well within the United States, we might be able to bring that species back to a healthier state.

But the problem here is we're talking about shortfin make whose critical habitat is the entirety of the North, Central, and South Atlantic Ocean including its adjacent seas. And the U.S. represents a very, very, very small amount of this mortality.

And as anyone knows who's involved with ICCAT the data on catches of shortfin make from many other nations is on the order of, I don't know what you'd call brouhaha, ballyhopefully, and balderdash. They're essentially

saying they're not catching these fish, but it's virtually impossible that they couldn't be interacting with these fish because we know where they're fishing, and that's just not a possibility.

So Glenn's statement reminded me that really the United States taking a position on shortfin mako, determining that it is an endangered species will probably have little or no effect on the international community at ICCAT.

So it seems to me that we are entirely dependent upon the science. And to see this report that they're going to develop. But I wouldn't want anyone to be suffering from the notion that doing this, that for the U.S. to do this, for the U.S. to determine an endangered status for shortfin make is anything other than a polemical statement coming from the U.S. when it's made in the international arena. Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Thank you, David. All right. I think we are at the end of our day together today. I just want to remind folks that we will be starting tomorrow at 9 o'clock and invite you to sort of look in around 8:45 or so so we can just make sure everyone is connected, work out any tech issues in the morning.

We'll start with a report on the fisheries economic situation which I know HMS staff have been doing for a couple of times now. It seems to have some pretty important information in there.

There will be an update from leadership at 10:30, both Paul Doremus who's Acting AA for fisheries will be there as well as Sam Rauch who's deputy assistant administrator for regulatory programs.

Before lunch we'll have an update on the Deepwater Horizon Oceanic Fish Restoration Project, and then after lunch we'll come back with a law enforcement update, and then more public comment.

We will then be ending earlier tomorrow than the other days. So public comment will be at 2 o'clock, and we'll wrap up at 2:30 and just remind people that on Friday there will be the HMS recreational roundtable. So that is the game plan going forward.

I think that's all I needed to hit right now. Randy or Pete, anything either one of you want to fold in before we sign off for the day here?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Just to say thank you for another good day of discussion and input. Really appreciate everybody's time. Looking forward to tomorrow.

MR. BROOKS: Great. All right, well thanks, everybody. Thanks for hanging in there and we'll see you tomorrow bright and early. Appreciate it. Take care, bye.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:31 p.m.)

Α
a.m 1:25 5:2 38:33,34 68:26
A13 68:38 89:31 121:7
AA 123:35
ABC 15:34
ABCs 74:15
abide 6:19 35:44
ability 44:18 107:9
117:17
able 8:38 14:26 17:38
22:19,22 34:45 35:35
37:3 38:10 40:12
41:15 44:38 53:35
60:47 85:6 90:33
96:47 97:34 101:18
103:18 104:29 115:2
115:6 116:40 117:19
117:29 122:36
above-entitled 38:32
68:25 94:26 124:13
absence 31:26,29
absent 108:32
absolutely 32:1 120:4
absorb 88:2,16
absurd 36:3
abundance 33:40 36:23
59:22,24 60:5 62:34
62:34 64:29 105:7
academia 31:16 47:11
academics 51:12
acceptable 67:33
accepted 89:21,23
access 10:8,8,25 14:44
25:11 39:20 45:34
52:16 71:24 79:1,39 88:33 106:23
accomplish 18:10
accomplished 75:47
93:44
account 11:37 54:38
64:8 65:25 67:4 93:42
accountability 92:34
107:6
accountable 106:41
113:42
accounting 84:24
ACCSP 99:6
accurate 40:40 71:42
71:44 104:39 105:29
accurately 34:9
achieve 31:6 32:33 33:1
67:36,39 113:11,14
achieved 83:26 113:1
113:37,39,45
achieves 116:10
achieving 32:27
acknowledge 108:41

I

acquire 34:26 acquisition 93:11 **Act** 4:21 55:35,41 56:1 67:29 69:11,20 73:27 73:35 82:45 93:14 121:28 122:18,20,33 **Acting** 123:35 action 40:3 41:6 56:24 58:37 67:28 114:9 actions 15:33 37:46 58:20 60:41,45 72:20 74:18 active 10:18,25,34 18:13 86:25 110:8,38 actively 117:16 activities 58:31 actual 7:23 16:19 29:22 adage 12:48 **adapt** 66:6 add 8:12,47 22:24 27:8 33:14 68:46 109:18 119:33 added 11:14 addition 11:17 14:25 33:14 44:39 113:34 116:8 117:8 additional 21:45 40:43 40:48 42:41 44:4,17 51:26 56:31 68:10 69:39 70:39 106:45 117:16 121:38 address 20:24 22:13 28:7 32:13 35:17 52:11 61:7 67:34 92:12 93:2,14 112:36 addressable 71:43 addressed 45:42 50:46 51:3 108:11 addressing 38:23 adjacent 122:41 adjust 41:39 42:28 adjustment 39:26,29,35 39:40 40:21 41:29,34 41:38 42:39 adjustments 41:23 43:12 administration 1:5 90:43 91:8,21 93:37 administrative 99:47 administrator 123:36 adopt 41:27 adopted 71:14 adopting 41:36 adoption 16:45 18:5 44:15 adopts 58:26 **Adriance** 1:30 19:10

20:3,5

Adrienne 3:34 55:7.10 55:25,28 61:4,18 63:7 67:11 68:1,9,22 Adrienne's 68:8 advance 37:33 113:9 114:4 advancing 102:10 advantage 16:29 106:10 advent 35:9 adverse 58:41 advice 16:45 18:5,11,16 18:19 82:30 113:4 advisable 58:24 advise 16:42 73:31 advisors 74:3 advisory 1:12 6:37 17:48 40:14 55:8 78:13 95:42 102:17 Advocates 2:6 **afar** 115:7 **Affairs** 67:46 78:17 affect 33:18 34:23 72:18 affirmations 73:40 affirmed 77:41 **affirms** 77:25 afraid 16:1 115:4 **AFS** 23:35 afternoon 94:31,39,44 age 89:42 agencies 41:19 48:8 51:10 58:36 agency 6:7,22,29 8:40 16:11 17:1 19:1 22:18 22:19 32:13 33:11 35:16 37:38 38:19 43:1 46:4 56:29,32 58:38 60:22 65:8,14 75:13 76:26 78:16 88:43 89:9 90:4 93:40 95:9 96:45 97:28,46 99:10,16,38 104:15 105:40 108:24 109:38 112:19,21 agency's 23:25,39 31:47 93:35 94:9 98:19 agenda 51:46 **aggregated** 10:40 11:3 aggregations 54:7 aggressive 45:48 113:7 aging 111:19 **ago** 22:41 23:35 26:30 27:13 36:14 46:32 52:24 61:19 79:45 95:21 111:4 121:16

109:11 112:46 115:11 **agreed** 70:36 agreement 105:2 agreements 37:29 ahead 18:25 37:5 46:31 46:39 71:24 77:15 84:13,29 89:40 92:20 aid 100:28 aim 60:34 68:35 aiming 85:11 **AIS** 36:14 Alabama 1:39 Alan 3:12 36:45 37:5 45:23 53:22,41 110:43 111:34 **Alaska** 52:43 95:31 align 42:35 all's 25:37 83:33 all-36:24 all-time 10:21 36:22,26 Alliance 2:34 allocation 84:21 104:28 allocations 104:23 allow 22:21 39:18 44:3 47:35 80:1 95:42 110:5 113:16 allowable 30:30 34:15 allowed 35:25 43:44 44:11 47:1,29,40 49:5 49:40 50:9,10 65:15 79:33 92:47 93:5 108:22 allowing 22:10 47:38 53:11 102:38 allows 41:31 96:14 alongside 113:18 alternate 112:35 alternative 34:41 40:24 41:6 71:37 81:7 alternatives 40:29 41:4 41:12,25 43:19 94:4 amazing 79:24 amendment 9:47 15:34 15:35 20:7 66:1 90:3 91:41 93:33 94:3 106:42 108:19,21,27 114:19 America 1:37 **American** 1:44 2:43 87:1 **amiss** 26:13 amount 20:12 50:10 56:21 79:5,6 122:43 amounts 84:26 analyses 70:24 74:26 87:20 **analysis** 17:31 61:35,45 69:31 81:8 83:13 94:5

agree 52:6 62:9 108:30

attend 117:42 analyzed 72:4 **applies** 13:1 43:24 95:26 and/or 78:36 69:12 113:44 aspects 9:35 22:30 attended 82:21 **ANDREW** 1:37 apply 48:48 50:14 29:8 72:16 96:27 attendee 7:48 8:1 112:8 **ANGEL** 3:15 97:32 101:48 58:25 64:30 75:4 attention 5:36 7:23 angler 12:37 13:2 108:46 assess 61:42 106:4 21:41 32:18 35:8 anglers 12:42,45 28:30 applying 28:10 48:47 assessed 79:4,15 81:34 87:23 95:35 Angling 98:46 81:37 82:41 87:8 attentive 5:15 49:2,8 75:41 animal 31:15 appreciate 8:31 26:17 assessment 18:36 attrition 111:19 Anna 1:33 83:2 104:34 33:10,27 65:26 82:35 20:19,24 28:35 61:33 audio 10:20 16:20 122:3 83:1 85:16 88:1 95:4 66:45 70:9 75:48 19:33 24:28,29 46:8,9 anniversary 76:20 103:11 104:6,8 53:37 79:38 88:27 76:23,32,34 77:1,10 108:15 112:47 117:2 annual 10:15 59:19 77:12,35 78:4,6,31 89:1,45 92:5 106:12 85:33 114:26 120:44 121:43 124:7 80:17,34,35,38,42 106:22 107:36 108:46 answer 27:41 34:45 124:12 81:2,3,6,35 83:4,27 116:20 35:38 47:27 48:7 approach 17:19 18:3,7 84:44,45 86:10,31,47 Augustine 1:32 30:18 84:18 85:7 90:46 18:9 22:19 26:38 27:5 89:21,24 103:17 **author** 23:36 99:26 105:19 106:31 27:11 67:27 101:14 104:22 111:27 authorities 98:11 107:30,32 108:9 approaches 110:41 assessments 11:16 105:40 authority 14:30 answered 87:24 appropriate 17:47 59:25 70:25 76:29,35 authorization 39:29 answers 19:5 35:47 64:37 77:35 116:44 76:44,48 77:4,8,17,29 53:45 54:43 103:29 117:26 77:31,38,46 80:17,45 41:39 appropriately 33:35 authorized 58:37 101:9 108:12 81:4,10,42 82:3,5,17 anticipate 21:44 102:15 82:39 86:42 87:3,27 automated 98:43 70:17 automatically 58:2,15 anybody 35:19 85:9 approval 76:5 87:29 89:22,25 103:44 106:29 118:18 apps 22:27,31 assigned 76:2 58:23 119:20.21 120:10 **April** 39:8 59:44 119:5 assistance 87:19 availability 72:17 anymore 106:25 118:26 architecture 118:27 assistant 123:36 available 4:23 5:41 anyone's 62:5 area 29:45 32:44 41:42 assisting 14:24 18:19 21:38,43 28:24 42:3,14,32 45:43 82:6 associated 23:32 70:40 44:37 51:14 54:10,48 anyway 36:33 85:48 89:46 90:1 91:16 92:4 108:37 111:22 83:46 85:40 98:38 56:28,35 57:2,8,14 92:30.32.39 93:13 areas 9:32 10:2 11:11 100:37 101:45 110:4 59:11 60:44 61:41 103:34 121:5,38 11:21 12:28 13:40 Association 1:45 2:41 64:23 67:1 68:20,31 2:44 112:33 **AP** 5:4,5,10 6:12,13,16 14:21,39 15:29 21:20 69:7,24 72:2,9,29 6:38 8:37,42 9:5,9 66:2 69:39 106:23 assume 112:28 74:11,33 75:9 79:35 17:44 28:25 29:25 108:32,33,34,35 **assuming** 7:15 68:40 79:36,43 81:33 83:14 61:11 69:6 78:19 111:10 68:41 94:40 104:44 83:25 84:7,8,14 88:24 87:38 102:38 108:10 arena 123:20 111:35 96:9 99:34 assumption 64:13 112:21,44 113:26 argued 33:43 avenue 89:25 115:5,24 120:46 arguing 122:29 **assure** 113:26 avenues 13:12 99:9 apologies 8:4 argument 80:18 at-sea 97:33 100:31 average 25:2 120:25,26 apologize 85:12 arrow 56:38 **Atlanta** 118:40 avoid 22:45 44:7 71:45 apparent 104:14 114:29 articles 64:33 **Atlantic** 1:12,33 2:38 **avoiding** 23:1,5 apparently 112:44 articulated 104:13 3:21,24,26,28,32,37 aware 22:2 46:2 76:35 appear 14:11 17:12 3:39,41,43,45 10:30 77:34 87:18 93:30 109:17 54:30 65:1 articulates 103:15 10:36,40 11:3,42 105:44 104:36 awareness 83:16 appears 11:26 13:19 16:42 24:38 appendices 16:21 articulating 105:30 42:2,18 54:15,16,37 awful 30:3 78:7 ascertain 96:19 101:1 61:27 62:10 68:30 axis 10:29,29,46 12:19 Appendix 16:26 **Apple** 102:7 **aside** 6:3 76:17 77:28 78:10 12:20 asked 22:25 81:39 81:30 82:27 83:43 apples 66:18 В applicability 117:30 90:43 91:21,29 92:40 98:9 100:47 105:32 applicant 96:15 93:11 104:14 121:32 116:34,42 117:24,29 **B** 40:24 41:41 application 99:6 105:35 asking 45:39 53:20 122:6,41 back 5:39,47 7:14,16,37 114:1 62:31 85:13 88:42 **ATMOSPHERIC** 1:5 8:14,15 11:20 15:44 applications 99:13 105:17,40 attachments 60:21 17:40 26:34,39 30:32 105:46 asks 113:23 attacking 30:47 32:28 33:31 34:37 **ASMFC** 82:15 attain 37:10,14 36:20,47 37:2 38:4,10 applied 58:3,15,23 76:37 98:11 aspect 32:34 33:15 **attempt** 58:19 38:12,30,35 39:8

	ı	ı	ı
54:18,23 55:4 59:40	Bayamon 48:35	55:29 90:10 94:45	41:36,40 42:10 43:20
74:23 78:1,41,47	bear 20:9 97:2 101:28	121:5	43:45 44:16,33,37
81:20 83:7 84:33	bearing 98:32	bigeye 80:38 118:29	45:40 47:30 66:23
85:18 87:40,47 90:42	beautiful 80:8	biggest 79:11 97:6	101:9 107:24,33
92:36 93:20,23 94:7	Beckwith 1:33 83:3	115:42	118:8 119:26 120:7
94:22 97:10 98:17	104:34 122:3	billfish 76:46 79:27,28	boats 32:45 92:38
99:37 106:32 107:27	beg 20:16	88:6 98:48	106:15 107:14 120:17
111:3 112:20 114:24	begging 79:26,28	bills 93:9	Bob 2:21 23:15 24:16
115:26,27,30,37,42	beginning 16:20 26:21	binding 113:10	25:48 26:4,8 27:41
115:47 116:16 117:35	59:41	biological 74:13 101:47	52:34 53:22 85:35
118:1 120:35,46	behalf 3:9	108:45	106:2
122:37 123:40	behavior 12:37	biologically 109:5	body 6:25 88:27
background 9:1 39:7	believe 20:37 21:4	biology 58:30	BOEM 97:36
74:31 78:39 95:20	24:42 25:5,6,8,40	bit 7:29 16:31 17:41	Bonanza 2:22
backward 96:43	48:14 53:5 54:22	18:2,17,22 19:28 21:6	bonnet 30:5
bacon 69:2	62:46,47 66:40 91:10	21:36 24:43 36:44	booked 119:4,5
bad 45:43	91:22 114:39,47	37:43 38:7,21 54:33	booking 119:1
bag 15:6	116:35	55:39 70:20 81:4	books 64:6 121:30,31
bait 103:23	believed 84:16	85:10,28,47 88:4 91:5	booms 107:14
balance 9:11 29:5	belittle 97:13	91:28 95:19 105:1	born 89:41
balanced 31:41 71:44	bell 21:29	110:9 116:10	Boston 120:21
73:20	Bellavance 1:35 61:17	bite 121:1	bottom 10:32 12:21
balances 109:4	63:4,6,24,29 99:22	biweekly 100:1	26:31 77:30 97:42
balancing 89:16	102:33,34 104:31	black 25:29 30:1 108:8	bought 119:7
balderdash 122:48	Ben 28:24	blacknose 14:47 30:5,5	bouncing 36:44
bally- 122:47	benefit 97:7 101:47	43:42 46:47 47:31,36	Bound 2:30
ban 16:42 27:24 29:41	benefits 8:38 108:29	47:39 48:48 49:23	box 48:16 71:22 94:46
86:22,22,23	benefitting 29:45	50:1,4,12,14	103:27
bankrupt 119:12,14	Bennett 1:26 8:34 9:18	blacktip 20:8,12 27:15	boxed 66:43
banned 29:40	18:23 20:5 26:9 28:6	30:9,25,26 34:28 38:1	Brad 3:36 68:32 85:36
bans 14:8,17,31 17:7	32:23 33:9 36:37 37:6	43:48	94:23,32,36,45
17:11	38:14 46:42 53:24	blacktips 30:7	102:27,28,35 104:43
bar 62:6	63:1,6,32 81:17 86:1 89:19 94:38 102:34	Blankinship 3:21 8:13 17:25 21:35 38:14	105:21 109:14,17
barriers 51:27,28 base 70:47	110:45	52:22 53:47 68:15	110:30 111:39 branch 3:23 28 36
based 6:13 11:16 13:20	best 4:23 5:34,41 6:29	82:36 85:16 93:28	branch 3:23,28,36 57:21
14:10 15:3 36:31	22:15,23 57:2,8,14	109:16 112:43 117:1	break 5:23,29,30,45
39:34 42:22 43:40	60:44 65:32 66:48	117:23 124:5	36:43,45 38:2 61:12
49:42,45 56:26,34	68:20,30 69:7,23	bled 120:16	67:9 68:4,12,14,31
59:36 65:7 69:23 75:8	74:11 75:8 79:34,36	blessed 118:34	89:29 94:20,22
75:43 83:38 86:6,14	79:36,40,42,43 80:32	block 55:29	105:27
87:5 94:15 122:23	81:32 82:3 83:14,36	blue 3:12 10:45 12:4,12	breaking 8:27
baseline 33:34	84:6,8,14 88:2,16,18	12:19 32:37,44 60:20	Brett 102:24
baselines 33:42	88:23 101:47 114:39	90:5,44 93:1 108:36	BREWSTER-GEISZ
basic 28:16	better 14:48 15:5,15,23	112:33 122:34	3:23 18:23,26 22:24
basically 25:18 27:17	19:22 22:8,32 29:2,13	bluefin 1:44 2:22,43	26:1 35:21 49:47
31:35 41:34 43:39	32:12 44:44 53:29,37	13:32 98:47 99:45,48	82:10,31
48:2 64:1,28,35,40	55:23,32 70:20 72:26	100:3 101:6,10	brief 5:25 9:31,34 29:25
72:47 81:2,42 87:37	85:23 88:19 94:47	103:20,21 105:8	33:26 52:35 113:35
106:38	102:5 106:4,23	106:11,37,41,45	briefly 28:7,14 35:20
basin 61:27 62:14,20	107:46	107:39 115:39 118:28	43:21 59:13 109:22
62:27	beyond 14:30 15:10	119:9,41,42 120:1,20	112:37
basin-wide 54:16	27:3 48:42 50:35 65:2	120:21,23 121:6	bright 26:47 124:11
basing 64:20	65:4 97:30	bluefins 107:29	bring 5:42 7:7,30,45
basis 37:11 62:40 99:11	biases 71:43	blunt 26:36	18:43,44 21:28 36:20
107:40 109:24	big 5:31 12:9 22:15	board 36:23	46:25,27 61:42 83:9
bass 13:32	24:45 25:40 30:3	boat 39:23,34,45 40:1,7	89:36 101:27 104:11
Bay 2:22	37:40 44:28 50:46	40:38,45 41:5,29,31	108:16 110:25 112:12
II	I	I	I

42:46.47 43:18 97:14 119:31 122:37 31:42 59:33 64:6 75:8,24,31 bringing 29:35 **Campo** 3:10 6:9 76:3,26 83:28 84:5 channel 22:42 **broad** 18:8 24:28 69:42 **Canada** 113:29 96:12 98:47 100:3 channels 96:1 70:23 75:45 101:13 Canadian 89:21,23 119:17 120:33 chapter 74:28 113:9 **Canadians** 105:9,10 **catches** 122:45 characteristics 44:36 cancel 119:36 broader 37:45 66:14 catching 11:33 35:12 72:35 broadness 84:19 capability 87:35,36 44:20 107:2 123:1 characterization 16:13 **broken** 36:19 117:18 categories 108:1 28:17,19,21 **brought** 30:11 96:30 capacity 43:2 category 90:20 91:33 characterize 16:17 110:48 113:18 capitalizing 29:11 98:45,45 106:13 28:23 29:3 44:38 54:3 brouhaha 122:47 101:45 caught 33:41 36:6,17 113:22 46:8 49:24 53:36 84:9 **brush** 66:14 101:13 **CAPT** 118:3,6 characterized 37:18 **BSIA** 69:7,10,24,38,44 captain 114:47,48 101:3 107:28 111:26 **charge** 31:13 70:2,5,22 71:7,10,13 115:1,3 117:35 118:1 114:40.42 **chart** 11:43 56:2 57:22 caused 11:39 71:17,28 73:12 74:2 118:8,9 120:43 59:40 **charter** 116:35 118:24 74:42,45 75:11,28,29 **causing** 13:48 captain's 43:1 75:34,41,43,44 76:16 **captains** 2:41 43:3 caution 7:25 33:30 118:35,48 119:26 76:44 77:11,45 78:11 118:48 38:21 120:34 78:29 83:23,26 87:30 **capture** 58:19 center 2:19,27 77:21 Charter/Headboat build 28:33 52:22 85:37 captured 25:46 28:32 78:17 103:37 104:20 35:29,43 39:22 98:46 96:38 99:20 114:16 **Central** 122:40 Charter/Headboats **building** 65:36 100:11 captures 26:22 certain 33:19 58:2 42:9 52:17 101:16 119:38 121:19 care 7:25 8:12 88:48 64:33 105:10 Charterboat 2:40 119:19,20,22 120:11 **bull** 20:8,19 30:2,12,15 certainly 8:17 16:37 **charters** 2:21,32 119:31 120:26 124:12 17:37,44 18:19 22:15 30:23 119:37 bullet 77:2 102:37 careful 33:46 33:10 38:22 52:30 **chase** 17:46 105:28.33.36 carefully 33:31,33 67:4 72:37 80:16 87:9 **chat** 7:5,11,11,18,43,44 Caribbean 2:9 39:23,33 Bulletin 87:2 87:15,23,40 88:15 7:44 8:44 9:3 37:1 **bump** 42:19 91:25 39:41,45 40:1,6,37,38 93:42 117:11,25 38:11 46:35 55:3 68:7 **bunch** 15:42 87:44 40:41,45 41:5,20 42:4 121:25 104:34 106:3 110:15 **burden** 14:36 42:10,17,37 43:19,23 certificate 116:21 112:10 115:47 121:45 **burdens** 95:38 43:45 44:14,16,19,33 certification 116:31.32 122:15 burdensome 103:8 45:32 47:30,33,36,44 cetera 38:1 82:27 **check** 25:39 48:16,42 business 32:40 66:24 48:6 49:7,10,15,40,43 Chaibongsai 20:3,31 64:25 77:15 118:31,46 119:15 49:45,45 50:2,8,15,47 20:35 checked 32:7 **busy** 5:17 51:7,16 53:6 54:8 **challenge** 98:4 100:31 checking 76:48 **button** 8:5 60:20 95:30 98:8 **challenges** 37:46 97:14 Chernobyl 121:21 **cherry-pick** 64:43,47 buy 92:37 119:2 Caribbean's 45:40 97:21 100:28 101:44 buying 90:6 Carlson 23:35 102:9 **Chief** 3:21,23,28,36 **by-case** 62:40 Carolina 2:24,35 84:10 **chamber** 119:29 **choice** 87:31 bycatch 60:8 74:17 **CARRIE** 3:43 chance 6:5 37:41 46:26 **Christina** 3:9 6:8,10 117:24 carried 58:37 62:13 68:5 106:26 33:25 34:2,6,48 bycaught 59:34 carriers 121:20 115:23,43,45 122:19 Christmas 119:2 bye 68:24 124:12 chuckles 25:21 carry 43:2 58:9,12 change 12:38 14:42 60:41 96:17 41:24 42:33 43:15 **chum** 30:18 C 44:3 65:38 70:48 **chunk** 5:31 **Casco** 2:22 C 41:3 43:17 case 38:20 49:12 56:12 72:36 76:28 108:5 **circle** 7:37 15:43 17:40 calculation 26:11 56:45 64:34 72:27 110:41 117:7 25:32 54:18 65:23,45 call 5:32 6:48 26:23,34 76:27 91:37 97:35 changed 31:24 39:31 85:18 109:7 113:33 117:7 circling 87:44 38:26 57:19 70:37 **changes** 9:39 14:42 case- 62:39 15:9,11 17:17 39:10 circumstances 69:44 112:1 115:15 122:47 called 29:16,17 47:5 cases 32:16 81:5 84:21 39:42 40:23 41:21,32 87:30 casting 64:26 45:46 50:46 51:30 **citations** 64:21,24 58:26 87:18 cat 35:11 65:41 66:6 72:39 cited 56:27 59:37 64:22 calling 38:17 94:14,17 108:39 **calls** 37:44 **catch** 30:6,7,27,31,48 64:27 65:9 camera 6:47 66:36 33:33 39:14 40:47 116:26 cites 14:9 16:17,19,21 cameras 28:47 106:30 44:13,44 46:20,21 changing 14:44 39:39 31:11 57:14 64:33 51:42 53:35 55:8 39:44,48 40:25 42:6 citizen 13:42 21:5 22:26 campaign 15:19 27:24

22:30 87:16 citizens 17:8 **City** 2:40 116:1,3,3 121:48 clarification 25:9 63:30 63:43,45 112:24 clarifications 70:8 clarified 53:15 clarify 49:48 58:16 74:3 75:12 112:43 **clarifying** 63:8 74:1 clarity 53:20 class 117:42 122:4 classes 116:19,38 117:36 122:10 classified 86:8 clean 84:11,16 clear 16:24 27:28 53:18 61:20 71:44 82:37 108:25 118:21 clearing 86:33 clearly 37:43 84:7 88:7 103:15 104:45 click 60:20 **Cliff** 29:2 climate 108:4 close 38:3 95:35 118:44 closed 66:2 88:32 106:23 108:33 115:44 **closer** 19:14 **closes** 60:23 116:2 closure 120:40 closures 108:7 clueless 25:24 co- 23:35 coast 29:43,44 30:16 30:44 32:39 95:31 119:27 coastal 10:40,42 11:4,8 11:36,48 12:13 13:37 14:34,47 35:26,26,36 35:37 54:35,37 coastals 30:4,24 36:5 cognizant 88:44 coin 99:24 collaborate 47:7 101:25 101:38 collaborated 104:45 collaborating 99:11 105:43 collaboration 23:44 47:15 48:21 50:26 100:46 collaborations 100:21 105:37 collaborative 6:32 **collect** 22:8 58:19 61:40 79:44 93:41

96:47 97:34 99:21 104:38 107:25 **collected** 72:4 97:38 98:29 collecting 28:16 97:24 97:24,25 98:46 107:47 collection 13:44 21:7 72:23 98:19.24 99:44 100:30,39 103:46 108:8 **color** 10:31,32 11:48 12:2,4,12,18,19 column 41:43 43:21,37 **columns** 16:10 combination 41:11,14 43:47 combined 43:31,47,48 46:12 come 5:39 6:40 7:13,28 7:36 9:9 14:39 15:23 19:3,4 21:17 22:46 35:8 36:19 38:4 52:35 53:32 54:22 60:47 63:5 66:44 75:32 85:48 87:22 89:45 92:39 93:20.22 94:22 97:10,14 102:23,33 102:47 110:22 111:17 115:26,27 119:9 120:2,15,46 123:40 comes 7:32 17:34 20:48 24:6 37:42 53:14 54:46 72:29 95:39 98:28 106:3 111:20 121:39 coming 5:43 8:41 15:27 17:31,32 20:38 21:32 26:40 28:9 45:16 46:2 76:20 78:40 79:3 92:28 97:2 100:29 107:41,42 111:40 115:46 119:6 123:19 comment 4:29 6:1,3,35 6:42 7:10 17:26,41 18:21 24:47 31:46 32:24 33:47 36:4,8,34 36:48 37:18 38:17,23 38:24 44:6 52:27,35 54:1,13 55:43 57:1,32 59:44 60:1,20,23,27 63:46 65:18,36 66:19 68:6,35,38 77:23 79:46 80:9 88:3,25

90:2 94:15,17,34

106:3 110:15,27

111:43,48 113:35

115:46 117:2 121:7

121:27,44,45,46 122:3,4,14,16 123:42 123:44 commentary 7:21 108:36 commenter 36:42 38:24 commenters 40:22 42:25 commenting 115:22 118:22 comments 7:13,20 8:41 8:43 13:8,28 15:28,38 18:27 23:18 24:22 25:38 26:7 30:36 31:23 32:19 33:12 37:8,39 38:18,22,41 39:9 40:15,17 41:7 43:40 44:23 45:19,22 51:37 55:2 60:4,12 61:11 63:42 65:30 67:33 85:20 87:44 93:26,33,35 94:6,8 102:37 105:3 109:36 111:40 112:25 114:28 115:33.40 commerce 1:4 32:8 58:13 119:30 commercial 9:28,39,48 10:5,6 13:18 14:33,47 18:41 27:16,33 28:30 29:39 31:31 32:6,11 32:30 35:46 39:21,22 39:28,33,45 40:37,40 40:44 41:28,29,30,35 41:36 42:1,8,9 43:45 52:11,17,18 56:18,41 56:47 59:33 63:44 64:1,3,5,18 67:16 79:29 83:35 88:8 103:42 110:5 113:5 116:36 118:13,23,26 119:26 Commission 2:8.39 19:29 82:16 98:10 122:7 commissioned 80:42 commissioner 112:35 commissioners 37:22 Commissions 77:20 commitment 108:27 112:39 commitments 108:23 **commits** 114:10 committee 17:48 73:7 77:5 81:39 82:12,13 82:32 committees 70:6

Commodore 102:7 common 56:13 86:17 120:5 commonly 24:11 43:33 100:37 communication 15:13 15:18 100:17 111:44 communities 69:36 119:27 community 16:5 49:28 67:35,44 80:26 99:35 108:26 113:26 114:38 123:10 **company** 3:13 29:16,16 compare 30:24 compared 12:5 30:30 competing 82:20 competitive 16:28 **compile** 57:1,8 compiled 70:26 **compiling** 59:46 60:43 complaining 107:31 complement 39:12 **complete** 9:41 16:42 60:29 71:44 83:37 105:2 completed 20:20 77:4 77:17,29,31 87:4 completely 16:4 27:17 79:13 118:46 **complex** 104:45 complexes 74:14 **compliance** 37:28 43:4 43:10 45:38 100:25 compliant 106:16.40.46 complicated 103:4 complimentary 19:30 component 26:42 30:29,33,34 102:42 composition 47:3 compounded 108:38 comprehensive 5:21 64:31 compromised 92:22,25 computer 89:42 concentrating 17:45 **concept** 104:35 concern 11:12 12:29 13:41 14:1,22 16:10 27:4 32:47 36:29,31 47:47 53:26,32 54:2 84:41 **concerned** 16:1 17:8 54:4 114:38 concerning 32:25 45:1 48:45 71:3 73:48 85:1 concerns 9:32 10:3 11:21 12:40 14:29,39

ii .	1	1	ı
16:5 17:10,15,21 19:1	consideration 22:11	continues 33:2 67:37	31:21 46:44,47 54:18
19:3 24:23 32:35	44:6 65:38 109:41	101:17	55:2 61:19 68:3 77:27
39:13 40:34 42:48	considerations 71:47	continuing 20:22 37:11	80:8 83:15,17,30,32
47:42 48:2,4 50:13	considered 70:28,34,41	117:6	85:21 90:42 93:13,37
84:43 85:1 86:7	71:21,27,31,40 73:34	continuity 96:14	93:40 95:1 109:37
121:29	73:36	continuous 71:19	110:16 112:4 118:7
ConCiencia 1:42	considering 71:37	102:16	123:30
concisely 76:22	92:44	contracted 81:6	coupling 52:40
conclude 56:23 60:28	considers 82:38	contracting 67:24	course 23:43 29:36,38
102:25,26	consistency 19:32	contribute 6:20 17:4	50:37 72:1 73:22
concluded 59:7 102:28	77:25 100:22	contributes 84:40	76:45 80:23 82:37,43
concluding 56:40	consistent 11:5 18:11	control 15:35 26:33	84:32
conclusion 71:7	18:15 47:38 49:4	79:14 120:1	cover 9:34
conclusions 57:17	67:18 73:36,41 77:42	controversial 70:36	coverage 106:33
66:42	96:32	controversiality 70:40	covered 8:48 17:12
condensed 80:1	consolidate 39:25	conversation 5:7,26,37	32:3 41:48
condition 53:31 60:7	consolidating 39:39	6:37 7:23,30 19:8	covers 75:22
74:13	constantly 98:13	23:9 26:6 38:40 48:13	COX 1:37
conduct 33:20 56:30	107:18	53:46 61:15 68:19	CPCs 65:21
57:6 59:46	constituency 21:2	82:34 110:18,23,26	CPF 2:32
conducted 77:40 94:5	89:11	112:11 115:35	CPUE 59:25
conducting 56:22	constituents 20:46	conversations 5:13	crab 101:8
60:39	21:20 22:21 53:29,39	49:9 95:3 99:18	Craig 91:29
conducts 17:30	constitute 69:44	101:33 102:18 104:9	create 35:18 44:40 51:6
conduit 81:47	constitutes 70:2	Conversely 90:24	68:42 75:16,39 76:17
conference 62:18	constitutional 29:41	converted 108:33	76:39 83:23,24 108:7
confident 38:6	constructed 70:30	conveyed 74:8	created 11:13 14:17
conflicts 13:17 73:21	constructive 6:32	COOPER 3:28 8:47	39:37 61:32 103:6
confront 27:4	17:19	coordinate 102:45	creates 36:1 43:5
confused 27:26 64:16	consult 58:36,48	coordinating 60:40	creating 7:38 44:29
confusion 12:42 14:18	consultation 58:35,44	Coordinator 3:37	51:26
19:46 44:48	116:42	copy 78:35	creation 48:19
Congress 22:36	consultations 60:39	cordial 38:27	Cradibility /3.4 84.77
			credibility 73:5 84:22
congressional 13:16	consulted 71:35	corner 71:22	88:41
congressional 13:16 22:33	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6 consensus 88:26	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6 consensus 88:26 consensus-seeking	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6 consensus 88:26 consensus-seeking 6:25	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6 consensus 88:26 consensus-seeking 6:25 consequences 96:38	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6 consensus 88:26 consensus-seeking 6:25	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6 consensus 88:26 consensus-seeking 6:25 consequences 96:38 Conservaci¢n 1:42	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41 78:39 80:11 81:32	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23 costs 98:32	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22 cross-section 32:46
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6 consensus 88:26 consensus-seeking 6:25 consequences 96:38 Conservaci¢n 1:42 conservation 2:8 16:5	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41 78:39 80:11 81:32 85:28 86:40 104:15	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23 costs 98:32 council 1:34,36 2:10,13	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22 cross-section 32:46 crossed 95:15
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6 consensus 88:26 consensus-seeking 6:25 consequences 96:38 Conservaci¢n 1:42 conservation 2:8 16:5 26:48 31:12,28 32:32	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41 78:39 80:11 81:32 85:28 86:40 104:15 104:24	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23 costs 98:32 council 1:34,36 2:10,13 48:21 51:11 71:12	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22 cross-section 32:46 crossed 95:15 CRP 29:1 crucial 51:16 Cudney 3:26 68:29,48
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6 consensus 88:26 consensus-seeking 6:25 consequences 96:38 Conservaci¢n 1:42 conservation 2:8 16:5 26:48 31:12,28 32:32 32:33 37:9 58:24,30	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41 78:39 80:11 81:32 85:28 86:40 104:15 104:24 continental 52:39 continual 51:48 continually 51:43	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23 costs 98:32 council 1:34,36 2:10,13 48:21 51:11 71:12 73:29,31 76:9,10,11	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22 cross-section 32:46 crossed 95:15 CRP 29:1 crucial 51:16
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6 consensus 88:26 consensus-seeking 6:25 consequences 96:38 Conservaci¢n 1:42 conservation 2:8 16:5 26:48 31:12,28 32:32 32:33 37:9 58:24,30 60:9 67:19,39 69:22	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41 78:39 80:11 81:32 85:28 86:40 104:15 104:24 continental 52:39 continual 51:48	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23 costs 98:32 council 1:34,36 2:10,13 48:21 51:11 71:12 73:29,31 76:9,10,11 81:30 82:26 83:42,43 91:29 98:7 councils 73:28 77:19	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22 cross-section 32:46 crossed 95:15 CRP 29:1 crucial 51:16 Cudney 3:26 68:29,48
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6 consensus 88:26 consensus-seeking 6:25 consequences 96:38 Conservaci¢n 1:42 conservation 2:8 16:5 26:48 31:12,28 32:32 32:33 37:9 58:24,30 60:9 67:19,39 69:22 69:26,33 70:3,14 73:9 89:15 112:40 113:2,8 113:28,32,40 114:5	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41 78:39 80:11 81:32 85:28 86:40 104:15 104:24 continental 52:39 continual 51:48 continually 51:43 continue 8:16 14:27 15:20 18:13 27:7	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23 costs 98:32 council 1:34,36 2:10,13 48:21 51:11 71:12 73:29,31 76:9,10,11 81:30 82:26 83:42,43 91:29 98:7 councils 73:28 77:19 82:14,15 84:17	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22 cross-section 32:46 crossed 95:15 CRP 29:1 crucial 51:16 Cudney 3:26 68:29,48 80:13,44 82:1 83:19 84:31 86:40 87:33 89:19,34
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6 consensus 88:26 consensus-seeking 6:25 consequences 96:38 Conservaci¢n 1:42 conservation 2:8 16:5 26:48 31:12,28 32:32 32:33 37:9 58:24,30 60:9 67:19,39 69:22 69:26,33 70:3,14 73:9 89:15 112:40 113:2,8 113:28,32,40 114:5 114:38,43	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41 78:39 80:11 81:32 85:28 86:40 104:15 104:24 continental 52:39 continual 51:48 continually 51:43 continue 8:16 14:27 15:20 18:13 27:7 32:33,48 33:1 49:44	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23 costs 98:32 council 1:34,36 2:10,13 48:21 51:11 71:12 73:29,31 76:9,10,11 81:30 82:26 83:42,43 91:29 98:7 councils 73:28 77:19 82:14,15 84:17 count 86:23	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22 cross-section 32:46 crossed 95:15 CRP 29:1 crucial 51:16 Cudney 3:26 68:29,48 80:13,44 82:1 83:19 84:31 86:40 87:33 89:19,34 cultural 51:27
congressional 13:16 22:33 connect 104:29 connected 82:25 123:26 connections 83:6 consensus 88:26 consensus-seeking 6:25 consequences 96:38 Conservaci¢n 1:42 conservation 2:8 16:5 26:48 31:12,28 32:32 32:33 37:9 58:24,30 60:9 67:19,39 69:22 69:26,33 70:3,14 73:9 89:15 112:40 113:2,8 113:28,32,40 114:5 114:38,43 conservationists 31:45	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41 78:39 80:11 81:32 85:28 86:40 104:15 104:24 continuental 52:39 continual 51:48 continually 51:43 continue 8:16 14:27 15:20 18:13 27:7 32:33,48 33:1 49:44 50:26 81:18 85:32	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23 costs 98:32 council 1:34,36 2:10,13 48:21 51:11 71:12 73:29,31 76:9,10,11 81:30 82:26 83:42,43 91:29 98:7 councils 73:28 77:19 82:14,15 84:17 count 86:23 countries 67:30,31	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22 cross-section 32:46 crossed 95:15 CRP 29:1 crucial 51:16 Cudney 3:26 68:29,48 80:13,44 82:1 83:19 84:31 86:40 87:33 89:19,34 cultural 51:27 cumbersome 103:7
congressional 13:16	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41 78:39 80:11 81:32 85:28 86:40 104:15 104:24 continental 52:39 continual 51:48 continual 51:48 continual 51:43 continue 8:16 14:27 15:20 18:13 27:7 32:33,48 33:1 49:44 50:26 81:18 85:32 96:44,46 101:24,38	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23 costs 98:32 council 1:34,36 2:10,13 48:21 51:11 71:12 73:29,31 76:9,10,11 81:30 82:26 83:42,43 91:29 98:7 councils 73:28 77:19 82:14,15 84:17 count 86:23 countries 67:30,31 84:23 122:22	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22 cross-section 32:46 crossed 95:15 CRP 29:1 crucial 51:16 Cudney 3:26 68:29,48 80:13,44 82:1 83:19 84:31 86:40 87:33 89:19,34 cultural 51:27 cumbersome 103:7 curious 50:48 86:12
congressional 13:16	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41 78:39 80:11 81:32 85:28 86:40 104:15 104:24 continental 52:39 continual 51:48 continual 51:48 continual 51:48 continue 8:16 14:27 15:20 18:13 27:7 32:33,48 33:1 49:44 50:26 81:18 85:32 96:44,46 101:24,38 102:2,39 103:11	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23 costs 98:32 council 1:34,36 2:10,13 48:21 51:11 71:12 73:29,31 76:9,10,11 81:30 82:26 83:42,43 91:29 98:7 councils 73:28 77:19 82:14,15 84:17 count 86:23 countries 67:30,31 84:23 122:22 country 103:35 118:41	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22 cross-section 32:46 crossed 95:15 CRP 29:1 crucial 51:16 Cudney 3:26 68:29,48 80:13,44 82:1 83:19 84:31 86:40 87:33 89:19,34 cultural 51:27 cumbersome 103:7 curious 50:48 86:12 116:38
congressional 13:16	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41 78:39 80:11 81:32 85:28 86:40 104:15 104:24 continental 52:39 continual 51:48 continually 51:43 continue 8:16 14:27 15:20 18:13 27:7 32:33,48 33:1 49:44 50:26 81:18 85:32 96:44,46 101:24,38 102:2,39 103:11 104:10 109:7	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23 costs 98:32 council 1:34,36 2:10,13 48:21 51:11 71:12 73:29,31 76:9,10,11 81:30 82:26 83:42,43 91:29 98:7 councils 73:28 77:19 82:14,15 84:17 count 86:23 countries 67:30,31 84:23 122:22 country 103:35 118:41 119:6	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22 cross-section 32:46 crossed 95:15 CRP 29:1 crucial 51:16 Cudney 3:26 68:29,48 80:13,44 82:1 83:19 84:31 86:40 87:33 89:19,34 cultural 51:27 cumbersome 103:7 curious 50:48 86:12 116:38 current 11:9,32 14:38
congressional 13:16	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41 78:39 80:11 81:32 85:28 86:40 104:15 104:24 continental 52:39 continual 51:48 continual 51:48 continual 51:48 continual 51:43 continue 8:16 14:27 15:20 18:13 27:7 32:33,48 33:1 49:44 50:26 81:18 85:32 96:44,46 101:24,38 102:2,39 103:11 104:10 109:7 continued 16:46 31:35	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23 costs 98:32 council 1:34,36 2:10,13 48:21 51:11 71:12 73:29,31 76:9,10,11 81:30 82:26 83:42,43 91:29 98:7 councils 73:28 77:19 82:14,15 84:17 count 86:23 countries 67:30,31 84:23 122:22 country 103:35 118:41 119:6 couple 7:46 15:43	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22 cross-section 32:46 crossed 95:15 CRP 29:1 crucial 51:16 Cudney 3:26 68:29,48 80:13,44 82:1 83:19 84:31 86:40 87:33 89:19,34 cultural 51:27 cumbersome 103:7 curious 50:48 86:12 116:38 current 11:9,32 14:38 14:48 15:4,32 16:8
congressional 13:16	consulted 71:35 consulting 78:15 consumer 17:15 consuming 39:36 contact 68:8 102:21 contained 56:27 content 70:8 CONTENTS 4:9 context 37:40,45 56:28 69:13 71:9 74:41 78:39 80:11 81:32 85:28 86:40 104:15 104:24 continental 52:39 continual 51:48 continually 51:43 continue 8:16 14:27 15:20 18:13 27:7 32:33,48 33:1 49:44 50:26 81:18 85:32 96:44,46 101:24,38 102:2,39 103:11 104:10 109:7	corner 71:22 cornerstone 95:42 correct 21:13 24:38,39 24:42 26:10,11 50:1 64:47 correctly 113:21 corresponding 52:9 cost 96:3 98:21,31 101:19 121:29,39 cost-effective 98:23 costs 98:32 council 1:34,36 2:10,13 48:21 51:11 71:12 73:29,31 76:9,10,11 81:30 82:26 83:42,43 91:29 98:7 councils 73:28 77:19 82:14,15 84:17 count 86:23 countries 67:30,31 84:23 122:22 country 103:35 118:41 119:6	88:41 crew 40:35 42:48 92:24 92:29 criteria 39:30 41:29,35 41:39 47:28 61:47,48 62:43 71:13,26 87:28 122:26,27 critical 58:41 88:23 102:42 122:39 cross 74:23 102:22 cross-section 32:46 crossed 95:15 CRP 29:1 crucial 51:16 Cudney 3:26 68:29,48 80:13,44 82:1 83:19 84:31 86:40 87:33 89:19,34 cultural 51:27 cumbersome 103:7 curious 50:48 86:12 116:38 current 11:9,32 14:38

72:34 decided 9:41 50:14 depredation 9:29 13:6 developing 60:37 currently 10:18 28:15 decision 49:42 56:25 13:10,10,14,21,41,46 development 4:24 76:3 77:48 78:10 106:5 28:39,45 53:9 57:46 64:45 87:20 94:9 13:48 15:24 20:11,41 75:19 79:39,39 86:14 decision- 79:10 20:45 21:25,38 22:9 107:48 108:9,19 95:9,14 98:25 100:46 decision-making 6:30 22:29,34,35 26:28 110:37 112:34 47:4 74:21 79:19 80:2 28:8,10,17,18,31,36 developments 105:35 curriculum 117:9 decisions 70:48 71:30 28:41 29:36 31:36 deviate 7:29 cursory 95:8 96:22 72:41 75:43 79:3 36:30 79:12 89:6 devices 23:2 28:42 88:31 101:29 deprive 122:1 customers 118:37 **Dewey** 2:12 23:14 declare 107:41,43 deputy 123:36 24:15,18,48 25:45 119:39.41 decline 10:22,33 11:39 deregulation 109:46 cut 88:28 89:3 100:6 54:19 63:37,37,40 derived 70:34 108:30 cutting 46:42 14:32 31:35 34:13,14 65:27,45 83:9 84:28 cycle 81:20 declined 11:22 descender 28:41 85:17 88:10 116:15 declines 59:24 descenders 28:43 117:2,48 D decrease 12:35 23:40 describe 43:21 73:44 Dewey's 26:10 65:36 daily 107:40 37:25 76:23,36,40 dial 101:12 described 9:35 75:6 **Dallas** 118:40 decreasing 23:38 dialogue 81:47 94:44 deemed 58:23 94:11 damaged 13:24 95:45 101:33 102:15 deep 46:8 65:46 92:24 describes 76:9 83:26 danger 57:40,47 108:25 109:8 112:20 **description** 9:26 74:28 dangerous 107:15 Deepwater 123:39 115:35 dark 12:2 default 42:15 43:29,46 84:35 85:24 die 111:19 darnedest 68:42 defaults 42:29 descriptions 72:3 differ 20:16 date 25:44 29:26 52:8 Defense 3:14 design 16:3 difference 12:10 20:1 57:17 63:20 81:11 defers 42:16 43:1 designed 29:18 75:20 25:6,41 49:21 57:45 deficiencies 66:41 99:14 111:33 87:5,14 108:15 dates 120:41 define 81:14 103:47 designs 43:2 differences 12:41 19:26 **dating** 32:28 defined 56:20 82:44 **desire** 109:2 19:34.46 **Dave** 3:9 6:9 34:8,27 definitely 21:15,47 desks 5:38 different 6:23 8:39 25:39 34:35 66:13 **despite** 113:36 10:38,48 28:30 37:44 **David** 2:26,43 80:5 82:37 87:46 104:41 93:22 94:7 103:8,39 destroying 30:43 41:48 42:38,40 46:3 106:1 111:34 120:47 definition 71:17 destruction 58:41 48:12 49:34,39 55:38 121:2,44 122:13,15 definitions 57:39 detail 24:5 27:47,48 56:5 57:35 62:40 66:6 123:21 **degree** 71:42 113:40 58:44 70:20 87:38,39 67:5 69:44 71:8 76:13 **David's** 83:5 118:27 **details** 9:35 46:45 76:23,31 78:30 80:14 day 5:4,5,12,17 6:36,40 degrees 50:8 **deter** 14:2 80:14,39 82:14,20 6:43 8:17,20 36:14,33 **DEIS** 94:8 determination 57:3,18 83:45 84:38 85:27 57:34 59:14 60:30 107:37,39 117:46 **Delaney** 112:26,28,32 86:43 89:8 94:4 95:37 120:12,32 121:15,18 112:32 61:3 64:17,21,41 96:31 97:46,48 98:1 123:22 124:4,6 delayed 72:21 122:24,26 98:11 99:25 100:16 days 35:7 56:15 90:21 delegation 37:21 determinations 75:7,12 102:44 103:41,48 75:24,30 95:2 118:33,33,42 **Delisse** 3:39 7:13 38:36 105:7 108:44,45,46 120:13 123:44 38:41 45:21,28 46:43 determine 23:4 58:31 110:31,33 111:9 dead 113:18,27 47:25 49:48 53:7 61:33 62:22 74:44 114:17 121:31 deadline 78:22 94:13 106:48 75:1 104:21 108:34 difficult 13:3 33:18 deal 20:14 22:22 35:6 **Delisse's** 52:23 123:17 34:25 61:23 79:9,14 deliver 58:9,12 determined 53:33 66:32 71:1 79:12 88:18 dig 85:45 91:48 92:3,23 83:45 98:39 116:13 demand 17:16 62:39 77:45 dealer 10:9 98:40 99:40 demographic 57:10 determining 62:11,37 92:26 demonstrate 54:25 74:2 75:7 122:27 99:46,48 digested 122:12 **DENIT** 3:30 123:8 **digging** 84:39 dealers 10:14 14:26 deterrent 23:1 29:16 dealing 20:46 99:44 **Department** 1:4,30 2:14 diligence 87:24 dealt 31:38 66:35 2:24,48 3:15 32:8 devastate 118:46 dilute 109:2 45:7 119:41 dinner 21:29 debated 95:3 decade 53:19 depend 119:27 devastating 119:25 dire 16:41 **develop** 95:11 103:14 direct 14:31 23:41 decades 27:6 dependent 123:13 December 95:8 depends 57:37 69:31 123:14 102:18 114:31 88:35 developed 69:8,46 directed 2:17 10:26 decent 16:6 decide 70:11 82:17 depleted 33:37 71:13 75:3 76:31 11:30,33,39 14:13

ecosystem 28:34

23:31 35:14.27 51:45 106:12,31,36 directing 27:14 38:18 direction 49:37,41 50:19 83:22 114:17 directive 13:16 22:33 69:14 75:6 78:23 directives 75:2 directly 70:27 98:38 102:20 Director 3:30 disagree 109:11 disallowed 35:12 disappeared 109:21 disappears 103:28 disappointed 51:43 disaster 91:48 discard 35:18 36:1 discards 54:29 disciplines 71:35 disconnect 25:36 88:12 88:20,46 89:12 disconnected 46:41 discount 66:39 discouraged 112:45 discrepancy 54:30 discreteness 61:48 discretion 43:3 **discuss** 59:14 discussed 21:28 96:25 97:18 98:22 discussing 16:47 17:43 71:10 discussion 5:8,26 8:18 8:37 35:16 55:3 62:26 66:31,32 67:12 68:2 85:38,39,40,43 90:19 95:1 96:30 98:33,34 99:2 111:5 117:26 124:6 **discussions** 5:19 8:16 8:20 17:47 18:12 22:17 24:7 38:7 97:6 108:25 disincentive 103:6 disinformation 27:24 dissected 80:20 disseminated 88:36 disseminating 22:21 distilled 97:27 distinct 47:43 61:34,46 distinctive 44:36 distribute 45:14 distributed 51:14 **distribution** 59:16 60:6 62:35 **distrustful** 79:18,22 dive 17:38

divergence 6:28 diverse 8:21 **divide** 17:3 division 2:5,35,45 3:21 3:22,25,27,29,33,38 3:40,42,44,46 17:22 69:8 77:21 83:22 99:41 108:20 109:4 **DNER** 2:4 dock 107:40,42 docket 60:13,18 document 4:24 9:36 15:26 17:30,31,37 18:42 19:2 26:22 27:42 33:28,47 36:38 36:40 57:13 68:21 78:18 83:25 96:40 101:32 103:15 104:36 documentation 37:24 74:18 100:3 documented 53:4 113:16 documenting 80:31 documents 72:11,11 74:23.31 75:26 80:47 113:20 114:24.27 dogfish 11:37 12:1,13 27:31,36,42,43 doggone 92:36 doing 14:19 15:18 16:32 22:5 28:45 30:6 39:12 40:46 44:28,32 45:6 47:12,14,18 48:36 49:28 61:45 65:7.44 66:24 82:9 88:2,18 97:23,28,47 105:37 108:24 118:30 123:16,30 dolphin 28:45 81:23,32 81:33 82:42 dolphins 13:17 domestic 17:45 65:39 82:38 100:4 114:6 domestically 15:21 26:25 77:13,37 82:40 86:13 87:7 Donaldson 9:14 doors 88:32 **Doremus** 123:34 dots 104:30 dotted 95:14 double 83:7 downstream 104:23 **DPS** 61:30,31,32,32,45 62:1,9 **DPSs** 62:31 draft 15:26 21:17 76:9

78:10,21 94:2

drafting 78:15 draw 72:25 drawn 19:28 dressed 10:46 **drifted** 111:5 driven 31:43 89:9 dropoff 11:5 dropping 27:19 drops 10:22 120:19 Drymon 1:38 26:5 28:4 28:6 **DuBeck** 3:32 9:16,18 9:21,22 19:37 21:12 23:48 24:3,27,39,48 27:41 36:36 ducks 92:8 due 10:23 13:41 14:12 59:34 72:21 87:23 89.32 **Duffin** 28:24 **Duke** 1:40 **Duly** 82:48 **DUNPHY-DALY** 1:40 **duskies** 30:43 dusky 13:35 31:4 43:43 48:2 49:17 88:10 100:42 dynamic 65:38 66:3 70:46 71:18 72:14 dynamics 49:33 95:48 F

e-dealer 99:43

Eagle 36:13 earlier 12:46 20:48 37:8 37:18 49:9 53:25,45 72:6 94:10 110:1 111:36 122:19 123:43 early 20:39 26:21 78:20 124:11 easier 85:25 95:2 101:19 easily 44:34 59:13 east 29:43 32:39 eastern 98:27 eaten 28:44 echo 8:34 88:3 110:46 echoed 88:7 echoing 37:7 ecological 71:39 economic 32:43 64:7 74:17 95:48 101:48 120:41 121:32,33 123:29 economically 32:43 economics 89:16 economy 32:37,37,44 119:32

ecosystems 69:35 **EDF** 110:24 **EDT** 1:26 educate 15:15 45:11 **educating** 45:7 51:16 **education** 26:41 40:43 40:48 41:18 44:26 educational 12:31 23:26,39 44:29,41 46:1 48:20 51:8 **EEZ** 58:8 **EFCs** 83:46 effect 11:23 24:23,25 24:33 25:16,24 108:5 123:10 effective 45:12 70:3 101:19 effectively 54:33 69:28 effectiveness 96:4 effects 52:20 55:39 efficiencies 43:12 96:36,39 **efficiency** 97:9 99:2 100:12 efficient 39:36 effort 8:31 11:35 32:33 33:27,46 37:19 39:12 44:28 45:16 48:30 51:5 65:48 66:4,5 72:40 95:9 96:33,42 99:9,28,46 efforts 11:30 14:3 15:4 17:16,42,45 23:26,39 28:27 39:15 51:44 67:30,31 108:41 110:32 112:47 114:5 **EFH** 69:35 **EIAs** 74:27 eight 23:8 24:30 **EISs** 74:27 either 8:11,43 25:28 38:7 56:1,8 57:27,30 60:31 68:6 78:2 95:27 96:2 103:16 116:5,48 124:2 elaborate 88:4 105:21 electing 100:23 electronic 4:26,26 5:46 68:33,33 94:24,33 95:11,22,23,24 96:11 96:27 97:2,15,32,40 98:22,42 99:8,31,40 99:44 100:2,27,38 101:1 102:6,40 103:32,48 105:31 113:17 **element's** 103:16

elements 99:14 100:14 105:3,10,15,25,34,45 122:30,30 eliminate 31:7 eliminated 30:28 **EM** 101:16 106:8,8,9,17 106:22 107:12 108:30 110:37 email 7:43,44 9:2 61:7 113:24 emergency 111:29 emergent 70:32,37 **emphasis** 26:47 73:13 **emphasize** 26:19 33:22 73:17 111:11 emphasizing 105:1 empowered 8:43 **EMs** 106:19,20,21 108:2 encompass 71:36 encompasses 85:42 **encourage** 5:32 8:35 17:33 38:11 54:47 55:4 60:26 61:1 94:1 95:33 encouragement 111:31 encouraging 28:42 44:15 encroachment 108:22 endangered 4:21,21 5:28 55:35,40,48 56:1 57:20,28,31,38,40,43 58:2,10,15,39 59:38 60:32 122:18,20,33 123:9.17 endeavor 48:22 ended 91:47 endorsed 104:34 endorsement 11:29 12:31 23:40 42:10 52:18 106:5 endorsing 110:16 energy 97:5 enforcement 40:41 45:10 47:20 106:14 123:41 engage 6:31 47:22 100:16 102:40 engagement 13:46 engaging 99:18 engine 21:28 engines 21:27 **England** 1:35 67:17 82:26 enjoyed 69:4 **ensure** 19:31 28:43 57:14 58:36 69:17

99:13 100:21 105:33 ensures 73:4 **Ensuring** 100:12 entail 87:11 Enterprise 81:2 entire 26:22 32:44 51:46 108:18 118:46 120:14 entirely 84:38 123:12 entirety 122:40 entities 78:16 environment 1:41 52:38,40 74:29 environmental 2:15 3:14 9:10 89:14 94:3 108:38 envision 93:6 epipelagic 81:26 equally 98:30 equation 48:6 equity 108:43 era 122:21 error 100:6 **ESA** 55:37 58:34 60:33 113:35,43,44 122:23 especially 14:33 42:37 51:29 52:31 96:44 103:4 106:8 **Espinoza** 1:42 46:25,28 46:37,40 48:31 50:16 50:31.37 essential 60:43 74:16 104:17 **essentially** 66:39 75:35 95:40.41 96:21 97:36 122:48 establish 73:28 established 11:10 42:43 70:32,33 73:32 102:43 establishes 75:1 establishing 15:36 estimate 97:39 et 38:1 82:27 96:19 eTrips 99:5 105:39 **EU** 113:30 evaluate 56:33 57:11 72:28 evaluating 71:13,27 evaluation 56:26 69:32 70:10 71:5 **EVAN** 2:16 **event** 14:2 events 8:3 15:24 21:25 eventually 103:35 everybody 6:14 8:23,38 34:6 36:32 39:1 54:47

116:11 118:12,17 124:10 everybody's 83:44 87:42 124:7 evidence 59:27 evidently 53:28 **evolve** 96:45,46 102:2 evolving 70:38 **eVTR** 103:19 **ex-vessel** 10:16 **exact** 108:10 exactly 40:16 50:20 69:43 70:2 93:11 example 30:14 33:19 39:28 46:46,47 48:46 50:23 51:8 58:46 74:27 79:11 80:28.36 80:38 86:16,48 94:16 97:30,36 100:29 102:8 104:19 examples 72:37 77:27 86:34 100:34 exceeded 11:15 excellent 112:42 exception 59:26 excited 50:27 exciting 39:3 excluding 121:11 **excuse** 14:23 24:13 executive 108:3 exist 42:38 61:27 62:7 62:13 122:35 **existed** 114:28 **existence** 58:39 59:3 **existing** 40:8,33 **exists** 62:48 **expand** 100:9 106:9,20 107:11,12 expanding 25:17 103:32,36 105:31 **expect** 45:16 87:13 expectation 74:20 expectations 71:11 expecting 45:46 expended 99:28 expensive 13:26 **experience** 83:48 85:14 87:5 experienced 22:28 83:31 87:14 experiences 101:28 experiencing 13:26 84:17 expertise 82:6 experts 80:21 explaining 26:43

107:20 109:33 116:7

explanation 104:16 **explore** 17:14 96:2 exploring 96:48 exponentially 101:18 export 58:6 exporter 32:17 expressed 53:26 114:16 expressions 54:2 extend 50:2 extending 117:11 extension 63:27 extensive 17:30 41:17 extent 13:9,48 17:46 56:14 70:15 72:16,45 external 76:34 77:34 80:16,17,34,35,45 81:4,5,10 86:10,29,38 86:42 87:26,29 96:13 externally 100:18 extinct 30:15 **extinction** 57:11,40,47 60:36 61:42 62:44 extra 8:30,31 65:6 **extremely** 30:16 50:6 eye 36:13 78:3

F/V 2:30.42 face 34:34 37:22 Facebook 29:4 facilitating 1:26 fact 16:22 21:4 26:34 27:25 36:31 52:26 54:14 65:22 66:39 81:13 90:36 92:40 94:16 97:39 112:23 113:1,38 119:16 factor 17:15 18:29 factors 9:30 14:5,6,23 14:24,27,30 16:14,48 17:2,20 18:40 34:38 62:28 facts 32:47 37:23 53:30 61:24,25 112:43 factual 70:24 failure 27:21 failures 26:24 27:3,4 faint 19:13 fair 116:7 fairly 51:36 115:33 fairness 62:5 fall 43:9 45:17 62:47,47 78:19,41 92:36 98:17 **falls** 110:10 familiar 19:47 83:43 95:26 117:28,39 **families** 120:35

explains 12:23 54:29

69:1 75:21 89:5 94:1

70:12 74:32 75:42

	1	1	,
family 118:32,32 119:3	finally 28:11,48 29:23	108:5 109:6 111:21	focus 5:18,34,38 9:27
far 22:6 30:25 36:45	29:27 70:8 71:1 72:42	113:6 114:10,41	18:32 26:17 27:44
62:41 87:6 101:16,31	73:1 74:7 76:4	122:6 123:29,35	48:19,39 76:31 80:48
107:9 108:2,29,43	find 7:4 17:18 22:32,45	fisherman 34:37,42	95:34
114:15	37:13 57:23,27 59:13	118:23	focused 5:15,41 40:46
farm 80:37 103:36	62:9,31 77:2 92:24	fishermen 10:23 11:24	43:22 51:36 64:9
fashion 72:10	93:11 95:2 96:21	11:26,36 13:18,26	65:13,29 73:14
faster 11:20 109:25	109:10 112:7	14:10,19,25,35 15:21	115:33
fathom 121:10	finding 4:19 33:18	15:22 16:48 19:47	focuses 9:43
fear 103:3 114:18	55:42,45 56:16,38,39	22:22 24:12 25:19,30	focusing 11:26 30:36
features 77:22	56:46 57:6,19,24,29	26:29 27:14 28:36	33:11 51:41 75:29
February 84:3,10 119:4	59:5,10,44 60:1,16	29:42 34:20 41:18	fold 6:42 89:30 110:14
fecundity 59:20	63:11,19 64:13,21	44:36 45:33 46:11	124:3
fed 52:44	65:5 74:34 109:10	53:20 65:22 81:25,30	folding 110:17
federal 10:8 12:41	findings 66:44	82:46 99:4,9 105:40	folds 71:38
19:26,32 20:1 21:42	fine 47:1 50:23,24	110:41 111:2,28	folks 6:45 7:32 9:11
22:4 35:10,24,27,30	85:10	113:41 117:13	15:40,41 21:27 26:5,7
35:39,42 36:6 54:36	finished 25:5	Fishermen's 112:33	28:42 33:6 34:5 35:20
58:36 73:33 77:7	fins 59:35	fishers 25:37	36:46 38:22 43:6,27
federally 32:2	first 9:47 10:1,5,24	fishing 2:29,33 3:12	45:7 46:24 47:23
feed 118:32 120:34	14:41 15:48 23:18	11:30 13:25 14:11	48:10,33 51:13,16,36
feedback 5:14 17:35	24:3 28:22 39:38	15:4 18:9 22:47 23:45	68:3,4 78:42 82:1,9
37:38 45:45 87:42	40:20 41:22,27,43,44	25:18 26:29 34:20,24	84:46 94:30 95:33
115:41	43:21 44:43 47:28	35:12,31,41 39:19	97:32 100:16 101:40
feeding 31:16	78:25 80:10 91:1	42:23,42 44:4 45:34	103:45 104:11,17,24
feel 8:42,42 9:2 68:9	102:33 108:40 118:11	49:28 50:11 65:41,46	104:29 110:14,25
71:24 78:32 87:39 102:19	121:1	65:48 66:4,5,12 67:25	112:3,13 113:19 116:40 120:10 123:23
feeling 14:35	fish 2:7 3:23 11:25 13:4 13:23,24,38 22:27,28	69:36 74:16 79:29,44 90:13,21 91:46 92:1,9	follow 35:30 45:39
feels 8:29	28:26,44 30:17,41	98:12 99:36 107:44	105:47
feet 40:39 93:3	34:21 35:25,36,40,45	113:4,11 114:1,41	follow-on 15:35
felt 45:34 90:7,8	45:2 66:6,11 74:16	118:26,28,28,29	follow-up 86:26 87:26
FERRER 2:4	81:24,32,33,40 82:42	119:9 123:4	109:35
feta 69:3	89:11 90:34,35	Fishpath 87:18	followed 9:26 91:10
fight 103:22 104:19	106:11,46 107:7,22	five 13:31 34:4 47:18	following 41:47 68:34
Fighting 29:5	107:23,23 113:17	50:35 65:28,30,33	footage 107:13
figure 10:26 11:8,45	114:40,42 115:45	67:11 89:43 94:21	footed 122:34
32:12 46:35 62:14	116:2,12 118:41	95:21 96:23,43	footprint 103:47
86:28 100:26 101:26	119:10,17 120:5,12	116:20,23,28 120:48	footprints 103:41
119:16	120:15,16,26,27,32	121:23	for-hire 67:16 99:8
figured 95:15	120:32 123:1,3,39	five-year 26:17	103:42
figures 10:44,48	fished 65:25	fix 84:18	force 16:18 45:17 52:44
filed 52:48	fisheries 1:10,31 2:5,18	fleet 67:16 91:38 120:7	67:29,30
files 56:29,35 65:8,15	2:36,39,46 3:31 5:20	120:14	FORDHAM 2:6 15:46
fill 77:38	9:40 11:25 13:23,30	fleets 110:34	86:5
fin 14:8,17,31 17:7	13:33 14:7,12,22	fleshed 98:34	forefront 37:26
27:24 31:7	15:11 16:23,28 24:41	flexibility 75:46 76:14	foreign 50:44 58:13
final 4:17 5:25 15:29	25:14 30:43 32:9,11	81:15 91:9 92:47 93:6	foreseeable 57:44,48
21:17,18 31:46 39:3 39:10 41:22,46 42:25	34:19 36:2 50:24,29	117:3,17	62:37,42,45
42:29 43:35 57:34	52:42,46 55:7,26 58:48 59:33 64:5	flies 37:22 flip 78:25 99:23	forest 62:25 forever 49:17 50:25
63:14,15,23 94:12,14	67:46 69:16,47 70:4	floor 89:34	form 72:9 99:20
95:14 109:47,48	70:14 74:48 75:5,44	Florida 2:7 19:41 22:40	formal 5:10
111:41	76:3,4,7,8,10,18	22:42 29:37 30:9,46	formally 73:32
finalize 70:11	77:20,34 80:46 86:48	42:3,13,31 50:11	forming 51:1
finalized 40:15 75:5	87:1 97:3,42 98:5,6,9	79:13,30	formula 119:34
116:20	100:45 101:41,43	flow 59:40	formulated 79:21
finalizing 78:21	102:1 103:41,48	fly 2:29 118:40 121:17	formulation 88:42
			l
•			

forth 41:2 66:22 112:20 grow 101:18 funds 28:11 96:19 74:40 80:10 91:36 fortunate 118:34 further 18:22 48:43 95:15 113:44 growing 45:36 59:18 **forum** 112:40 56:44 57:25 65:2 gives 25:18 59:20 guess 23:28 24:21 35:8 **forums** 115:41 85:46 116:10 120:2 giving 34:46 69:5 83:16 62:2,30 66:47 78:24 forward 5:48 8:19 9:37 future 13:12 22:1 57:44 87:12 92:36 117:46 82:34 85:7 86:18 17:35 21:47 26:14 57:48 61:26 62:37,42 glad 6:38 8:15 20:6 88:25,42 89:22 28:13 29:14,22 77:41 62:45 72:22,28 87:20 32:31 113:22 102:26 109:13 110:35 85:33 91:22 96:16,43 92:4,38 111:18 Glenn 112:26,30,32 guidance 69:42,45 70:1 **FWC** 29:35 97:37 100:8,34 103:1 **Glenn's** 123:6 70:2,19 72:11 73:25 109:8,12,26 110:17 73:37 74:7,8 75:3,27 **global** 59:15,25,30 G 111:18 113:28 123:48 62:32 guideline 72:15 124:8 gain 83:40 86:18 Gloucester 114:30 guidelines 69:47 71:2 Foss 2:7 22:41 119:30,31 71:16 73:3 74:39,43 gains 101:16 foster 51:28 gallery 92:8 gluttony 120:28 74:46 75:36 77:26 fostering 45:4 51:4 goal 48:23 60:33 67:25 78:28 83:24 87:13 game 123:48 found 29:47 56:46 gulf 1:47 10:31,41 11:7 gap 77:39 96:18 116:11 59:37 60:15 61:21 gaps 71:6 goals 32:34 44:3 51:1 13:18,22,36 14:34 65:13 81:13 92:25 **GARFO** 98:6 99:7 67:39 95:46 20:13,19,21 28:14,38 **gather** 64:13 gold 10:45 105:9 28:39 42:2,18 47:34 foundation 2:28 79:27 golden 85:7,13 90:40 47:35,37 48:47 49:5 gear 13:25 21:26 22:47 88:6 102:44 25:27 101:2 108:32 Golet 1:46 32:21 33:5,8 49:11,13,14,31,38 four 9:27,33 36:22,46 108:46.47 116:37.39 45:24 50:2,2,7 52:39,41 47:17 51:34 70:1 116:45 117:38 Gotcha 63:35 54:45 82:16,26 98:7 118:42 121:31,33,37 government 41:19 47:9 **gears** 23:5 41:1 101:5 Н four-page 81:35 110:6 117:25 47:13.21 frame 22:11 **GRA-** 109:46 **general** 17:16 35:11 habitat 58:42 60:7 framework 4:24 39:35 39:21,28 40:26 41:28 grab 5:35 7:13 38:7 74:16 122:39 41:33 68:21,31 69:8 41:35 42:1,8 50:20,28 81:19 half 6:2 23:9 92:28 75:6,10,23,34,38,40 65:47 66:19 70:41 graduate 48:25 hammerhead 41:9 75:42,45 76:9,17,22 75:44 78:48 79:1.10 grant 1:39 28:23 45:9 43:41.41 44:9 47:43 76:30,36,44 77:11 79:31 90:20 91:33 46:3 47:20 48:20 47:45 78:4 96:32 98:36,44 78:9,9,11,22,29 80:31 51:10 hammerheads 49:1,11 83:23 84:34 87:31 generally 7:27 16:1 granted 51:22 49:38 100:43 frankly 93:1 17:14 41:23 53:34 **grants** 60:40 hand 7:2,6 9:14,15 free 8:42 9:2 68:9 71:24 70:36 77:4 graph 54:20,23 10:43 15:41 23:12,13 78:32 102:20 Generation 81:1 **graphs** 16:34 38:36 45:24 55:6,10 Friday 5:6 85:38,44,47 generic 83:5 **GRAVES** 2:2 61:13 68:28,47 78:44 120:5 123:46 generous 81:22 gray 55:29 94:46 87:48 90:31,32 93:26 Fridays 118:44 119:11 greater 11:23 24:23,25 94:23,31,36 97:47,47 genetically 23:4 friend 89:45 91:47 genetics 28:46 24:33 67:17,17,23,23 102:32 106:6 111:35 92:21 121:16,18 geographical 51:28 70:20 100:47 112:6,26 114:4 front 103:37 greatest 65:19 GEORGE 2:37 115:16,24 116:15 frustrating 8:25 Georgia 31:3 50:11 greatly 119:22 121:43 handled 84:43 frustration 108:17 getting 12:30 17:35 green 11:48 12:2,18 full 5:5,12 7:14 9:10 71:21 hands 7:27 9:7 33:7 20:11 22:20 49:6,7 10:1 13:48 33:28,29 Greg 2:14 50:39,39 52:29 58:47 66:23 61:16 64:36 89:27 33:47 37:4 45:17 79:36 86:29 88:13 **GREGORY** 2:45 **handy** 6:41 hang 80:48 86:30 88:33 90:10 94:30 112:11 120:22 ground 6:15,18 25:47 106:16 **GETTO** 1:44 109:10 **hanging** 124:10 fullest 31:6 gillnet 29:41,42 groundfish 13:32 **HANKE** 2:9 45:28 fully 61:20 74:38 98:34 **happen** 46:17 79:30 give 9:31 16:28 18:36 grounds 120:8,14 102:15 105:41 29:24 33:29 36:45 group 7:15 10:14 29:4 101:8 120:6 fumes 27:18 37:4 48:28,34 62:29 39:7 53:23 62:21 69:6 happened 7:12 25:25 **Fund** 3:14 67:46 80:41 81:6 70:20 80:35 83:37 25:35 114:27 funded 28:39 29:1 105:6 106:38,43 happening 7:24 18:34 87:23 92:30 106:23 58:37 107:7 111:30 114:14 110:10 118:35 20:44 21:8 26:18 funding 21:43 22:4 96:8 115:43 116:7 groups 10:39 17:8 29:23,27 46:36 53:3 96:9,13 given 32:17 51:47 48:12 96:12 105:5,6 85:14 86:14 119:48

happens 57:36 79:11 79:18 92:5 happy 29:23 45:29 harass 58:18 harbor 115:48 hard 6:21 12:36 62:12 92:29 107:32 118:16 118:33 harm 58:18 harpoon 98:45 120:36 120:38 **HARRIS** 2:11 Harrison 32:18 harshest 92:1 harvest 2:11 12:3,23,35 20:11 44:4,38 54:11 107:10 119:10 harvested 11:7,37,42 11:44,46 12:6 20:12 20:21 41:16 44:11 47:30 harvesting 107:23 harvests 31:41 **hash** 15:19 haul 107:27 Hawaii's 52:42 head 30:5 79:32 117:27 headboats 31:2 heading 5:43 92:7,34 114:18 headwinds 121:9 health 104:27 healthier 122:37 healthy 20:23 30:16 54:17 119:45 hear 5:40,46 6:7,20,21 6:26 8:18,32,39 19:12 19:17,20,34 20:32 24:17 29:33 31:2 33:12 35:4 38:43 46:26,28,31 50:40 63:34,39 66:27 68:32 78:41 79:26 83:11 89:38 108:12.17 112:29 115:9,12 118:3 heard 7:31 8:19 42:24 43:32 45:33 49:31,32 53:5 59:4 85:20 91:42 91:43 107:9 114:32 hearing 6:24 20:38 30:48 37:42 45:45 48:41 63:33 85:2 86:2 87:44 100:19 110:11 110:12 114:21 115:1 115:3,4,10 119:10,47 **hearings** 102:17 hearts 114:17

heated 95:3 **Hinks** 2:14 50:39,40,42 Heather 7:13 **heavily** 31:10 **HIPSLEY** 2:16 **heavy** 73:13 heck 121:23 held 113:41 Hell 84:24 hell's 107:45 Hello 35:2 46:28,37 **help** 14:20 21:1 22:5,13 34:29 39:13 44:37 48:21 49:48 51:7,41 56:33 60:25 89:46 94:9 96:17 97:37 99:13 100:27,38 101:2,23,28,43 104:21,27,40 117:45 120:1 helpful 5:13,16 6:26 7:20 16:15 19:7,16 53:40 56:2 62:17,18 104:3,32,37 112:24 117:21,43 helping 9:1 11:19 14:3 23:40 48:29 85:29 helps 6:29 8:40 57:1 78:47 79:47 103:47 **HEMILRIGHT** 2:12 24:17,20,34,40 25:4 63:38,41 64:11,39 65:18 83:10.13.29 84:30 85:12 116:17 116:32 117:32,36 hey 7:6 84:28 86:1 92:16 103:18 117:32 **hi** 23:16 35:3 50:40 51:4 61:18 68:48 104:43 115:14 high 33:20 36:25,26 58:8 59:19 61:28 62:6 87:34 90:29 high-84:34 high-quality 69:27 high-value 59:35 higher 11:25 12:23 14:12 19:44 40:28,31 42:26,43 87:32 highest 12:13,25 113:2 highlight 44:41 97:20 98:36 highlighted 21:39 59:42 60:14 highly 1:12 3:22,24,26 3:28,32,37,39,41,43 3:45 59:17 62:19 72:33 95:33,34 98:12

historical 9:45 60:5 62:35 72:31,32,37 historically 98:18 101:14 history 26:20,21,23,24 27:37 37:45 57:10 72:35 hit 95:17 102:36 124:1 **HMS** 3:36 4:23 7:11 12:44 14:30 22:3 27:45,47 29:1 35:20 35:29,34 39:21,22 42:8 67:45 68:20,30 69:13 74:6 76:12,15 76:17,22,27 77:11,21 77:28,31 78:9,11 80:10,46 81:11,25,25 81:45,46 82:8,25,32 82:44 83:22,22,44,47 91:20,32 95:32 96:16 96:47 98:4,35,43 99:4 99:10,13,30,41,43 100:14 101:2.10 102:19 104:15 105:45 108:5 113:26 115:5 116:42,47 123:29,47 hold 14:14 33:46 40:12 holders 10:12 14:14 44:33 54:38 95:38 97:28 103:5 hole 25:29 92:24,27 holes 108:8 **Honolulu** 118:10 hook 65:20,45 109:47 hooked 103:21 118:27 hooks 25:32 65:23 hope 5:11 19:5 26:22 29:32 34:9 52:47 54:43 69:1 87:24 91:18 93:6,10 114:33 117:19 hopefully 20:13 21:45 43:5 47:15 65:24 78:18 80:21 93:8 95:16 110:47 111:18 112:45 122:48 hoping 19:27 30:37 48:20 68:38 78:12 **Horizon** 123:39 hotel 119:28 hour 6:2 23:9 68:24 **hours** 107:27 house 98:39,40 **Houston** 121:17 hovering 112:8

51:20,32

HQ 3:23 **HUDSON** 2:17 29:32,34 30:40 **Hueter** 2:19 23:15 24:16 26:4,9 52:35,37 53:14 huge 32:1 37:24 103:1 **humble** 52:45 **Humphrey** 2:21 106:2 hunt 58:18 **hurdles** 34:34 hurt 27:27 120:36 hurtling 27:17 husband 69:3 119:3 Hutt 29:2 hypothetical 83:30

i's 95:14 **IBQ** 92:45 121:29,39 **ICCAT** 14:9 16:37,43 17:48 18:1 24:41 25:1 25:7,12,43 37:20,30 54:29 62:9 65:22 66:34,44 67:14,23,24 67:43 76:33,44 80:30 81:27,43 83:38 84:1 85:30 86:18,21 89:22 100:2 110:36,40,46 112:35,39 113:3,3,11 113:27 114:3,5 122:45 123:11 **ID** 26:44 44:31 46:1 idea 20:20 62:21 70:20 80:43 105:13.21 109:46 110:7 115:42 ideal 86:20 ideally 86:16 91:35 ideas 90:17,23 93:36,38 93:46 109:37 110:3 110:16 identification 12:38,44 13:5 23:26 39:14 40:47 41:19 44:31,44 identified 12:36 113:30 identifies 44:35 identify 10:3 13:3 51:15 69:38 identifying 71:6 **IFQ** 34:42 ignorant 66:38 ignored 91:15 II 2:42 16:26 **IIE** 102:8 illegal 58:4 illegally 58:11 illusion 36:30 image 60:19

105:32,34 108:37

highs 36:23

imagine 87:27 initiated 39:17 108:46 116:21 40:45 46:48 74:9 immediate 34:36 76:43 77:9 81:11 **initiative** 5:40 46:1 **interim** 72:26 **immense** 95:37 90:36 105:35 109:20,21 internal 80:24 internally 100:18 **impact** 94:3 120:41 includes 52:16 57:9 initiatives 93:41 109:44 impacted 32:36 54:12 58:17 70:31 71:28 110:47 international 2:6 14:9 impacts 14:32 69:33 77:18 **inland** 36:16 14:15,36 16:13 17:3 71:37 104:2 106:4 including 17:2 60:8 innovative 102:5 17:42 18:12 54:17 input 8:17,36 51:11 **impart** 53:29 69:32 77:19 78:28 65:21 66:33,41 67:35 impartial 56:23 65:10 113:29 122:41 60:42 70:24 90:43 67:43,44,46 78:16 imparting 53:38 inclusion 80:19 91:21 102:39,48 100:2 101:27,30,39 **impediment** 37:20,27 inclusive 96:47 100:14 103:31 124:6 123:10,20 inclusiveness 71:33 65:19 **inputs** 114:31 internationally 14:19 implement 76:26 98:31 88:33 insane 32:16 15:21 18:8 86:24 implementation 5:47 incomplete 67:2 inside 22:18 114:40 incorporated 109:40 interpolating 79:45 94:24,33 95:12 97:13 insight 108:16 intersessional 16:38 97:15 **increase** 13:14,43 **instance** 54:5 84:2 implemented 12:22 36:26 43:11 44:45 90:20 92:22 117:8 interstate 58:13 67:14 52:28 75:11 84:25 **Institute** 1:48 2:2 interview 28:29 implementing 25:32 instituted 98:43 interviewers 12:39 106:43,44 107:1,5,9 60:38,45 81:1 increased 11:35 13:42 **insult** 51:48 introduction 69:6 implications 33:15 13:46 39:18 52:7,25 **integrate** 6:23 17:2 introductory 81:36 import 58:6 54:11 invite 15:40 36:48 68:5 18:43 importance 73:18 increases 52:9 59:28 integrated 69:11 75:30 89:31 123:25 110:19 increasing 11:17 15:6 98:16 inviting 60:48 **important** 20:10,17,26 23:38 40:4,9,26,33 integration 17:20 involve 15:9 23:45 37:13 49:44 121:8 intend 109:26 involved 22:9 31:10 70:44 71:8 72:32 73:2 incredibly 23:45 intended 11:23 24:24 55:39 73:19 95:27 75:17 81:24 82:46 incur 95:38 24:26,33 69:17,38 99:42 118:18 122:44 86:10 104:25 110:38 index 105:7 74:10 75:10,15 involvement 18:1 60:42 111:7,23,33 113:19 indicate 72:39 112:20 115:34 73:25 involves 82:38 123:31 indicated 59:24 intent 87:9 96:5 106:19 importantly 113:10 indicating 56:42 59:9 intention 16:24 involving 71:18 impossible 32:15 123:2 64:28 intentionally 74:43 **island** 52:38 impression 26:33 indication 23:25 intentions 27:26 **Islands** 43:24 **improve** 10:4 15:13 indices 104:21 interacted 100:44 issue 14:1 20:11 22:11 43:4 44:13 indirect 14:32 **interacting** 24:13 123:3 22:22 26:28 27:26 improved 12:38 13:43 individual 38:26 56:9 interaction 25:27 29:46 29:37 31:26,36 35:23 84:48 99:15 improvement 71:19 82:29 37:26 63:22,22 66:31 81:3 individuals 99:12 interactions 29:19 79:12 93:31 107:15 improvements 21:5 industry 10:2 16:11 106:41 issued 108:3 113:7 19:2,4 31:31 51:44 improving 22:30 interagency 60:39 issues 7:42 8:24 20:22 Interamericana 48:35 102:40 52:1 65:42,43 90:7 31:44 44:42 50:45 **in-person** 122:10 91:14 92:42,46 93:7 intercepts 84:4 68:37 72:17 84:21 in-shore 36:16 102:48 103:8 106:21 interest 73:21,46 77:43 85:3 89:7 100:25 inability 31:47 106:39 107:17 118:19 81:27,28 101:42 104:28,46 111:23,32 inaccurate 13:4 120:42 121:9 **interested** 16:9 50:43 123:27 inbox 48:16 influence 104:22 **issuing** 58:29 71:21 76:47 77:15 incentive 43:6 influences 71:46 78:31 81:7 95:27 item 35:16 105:23,24 inches 12:43 19:39 info 91:30 112:1 lwicki 2:23 115:27,36 incidental 10:27 14:44 inform 22:10 72:40 interesting 82:19 102:29 74:21,30 94:9 101:28 35:13,28 59:33 106:11 104:27 interests 82:20 **J** 65:20 incidentally 44:20 46:9 **informed** 117:14 interface 81:45 January 59:7 63:21 include 16:8 22:28 informing 72:34 interference 10:20 84:2,10 informs 71:4 16:21 19:33 24:29,29 70:23,26 71:5 74:12 **Japan** 91:35 inherent 81:15 75:45,48 76:45 77:11 46:9,10 53:37 79:38 Japanese 105:8 77:47 80:44 inherently 79:22 88:27 89:2 92:6 Jason 1:30 15:45 19:9 included 17:37 23:35 initial 13:9 106:12,22 107:36 20:3,4,30 30:11

lately 30:3 **Jeff** 2:30 34:2 35:1,3,5 120:31 light 11:48 23:36 101:2 keeping 18:20 78:3 35:47 36:7,37 54:34 laughed 121:21 lighter 65:23 68:36 88:10 89:31,35 109:28 **Laura** 102:24 **limit** 15:7 24:30 27:12 89:37,39 91:4 92:13 **KELLY** 3:30 law 40:41 45:10 122:21 27:12 32:19 39:5,26 92:16 93:15,29 kept 12:17 24:36 98:16 123:41 39:44 40:5,8,27,29,33 109:36 110:3,11 115:46 lay 61:25 96:41 41:14,38,44 42:3,4,12 114:15 115:26,30 **KERSTETTER** 2:26 lead 33:2 39:2 56:22 42:14,26,32,41 43:14 116:16 120:46,48 **key** 44:42 67:37 43:16,18,25,29,36 leader 16:19 65:20 46:16 47:29,34 52:25 121:43 kill 58:18 **Jen** 68:29,47,47 78:39 Kirby 2:38 15:45 17:24 **leaders** 65:46 52:29 86:19 94:12 78:42 82:11 84:29 19:9,10,16,38 23:12 leadership 74:48 109:48 112:13 87:25 89:30 104:44 knowledge 22:6 70:34 123:34 limitations 72:21 JENKINS 2:24 70:38 71:39 73:20 leading 16:34 100:32 leads 32:32 64:11 Jennifer 3:26 80:7 86:6 known 5:22 12:45 limited 10:8,25 40:38 28:25 71:42 43:37 46:19 48:8 50:6 jeopardize 58:38 lean 89:14 jeopardizing 42:44 59:2 knows 97:47 122:44 learn 16:9 28:31 116:45 70:23 88:5 97:5 **Jersey** 2:14 3:11 116:4 KnowSharksBetter learned 96:24 114:8 limits 14:48 15:5 19:42 122:1 15:19 leave 27:30 28:1 61:10 19:43,44 32:39 34:22 jives 85:3 Kristin 2:7 22:41 93:12 107:42 34:35 39:30,32,33,40 **job** 26:16 28:25 92:28 39:43 40:1,2,21,25 **leaves** 43:3 104:6 121:20 leaving 40:3,7 107:43 41:2,4,13,33,37,39,43 John 2:2 23:35 led 10:22 12:42 16:23 42:7,36,40,47 45:3 Laboratory 2:20 **Johnny** 114:47 lack 13:47 14:1 40:39 16:41,45 32:26 34:36 52:7 86:18 **Johnson** 114:47,48 40:40 54:5 66:32 left 11:43 25:18 43:35 Lindgren-Pitman 2:31 115:1,3 117:35 118:1 line 10:45 30:18 72:25 73:21 82:5 103:39 44:10 51:34 56:38 118:3.6 120:43 lacking 51:22 75:37 92:43 93:8.12 103:25 112:27 114:48 ioined 95:7 laid 93:3 97:47 115:25 120:45 116:9 121:48 joining 6:10 land 35:26 44:17,18 left-hand 10:27,39 12:5 lines 32:16 38:27 52:28 iot 6:42 landed 12:43 37:33 100:17 111:45 117:10 12:6 journal 80:22 86:48 44:20 **leftover** 45:25 61:14 121:47 87:1 landing 6:27 10:19 87:47 100:5 111:35 link 71:23 110:23 **JR** 3:41 14:16 19:45 24:13,13 legislative 74:41 linked 59:11 27:36 30:13 98:43 jump 9:15 18:24 20:8 lemon 30:2,12,14,23 list 4:19 5:27 7:48 8:1 9:6 14:41 21:37 22:2 20:29 21:35 33:5 landings 10:13,16,21 78:5 35:19.21 36:8 38:35 10:37,41,45,46 11:4,8 **lemons** 30:3 22:37 27:8 46:10 47:6 length 117:3 47:26 49:47 50:32 11:31,40 12:19 14:33 48:9,11 53:2,8,10,10 55:9 56:8,13 57:30,35 51:35 52:13 53:44 14:34 24:31 27:19,32 **let's** 9:13,15 15:40,44 17:23,47 19:8 20:2,30 65:33 78:45 80:5 27:48 29:39 30:26 81:28,41,41 107:32 82:11 86:4 87:48 37:25 40:40 43:5,9 23:10,13 24:15 25:48 107:34 112:8 89:28 104:41 110:28 44:14 50:14,24 54:21 26:4 28:3 29:30 31:19 listed 16:10,30 32:36 114:47 116:48 54:28,36,38,39 83:37 32:20 33:24 34:1,48 32:47 43:39 53:12 57:37,38 58:1,22,47 jumping 80:6 38:2,4,35 42:20 45:22 84:14,25 97:24,25 June 45:12 60:23 98:48 45:26 46:23,24,27 60:31,32,33,34,38,46 iurisdiction 58:5 71:20 77:9 86:35 language 51:27 71:2 50:38 51:38 52:40.43 juvenile 90:27 61:10,16 63:36 65:29 listen 6:21,22 22:39,42 75:26 66:26 68:12 79:43,44 listening 6:39 15:37 large 5:8 10:40 11:3 K 12:48 13:37 14:34,46 83:9 84:28 89:36 82:23 103:8 Karnauskas 28:34 26:27 30:24 35:26,36 93:24 94:20,21 listing 16:20,25 53:42 Karyl 3:23 18:25 19:6 36:5 54:24,32,35,37 **letting** 112:10 120:38 55:36,38,40,48 56:18 level 17:48 32:14 84:35 23:7 28:46 29:34 82:3 56:42,48 57:3,19,23 85:41,43 largely 26:42 27:1 87:5 87:32,34 88:40 100:2 57:27 58:34 59:9,37 82:35,37 89:20 Katie 3:14 23:14,15 111:14 101:27 62:1 64:9,34 66:42 levels 31:41 32:5,10 113:35,43,46 122:23 110:15 **LARRY** 3:41 33:38 37:16 keep 6:41 30:48 33:9 lastly 8:7 9:36 10:16 lists 110:5 leveraged 96:3 literally 119:14 38:3,26 46:11,13 14:35 15:4,22 39:11 47:32 50:9 78:47 41:3,17 43:11 45:14 **liaison** 83:43 literature 64:22 78:1

life 57:9 72:35 118:30

lifetime 116:12

100:33 101:24

late 36:44 59:18

79:37 82:45 90:33

96:1 102:12 109:29

little 7:29 13:24 17:41

81:12

18:2.17.21 19:28 21:6 21:36 24:43 25:18 31:48 33:29 37:33,43 38:7,21,38 39:6,7 48:26 54:33 55:13,39 64:16 68:23 70:19 81:4,43 85:10,28,47 88:4 89:7 91:28 92:2 95:19 102:47 105:1 110:9 116:10 123:9 **live** 90:17 115:48 livelihood 88:35 **lively** 8:18 lives 36:32 62:24 122:34 living 69:34 101:32 111:2 118:26 lobster 49:32 101:8 local 45:5,10 47:7,13,21 71:39 119:32 locally 54:4 location 21:24 log 64:5 107:34 121:30 121:31 **logbook** 97:39 logical 80:27 logs 107:36 **Lohe** 3:34 55:7,15,17 55:21,23,25,26,32,34 61:6,38 62:30 63:18 63:26,31,48 64:20 65:3 66:47 67:42 long 28:9,11 34:4 48:9 55:13 98:21 117:19 119:44 121:16 longer 32:40 60:35 62:48 86:20 longevity 59:19 longline 13:22 29:40 30:45 51:44 65:42,47 79:29 96:28 97:42 98:42 106:21,39 107:17,26 110:6 111:13,28 118:9,13 longlines 28:26 longstanding 101:4 look 5:47,48 17:34 18:31,46 21:19,20,47 25:11,33 26:14,17 27:1,21 30:22 33:28 33:38,40 49:16 54:47 55:5 65:6,16 66:3 71:25 76:12 78:1,13 78:18,32 80:23 87:40 94:2,4 96:42,43 97:31 97:41 100:8 103:9,18 106:9 108:4 109:8 111:24 117:44 122:14

123:25 look-alikes 30:10 looked 9:45 10:10 13:10 14:8 23:31 33:30 40:7 108:6 116:6 looking 8:19 9:6 17:35 18:9,33,38 19:38 22:7 22:35 23:2 25:6 28:40 36:38,39 59:22,29 62:16,22,28,32 63:43 66:13,15 70:42 78:6 78:21 82:24 84:47,48 85:23 87:18 89:25 92:28 94:35 97:40 99:40 100:34,35 103:19 105:6,7 106:27 107:11 112:7 122:25 124:7 looks 26:23 41:4 43:18 113:28 loopholes 45:41 **lose** 119:37,39,40 loss 13:26 31:30 lost 32:45 89:43 93:45 109:30.41 110:2.7 lot 5:13.13 16:36.36 20:46 21:41 22:6 23:3 25:28 27:48 28:1,29 29:28,37 30:7,17,43 30:47 31:11,11,14 36:17 37:38 40:42,48 41:24 44:26,48 45:29 46:43 48:14,43 50:12 54:9 65:41 66:40 71:7 74:27 75:46 78:7,27 79:2 82:20,46 83:20 84:31,32,42 85:2,46 88:12,47 89:48 93:42 99:27,45 102:43,45 105:37 111:9,9 114:35 115:40 117:42 118:37,39 119:9 120:10 lots 7:33 78:39 **louder** 19:15 Louisiana 1:30 love 21:6 29:24 109:24 **low** 10:21 12:23 59:19 59:20 low-priority 77:39 lower 19:42 23:11 24:31 33:7 45:26

61:15 71:22

lowering 23:13

lunch 5:29,30,39 38:8

69:1 123:38,40

LUKE 2:11

M mackerel 13:38 magnitude 25:16,35 magnitudes 84:26 Magnuson 72:1 73:27 Magnuson- 82:44 Magnuson-Stevens 32:4 69:11,20 mahi 81:24,24 82:5,42 83:3 90:35 main 9:27,33 48:23 57:45 59:32 115:46 Maine 1:46.47 mainland 49:34 maintain 34:32 113:15 maintained 32:9 108:20 **major** 16:44 majority 10:35 11:37 40:22 106:15 making 22:45 37:44 39:42 48:38 64:34 79:11 93:33,34 100:17 101:46 102:48 105:44 122:26 mako 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 16:35 16:40 17:42 24:36,42 25:2,31 26:12 32:25 32:28 37:26 41:9 47:48 53:43 55:10,36 55:42 56:6 58:46 59:6 59:42,43 60:30 61:26 62:13 65:20 66:31 67:31 84:9,14 112:38 112:40 113:2,16,27 113:31,36,48 114:4 114:14 122:19,39,45 123:8.18 makos 16:36 23:19 37:20 84:1 88:11 **mammal** 22:34 **mammals** 28:19 manage 69:15,28 71:10 112:24 managed 16:27 44:5 47:37 49:10 54:15 71:32 74:14 75:2 76:10 77:14,37 81:26 81:29 82:40 86:13,24 87:7 109:1 114:40 management 1:34,36 2:9,13 3:22,24,27,29 3:33,38,40,42,44,46 10:14,39 11:13,22 12:32 14:30 19:30 21:39 26:25 27:5,22 27:43,46 39:3,38

42:14,32 43:17 50:3 51:47 60:9 62:2 64:30 69:13,18,22,26,30,34 69:39 70:3,13,43,48 71:4,30 72:18,20,27 72:41 73:9,30 74:18 74:42 75:14,27,33,43 76:8,12,28 77:21,36 78:2 80:19 82:39 83:22 86:25,32,39 87:1,17 93:36 101:25 101:30,42 103:16 106:24 108:37 109:20 109:42 111:23 114:22 122:6 managing 52:42 75:14 mandate 32:8 mandated 99:7 mandating 103:44 mandatory 72:20 116:35,39,44 117:37 Mandy 28:33 manifested 93:43 **manner** 71:45 map 13:9,28 **March** 91:19 119:4 marching 76:16 Marcos 2:9 45:23,26 46:15 61:13 Marcus 1:38 26:4 28:4 28:5 Marcus's 33:11 marginalized 27:17 **Marina** 3:11 marine 1:10,47 2:2,20 2:36,38,45 16:23 22:34 25:14 28:18 29:5 31:13 69:34 98:9 111:21 mark 2:40 32:18 94:21 market 13:24 17:16 34:39 120:29 marketing 31:30,42 marry 99:24 MARTIN 2:42 Marty 51:38 52:2 61:13 90:13,44 91:42,43 92:33 106:6 108:16 109:18 110:12 111:4 114:16 122:12,14 Maryland 3:15 116:4 Massachusetts 2:45 master's 48:37 materials 12:32 46:1 51:6,20 math 24:44 119:32 mathematical 70:29 **mats** 107:16

40:18 41:3,26,41 42:3

II.	i	ı	ı
matter 27:25 38:32	82:17 88:17 95:6	83:42	moderately 59:19
53:30 54:14 68:25	96:25 102:17 105:5	mid-fifties 111:14	modification 58:41
88:11 94:26 118:19	114:23,25,26,30	mid-sixties 111:15	modifications 14:40
118:41 124:13	meets 62:43 82:13	middle 55:29 59:45	15:9 100:13
matters 95:25	member 6:12 60:11	92:10 109:10	moment 6:4 22:48 23:1
maturing 59:18	73:25 102:38 115:24	migratory 1:12 3:22,24	34:22 36:46 38:16
maturity 15:6	members 1:28 6:3,16	3:26,29,32,38,39,41	46:32 89:29 104:26
maximize 32:10 90:31	6:18,34,38 9:9 74:2,4	3:43,45 59:17 62:19	115:16,24
maximizing 37:48	95:43 111:48 112:21	95:34 98:12 105:32	monetary 96:6
maximum 32:4 56:14	112:44 115:21 120:46	105:34 108:37	money 28:12 119:9,28
McHale 3:36 68:32	memories 69:10	Mike 31:19 32:21,22	monitoring 4:27 68:34
94:38,43,48 104:8	memory 92:2 105:23	33:4 51:38 52:2,23	95:24,47 96:27 97:17
105:27 108:13 111:44	mental 28:33	67:8,41	97:31,33,40 98:42
MEAGAN 1:40	mentality 17:5	mile 8:30	100:38 108:34 113:17
mean 16:3 32:6 36:15	mention 8:33 16:38	miles 29:43,44	mono 25:32 65:23
38:5 47:8 48:32,40	20:7 23:43 37:7,17	milestone 101:34	monofilament 65:46
63:45 64:7 66:2,13,38	38:21 53:26 74:37	Miller 2:28 33:25,26	month 76:21 118:33
71:7 72:19 79:5,20,22	89:20 93:47 98:8	110:27,29	120:13
79:42 81:16 82:22	99:29 109:31,42	million 12:9 91:33,34	months 5:43 15:27
83:20 90:16,40 91:46	110:35 112:36,45	91:38	21:15,33 57:16 63:20
92:2,7,11,29 106:10	116:38	mind 23:12 47:32 51:21	63:23,25,25,26,28
106:26,39 107:21,39	mentioned 5:31 6:35	82:45 85:32 93:46	moon 90:10
107:44 114:19,23	13:15 15:17 20:18,25	109:28,29	morning 5:3,18 8:14
117:13 119:1,29,44	21:9,14,37 22:15,41	minded 32:32 67:39	9:21 19:11 20:31,34
119:44 120:4 121:23	27:31 28:46 29:8	mine 118:47	23:16 24:19 27:10
121:30	30:34 33:17 36:11	minimal 31:32	31:23 32:24 39:1
meaning 56:46 59:7	42:8,34 47:8,19 48:46	minimize 7:18 90:33,39	107:33 123:27
72:43,45,46	61:30 62:34 73:42	104:10 105:45	Morocco 32:29
meaningful 113:46	81:30 82:11 85:17	minimizing 48:4	mortality 16:40 18:9
means 34:19 39:27	95:28 97:8 98:41	minimum 19:42,42,44	23:32 25:26 32:27
58:47 64:4,10 70:21	99:23 100:35 102:46	30:8	65:19 67:15,25,32,36
70:33 72:19 80:13	104:48 109:35 110:3	minute 81:18,19	74:16 97:43 100:41
meant 18:40	mentioning 21:32	minutes 5:35 34:4 38:5	113:5,12,37,45
measurable 113:47	50:43 82:37 85:17,19	38:13,39 50:35 51:36	122:43
measure 42:25 49:37	104:48	65:29,33 67:11 89:44	Mote 2:20
50:18	message 48:15,24	94:21 111:4 112:14	motels 119:8
measures 11:13,22	86:37	115:25 120:45,48	motto 31:7
12:32 24:23,25 32:40	met 1:25 12:33 34:14	121:1	Mountains 122:35
33:1 35:33 39:4,11,47	34:16 67:25	mischaracterized	move 28:13 29:13
50:28 64:30,30 67:15	metadata 72:12	37:19	32:15 49:36 85:32
67:18,19,37 69:22,34	method 99:37	misinformation 31:44	96:33 101:36 109:12
69:39 73:9 93:36	methodologies 98:20	misleading 83:36	109:25,26 111:31
113:9	98:30	mismatch 19:26 53:2	114:43
meat 59:35	methodology 84:6,15	missing 8:5 24:46	moved 34:18 91:15,22
mechanism 82:24	methods 14:2 22:14	90:12	93:34 114:9 122:7
mechanisms 80:29	73:6 metric 24:43,44 25:41	Mississippi-Alabama	movement 20:24 33:32
media 13:42 29:7,8		1:38	37:34 115:10
45:15 meet 51:17 61:47 73:6	84:4,8 metrics 75:32 83:28	mistrust 88:5,45 mitigate 15:23 29:18	moving 11:11,28 12:28 13:6 14:4,21 29:22
73:34 74:38 78:22	Mexico 10:31,42 11:7	60:10	57:5 103:1 110:27
82:16 95:46 100:24	13:19,23,37 20:13,19	mitigation 13:11 21:1	115:48 116:9 121:48
120:39	20:21 28:14,38,40	21:22 28:20 29:14	MRIP 24:10 83:45,46
meeting 1:16 5:4,5,9,10	42:2,18 47:34,35,37	31:39 117:25	84:18,23,32 85:1,3,8
6:36 7:43 29:25,36	52:39,41 54:45	mix 6:11,17 82:40	85:35,40
51:47 78:14,19 82:19	MICHAEL 2:32	mix-up 24:46	muddled 53:19
82:22 91:29 108:10	microphone 8:26 19:15	mode 82:23	multi-regional 103:5
112:38 114:15,22	Mid- 82:26	model 28:35 98:18	multilateral 114:5
meetings 8:8 79:2	Mid-Atlantic 2:12 13:34	models 28:33 70:24,28	multiple 96:35 99:17
		2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	
II			

101:20 105:45 110:33 **museum** 102:7 mute 23:47,48 46:33 63:1,37 89:37 115:2 **muted** 6:46 Ν nail 77:44 name 7:4 9:22 48:27 112:8.45 names 38:17,26 narrow 112:23 narrowly 81:14 nation 69:37 113:3,8 **nation's** 69:15,28 **national** 1:5,10 5:40 16:22,29 25:14 37:8 51:11 69:17,20,21,47 71:2,12 72:15 73:2,36 74:38 75:10,22,34,37 75:41 77:25,42 78:8,8 78:28.29 83:24 101:39 102:22 111:21 nations 37:28 113:11 113:14,28,39 114:1,8 114:42 122:46 natural 3:16 33:39 45:7 75:1 NAVARRO 2:29 navigate 14:26 16:48 navigated 34:37 near-shore 29:47 30:33 **nearly** 88:40 necessarily 20:17 63:25 66:4 67:48 71:17 80:45 82:4 86:31 88:33 89:13 97:35,48 98:17 100:28 101:34 102:3 102:12 104:26 118:38 necessary 27:13 43:16 58:23 76:25 need 7:2,29 15:22 30:22 33:33,34,39,45 35:39,42 36:43 44:24 44:42 48:44 49:4,27 50:26 51:35 52:31 55:13 58:31 65:37 66:3,8,12 68:4 69:42 72:23,24,33 76:14 79:34,40 82:33 86:15 87:39 90:25 93:16,20 96:34 98:13 100:15 100:16 107:28 108:44 120:40,47 121:24 needed 43:16 44:18,25 51:18 53:31 62:1

120:39 124:1 needle 87:12 **needs** 30:13 33:30 48:43 51:15 58:30 74:8 88:36 97:14 98:30,32 101:21 109:5,5 **NEFSEC** 36:12 **negative** 56:37,39 57:24 negotiations 18:7 114:4 **NEPA** 74:26 net 64:26 never 63:3 79:26 81:33 81:34,37 90:35 106:10 114:27,28,32 116:4 new 1:35 2:14 5:40 6:11 6:46 7:46 20:14 45:11 45:34 67:16 70:1,38 72:28 74:8 75:16 76:39 82:26 83:15 97:19 108:4 110:17 114:17 117:8 newness 83:19.21 **Newport** 121:19 **News** 121:19 **NFWF** 96:13 **NGOs** 48:14 Nic 7:44 nice 67:11 86:36 Nicholas 1:40 night 90:9 115:41 nine 38:13 nineties 26:21 Ninety 14:13 Nixon- 122:20 NMFS 1:10 3:19 32:6 51:41 58:26.48 60:37 **NMFS-2021-0028** 60:15 **NOAA** 1:6 3:19 9:38 13:9,16,29 15:11 26:37 28:15 33:21 55:26 67:46 69:47 74:48 75:5,44 76:3,4

76:7 77:33,47

NOAA's 55:7

NOAA- 60:14

106:15

106:43

11:7

nobody's 84:18

non-11:32 99:44

non-blacknose 10:42

non-compliant 106:38

non-directed 11:30

non-HMS 12:45 14:14

non-pelagic 110:6 non-profit 47:11 non-profits 47:18 non-scientific 71:46 normal 26:35 north 1:37 2:35 16:42 42:2 50:8 54:15,16 61:27 62:10 76:8 84:10 86:48 122:1,40 northeast 3:36 13:31 95:29,36 96:16 98:5,6 103:34,38 northwest 42:17 note 9:8 10:47 16:27 19:25 34:3 55:2 68:36 69:41 83:2 104:33 106:2 noted 53:25 59:27 82:48 notice 73:39 77:23,41 **noticed** 73:33 77:7 109:32 116:33 notion 105:14 123:16 Nova 2:26 **nuclear** 121:19 number 10:11.18.24.28 10:34 11:18,44 12:7,8 12:16,19,26,48 25:40 26:31,39 32:38 37:39 37:47 46:21 60:14,18 97:18 98:37 99:15,17 99:33 100:15 111:48 112:15 120:21 122:8 **numbers** 12:23,24 24:35 25:1,3,7 26:10 27:34,35 67:17 79:21 98:1 numerous 65:23 77:22 78:15 nutshell 17:18

0 o'clock 6:2 68:19 94:35 123:24.45 **objective** 39:24 97:12 objectives 42:22 Objectivity 71:41 obligation 113:10 **obligations** 16:14 17:2 observation 88:20,40 114:14 observations 67:13 102:31 observed 9:39 observer 97:34 106:33 113:16 observers 100:31 obstacle 16:44 18:5

obstacles 34:34 obtained 71:40 **obvious** 86:34 obviously 20:38 25:36 53:18 55:12 64:2 68:8 78:40 118:15,16 occasionally 76:35 occur 21:25 82:29 occurring 50:5 occurs 23:46 ocean 2:28,40 16:46 37:36 59:17 116:1,2,3 119:21 121:48 122:41 oceanic 1:5 41:9 47:47 86:23,34 123:39 Oceanographic 2:27 odd 6:44 81:43 121:47 Oden 2:30 34:2 35:1,2,4 35:6 36:1,10 54:34 68:36 89:31,38,41 91:7 92:14,21 93:19 93:22 109:36 110:3 114:15 120:46 121:3 offensive 37:21 offer 8:13 42:23 58:11 58:27 92:48 102:39 offered 91:23 offers 34:31 office 3:30,34 55:7,26 56:3 58:48 67:44,47 100:48 offline 82:34 offshore 30:46 36:13 **OFL** 74:15 old 26:35 66:16,16 118:29 **OMB** 73:35 omelet 69:3 on-shore 36:2 onboard 101:5,6,11 once 11:9 21:7 23:11 29:12,13 49:24 52:5 54:46 60:17 61:39 77:33 93:48 99:27 100:7 102:5 116:12 one-third 53:35 ones 24:28,32 47:12 48:5 49:13,23 75:17 99:29 ongoing 13:11 15:33 20:44 21:8 29:20 36:12 45:17 72:14 77:8,28 95:44 100:47 101:34 102:16 109:23 online 64:23 99:31 117:18 122:4

69:40 105:12,17,46

open 5:9 10:8 14:44

22:17 39:20 48:17,43

52:16 56:48 59:45 94:7 96:1 100:18 111:45 112:27 115:1 117:25 opened 60:1 openness 71:48 opens 118:45 120:13 operationalizing 74:46 75:36 operators 43:2 96:34 **opinion** 62:20 89:10 opportunistic 59:34 opportunities 39:19 42:23,42 44:4 52:32 72:28 77:22 **opportunity** 18:21 34:8 34:46 44:17 45:34 51:48 68:39,42 90:38 90:40 91:9,26 92:2,31 99:4 112:18,22 113:26 opposed 41:7 110:20 opposition 40:32 **OPR** 56:3 opted 42:40 optimal 30:31 **optimize** 90:22,25 **optimum** 37:10,14 option 14:43 15:2 41:3 41:26,41 43:17 86:11 options 15:12 39:38,42 40:19 86:29 orange/red 10:30 **oranges** 66:19 order 7:28 35:40 43:4 54:25 58:32 108:3 116:7 122:46 orders 76:16 organization 32:7 48:28 56:9 80:43 organizations 45:6 47:8,9,11 50:45 101:26 organizers 79:28 originally 95:20 **Ortiz** 3:39 38:36,43,45 38:48 46:16 47:27 51:4,24 52:15 53:9 ounce 91:35 outcry 89:9 outlined 87:28 outreach 31:27,27 37:48 39:11 40:43 41:18 44:24,43 49:28 51:5,18 67:43 79:21 outside 9:30 14:5,23,26 14:29 15:14,14 16:14 16:17,48 18:34,40,40

18:41 22:18 29:48 30:44 31:48 32:13 34:38 56:32 64:46 65:16 80:12,15,42 85:41 117:5 122:22 over-harvest 44:7 48:4 overall 34:11 39:16 47:33 54:41 59:20,36 66:45 91:33 99:35 102:41 110:10 114:14 116:11 overarching 75:41 97:20 102:22 overfished 50:6,19 overfishing 16:46 41:7 50:5 59:32 113:47 overlap 6:27 82:47 95:37 98:5,10 overlooked 90:14 91:40 overlooking 16:4 overnight 118:39 overpopulated 33:44 oversight 106:28 107:5 107:17,19 overview 9:24,31,34 13:15 15:17 17:30,38 39:6 84:35 95:9 109:22 overwhelm 122:9 owner 96:34 owners 119:28,29 owning 66:23

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

5:1 **p.m** 68:27 94:27,28 124:14 pace 102:12 Pacific 59:26 76:8 page 24:21,22 52:5 105:19,22,24 pains 74:32 panel 1:12,25 6:37 40:14 55:8 78:14 95:43 102:17 paper 6:41 23:34 81:36 110:23 paperwork 93:14 121:28,38 paradigm 113:31 **Parks** 2:47 part 14:20 16:32 22:16 25:20 26:28 28:22 34:29 37:9 39:18 40:21 45:31 46:5 47:34,38 48:26,34

49:26 53:11,17 61:44

63:12 69:31 72:14 73:2,14,47 77:6,40 84:22 85:42 87:41 88:19 90:5,5,12,37 91:20 96:28 98:32 103:46 116:18 partial 31:8 86:22 participant 18:14 63:32 63:35 86:1 94:42 115:8,12,14,19 participants 34:18 37:35 69:36 77:19 111:20 participate 14:7,27 34:8 74:4 117:46 participated 114:2 participating 101:41 participation 34:13 72:40 particular 38:20 50:12 54:4 62:25,25 83:4 85:5 93:39 99:36 102:37 104:27 111:6 particularly 16:12 25:31 31:13 74:25 83:33.47.48 104:37 111:22 112:14.39 116:43 particulars 84:39 parties 56:32 67:24 **partner** 102:39 partner's 100:13 partners 22:18 44:40 45:5 75:14 90:8 95:44 96:45 97:27 98:14 100:21 101:39 103:1 103:9 105:44 partnerships 45:5 50:44,48 51:2,5,19,25 51:29 parts 9:28,33 97:46 108:23 party 16:18 77:35 99:33 100:6 pass 106:29 passed 73:25 **passing** 107:46 paste 100:6 path 90:7 pathway 99:20 pathways 97:38 patient 8:23 PATRICK 1:32 Paul 123:34 **pause** 93:16 pay 93:8 95:35 paying 7:22 peer 57:13 70:4,7,16

73:1,10,13,15,26,28 73:40 74:3,5 76:1,24 77:24 78:29 80:11,12 80:13,15,18,29 81:12 81:34 86:47 pelagic 11:40 12:14 13:21 28:26 30:46 43:42 44:8 51:44 54:32 76:46 86:17 96:28 98:42 106:21 106:39 107:17,26 111:13,28 pelagics 5:8 48:1 54:24 85:42,43 pen 6:41 pendulum 33:31 people 6:26 7:18,22,47 19:7 21:23 23:8 26:43 30:37 31:15,16 35:33 43:7,7,9 45:38,45 50:33 51:34 53:26,32 55:4 60:2 62:17 64:24 64:42 65:30,44 66:6 66:40 79:14,25,26 80:41 85:8 88:34 89:5 92:28 102:31 103:6 104:40 111:14 112:15 112:17 115:43 118:35 119:2 123:46 **people's** 31:23 **perceived** 16:11 26:46 26:47 percent 11:6,47 12:1,3 12:11,15,34,46 14:13 23:22 25:23,23 32:27 33:3 36:26 53:36 54:39,41,41,42 67:36 84:13,13 91:34,38 106:40,40,46 113:4 113:11,15,38 119:4,5 121:34 percentage 10:15 11:41 30:23 36:5,38 54:35 percentages 54:45 perception 114:34 **Perfect** 9:4,21 55:22 perfectly 38:44 performance 110:19 **period** 34:24 57:1,32 59:44 60:2,23 63:16 65:43 117:11 periodically 74:10 periods 34:20 permit 10:12 14:13,14 14:43 35:10,11,24,25 35:28,30,34,35,39,42 35:44 39:21,22,28,34 39:41,46 40:7,38,44

	I	1	I
40:45 41:5,28,30,31	pieces 120:24	policy 61:47 75:25	precautionary 26:38
41:35,37,40 42:1,10	Piedras 48:37	76:19	precisely 105:17
43:6,7,20,24,45 44:12	Pierdinock 2:32 31:20	polite 38:27	precision 71:43
44:15,16,33 45:40	32:21,23 51:39 52:3,4	political 89:8	predecessors 109:3
47:30 52:19 54:38	52:30 67:8,10	pond 62:25	predominant 30:27
95:37 97:28 103:5	pike 100:29	Pool 77:22	predominantly 30:42
permits 10:7,8,9,9,19	pilot 97:41	pop 104:12	preempted 114:6
10:25,26,27,28,30,31	pioneered 111:1	popular 13:7	preface 81:31
10:34,35 11:29 12:30	placards 44:29	populated 33:38 111:14	prefer 43:32
14:44,45 35:46 39:20	place 5:34 25:16 43:15	population 16:8,41	preferred 41:25
39:23,27 40:1,48	46:3 67:26 82:29	33:35,40 47:44 59:28	prescriptive 74:44
41:20 42:7,27,31,36	85:41 88:39 99:32	60:5,6 61:34,46	86:46 87:10,37
42:38 45:2 52:16,20	100:10 113:10 114:35	113:48 119:41,45	110:20
116:37 122:9	114:39 116:18	121:6	presence 40:41
perpetually 111:45	placed 101:22,35 102:6	populations 11:17	present 1:28 3:9,19
PERRY 2:47	places 33:19 85:27	13:11 27:20 33:44	40:13 56:40,47 87:38
Perseverance 2:33	109:10	72:39	95:16 104:45
person 48:36 56:22	plan 5:47 15:29 19:30	porbeagle 89:21,24	presentation 5:24 9:25
58:4	21:13 38:38 45:9 81:3	porch 90:10	15:48 16:2 17:29,39
personally 28:10	90:3,6 91:14,16 93:1	portion 16:6 24:3,9	18:30,44 19:25 20:6
persons 25:28	94:25,33 95:12,32,40	57:41,44	20:42 23:17 25:14,24
perspective 18:17	97:13 102:13,19,30	pose 68:6	29:9,24 33:23 34:12
73:20 91:27 93:4	105:30 123:48	position 18:1 66:23	45:29 46:43 53:25
95:47 96:7	plane 119:7	123:7	54:19 55:11,30 59:12
perspectives 6:6 8:39	planning 15:25 28:23	positive 32:34 45:47	61:19 63:7,42 68:23
101:30 102:31	48:13 104:47	50:28 55:41 56:45	69:6,9,19 76:7 78:35
pertain 51:44	plans 60:38 86:19	57:6,29 59:5,43,48	78:47 79:47 80:8 86:6
pertinent 7:35 71:29	95:13,17,20,29,36	61:21	88:2 89:44 94:11,13
perverse 113:36	96:5,7	possess 58:9	94:37,47 102:35
Pete 3:28 7:43 8:8,11	plate 67:35	possibility 91:36 117:6	104:5,46 107:1
8:45 9:4 68:13,45	play 7:40	123:5	109:22 111:6,41
78:37 124:2	played 98:24	possible 48:11 70:15	presentations 5:19
Peter 20:3,30,33 21:11	please 5:38 8:37,42	72:45 81:40 86:15	7:24 25:22,34 68:40
21:12,37 23:12	36:48 38:11 45:27	103:10,14 106:44	114:25
Peter's 28:7	52:40 63:46 74:35	111:31 116:23,26	presented 41:12 56:34
petition 4:19 5:26 55:9	78:32,36 102:32	possibly 67:45 78:20	59:8,23 71:43 74:19
56:8,14,16,17,24,27	112:9	post 32:26	74:29,47 87:4 88:13
56:33,34,40,46 57:16	plenty 30:6	post-release 23:32	110:1,33
59:6,8,10,23,37 63:20	PLL 91:38	97:43 100:40	presenter 55:19
64:22,28,33,35 65:10	plus 16:33 82:15,15	posts 13:42	presents 56:17
65:14	118:36	pot 101:8	preserve 111:17
petitioned 56:12	pocket 91:48 92:3,23	potential 9:37 14:40	president 31:12 108:4
PFCs 84:12	point 7:3 11:44 12:10	15:8,28,31 69:33	pressure 66:12 67:24
phase 28:21	16:43 17:28 18:3,4,6	71:36 98:28 101:29	prestigious 80:21
phenomenal 36:15	27:32 36:28 54:23,31	104:2 105:30,30	pretty 5:34 6:13 7:8
phone 6:48	55:6,46 56:5 62:48	106:4 108:38	24:45 36:45 38:3 73:2
phonetic 29:35	64:38 65:7 72:24	potentially 14:42 15:2	76:13 82:2,8 86:41
physically 32:14	78:44 88:38 89:47	22:1,12 40:30 104:28	91:12 93:4 95:8 96:22
pick 8:26	102:21,26,38 103:14	113:42	101:31 103:37 123:31
picked 92:9	109:13 110:36 111:13	pound 120:27	prevalent 98:19 108:31
Pickett 2:31 65:33,35	111:47 118:25	pounds 10:46 26:12	prevent 41:6 121:20
78:44,46	pointed 26:45	PowerPoint 94:40	previous 13:45 36:25
Pickett's 88:3	points 17:27 71:38	practicable 56:15	36:26 38:24 44:27
picture 11:14 33:29	112:42 116:48	practice 13:1 98:25	49:9 53:48 61:15
37:40 44:30 83:37	POLAND 2:35	practices 15:23 22:15	90:42 91:8,20 93:36
pictures 13:42	polemical 123:19	99:36	100:35
pie 11:43	policies 69:46 75:1,4	Praeger 81:36	previously 110:4
piece 6:41 38:10	83:45	pre-fishing 33:38	price 120:1,16,19,22,25
	I	I	I

productive 8:20 provided 70:1 120:26 73:35 120:20.28 Provider 2:42 prices 10:17,23 productivity 59:21 question 6:42 7:36 primarily 39:20 99:43 products 14:16 provides 73:27 75:35 18:48 23:28 27:23,30 **primary** 70:30 program 16:2 17:12 providing 60:40 72:38 27:42 35:15,16,47 **prime** 97:35 100:29 27:9 96:19,28 97:36 public 1:16 4:29 5:9 6:1 36:4 37:1 46:6,10,13 102:8 104:19 97:41 98:42 99:43 6:3,4,17,34,35 15:15 46:46 47:28 48:8 52:5 principles 69:16 103:47 110:39,40 15:26 16:6 26:41 52:27,36 54:20,35,44 prior 96:26 108:33 programs 60:9 70:27 31:27,27 40:12,17 61:29 62:8 63:8 64:12 66:30,37 67:20 68:6 priorities 97:1 109:28 75:27 96:12,46 97:10 44:6,24 55:43 57:1,32 74:45 80:10,33 83:5 prioritizing 14:11 97:16,23 98:26,35,37 59:44 60:1,11 68:34 priority 21:40 33:21 99:3,12,32,41 100:9 72:3,9 77:23 78:48 83:39,41 84:42 85:7 96:15 103:2 100:13,38 102:43 79:1,10,20,22,32 80:2 85:13 87:26 91:45 privilege 112:34 103:4 110:33 117:27 86:37 87:12 90:2 104:13,24 105:18,20 proactive 27:7 32:48 123:37 94:15,17,34 102:17 108:10 109:32 112:23 110:27 111:42,47 progress 114:36 117:33 121:40 34:40 46:5 112:4,25 115:22 probably 20:39 21:29 prohibited 19:45 23:31 questioning 54:6 90:11 38:25 48:11 59:4 23:41 24:9 27:8 44:8 122:13 123:42,44 questions 6:23 7:34,47 85:46 90:35 106:18 46:48 49:12,14,14,19 publication 76:18 80:22 9:5 15:38,42 19:5 110:26,36 119:12 50:1 53:8,10,13,16 publications 73:39,43 20:36 23:20 24:21 123:9 58:32 publicly 74:33 83:25 28:7 34:45 37:47 **problem** 26:27,44 29:3 prohibiting 49:19 publish 57:18,24,28,34 38:40 45:19,22 46:44 published 48:18 59:5 31:4 32:1,1 55:15 prohibition 58:17 54:11,19 55:46 61:11 63:31 82:24 89:12 **prohibitions** 58:2,14,22 63:13,14,15 76:19 68:10 71:29 78:25,34 121:5 122:38 81:12 86:47 78:36,42 80:9 83:15 58:25 project 21:43 28:15,40 publishing 59:48 63:19 83:18,30,31 84:37,43 **problems** 9:2 51:2 procedural 69:14 75:2 62:42 123:40 Puerto 2:4 43:23.34 87:24 99:26 102:22 75:6 78:23 projects 21:38,48 22:3 45:1,8,32,36 47:13,24 102:23.30 103:29 48:26,29,37 49:17,20 procedure 75:26 77:44 104:3 107:30 111:39 112:37 procedures 39:26 **promise** 72:22 119:22 51:10 52:38,40,47 queue 7:26 23:8 45:24 40:23 42:39 43:14 promote 16:24 53:3,15 50:34 51:34 68:4 72:47 80:30 promoting 45:38 **pull** 94:39 87:47 112:5 process 18:36 21:45 properly 120:11,17 **pulled** 74:25 quick 7:20 8:14 9:24 26:20,37 47:22 55:36 **proposal** 18:15 39:10 pulling 22:37 23:19 25:11 33:9 36:4 55:38,48 56:6,7,10,43 40:13 42:20 96:17 punt 85:37 36:36 52:5,37 53:23 60:27 61:44 63:12 106:42 113:8.13.23 Pure 2:11 63:8 87:26 115:36 64:9,46 66:37 70:7,35 **proposals** 96:8 113:32 **PURMONT** 2:37 quickly 17:26 33:32 70:46 71:4,18 72:2,18 **propose** 42:11 43:26 **purpose** 39:17 70:9 53:48 58:4 76:42 99:1 73:4,23,26,29,44 74:5 **proposed** 39:8,37,48 84:33 103:16 117:34 74:22 75:15 76:1,10 40:2,11,23,29 41:22 purposes 70:43 98:2 quirk 8:3 76:12,16,33,34 77:7 41:45 42:6 56:24 100:24 101:20 **quit** 91:46 77:10,12,13,18,30,32 57:33 63:12,15,22 pursuant 113:3 quite 16:1 19:13 49:25 77:40 79:7,11,18 80:2 90:4 94:8,14,18 117:13 122:33 **pursue** 58:18 80:20,24,28,39 82:38 103:37 113:35 114:19 push 83:6 93:16 quo 40:4 43:27 75:16 83:27 84:23 88:5,26 pushed 8:9 proposing 43:28 57:29 quota 10:38,40,44 11:9 88:46 90:15 91:20,40 proprietary 99:34 100:7 put 25:15 28:27 29:41 11:9 24:32 27:11 34:25 47:32,33,35 102:39,46 103:17 prosecuted 109:6 37:4 55:3,11 60:19 51:42 52:7,31 53:33 107:26 108:21,28 protected 3:34 55:8,27 64:42,43 81:40 85:46 109:25,29 114:3 56:3 59:1 67:47 97:44 87:8 96:16 97:37 76:27 90:40 91:45 121:11 100:43 121:13 103:20,22,23 106:19 92:5,23,36 104:22 Protection 2:15 processes 73:32,40,41 106:35 107:13,14,16 106:43 120:33,39 75:16,28 76:24,32,37 protections 58:28 110:16,23,24 115:47 121:7 76:43 77:24 78:30,31 **proud** 33:1 119:14 quotas 11:15,18 15:3 80:15 84:36,41 86:43 **provide** 9:36 18:16 puts 67:23,23 106:48 15:36 20:14 34:14,15 100:31 20:47 42:41 51:17 42:44,46 50:2 putting 97:4 produced 84:4,15 52:32 55:44 62:16,29 quoting 26:11 Q 85:34 67:21 71:17 73:44 product 31:42 32:15 R 75:3,27 84:34 85:28 qualifications 73:18 33:16 57:25 87:37 94:6 quality 33:16 73:4,17 radar 103:38

П			
radio 114:21	reasonably 71:36	reductions 12:33 25:33	14:15,36 19:27,39,48
Raimundo 1:42 46:24	reasons 17:11 29:39	32:27 113:45	20:1 25:15 35:31
46:30,31,33,35,39	40:34 74:22	redundancy 100:12	40:15 44:47 45:12
50:30 61:14	rebounding 27:20	reef 13:23,38 28:26	56:21 66:7 69:12
	rebuild 11:19 14:20	30:41 53:6	93:38,39 106:16,35
raise 7:2,6 15:40			·
102:32 112:6	16:32 37:15 113:47	reexamine 120:40	106:47 110:20
raised 9:7,14 83:39	rebuilding 14:24 18:11	reference 9:46 61:31	regulations.gov 60:13
88:38 112:37	26:32 121:6	73:45 80:12,15 84:47	60:18
raises 74:45	rebuilt 26:39	referenced 78:27	regulatory 39:25 42:39
random 121:34	rec 23:30 84:24	references 74:23 78:26	43:14 60:9 64:29
Randy 3:21 8:11 13:15	recap 96:23	referencing 80:40	74:47 75:26 102:11
15:17 20:37 21:14	receipt 56:15 57:17	81:47	123:37
22:25 38:30 53:44	63:20	referring 51:19 95:22	related 5:19 17:41,42
68:13,45 83:1 85:9	receive 30:31 56:8	95:23 105:29,36	18:5,17 21:38 38:18
91:2 93:25 94:19	58:12	refers 64:1 71:33	39:42 54:13 69:19
108:12,14 109:3,14	received 13:8,29 39:9	refine 100:9,38	77:45 82:42 85:21,29
110:13 112:42 117:22	40:14,18 44:23 49:29	refined 101:13	85:35,43 93:29 96:48
124:2	59:6	refinement 109:9	100:25 110:4 117:23
range 8:21,41 18:18	receiving 46:13	refining 105:31	relates 23:30 51:5
30:41,42 40:28,31	recipe 75:35	reflect 7:14 14:48 15:5	97:42 100:40,48
41:44 42:21,27 43:25	recognize 34:17 108:45	reflected 110:40	102:19 105:38
43:28 54:40,40 57:42	111:8	reflecting 75:19	relating 39:13 80:34
57:44 59:25,30 62:33	recognized 34:30	reflection 75:15	102:37
71:34,34 116:3	recognizing 34:12	reflects 75:40	relation 10:38 93:35
rangers 45:10	recommend 7:17 71:19	refresh 69:10	relationship 70:6 82:8
ranks 16:21	recommendations	refuels 121:19	119:38
rarely 24:9	67:21,22	refused 81:42	relationships 51:25
rates 28:41	reconvene 68:19	regard 110:47 111:22	relatively 70:38
rationale 44:2 90:11	record 17:6 36:19 38:33	regarding 11:12 28:8	release 12:24 15:26,29
104:40	68:26 94:27 112:47	63:8 72:30 74:44	28:44 30:7 32:26
Rauch 123:36	124:14	96:27 100:39 104:5	33:32 39:15 40:47
Ray 52:45 53:3	recording 8:8	105:2 122:4	44:45 96:22 97:26
reach 48:39,45 51:13	recover 60:34	regardless 95:26	119:17 120:34
61:7 66:42 68:9	recovery 60:34,38,41	100:22	released 11:42 12:8,14
102:20	60:45 121:29,39	regards 20:45 72:17	12:18,26,47 13:3
reached 37:30 47:10	recreating 75:18	81:10 87:19	23:22 24:4
48:31	recreational 2:5,33	regime 114:6	releases 54:22
reaching 48:10	3:37 5:7 9:29,40	region 10:25,36 11:43	releasing 11:33 90:28
reaction 93:26	11:28 12:29,34 13:18	13:34 30:47 40:41	relevance 71:28
reactive 27:6,10 34:35	15:5 18:42 23:42	41:43 42:16 47:37	relevant 17:20,44 29:38
read 24:6 103:18	24:38,41 28:30 29:46	51:31 59:31 75:40,42	35:46 61:2 71:34,39
105:28 107:35	30:47 32:29 44:32	75:47 95:21 96:16	72:33 74:25
readily 56:28	52:9,20,25,28,32	regional 15:3 42:35	reliable 5:34
reading 116:33	54:21 65:43 66:11	73:39 75:39 76:14,17	relief 111:20
real 12:36 17:26 31:29	67:15 83:34 85:39	78:9,29 83:23 95:29	relieving 93:39
31:34 36:3,31,36	88:6 89:5 103:42	97:9 98:6 99:3 100:47	rely 66:48
52:37 53:48 66:40	113:6 115:39 123:47	101:25,38 102:23	remarks 112:14
114:20 115:36	recreationally 84:9	regions 41:48 42:13,30	remember 48:27 71:9
reality 70:29 83:31	red 103:25	95:10,30 102:45	74:5 75:18 76:38
85:14 113:36	REDD 3:41	103:30	120:37
realizing 102:4	reduce 67:31 99:15	Register 73:33 77:7	remind 6:15,45 42:45
reallocation 91:40	reduced 14:2 16:40	registration 99:30	43:26 75:21 112:17
realm 109:41,46 117:5	25:26 32:41	regular 99:11	122:32 123:23,46
reason 12:36 29:41	reducing 100:12,14	regulated 32:3 58:32	reminded 89:20 123:6
36:24 42:33 46:41	reduction 18:10 32:28	108:26	reminder 8:7 12:21
50:20 87:41 106:32	33:3 65:48 67:15,25	regulation 101:4	16:18 94:30
113:30 117:37 119:48	67:36 93:14 113:4,12	regulations 11:38	reminders 112:4
reasonable 56:22	113:15,37 121:28	12:22,25,41,44 14:8,9	remote 45:37
	1	1	
11			

removal 42:43 research 1:47 2:19 40:28,33 41:4,31,37 road 121:40 removed 47:45 48:1,5 13:12,12,44 20:44 41:44 42:6,12,36,40 **ROBERT** 2:19,29 renewals 116:27 21:9,37,40,42 22:3,38 43:13,18,25,29,36,38 **Rocky** 122:35 **RODRIGUEZ** 2:4 repairing 13:25 22:43 23:3 28:8,11 43:40,41 47:36,39 repeat 100:11 29:22 30:13,28 33:12 49:39 52:25,29 53:11 role 51:30 70:5 73:48 repetitious 116:25 47:41 56:31 65:6 53:17 59:34 94:12 roles 74:1 75:16 replacing 13:25 71:12 77:5 100:36 109:48 113:16 rolled 27:9 95:31,32 replicating 49:30 97:33 reservations 119:8 returned 80:21 room 63:27 report 22:27,32,36 24:5 resource 74:30 82:3 rev 21:29 Rootes-Murdy 2:38 25:44 26:15,16 27:35 95:47 111:29 revenue 10:17,23 11:25 19:9,11,18,20,24 37:41 43:8 50:23 resources 2:25 3:16,35 13:27 14:12 **roundtable** 5:7 22:40 54:46 57:13 71:23 17:10 45:8,47 51:12 review 4:15 5:20,21 85:39 123:47 9:23,32,41,42,48 route 86:10 74:20,24,26,30,38 55:8,27,45 56:3 59:1 83:33 85:19,21,33 61:6 67:48 69:29,35 13:16 14:10 15:27,29 row 121:33 96:34 99:5,16,37 75:2 82:18 97:5,44 51:7 56:10,13,23 57:7 rule 4:17 5:25 7:40 103:7,21 105:41 15:35,35 39:5,13,17 100:44 102:25 57:13,18,25 59:46 107:28,38,39 123:14 respect 7:34 16:29 60:3,25,29,44 61:39 39:37 40:11 42:23 123:28 114:9.20 64:31,37,40,42 65:7 43:35 44:29 45:23 respective 96:46 48:18 53:14 57:29,34 reported 11:6 12:11,35 65:17 70:4,7,16,19 respond 19:36 84:29 24:10,11,41 25:3,7,11 73:1,13,15,26,29,40 58:25,26,27,29 63:12 27:34 49:17 66:34 91:1,2 74:5 76:1 77:13,24 63:14,15,16,22,23 response 52:23 55:44 88:41 94:9,12,12 83:38 85:27,30 78:30 80:11,12,13,16 responses 53:45 80:24,29 96:29 109:47,48 114:19 100:15 reporting 10:15 21:47 responsibilities 74:1 105:14 116:6.43 25:1,42 66:33,41 84:1 reviewed 10:6.16 11:29 rulemaking 15:10,11,31 75:13 95:24.39 96:31 97:16 responsibility 107:47 13:8.8 14:6 56:44 52:24 53:21 69:46,48 97:31 98:44 99:6,8,10 responsible 31:40 57:13 73:10 76:24 70:12 71:15 72:10 99:25,30 100:1,1 32:10 34:42 45:47 80:18 81:12,34 86:47 74:23,31 87:20 110:8 101:17 103:10 105:42 reviewer 65:11 rulemakings 75:32 69:18 107:6 rest 27:1 47:10 67:38 reviewers 74:3 93:44 reports 13:14 52:48 94:31 reviewing 14:38 53:39 rules 6:15.19 52:42 54:28 70:10 74:9,10 restate 112:41 64:36 53:18 73:42 75:12 74:33 96:22 99:7 restaurant 119:29 reviews 16:7 76:2,28 106:35 105:38 Restoration 123:39 **revise** 15:3 run 7:26 9:1 25:47 55:13 91:45 93:40 represent 101:40 **RESTORE** 28:15.22 revised 71:16 76:25 representation 9:10 restricted 35:30 90:21 revision 76:1 100:24 118:33,33,36 108:32 73:21 revving 21:27 running 7:21 121:37 restrictions 14:45 representations 70:29 rewarded 106:45 runs 120:33,33 representative 1:39 33:33 34:25 113:43 **RFDs** 90:20 91:28 RUSSELL 2:17 71:31 restrictive 35:32 **RFMOs** 80:37 Rusty 28:4 29:30,31 represents 122:42 result 13:4 32:39 57:12 rich 74:30 30:35 31:18 reproducible 72:46 58:40 67:18 **Rick** 1:35 3:11 61:12,16 S request 41:17 91:6 resulted 27:16 61:17 63:4 99:22 results 15:31 29:26 102:32 104:8.35.48 92:41 93:29,35 sacrifice 25:31 requesting 64:35 72:26,46 76:29 105:13 110:16 121:46 **SAFE** 70:10 74:9,9,20 requests 40:43 82:14 resumed 38:33 68:26 Rick's 106:3 74:24,26,30,33,38 require 75:28 94:27 **Rico** 2:4 43:23,34 45:1 83:33 85:19,21,25,27 required 41:1 65:3,5 resurgence 31:42 45:8,32,36 47:13,24 85:33 66:38,48 retain 46:18 48:26,29,37 49:17,20 safety 40:36 42:48 requirement 37:10 retained 41:2 43:44 107:15 51:10 52:38,41,47 58:35 122:5 47:41 53:3,15 sailfish 30:48 requirements 40:44 retaining 10:10 ridiculous 37:31 sails 121:9 73:34 96:32 99:25 retention 4:17 5:24 right- 10:42 **sake** 36:9 100:4 110:21 117:24 14:47 16:42 18:6 right-hand 10:28 12:7 **sale** 58:11 120:1 117:28 24:30 27:12 34:22,28 **rights** 31:15 **sales** 31:8,31 42:9 requires 7:39 69:26 34:35 38:38 39:4,26 **Rio** 48:37 52:18 39:30,32,33,40,43,44 risk 57:12 60:35 61:43 **Sam** 123:36 72:1 rescue 111:17 39:48 40:4,8,21,25,27 62:44 **sample** 121:35

sampling 70:27
SAMPSON 2:40
sand 72:25 101:35
sandbar 13:35 24:11
30:28,29 31:3 43:43
44:8
sandbars 30:42 47:40
47:40 88:10 sat 79:2
Saturday 120:6
Saturdays 118:45
119:11
saw 21:3 26:30 36:14
37:24 47:6 85:35 90:3
sawfish 49:20
saying 7:6,47 18:40
20:37,37 22:25 24:8
49:3 62:13 69:25
81:31 86:46 89:9
103:44 118:38 123:1
says 69:21 75:39 81:5 104:38 119:30 122:8
scale 16:46 71:9 84:38
85:10
scales 10:47
scalloped 47:42 78:4
scallops 49:1
Scanlon 2:42 51:38,40
106:6,7
Schalit 2:43 80:5,6,33
81:17,22 82:21,33,48 87:46 104:41,43
105:47 111:35,37
120:47 121:2,44
122:13,17
schedule 38:4,6 77:1
schematic 75:38 76:6
school 1:41,46 118:27
schools 106:34
science 2:3 13:43 21:5
22:26,30 33:18,45
57:2,8 70:33,37,42,45 71:18 72:13 77:20
78:17 79:35,37,37,43
81:33 88:14,16,21,24
123:13
Sciences 1:47
scientific 4:23 5:41
16:45 18:5,11,15,18
33:20 56:17,23,41,47
63:44,48 64:2,18
68:20,30 69:7,23,27
69:32 70:5,13,25,30
70:31,32,35,45 71:3
71:34,41 72:1,21,43
73:5,7,8,29 74:2,11 74:41 75:9 80:26
113:3 122:27,30
II

scientifically 53:33
scientist 88:15
scientists 16:41 77:48 104:20 105:15,16
122:24
scope 31:48 71:9,36
75:23 86:40 94:18
98:4 108:20,24
scopes 97:22
Scott 29:30 31:19,20 32:20 65:34 66:20,25
66:46 87:45,48 88:28
89:3,18 90:44 91:24
scratched 87:21
screaming 89:6
screen 9:19 38:47
45:30 71:23 89:42
screens 94:41 scroll 55:4
SCRS 77:6 105:6
SCRS's 80:40
sea 1:38 2:30 45:9 46:3
47:20 48:20 51:10
107:15,15
seaboard 98:27 Seafood 2:11
seagoing 121:21
search 60:17
searching 60:13
seas 58:8,9 122:41
season 15:37 39:29,31
39:40 40:20 41:23,28 41:38 42:16,28,30,38
43:12,30 118:8,45
119:24 122:2
seasons 25:28 49:33
second 23:18,28 25:13
29:40 39:24 40:24
42:5 45:4 48:7 58:17 77:2,10 80:48 83:41
94:32 97:11 105:23
105:24,33
secondary 61:37
secondly 14:46 36:3,10
36:11 52:45
seconds 67:9 Secretary 73:28
section 10:5 14:4 58:35
58:45 59:1 60:40
67:29
sections 9:44 14:38
83:34
sector 23:30 52:33 88:7 sectors 31:36 48:32
SEDAR 76:33 77:12,18
77:21,29 80:28 81:31

```
SEDAR-HMS 83:6
SEDARweb.org 77:14
seeing 9:6 26:14 28:36
  36:28 37:34 38:46
  55:17,19,30 62:41
  65:9 67:11 79:17,23
  79:31 88:46 89:27
  111:39 115:23
seek 90:25,34 91:9
seeking 52:28
seen 20:23 25:43 64:15
  79:25 82:26 88:43
  110:14
sees 88:7
SEFHEIR 105:39
segment 47:44 61:34
segments 61:46 108:44
segue 79:35 99:1
selected 43:32
self-initiate 56:10
self-sacrifice 114:11
sell 58:9,11
selling 107:23
send 7:16 9:3 90:28
 91:35 113:24
senior 22:48
sense 20:18,48 31:34
  35:45 51:14 79:16
  80:27 83:4 89:17
  99:35 119:33,35
  120:5,30 122:5
sensitive 66:9 100:41
sensors 100:36
sent 64:41
sentiments 8:34
separate 15:32 34:28
separately 49:10
series 44:40 72:38
serious 113:27
seriously 18:20 65:37
  121:37
SERO 77:21
serve 83:42 101:20
  114:3
service 1:10 16:23
 25:14 37:13 111:21
serving 112:34
set 6:3 33:34 40:8 42:17
  42:18 43:46 55:24
  65:46 69:16 84:46
  91:48 95:41 112:47
set-aside 121:8
sets 97:48
setting 8:30 18:1 83:28
settle 92:47
settled 94:30
seven 19:7 30:37
severely 33:36
```

shaded 41:42
Shana 2:28 32:22 33:25
33:25 34:1 110:27,43 shape 99:20
share 4:15 5:22,36 6:20
8:36,37 9:17,25,28,35
9:42,43 10:6,13 15:32
21:32 22:39 34:10
53:45 54:19,46 60:26
60:48 61:2 68:43
89:31 96:12 97:45
102:32 111:42 112:18 112:22 113:22 117:19
shared 8:35
sharing 5:15 78:43
Sharkbanz 29:16
sharkfin 31:30,44 32:17
sharp 38:4 68:19
sharpnose 100:42
shed 23:36 101:2
sheet 6:13 107:34
shift 94:34 111:42,47 shifting 33:42 112:3
Shimano 1:37
ship 58:10,12 121:19
shocked 53:28
shoot 58:18 115:6
shooting 92:8
shops 32:45
shore-based 11:35
shoreside 99:39
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2 113:48 122:19,39,45
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2 113:48 122:19,39,45 123:8,18 shot 116:5,7,11 show 8:6 10:20 30:15
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2 113:48 122:19,39,45 123:8,18 shot 116:5,7,11 show 8:6 10:20 30:15 54:27 120:25
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2 113:48 122:19,39,45 123:8,18 shot 116:5,7,11 show 8:6 10:20 30:15 54:27 120:25 showed 54:20,21
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2 113:48 122:19,39,45 123:8,18 shot 116:5,7,11 show 8:6 10:20 30:15 54:27 120:25 showed 54:20,21 showing 54:24,25,32
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2 113:48 122:19,39,45 123:8,18 shot 116:5,7,11 show 8:6 10:20 30:15 54:27 120:25 showed 54:20,21 showing 54:24,25,32 94:41
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2 113:48 122:19,39,45 123:8,18 shot 116:5,7,11 show 8:6 10:20 30:15 54:27 120:25 showed 54:20,21 showing 54:24,25,32 94:41 shown 13:45 14:32
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2 113:48 122:19,39,45 123:8,18 shot 116:5,7,11 show 8:6 10:20 30:15 54:27 120:25 showed 54:20,21 showing 54:24,25,32 94:41 shown 13:45 14:32 shows 10:13,37 11:41
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2 113:48 122:19,39,45 123:8,18 shot 116:5,7,11 show 8:6 10:20 30:15 54:27 120:25 showed 54:20,21 showing 54:24,25,32 94:41 shown 13:45 14:32
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2 113:48 122:19,39,45 123:8,18 shot 116:5,7,11 show 8:6 10:20 30:15 54:27 120:25 showed 54:20,21 showing 54:24,25,32 94:41 shown 13:45 14:32 shows 10:13,37 11:41 22:33 23:21 shrimp 13:38 Shutting 114:41
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2 113:48 122:19,39,45 123:8,18 shot 116:5,7,11 show 8:6 10:20 30:15 54:27 120:25 showed 54:20,21 showing 54:24,25,32 94:41 shown 13:45 14:32 shows 10:13,37 11:41 22:33 23:21 shrimp 13:38 Shutting 114:41 side 10:27,28,39,43
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2 113:48 122:19,39,45 123:8,18 shot 116:5,7,11 show 8:6 10:20 30:15 54:27 120:25 showed 54:20,21 showing 54:24,25,32 94:41 shown 13:45 14:32 shows 10:13,37 11:41 22:33 23:21 shrimp 13:38 Shutting 114:41 side 10:27,28,39,43 12:6,7 31:28 32:6
shoreside 99:39 short 34:24 65:43 86:30 shortened 71:23 shorter 34:20,21 shortfin 4:20 5:27 11:38 12:17,21,26,33 17:42 23:19 24:36 25:31 32:25,28 41:9 53:43 55:9,36,42 56:6 58:46 59:6,43 60:30 83:48 112:38 113:2 113:48 122:19,39,45 123:8,18 shot 116:5,7,11 show 8:6 10:20 30:15 54:27 120:25 showed 54:20,21 showing 54:24,25,32 94:41 shown 13:45 14:32 shows 10:13,37 11:41 22:33 23:21 shrimp 13:38 Shutting 114:41 side 10:27,28,39,43

81:38,46 82:2,9,12,25

82:38

11			140
	1	l	1
98:40 99:23,46,47	slowly 45:35	110:20 112:3,7	spinners 30:10,17,19
sign 124:3	small 10:42 11:8,36,48	123:25	spirit 6:32
significance 61:48	12:13 30:4,29 35:26	sound 36:18 66:38	spit 84:7
significant 9:39 45:31	35:36 39:23,34,45	soundness 72:48	spoke 61:18,30 72:5
51:30 57:41,43 98:10	40:1,6,38,45 41:5,29	source 54:26 84:40	77:24 91:30
significantly 16:39	41:30,36,40 42:10	85:5	spoken 23:11 81:38
32:41	43:19,45 44:16,33	sources 21:43 22:4	sport 2:5 89:11
silence 114:21	45:40 47:30 50:10	54:28 65:6 67:5 84:48	Sport-Ventures 2:21
silkies 86:22	90:27 122:42	85:26 96:9,10,13	Sportsmen 29:5
silky 43:43 44:8	smaller 40:36	south 1:33 2:24 3:11	spot 26:48 28:12
11			
silt 97:41	smooth 11:36 12:1,12	13:19 59:26 79:13,30	102:36
Silver 114:25	27:31,36,42	81:29 83:43 116:2,4	spread 21:1
similar 22:2 38:16	smoothhound 27:46	116:10,34,42 117:24	spring 78:21 114:26
44:30 91:12	35:9,24,24,34,39	117:29 121:48 122:6	spurs 61:37
similarly 17:13 86:21	46:11	122:40	squandered 91:26
simple 62:24 90:36	smoothhounds 35:12	southeast 13:36 77:12	squeeze 37:32
107:25 120:31	35:40 43:30 46:18,19	77:20 78:17 95:29,36	SSC 73:25 74:2,4,6
simplified 75:38	snag 89:33	98:7 99:8	76:11,11 80:11
simply 92:39 113:48	snags 102:47	Southeastern 2:26	SSCs 70:7 73:48 76:2
114:9	snapper/grouper	southern 116:1,9	St 30:18
Simultaneous 30:39	116:36	space 7:38 95:4	stability 11:14 34:31
61:5 92:15,19 105:26	snapshot 23:23	Spanish 44:34,41	stable 13:21
115:31	soapbox 20:9	spatial 51:47 103:40	stack 90:29
simultaneously 101:20	social 13:42 29:6,7	106:24 109:19,42	staff 3:19 7:12 13:9
	•	•	
single 31:35 84:40	45:15 74:16 95:48	111:22 114:21	76:7 99:11,17 109:3
96:35 98:26 107:39	101:48	speak 19:15 32:47	115:5 123:30
108:47,48 120:7	software 99:34 100:7	36:12 76:27 82:4,23	stage 21:17,17,18
sir 118:3	solely 31:43 49:42	85:6 87:31 115:5	56:25,30 57:7,31 65:5
sit 82:11 102:7	solicit 56:31	117:29	65:12,16 78:15
sits 82:32	soliciting 60:4	speaking 19:16 30:39	stages 77:48
sitting 6:9 90:10 94:46	solid 118:34	36:18 61:5 91:27	stakeholder 17:21
120:14	SOLTANOFF 3:43	92:15,19,32 105:26	60:42 102:38
situation 26:31 27:27	solution 34:36 118:15	115:31	stakeholders 13:47
72:34 81:44 92:26	somebody 22:47 46:34	speaks 72:15 76:13	17:9 95:43 99:42
112:38 123:29	52:11 89:28 91:1,1,18	81:3	103:17
situations 66:7	100:23	special 58:25	stalled 114:35
six 26:5 40:9 41:14,15	somebody's 117:43	species- 62:38	stance 113:21
42:12,15,16,19,20	somewhat 85:38 87:34	specific 37:47 41:8,15	stand 106:47 122:8
65:30 75:45 76:36	111:5	43:38 44:10,35 54:6	standard 37:8,12 69:20
	Sonja 2:6 15:44 17:23	62:39 75:24 76:1	· ·
size 15:5,6 19:42,43,44	•		69:21,47 70:35 71:2
25:32 27:11 32:39	17:27 18:27 20:18	86:41 91:5,7	72:15 73:3,37 74:39
40:39	37:18 83:9 86:4	specifically 16:4,16,25	75:22 77:26,42 78:8
sized 33:35	Sonja's 23:18 31:22	16:37 20:40,42 29:18	78:28 80:22 113:2
sizes 30:8 67:17	soon 21:14 45:16	40:2,36 44:8,10,32,42	standards 69:17 70:4
skipping 92:10	sorry 18:44 19:24 23:48	45:1 47:31 50:47 51:6	73:6,15,17,35 110:19
SKOMAL 2:45	27:27 34:8 35:6 36:36	54:10 58:45 60:4	110:39,48
slated 55:12	50:32 89:4,41,48	73:16 81:5 109:19	Standing 77:5
slide 10:24,37 11:41	122:7	110:3	standpoint 19:29 27:22
12:16 13:15 15:17	sort 5:36,42,47 6:19	specifications 20:14	27:39 89:8
21:4 23:21 24:20,35	7:40 8:2 15:10 16:34	75:8,25,31 76:4,27	stands 65:10
59:12 68:7 71:20	17:4,14 31:9 33:15	specifics 29:3	start 5:20 9:5,16,25,46
75:37 76:6 77:9,30	37:40,44 39:12,17	speed 5:42 47:16 79:3	15:42,44 22:12 27:14
78:26,26,35 88:41	48:5 50:48 66:43	98:16 102:10,11	28:27,35 38:12 39:16
97:10 98:39 100:35	71:22 74:40 75:41,47	spending 119:8	43:20 45:26 55:47
slides 10:21 13:45 16:7	76:26 83:5 84:34,44	spends 36:33	56:7 92:18 99:39
16:10 20:41 32:25	85:6 87:28,44 88:31	spent 96:42 119:38	100:8 107:23 119:1
	94:46 97:23 98:26	spinach 69:3	
55:18 70:18 76:41		spinner 30:1,11,23	123:28
slow 59:18 108:40	100:25 104:35 108:24	Spirite 30.1,11,23	started 9:8 26:30 48:9
II	ı	ı	ı

il .
48:13 95:21
starting 16:43 28:16
33:17 36:44 42:15,29
43:30 123:24
starts 28:19 56:7 89:5
119:24
state 1:39 10:9 11:32 11:35 12:41 14:8,15
14:17,31,48 16:13,41
19:27,32 20:1 23:46
19:27,32 20:1 23:46 24:12 29:37,38,42,48
29:48 32:14,15 35:31
35:32,36,40,41 36:6
45:5 54:36,38 122:37 stated 16:4 82:43
statement 16:33 69:41
94:3 123:6,19
statements 112:46
states 2:38 9:32 18:7
18:13,19 19:41 23:44
30:8 32:26,31 33:2 37:19,25,32 50:44
51:21 58:5 60:41
67:37 98:8,9 101:4
111:1 122:21,23,36
123:7
static 70:45,46 71:17
102:3 108:7,37
stating 21:4 statistical 70:6
Statistics 77:6
status 16:6,8 18:33,35
20:16 35:48 40:3
43:27 53:43 55:9
56:10 57:6,9,13,18
59:22,46 60:3,25,28 60:44 61:39 64:10,37
65:17 74:15 75:7,16
75:24,30 86:11,30
122:25 123:18
stay 87:32 93:31 102:9
stayed 11:8
stayed 11:8 staying 118:39
stayed 11:8 staying 118:39 stays 42:14,32
stayed 11:8 staying 118:39 stays 42:14,32 steering 82:12
stayed 11:8 staying 118:39 stays 42:14,32 steering 82:12 step 17:26 25:46 49:36 50:18 57:5 67:35
stayed 11:8 staying 118:39 stays 42:14,32 steering 82:12 step 17:26 25:46 49:36 50:18 57:5 67:35 107:25
stayed 11:8 staying 118:39 stays 42:14,32 steering 82:12 step 17:26 25:46 49:36 50:18 57:5 67:35 107:25 Stephen 2:23 115:27,29
stayed 11:8 staying 118:39 stays 42:14,32 steering 82:12 step 17:26 25:46 49:36 50:18 57:5 67:35 107:25 Stephen 2:23 115:27,29 stepping 113:29
stayed 11:8 staying 118:39 stays 42:14,32 steering 82:12 step 17:26 25:46 49:36 50:18 57:5 67:35 107:25 Stephen 2:23 115:27,29 stepping 113:29 steps 9:37 15:25 55:38
stayed 11:8 staying 118:39 stays 42:14,32 steering 82:12 step 17:26 25:46 49:36 50:18 57:5 67:35 107:25 Stephen 2:23 115:27,29 stepping 113:29 steps 9:37 15:25 55:38 56:5 57:36 75:45,47
stayed 11:8 staying 118:39 stays 42:14,32 steering 82:12 step 17:26 25:46 49:36 50:18 57:5 67:35 107:25 Stephen 2:23 115:27,29 stepping 113:29 steps 9:37 15:25 55:38 56:5 57:36 75:45,47 76:2,25,36 78:7 101:31
stayed 11:8 staying 118:39 stays 42:14,32 steering 82:12 step 17:26 25:46 49:36 50:18 57:5 67:35 107:25 Stephen 2:23 115:27,29 stepping 113:29 steps 9:37 15:25 55:38 56:5 57:36 75:45,47 76:2,25,36 78:7 101:31 Steve 1:44 2:35 116:14
stayed 11:8 staying 118:39 stays 42:14,32 steering 82:12 step 17:26 25:46 49:36 50:18 57:5 67:35 107:25 Stephen 2:23 115:27,29 stepping 113:29 steps 9:37 15:25 55:38 56:5 57:36 75:45,47 76:2,25,36 78:7 101:31 Steve 1:44 2:35 116:14 Stevens 82:45
stayed 11:8 staying 118:39 stays 42:14,32 steering 82:12 step 17:26 25:46 49:36 50:18 57:5 67:35 107:25 Stephen 2:23 115:27,29 stepping 113:29 steps 9:37 15:25 55:38 56:5 57:36 75:45,47 76:2,25,36 78:7 101:31 Steve 1:44 2:35 116:14

20:17,22,24 42:42,45
50:4 53:30 54:2,17
59:25 62:10 66:45 70:9 74:15 75:7,24,30
75:48 76:23,29,32,33
77:10,16 78:30 81:1,2
83:27 84:45 86:31
89:25 104:22 111:27
122:25
stocks 11:19 14:20,25 18:33,35 26:39 27:15
74:13 79:4,15
stop 52:40 92:9 105:42
109:13 113:47
stovepipe 98:18
stovepipes 96:33 100:40 104:11
straight 112:48
streamline 39:25 43:11
103:10 109:46 110:31
streamlined 99:20
streamlining 39:39
93:38 97:9 street 95:17 119:47
strengths 85:4
stress 45:33 113:14
stressed 44:25
strictly 27:21
strike 109:4 striped 13:32
stroke 101:14
strong 80:18 82:8
strongly 104:34
struck 16:12
structure 14:43 60:6 struggle 79:8
struggled 88:19
struggling 27:38
stuck 31:22
students 48:25,34
studies 64:2,33 study 48:29 79:41
study 40.29 79.41 studying 48:35
stuff 30:48 31:3,14
53:39 64:8 66:1,7,15
83:21 84:11 109:12
111:11 stunner 114:20
stupid 105:20
sub-regional 15:3
subject 58:5 69:19
70:15 85:44 95:25
113:42 submit 60:2,12,20,22
submitted 40:11 64:23

114:28

subpar 120:28

subset 44:10 97:29

substance 38:23 substantial 37:34 56:17 56:20,41,47 59:8 88:12 substantive 7:15 112:42 **success** 9:32 10:2 11:11 12:28 13:40 14:21,23,39 21:9 34:29 successes 11:12 12:30 19:3 26:24,37 successful 26:42 27:33 69:30 122:2,28,29 successfully 12:32 succinct 26:7 sudden 84:25 102:3 104:12 **suffer** 13:4 suffering 123:15 sufficiently 71:38 suggest 48:38 **suggested** 33:45 91:3 105:14 suggesting 16:34 suggestion 34:27 91:8 117:30 suggestions 15:28 37:48 49:8 90:48 91:11 109:36 suggests 121:46 **suite** 113:9 **summarize** 26:16,36 74:10 102:13 summary 26:15 29:25 40:17 summer 15:18 21:16 45:17 78:14 **Sunday** 120:6,13,15 **super** 86:45 104:3 support 15:20 40:26,31 41:6,24 42:43 61:21 87:16,20 96:18 118:31 supported 17:7 40:22 41:11 supporters 27:25 supportive 7:9 105:41 supports 73:9 **suppose** 84:22 supposed 67:21 91:44 91:46 121:34 supposedly 120:20 **surely** 45:36 surface 87:21 **surprised** 67:12 108:6 **survey** 5:8 11:30 13:3 36:12,20 54:24,32

85:42.43 121:33 surveys 70:27 85:41 survivorship 44:45 susceptibility 57:10 sustainability 15:16 16:24 26:40 40:35 42:45 53:27 101:43 sustainable 2:17 3:30 27:15,39 31:41 32:5 34:15 37:16 53:33 58:47 69:18 107:2 121:25 sustainably 20:12 44:5 swallowing 25:29 **sweep** 37:45 **swimming** 119:43 **swing** 33:31 switch 55:21 sword 106:31 swordfish 4:17 5:24 38:38 39:4,19,21,28 39:32,43,48 40:2,5,25 40:26,27,33,35 41:28 41:32,35,37 42:1,3,6 42:8,13,24,26,31,42 44:18 45:35 51:42 53:27,30 54:1,7,15,15 76:45 94:11 98:48 107:2,4,4 109:48 swordfishing 52:10 synthesis 28:32 synthesize 28:23 57:8 61:40 synthesizing 22:1 28:25 system 98:44 100:3,22 101:21 105:28 122:9 systemic 89:12 systems 66:36 96:11 100:16 101:19 102:4 102:44 Т

t's 95:14 table 41:42 43:20 92:44 97:18 106:25 107:7 108:16 tables 85:24 88:41 tackle 3:12 23:29 32:45 tactic-wise 65:41 tag 15:19 90:28,29 taken 10:11 17:28 20:13 37:26,46 58:11 64:8 65:24,24 67:28 76:25 117:12 takes 99:45 111:10 talk 10:7 15:43 16:35 18:2 27:4 38:37 44:22

55:39,41 66:15 68:23	51:25 66:45 73:45	thoughts 5:16 6:6 8:36	119:21 123:23
68:29 83:3,20 85:47	79:24 84:46 86:7	34:10 45:41 68:10,43	told 61:22 79:24 90:24
94:23,32 106:8 107:5	87:10 88:12,14 90:16	78:43 89:31 103:12	121:18,21
121:13	92:40	103:32 104:4 111:41	Tom 3:45 96:26 114:31
talked 16:36 20:41	territorial 44:40 58:7	112:19,22	tomorrow 5:6 114:45
34:33 59:31 78:7 86:7	tested 72:47 80:27	thread 87:12	123:24,44 124:8,11
108:21 117:40	Texas 2:47	threat 59:32	tone 45:47
talking 9:22 11:46 12:6	text 74:47 115:6	threatened 4:20 5:27	tons 24:43,44 25:41
12:8 14:5 15:34 22:48	thank 5:14 8:22 9:18	47:43 56:1 57:20,28	84:4,9
31:37 49:5 50:48	15:37,48 17:22 18:27	57:30,38,42,46 58:21	tool 98:23
55:35 66:14 81:9	19:23 20:27,35 21:10	58:27,40 59:38 60:31	tools 86:43 87:15,16
86:33,42 88:9 91:24	25:44 27:39 29:29,34	62:11,21,23,36,44	tooth 47:1 50:23,24
99:2 106:48 109:19	29:34 31:17 32:23	threats 57:11 58:31	top 102:9 106:35
111:25 115:38 122:38	33:3,23 34:7,11,44,46	60:7,10 62:35,42	117:27
talks 43:22	37:36,37 39:1 45:18	64:29	topic 13:7 21:39 23:34
target 12:33 32:28	45:20,28,43,44 46:4	three 29:43 36:22 39:20	87:45 93:17
targeted 11:39 24:10	46:13,41 47:24 50:42	39:38 40:18 41:13	topics 8:21,21 40:46
43:34 44:19 107:10	52:4,12,33 53:21,40	42:7,18,31,36,37	51:35 121:3
targeting 10:10,19	61:37 62:3 63:1,6,7	43:26,28,30,36,46,47	total 24:37 40:14 44:1
23:31,41	63:29,36,38,47 65:26	43:48 46:11,17,18	46:17,21
tarp 30:20	66:20 67:40 84:30	49:26 51:35 52:16,47	totally 84:41 91:15,39
tarpon 30:17	85:15 86:3,5 94:38,44	53:1 76:18,31,41,42	106:41
tasked 95:22	94:48 109:16 111:33	78:30 80:14 82:15	touch 110:9 121:4
tastes 17:17 31:23	114:45 115:19 116:14	104:4 112:14 116:20	touched 96:26 109:21
Taylor 29:31 31:19,21	116:28,46 117:31,47	116:24,28 118:42	121:13
65:34 66:21,22,27,29	118:6 123:21 124:5	121:3	tough 26:16
67:7 87:46,48 88:1,30	Thankfully 89:45	three-day 5:5 118:38	tournament 11:31,40
89:4	thereof 82:5	three-year 96:29	79:27 99:30 100:5
teal 10:32	things 5:37 6:24,40	thresher 86:17	118:14
10.02	90 0.0. 0.2., 10		
team 61:42,44 67:45	8:19 18:47 21:19,21	threshold 61:28 62:15	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45	8:19 18:47 21:19,21	threshold 61:28 62:15	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44	tournaments 32:36,38 32:42 79:28
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38 32:42 79:28 towed 120:17
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48 37:3 68:6 112:9	tournaments 32:36,38 32:42 79:28 towed 120:17 track 103:46 114:35 tracking 106:4 traction 83:40
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48 37:3 68:6 112:9 121:24 thrown 31:8 80:26 tickets 119:7	tournaments 32:36,38 32:42 79:28 towed 120:17 track 103:46 114:35 tracking 106:4 traction 83:40 trade 16:29 60:8 67:29
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48 37:3 68:6 112:9 121:24 thrown 31:8 80:26 tickets 119:7 tie 92:38 96:7	tournaments 32:36,38 32:42 79:28 towed 120:17 track 103:46 114:35 tracking 106:4 traction 83:40 trade 16:29 60:8 67:29 traditional 86:30
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48 37:3 68:6 112:9 121:24 thrown 31:8 80:26 tickets 119:7 tie 92:38 96:7 tiger 43:31,48	tournaments 32:36,38 32:42 79:28 towed 120:17 track 103:46 114:35 tracking 106:4 traction 83:40 trade 16:29 60:8 67:29 traditional 86:30 traditionally 51:22
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48 37:3 68:6 112:9 121:24 thrown 31:8 80:26 tickets 119:7 tie 92:38 96:7 tiger 43:31,48 tightly 82:2	tournaments 32:36,38 32:42 79:28 towed 120:17 track 103:46 114:35 tracking 106:4 traction 83:40 trade 16:29 60:8 67:29 traditional 86:30 traditionally 51:22 translate 76:15
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48 37:3 68:6 112:9 121:24 thrown 31:8 80:26 tickets 119:7 tie 92:38 96:7 tiger 43:31,48 tightly 82:2 Tim 2:31 9:13 65:33	tournaments 32:36,38 32:42 79:28 towed 120:17 track 103:46 114:35 tracking 106:4 traction 83:40 trade 16:29 60:8 67:29 traditional 86:30 traditionally 51:22 translate 76:15 transparency 71:48
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48 37:3 68:6 112:9 121:24 thrown 31:8 80:26 tickets 119:7 tie 92:38 96:7 tiger 43:31,48 tightly 82:2 Tim 2:31 9:13 65:33 66:20 78:44 80:4 88:3	tournaments 32:36,38 32:42 79:28 towed 120:17 track 103:46 114:35 tracking 106:4 traction 83:40 trade 16:29 60:8 67:29 traditional 86:30 traditionally 51:22 translate 76:15 transparency 71:48 73:46 75:11 77:43
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48 37:3 68:6 112:9 121:24 thrown 31:8 80:26 tickets 119:7 tie 92:38 96:7 tiger 43:31,48 tightly 82:2 Tim 2:31 9:13 65:33 66:20 78:44 80:4 88:3 91:30	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1 101:46 102:6,10,41	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12 107:33,34 109:17,27	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1 101:46 102:6,10,41 103:33,36,43 104:1	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12 107:33,34 109:17,27 110:10 111:16 114:18	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1 101:46 102:6,10,41 103:33,36,43 104:1 105:31	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12 107:33,34 109:17,27 110:10 111:16 114:18 114:34 117:9 118:7	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1 101:46 102:6,10,41 103:33,36,43 104:1 105:31 technology 5:46 96:11	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12 107:33,34 109:17,27 110:10 111:16 114:18 114:34 117:9 118:7 121:12	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1 101:46 102:6,10,41 103:33,36,43 104:1 105:31 technology 5:46 96:11 97:15 99:41 101:17	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12 107:33,34 109:17,27 110:10 111:16 114:18 114:34 117:9 118:7 121:12 third 40:42 43:17,37	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1 101:46 102:6,10,41 103:33,36,43 104:1 105:31 technology 5:46 96:11 97:15 99:41 101:17 tell 24:24 91:18	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12 107:33,34 109:17,27 110:10 111:16 114:18 114:34 117:9 118:7 121:12 third 40:42 43:17,37 44:46 77:35 99:33	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1 101:46 102:6,10,41 103:33,36,43 104:1 105:31 technology 5:46 96:11 97:15 99:41 101:17 tell 24:24 91:18 tells 88:22	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12 107:33,34 109:17,27 110:10 111:16 114:18 114:34 117:9 118:7 121:12 third 40:42 43:17,37 44:46 77:35 99:33 100:6	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1 101:46 102:6,10,41 103:33,36,43 104:1 105:31 technology 5:46 96:11 97:15 99:41 101:17 tell 24:24 91:18 tells 88:22 temperate 52:39 59:16	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12 107:33,34 109:17,27 110:10 111:16 114:18 114:34 117:9 118:7 121:12 third 40:42 43:17,37 44:46 77:35 99:33 100:6 thorough 69:31 74:18	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1 101:46 102:6,10,41 103:33,36,43 104:1 105:31 technology 5:46 96:11 97:15 99:41 101:17 tell 24:24 91:18 tells 88:22 temperate 52:39 59:16 temporal 72:15 103:40	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12 107:33,34 109:17,27 110:10 111:16 114:18 114:34 117:9 118:7 121:12 third 40:42 43:17,37 44:46 77:35 99:33 100:6 thorough 69:31 74:18 thoroughly 30:27 70:42	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1 101:46 102:6,10,41 103:33,36,43 104:1 105:31 technology 5:46 96:11 97:15 99:41 101:17 tell 24:24 91:18 tells 88:22 temperate 52:39 59:16 temporal 72:15 103:40 term 58:16 86:20	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12 107:33,34 109:17,27 110:10 111:16 114:18 114:34 117:9 118:7 121:12 third 40:42 43:17,37 44:46 77:35 99:33 100:6 thorough 69:31 74:18 thoroughly 30:27 70:42 73:44	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1 101:46 102:6,10,41 103:33,36,43 104:1 105:31 technology 5:46 96:11 97:15 99:41 101:17 tell 24:24 91:18 tells 88:22 temperate 52:39 59:16 temporal 72:15 103:40 term 58:16 86:20 terms 22:31,44 27:36	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12 107:33,34 109:17,27 110:10 111:16 114:18 114:34 117:9 118:7 121:12 third 40:42 43:17,37 44:46 77:35 99:33 100:6 thorough 69:31 74:18 thorought 93:1 105:20	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1 101:46 102:6,10,41 103:33,36,43 104:1 105:31 technology 5:46 96:11 97:15 99:41 101:17 tell 24:24 91:18 tells 88:22 temperate 52:39 59:16 temporal 72:15 103:40 term 58:16 86:20 terms 22:31,44 27:36 28:34 31:47 32:2	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12 107:33,34 109:17,27 110:10 111:16 114:18 114:34 117:9 118:7 121:12 third 40:42 43:17,37 44:46 77:35 99:33 100:6 thorough 69:31 74:18 thorought 93:1 105:20 110:18,22 117:4	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38
team 61:42,44 67:45 113:27 tech 9:2 123:27 technical 7:42 8:24 70:24 73:7 89:33 105:5 110:21 technically 101:9 technician 101:22 techniques 12:45 13:11 21:1,22 44:44 technological 68:37 101:15 technologies 4:26 68:33 94:24,33 95:11 95:23,45 96:2,44 97:2 98:22 100:27 101:1 101:46 102:6,10,41 103:33,36,43 104:1 105:31 technology 5:46 96:11 97:15 99:41 101:17 tell 24:24 91:18 tells 88:22 temperate 52:39 59:16 temporal 72:15 103:40 term 58:16 86:20 terms 22:31,44 27:36	8:19 18:47 21:19,21 21:31,36 25:15 27:7 28:47 31:11,21,47 33:16 35:48 37:7 38:27 40:7 42:35 45:30 46:47 47:6,16 48:44,47,48 49:4,18 49:22,26,35,48 50:25 62:15,33 64:27 65:44 65:47 66:11,17,18 67:20 69:35 70:1 71:8 71:20 74:15 75:23 78:33 79:4 80:14 81:11 85:1,17,22,32 87:22 91:17 100:10 100:15 103:33 104:12 107:33,34 109:17,27 110:10 111:16 114:18 114:34 117:9 118:7 121:12 third 40:42 43:17,37 44:46 77:35 99:33 100:6 thorough 69:31 74:18 thorought 93:1 105:20	threshold 61:28 62:15 throes 84:44 throw 7:5,10,44 36:48	tournaments 32:36,38

1		1	1
TRIAL 2:47	two 7:36 10:38,48 22:41	undertaking 110:37	92:42
tried 98:36	23:19 29:39 30:24	underway 108:42	
triggers 58:35	35:7 37:6 39:42 40:12	undue 71:46	V
trip 40:5,10,28 41:38	41:25 42:17 43:48	unexpected 115:15	Vaeth 3:9 6:8 33:25
42:27 43:29,31,37	48:33 53:19 61:47	unfamiliar 35:23	34:7
46:12,22 50:10 96:35	68:39 78:2 84:3 92:11	unfortunately 8:2 16:40	valid 84:41
99:7 105:38,46	94:14 106:32 110:25	31:15 85:6	validated 70:15 72:44
trips 10:11,19 11:33,40	118:37 120:12,32,45	ungodly 84:26	validation 72:43,46
103:46 118:36,38	121:1,12,22	unidentified 12:2,12,47	validity 117:4
119:2	two-year 76:20	23:23 24:4	valuable 8:18 34:18
trophy 115:38 116:12	type 15:10 21:26 28:34	unilateral 114:11	90:37
121:46	51:18 84:11 87:28	United 18:7,13,19 32:26	value 13:24 26:43 32:11
tropical 52:38 59:16	117:41	32:31 33:2 37:19,25	90:26 91:30,39 98:29
trouble 74:34	types 25:21 29:18	37:32 58:5 67:37	104:17
troubleshoot 101:23,44	73:38,43 84:42 101:2	111:1 122:21,22,36	valued 91:32,37
troubleshooting 115:7	108:47	123:7	variety 40:34 77:18
true 20:11 27:1 34:19	typically 63:27 77:36,40	units 101:16,16,17	86:43
37:27	81:9,23 115:44	106:8,22,33 107:24	various 22:14,17 77:48
Trust 31:12 114:12	typing 115:9	107:26,27	85:1 95:10,28,45 96:8
truth 120:3		University 1:40,46 2:27	97:22,27 115:41
truthfully 90:46	U	48:25	vehicles 87:3
try 6:23 19:19 23:10	U.S 1:4 14:19,35 15:20	unknown 86:9,11,35	verbally 8:43
27:28 33:19 34:5,32	16:18,22,28,31,39,44	unlucky 121:37	verification 72:42,45
37:13,32 38:3 46:32	17:2,9,48 18:3,4	unpack 84:32	verified 70:14,34,39
51:12 52:7 76:33,36	24:38,41 25:26,30,44	unrealistic 26:12	72:44
79:37 88:16,48 90:39	26:26,46 27:27 42:4	unreliable 67:2	verify 97:37
97:34 99:24 103:9	43:23 44:14 45:32	upcoming 69:13	version 15:30
109:4	49:34 50:7 51:41,42	update 4:13,24 5:21	versus 17:4 18:28,39
trying 7:6,28,30 18:10	52:39 58:6,7,8,8	9:16 14:46 15:5 53:42	18:46 26:24 36:6
18:29,31,39,45,46	65:22,47 66:35 67:23	73:14,48 95:10	79:16,23 87:13
19:31 21:23 22:32,44	105:11 110:39,40	106:14 123:33,38,41	101:13
26:6,34 30:40 31:10	112:35,39 113:1,5,13	updated 69:48 70:19	vessel 14:42 40:5,10,27
35:7 42:23 48:19,27	113:21,23,27,37,41	updates 4:27 116:34	42:26 43:1,29,31,37
51:9,28,41 61:23,24	114:10,41 122:42	117:44	46:21 96:34 98:38,45
62:6,14 71:45 76:38	123:16,17,19	updating 96:5	99:7 101:5,22 105:38
76:39 79:7 86:28	U.S.'s 66:34	UPR 48:37	113:18 114:41 116:36
87:11 88:34 90:32	ultimate 60:33	upward 13:22	vessels 35:9 40:37,38
92:24,48 93:2 95:40	ultimately 66:34 72:6	urgent 86:28	98:45 116:35
96:7,18,38,40 98:15	75:31 88:36 110:46	urging 111:31	viability 31:31
99:19,19 100:26,48	umbrella 70:5	use 7:18,24 28:42 38:11	vice 31:12
101:26 102:45 109:9 111:30 115:4	unable 8:3 11:25 89:32	41:1 52:7,31 60:3	video 117:44
Tuesdays 118:44	unauthorized 101:5 uncertainty 14:18 67:5	61:3 64:16,18 67:3,6 70:47 75:28 77:36	videos 44:30,41 48:20 51:8,13
119:11	70:40 71:3,5 72:5	83:47 99:36 100:23	view 25:37 55:20 71:38
tuna 1:44 2:43 13:33,36	under-harvested 11:18	101:20 104:1,36	114:2
98:45,47 99:45,48	understand 6:28 18:3	106:9,20,20 107:12	viewing 12:31
100:3 101:6,11	29:13 46:7 50:16,17	107:13 108:2 116:41	vigilant 98:14
103:20,21 105:8	50:21,45 61:20 69:43	116:45 117:38	Virgin 43:23
106:11,45 107:39	79:7,10,32,34,48 80:2	useful 16:17 17:14	Virginia 2:2
118:8,28 119:2	85:25,29 88:17,26,34	78:26	virtual 1:16 6:44 7:2
120:21	104:17,25,40 113:20	usual 6:18	112:6
tunas 76:45 106:37	120:31 121:10	usually 42:19 57:33	virtually 81:37 95:5
tuned 93:31	understanding 44:47	77:38 116:3	123:2
turnout 6:13	52:26 79:15 80:35	USVI 43:34	visible 8:4
turtle 106:34 116:19,21	85:4 104:2 109:9	utilization 31:6,8,33	vision 96:41
116:30,32,38 117:36	understood 44:34 62:3	32:5 38:1	visionary 46:4
tweaking 27:11,11	62:46 63:9 85:22	utilize 106:21,22	VMS 99:32 101:16
twice 82:13,19	undertaken 109:45	utilized 67:34 90:21	103:44 106:32 107:6
			

107:24,26 voice 33:30 voicemail 48:15,42 voices 7:30 89:1 void 89:1 volume 90:34 voluntarily 103:45 volunteerism 117:46 vulnerable 23:33 48:3

wait 9:13 wake 107:33 walk 55:37,43 56:4 61:40 76:42 94:37 walked 59:41 90:9 walking 55:47 WALLACE 2:24 Walt 32:21 33:4 45:24 90:28 **WALTER** 1:46 wanted 8:10.22 18:6.16 18:28 23:18 28:7 30:35 33:10,14,22 34:11 36:47 37:3,7,17 38:15 41:14 42:35 44:5,7,22 50:32 54:18 54:22 59:13 88:3 113:25 115:14,26,27 115:37 122:17 wanting 17:11,46 50:33 87:46 114:47 wants 7:1 83:7 89:28 92:27 93:25 107:12 108:14 warbler 122:34 warranted 56:19,24,42 56:48 57:4,20,24,28 59:9,39 108:35 Warren 3:45 96:26 114:31 wasn't 36:24 84:7 85:13 89:41 104:47 water 3:12 10:9 11:35 32:37 36:32 46:8 54:38 79:17,23,31 88:21 90:5,45 93:1 112:33 Water's 108:36 waterfront 32:44 waters 23:46 24:12 29:38,42,48,48 35:32 35:36,40,41 36:6 54:36,37 59:17 67:13 **Wave** 84:3 way 6:46 7:26 8:6 11:1 16:23 19:14 21:26

32:12,26,32 33:2 37:14 40:4,9 53:29,38 58:22 60:43 65:25,44 66:5,10,11,17,18,35 67:38 79:36,41,42,48 80:27 82:44 86:32,38 92:11,35 93:4 99:19 102:47 103:10,35 107:25,40 109:11 111:40 116:8,22 119:16 121:16 ways 9:37 10:3 22:8,32 22:45 23:5 27:32 28:36 33:43 96:2 101:12 **WCPFC** 80:37 Weak 109:47 weaken 114:4 weaknesses 85:4 wealth 29:6 Weber 3:11 61:12,17,18 62:3,46 121:46 Webex 8:3 webinar 1:25 25:10 117:41 webinars 15:27 40:13 website 25:43 56:3.4 59:11 74:34 77:1,14 websites 45:15 78:33 WEDNESDAY 1:20 week 22:41 95:18 99:18 118:33,45 119:24 120:12 weekend 120:9 weekenders 118:14 weeks 17:32 21:15 22:41 54:46 61:19 102:14 weigh 6:5 7:39 18:28 85:9 109:15 weighed 33:6 106:2 weighing 112:2 weighted 98:31 weights 10:47 25:2 Weiss 3:12 36:45 37:6 45:23 53:24 110:44 110:45 welcome 5:4 6:8 8:14 20:33 118:5 Welcome/Recap 4:11 welcomed 33:11 115:43 went 30:31 32:18 38:33

40:3 41:45 42:25,29

47:3 65:2 68:26 84:13

84:23 94:27 96:23,23

99:31,31 118:26

121:17 124:14

weren't 17:38 west 29:44 95:30 **western** 14:34 Westfall 3:14 23:14,15 23:16 110:15 wheel 75:18,19 whitetip 41:9 47:48 86:35 whitetips 86:23 wide 61:27,27 62:10,14 62:20,27 100:18 wider 64:26 wildlife 1:31 2:7,47 58:10 **WILLEY** 3:15 willy-nilly 50:13 wind 7:22 89:8 92:17 103:36 106:5 109:34 window 111:32 **windows** 34:21 **winds** 88:13 winter 78:20 92:1 105:4 winters 92:1 wire 65:20 wish 25:34 67:10 wishy-washy 87:35 women 48:26,28,33 wonder 67:22 92:7 115:5 116:26 wondering 23:23,30,37 24:45 47:2,9,22 82:22 82:30 87:45 91:5 116:22,41 word 23:2 26:47 31:34 53:23 64:48 119:47 words 69:25 80:39,41 90:26,34 work 5:33 7:5,7 15:22 17:1 21:46 22:1,7 23:5,10 31:9 33:20,42 40:46 45:30 47:13,14 47:19 51:9,26 52:24 58:45 88:24,48 92:27 99:47 102:45 103:35 111:9,10 112:9 114:36 118:12,17 122:33 123:27 worked 15:47 27:38 48:24 93:30 121:18 working 8:23,24,28 18:14 21:23 22:10,31 23:27 26:2 29:1,2,4 29:15 44:39 45:8 47:20,23 48:14,17,41 52:46 82:8 96:12 98:14 100:19 105:5,6

workshop 5:10 45:9 84:2 85:44 121:22 workshops 45:6 117:4 117:12,18 121:14 world 6:45 27:2 31:12 39:3 67:38 120:22 121:26 worldwide 14:20 16:33 65:40 worries 24:2 115:20 worst 114:43 worth 105:1 wouldn't 23:12 67:47 116:40,43 123:15 wound 58:18 wrap 31:10 68:35 79:32 94:35 122:5 123:45 wrapped 82:2 wraps 73:11 wrecks 30:21 write 60:21 written 81:36 wrong 24:42 114:33 Χ

x 10:29 11:2 12:20

y 10:29,46 12:19

YAMITZA 2:4

...

year 9:47 10:1 21:18,24

26:21 39:8 40:12,16 45:13,18 53:35 57:33 63:14,21 81:36 82:13 82:19 92:10,31,34,46 93:7 95:8 113:8 118:20,35,36 120:24 122:2 vear-round 11:13 34:30 years 5:44 9:38,43 10:12,29 11:2,34 12:20 19:31 20:25 23:34 25:17,25,35 26:30,30,38 27:13,44 27:45 30:21 31:5 36:21 44:27 47:18 48:42 52:24,26,47 53:1,34 54:40 65:24 66:1,16,16 76:18 79:45 83:32 85:21 88:19 90:42 92:11,43 95:21 96:23,43 97:18 99:33 101:7 106:32 109:37 114:3,23 116:20,23,24,28,28 118:9.20.20.20.24.29 119:38 121:22.23.33

110:30 117:16

works 6:46 79:48 84:19

23:24 30:21 31:38

121:37,47,47

yellowfin 90:27 118:28 **40** 11:6 30:21 114:3 2 120:23 119:4 **2** 5:4 69:20,47 71:2 yesterday 5:12,31 7:8 **45** 30:41,42 40:39 72:15 73:3,37 74:39 7:12,17,19,27,47 8:16 **46** 54:41 75:22 77:26.42 78:8 13:15 15:17,47 36:11 118:20 120:27 123:45 5 38:16 68:37,44 86:7 **2,800** 24:36,44 25:41 89:32,42 90:19 91:28 **5** 4:11 38:5 120:27 **2:07** 94:27 91:30,42,44 92:33 **50** 11:47 12:11,46 23:21 **2:15** 94:22 94:1 99:23 115:37,48 25:22,23 84:12 88:19 2:16 94:28 118:20 120:24 121:29 **2:30** 123:45 yesterday's 96:30 **54** 12:43 19:39 **20** 30:41 65:28 66:16 yield 30:31 37:10,14 **55** 4:21 79:45 121:34 89:34 90:22,25 **56** 36:25 **2000** 30:45 81:37 **2004** 71:13 Ζ 6 **2005** 77:32 Zeppelin 29:17 **6** 9:47 40:30 105:19,22 **2009** 78:4 zero 11:1 40:8,30 41:13 105:24 **2012** 36:27 42:12,14,28,32 43:26 60 91:38 **2013** 69:48 71:14 73:14 43:27,28,36 107:4 60-day 60:1 74:7 83:21 zone 2:29 115:44 116:2 **630** 26:12 **2014** 9:46 10:34 24:35 zones 115:38 **64** 102:7 24:36 25:7.40 68 4:27 **2015** 11:10,15 12:27 0 **2016** 73:39 77:23 83:21 7 **2017** 67:14 114:24 1 **7** 58:35.45 59:1 60:40 2018 12:22 36:24 91:19 66:1 108:19,21,27 **1:02** 68:27 **2019** 9:44 10:35 11:6 **10** 29:44 48:11,11 52:5 118:33 14:33 75:5 76:19 84:3 92:43 118:20 **75** 84:12 **2020** 9:45 100:29 **10-minute** 94:22 **750,000** 119:31 **2021** 1:21 96:6 **10:28** 38:33 **2022** 15:30 20:39 78:23 10:30 123:34 8 **21** 91:38 **10:37** 38:34 8 24:21,22 **23** 118:23 **100** 84:4,8 106:39,40,46 8.6 91:34 **24-month** 63:16 119:30 8:45 123:25 **240,000** 11:46 **11** 23:21 77:31 80 84:12 119:5 **25** 27:13 38:4,30 54:41 **11:30** 5:29,30 55:12 **800** 24:43,44 25:41 63:21 91:34 **11:49** 68:26 **85** 12:33 32:27 33:3 **26** 1:21 53:36 111 4:29 67:36 113:4,11,15,38 28 4:17 **12** 12:3 24:35 29:35 **29** 40:14 32:25 57:16 63:19,23 9 63:25,25,26,28 9 4:15 123:24 3 107:27 9:00 1:25 **3** 6:2.2 94:34 107:4 **12-month** 57:19,24,29 9:02 5:2 **3:30** 6:2 68:36 94:36 63:11,19 **90** 5:35 56:15 61:21 3:31 124:14 **120** 118:36 **90-day** 4:19 55:41,44 **30** 12:1 26:29,30 30:20 **13** 12:9 32:25 90:3 56:37,39,45 57:6 59:5 38:39 66:16 67:9 93:33 94:3 114:19 59:10,43,48 60:16 118:33 **14** 9:44 11:5 15:34,35 64:21 65:4 **30-** 26:20 20:7 27:44 60:24 **92** 29:40 **30-year** 26:20 15 30:42 115:25 118:9 **95** 84:13 **301** 67:29 **16** 11:5 96 11:10 **34** 50:8 **17** 21:4 118:29 **34.5** 91:32 **18** 12:24 21:4 40:5,27 **35** 36:21 54:39,42 40:30 42:26,28,30 **35th** 118:8 107:4,7 114:24 **19** 12:24 27:45 114:25 **1986** 36:21 **4** 4:24 **4(d)** 58:26,26,29

${\color{red} \underline{C} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{E} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{R} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{T} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{I} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{F} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{I} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{C} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{A} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{T} \hspace{0.1cm} \underline{E}}$

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Recreational Roundtable

Before: US DOC/NOAA

Date: 05-26-21

Place: teleconference

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 &