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MR. BROOKS: All right. Since you are all in your seats and quiet, $I$ think we should just get going here. Randy, $I$ will hand it off to you. MR. BLANKINSHIP: Good morning everybody. It's great to see you today for Day 2 of our meeting. Yesterday went very well. I certainly was very pleased with the discussion and input that we've been receiving. I'm looking forward to your continued input and the comment and discussion today on several different topics.

But before we get into all of that, we are really pleased to have with us Kelly Denit, who will be making some comments. Kelly is the Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries and that office, she's my boss, and that office is here in Silver Spring, of course.

Within the Office of Sustainable Fisheries that is located at Atlantic HMS Management Division; Domestic Fisheries Division, which deals nationally with a lot of the fishery
management policy with all of the different Councils and consistency across the country. Also, we have a division that includes some of our regulatory services activities for the agency, and then also NSIL, the National Seafood Inspection Laboratory, down in Pascagoula.

So we're really excited to have her. She's been this week at the Council Coordination Committee meeting in Annapolis, and then took some time to come over and join us today. So thank you Kelly for being here, and I'll turn it over to you.

MS. DENNIT: Great, thank you Randy. Hopefully I've got the mic situation. I'll do my best to make sure I speak loudly into it, so everybody on our webinar can hear me. It's really great to be here with you all today, live and in person. Thanks to all of you who traveled to come and see us here in beautiful Silver Spring. Thanks to all of you who are joining us online.

My props to Pete and the team for getting all of these amazing cameras and everything set up so that everyone can participate. It's
really quite impressive actually. So like Randy said, I'm Kelly. I know many of you from my previous work in the world of Highly Migratory Species, when I used to work on ICCAT issues way back when. So it's great to see some familiar faces, and it's awesome to see some new faces. I look forward to meeting those of you who I have not already, and spending some time together today over the course of our agenda. So that's really great.

And I reiterate, I know that we say this to you at every meeting, but appreciate your input over these few days when you come and participate in these conversations. I know you're taking time out of your day and your work, and so it's really appreciated to hear the diversity of perspectives that each of you bring to our different topics.

I also wanted to just briefly touch a little bit on some of the big picture issues that are going on here in Office of Sustainable Fisheries. So mostly I'm just going to take a couple of minutes to talk about the budget. As we,
you may know, Congress actually passed an FY '22 budget, which is very exciting for us. It was in general positive for the agency. We did get some increases.

Largely those were directed increases, meaning that Congress was telling us exactly how to spend them. I think the biggest increase that's of relevance to you all was the increased support for our survey wook, make sure that our ships are getting out to actually collect the data that we need for stock assessments and things like that.

I would also note that the FY '23 request is out, so the President's budget, which you know, it's themes that you have heard in previous AP discussions focus on climate as well as survey work, and other aspects of NOAA's mission, in particular weather forecasting and other things like that.

I think the challenge that we are facing, and it's not just us in the Office of Sustainable Fisheries is that, you know, Generally flat budgets are actually decreasing budgets
because of inflation and everything else. So we, like everyone else and I'm sure each of you in your respective businesses and work are also looking at how do we prioritize what it is that we do, and thinking about how we could be most efficient and effective in our current environment.

And so we will continue to do that. There's no need for alarm at this moment. I'm not saying that to you to all of the sudden get wheels turning, like oh my God, what's going to happen. But $I$ do think that's something to make sure that we're all aware of, because it is a challenge that we will be grappling with here in the years to come.

So just a couple more quick things. First, I know that Janet Coit our AA and Sam Rauch will be here tomorrow to speak with you. I hope you'll take advantage of the opportunity to engage with both of them.

I know that Janet is very much looking forward to meeting you all. She's finally able to get out and actually meet all of our constituents
in person, which she's looking forward to. Many of you know Sam. He's been our DAA for Regulatory Programs for a long time. So that's great.

And I'll wrap up, wrap up just by saying I'm really looking forward to the conversation today around Amendment 13. I'm really thankful to Tom Warren for his leadership, Brad and the rest of the A13 team pulling that together. I really appreciate all of you who took the time to provide really extensive feedback as part of our process for Amendment 13, and I'm really looking forward to that conversation over the course of today and hearing your additional thoughts and feedback as we go.

So with that I'll wrap it up, and I'm happy to answer any questions. If there's something in particular that folks would like to hear more about, otherwise I certainly don't want to delay getting into the real meat of why everybody is here.

MR. BROOKS: Anyone have a quick question for Kelly?
(No response.)
MR. BROOKS: All right. Good morning, everyone. It's nice to see you again and thank you all for being so focused in the conversation yesterday and, you know, experimenting with us in our exciting new hybrid world. Hopefully we can leave the hybrid part behind soon. I've been saying that for two years, so we'll see.

Anyway, today we have a full day. In the morning, we will be focusing A13 and walking you all through the final Environmental Impact Statement. We'll spend the rest of the morning talking about a couple of different recreational data issues. We will get to lunch as did yesterday from 12:30. We'll give you an hour and a half again, enough time for folks in the room to get out and get some food, and importantly for those of you who are online get a break from staring at a computer. We definitely understand how tough that can be. So thank you all for hanging in.

In the afternoon, we will come back and we'll have a conversation about offshore wind. So

BOEM will be here. We'll hear from the Southeast Region about the Pelagic Longline Take Reduction Plan and where that stands. We will talk about electronic monitoring cost allocation policy, and we're going to add a small topic to the agenda after that to talk about HMS permit issuance and particularly as it relates to the Southeast Region.

So make a little bit of time on the agenda for that. We think that will fit in just fine. For members of the public who are here, we will have a public comment period at $4: 15$, and we will look to get all of you out of here by 4:45, so you can get on to whatever other work you need to do or just an evening.

We have a couple of new faces in the room, so I'm just going to hit some highlights on the ground rules, just so everyone understands sort of how we're having this conversation. For members of the public that are here or online, the conversation is around this table among the Advisory Panel members. So as I said, there will be an opportunity later in the day for members of
the public to weigh in. But until then, the conversation is among the Panel members.

We will run the queue like we did yesterday. I thought that worked reasonably well, which was to just try to take chunks of people around the table here, then bounce to the webinar, take a few people there.

It's a little bit easier technology than just bouncing back and forth, and as I did yesterday we'll, you know, continue to make sure that folks who we haven't heard from can weigh in, and I'll do my best to not continue to skip over Dewey, though it's so hard. Sorry Dewey.

No, I try really hard to make sure I'm getting everybody in and if I'm screwing up, apologies and call me on it. For folks who are online keeping your camera on, those of you that kept your cameras on yesterday, I really appreciate it, and if you can keep doing that that's great. For those of you in the room, I really appreciated the lack of side talk. It's very helpful and makes it much more possible for people online to be able
to follow the conversation.
Again, if you've got any tech issues along the way, shoot an email or something to Pete or to Craig, and we are recording the conversation as we were yesterday, so just please be aware of that. In the meantime, just be comfortable, be focused, ask questions, share time with everybody so we can continue to have good conversations. That's all I have to say. Randy anything, or Pete, anything you want to add?

Okay. Now let me just see if there's any questions around the table on what we're covering today or ground rules, anything, and online as well. Just raise, raise your hand if you've got anything? We want to make sure we're covering before we dive into the discussion.
(No response.)
MR. BROOKS: Okay. I have just lost all
contact to the webinar, so I'm going to try to reconnect in the meantime. But let me hand it off to Tom Warren, who's going to talk to us about the A13 FEIS. Tom, all yours.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Bennett. Tom Warren with HMS based in Gloucester. Get this a little closer here. I'm going to be summarizing the current status of Amendment 13 and summarizing the final Environmental Impact Statement. I'll be keeping my presentation pretty high level. There's a lot of details in Amendment 13, but I figure we can dive into various detailed topic areas according to your interest level.

So Amendment 13 we released about a year, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and proposed rule. Subsequent to that proposed rule, we had two HMS AP discussions on Amendment 13 that were very valuable. We had three public hearing webinars, three presentations to councils and numerous written comments.

We recently released the final
Environmental Impact Statement published on our website, and we anticipate a final rule this summer, with implementation of Amendment 13 January 1, 2023. So I'll be summarizing the final measures and noting where these final measures
differ from the proposed rule. We organized these measures in this presentation according to the fishery. Again, Amendment 13 is focused on bluefin tuna.

So I'll be going the incidental bluefin tuna fishery and the pelagic longline fishery, notably changes to the method of distribution of IBQ shares, the Individual Bluefin Quota Program, as well as other aspects to the IBQ Program, and then summarizing briefly other changes or lack of changes that were analyzed for the Purse Seine fishery, General category, Atlantic -- excuse me, Angling category, Harpoon category and administrative measures.

So starting with the IBQ program, the first aspect is dealing with how the quota is distributed among the Longline fleet. So starting in 2015 with Amendment 7, there were 136 shareholders defined, and this was a static pool of shareholders. Since that time, a surprising number of those shareholders were inactive, approximately a third at times. So based on this,
we proposed a different system, thank you, where the method of share allocation would be dynamic.

So that in contrast to Amendment 7 and the current status where a substantial portion of the quota would go to inactive vessels, Amendment 13 proposed a dynamic system whereby annually you determine shareholders and their percentage shares based on the previous three years of fishing activity.

There were various alternatives that analyzed how the quota would be distributed, and what the basis for determining fishing effort would be. We had proposed a dynamic system based on landings used several designated species. Based on additional public comment, we are finalizing a dynamic determination of IBQ shares based on sets.

There were several reasons for this. Notably, folks thought that sets were a better, no problem; I'll just try to eat it -- that sets were a better, more standardized method of measuring effort because of the diversity of the fleet, and landings were more complex to determine on the
annual basis. And for example, folks were concerned that we did not include dolphin among the specified species and noted that dolphin is an important component of some members of the fishery at certain times a year.

One other new aspect that we did not propose but along with determining shares based on sets is a rule that only one set per day would count toward the share determination. Vessels are still free to make as many sets as desired during the day, but only one set would count toward the annual share determination.

The reason for this is to preclude vessels from speculative sets, basically throwing their short or small set in the water with the sole purpose of influencing their shares in the subsequent year.

Another aspect, we had proposed four different quartiles, basically binning share percentages in four categories to kind of smooth out the extremes on either end. Public comment came on strong, that they really felt that a customized
share percentage is a better way to do it.
Basically if you have a certain number of sets, that would translate directly into your share percentage.

And so vessels would not be modified in terms of their percentage wouldn't be rounded up or rounded down, so basically a more straightforward means. Another aspect that we proposed was in this vein of rounding up. We had proposed that if a vessel share was very small, basically the equivalent of one bluefin tuna, we would round up so that the vessel share would be increased and they would be allocated one bluefin, along with this custom share percentages. Then we're not finalizing any special treatment for the smaller share percentages.

Also a new aspect not proposed but finalized is we're authorizing a de minimis quota set aside for new entrants. This also was in response to public comment. This will lay the groundwork for potential development of such a program in the future.

So although it doesn't lay out the rules for precisely how much or the conditions, in the regulations it authorizes a framework provision kind of regulatory speak for laying the groundwork for this possibility in the future. So but it would entail future proposed and final rulemaking, to make this a full program.

So an example of annual IBQ share determination, under this new dynamic system is that Vessel A was active during the previous three years. It could have been one month, it could have been one year, it could have been active during three years. But during that three-year chunk of time, we would add up the sets.

So for example, this hypothetical vessel had 137 sets over the three-year period. If in the fishery at large over that same three-year period there were 16,629 sets, doing the math 137 divided by 16,629 is .82 percent. So that would be the vessel's share, based directly on their number of sets in proportion to the total number of sets in the fishery, and then applying that
percentage against the annual quota of in this case 366, 65 pounds, which was the amount used in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

That individual vessel's quota for that year based on those three previous years, and the current quota would be 2,957 pounds. Alternatively, another vessel, Vessel B say had no fishing activity during the previous three years. It would need to lease IBQ during that first year in order to fish, to meet the -- satisfy there's a minimum requirement for the first trip in a quarter.

So it would need to lease, for example, 551 pounds in the Gulf of Mexico or 276 pounds in the Atlantic. But if it fished during that year, then it would have sets on the board, and the subsequent year those sets would be calculated as a percentage and they would be a shareholder in Year 2.

So this is a method of keeping the shareholder's dynamic, yet allowing for new entrants with not too much of a hurdle to jump.

Also another important aspect to recall the IBQ Program is IBQ shares have designated regional designations, Gulf of Mexico or Atlantic in association with each share. Gulf of Mexico designated quota can be used either in the Gulf of Mexico or the Atlantic, whereas Atlantic designated IBQ may only be used in the Atlantic, and this method serves as a braking mechanism for increased catch or effort in the Gulf of Mexico.

So along with this dynamic program, the Gulf of Mexico designations are also dynamic. So in contrast to the status quo, where a fixed amount, 35 percent of the IBQ is designated Gulf of Mexico, and this was based on their original historical calculation for Amendment 7. The amount of Gulf of Mexico quota will be based on every year on the three previous years, relative amount of fishing effort sets in the Gulf of Mexico.

So for example, if 29 percent of the overall sets were from Gulf of Mexico, the maximum amount of shares or the amount of shares designated Gulf of Mexico would be 29 percent. So we're
finalizing this as proposed, but with a new twist. There was public concern that if fishing effort declines to very low levels in the Gulf of Mexico, that basically the program would be constrained with very little -- IBQ vessels would be reticent to lease it out, and leasing is key to the IBQ Program to distribute quote where it's needed.

You know, because the bluefin fishery is so dynamic, it's hard to predict who will need quota. And so on the very low levels of Gulf of Mexico IBQ, the program could kind of seize up. So therefore we're finalizing a system whereby at very low percentages, five percent, that there would be a temporary relaxation in the accounting rules, such that a vessel could use Atlantic IBQ to account for Gulf of Mexico landings or meet the minimum land, minimum requirement for fishing.

So again, vessels still would need to use IBQ to account for bluefin, but we would be relaxing the rules under those conditions. So the subsequent year, whether that threshold would
trigger would depend entirely on the relative amount of Gulf of Mexico quota. If six percent of the overall IBQ were Gulf of Mexico designated, then the full accounting rules would be in effect. Other aspects of the IBQ Program, we are finalizing as proposed no sale of IBQ shares. This was the no action alternative. Currently, and under Amendment 13, there's no sale of IBQ shares. So a share is associated inextricably with a limited access permit. So an individual cannot just buy shares. An individual could purchase a permit and the associated shares.

We are proposing or finalizing to cap the amount of shares an entity may hold at 25 percent. So this is in accordance with the Magnuson requirements for preventing excessive share accumulation. So a vessel, although they cannot -- an individual cannot purchase shares through the purchase of permits, could be able to accumulate shares.

So this would cap the amount of shares an entity might accumulate through the purchase of
permits, or if a vessel had say five permits and a huge amount of fishing effort, under dynamic determination of shares conceivably they could approach a large percentage of shares just based on fishing effort. So again, this would preclude shares above a 25 -percent level.

As a corollary though, we are not
capping the amount of IBQ allocation an entity may lease. So it's important to maintain that flexibility, to account for bluefin and a lease expires at the end of a year. So a real problematic accumulation of shares or a quota won't happen on a long-term basis.

We'll be modifying the dealer reporting requirements as proposed. No longer a requirement for a dealer to report their discards, because vessels have successfully been reporting dead discards through VMS, and no longer a requirement for $a$ dealer to enter the vessel personal identification or PIN number.

We'll be implementing a flexible cost recovery program, and flexible from the standpoint
of if it does not make any economic sense to do cost recovery, we will not. By "economic sense," I mean if because the amount of recoverable cost is limited under Magnuson to three percent of the ex-vessel value, and bluefin tuna is an incidental species, so basically the bottom line is there's not a whole lot landed and therefore three percent of that ex-vessel value is not a whole lot of money.

Basically, it would cost almost as much or as much to actually run an annual cost recovery program, calculate it, Federal Register notices, communication, you know, billing people, obtaining the money, follow-up. Those costs will approach the recoverable amount. So in most cases, we don't think it will make economic sense to implement a cost recovery program, but we do have one and so it's flexible in that manner.

Lastly, a provision to allow Longline category permitted vessels to retain bluefin caught on green-stick gear, regardless of whether longline gear is on board. So this basically clarifies the current regulations, to make it clear
that it is allowed to use green-stick gear on a longline vessel, and retain bluefin.

In that case, the bluefin would need to be reported through VMS, and I guess as a follow-up from yesterday's conversation, where there's concern or question about the ability of longline vessels to use multiple gear types, this is an instance where a longline vessel will be allowed to use green-stick gear at the same, on the same trip as longline gear.

So continuing on with the IBQ Program, with respect to electronic monitoring, we had proposed and are finalizing the same measure, mailing EM hard drives after every two trips. Currently, a vessel is required to mail their hard drives in after -- at the end of every trip. This basically reduces their burden, given that in most cases the hard drives are not full of data after every trip. So a vessel will be able to mail it in every two trips.

We had proposed clarification of the current regs that we do have the authority, if
necessary, to require the installation of booms or devices on the vessel to mount the camera in such a position that it obtains a good view of the side of the vessel where the fish are retrieved from the water.

So this is not another camera, an additional camera, but speaks to the method of where the current camera is mounted on the rail to improve the view. This is based on some research in Hawaii in the longline fleet that showed notably better views, that if you mount that real camera on a boom or a telescopic device to get it out over the water, when there's a better angle.

Now we had proposed the agency paying for it if funds are available. Since that time, budget constraints and the national policy regarding cost allocation have led us to determine that the vessel operator must fund that cost. We don't anticipate it being a huge burden in that it's a customized piece of equipment that will vary depending on the boat. But we don't anticipate it being more than $\$ 1,000$.

Folks had expressed their concern about safety issues and the logistics, and we hear you on that. Again, this is meant to be installed in coordination between the vessel operator and the agency. This will be a joint process and in the vessel operator, in the electronic monitoring operating plan. So this will be done in a customized manner.

The second aspect of the EM Program is the installation of measuring grids on deck, either a mat or a painted grid. This will facilitate measuring the animals on deck giving a standardized point of reference. This would help development of future AI algorithms to help identify and measure the fish.

And similarly, this is a somewhat minimal cost, but this would also need to be borne by the vessel operator.

We're getting near to the end of the -well we actually now we're at the end of the IBQ section, so we're going to switch gears to the measures that apply to all the bluefin quota
categories.
The first is a simple change to the method of allocation that reflects back on the fact that under Amendment 7, there was 60 metric tons basically taken off the top of the bluefin quota provided to the longline fleet, in deference to the old ICCAT provision that set aside from quota for the -- for the Longline category, to account for dead discards. So this is a simple modification to the percentage, category percentages.

But more substantively is the modification to the allocation percentages as a result of the discontinuation of the Purse Seine category. We had proposed reallocating to all directed categories and not including the Longline or Trap categories. However, based on public comment and additional analyses, we're finalizing reallocation of the Purse Seine category reallocation to all categories.

And specifically, the analysis that helped drive this decision was taking a closer look at where the leased quota was from. We realized
the importance of the Purse Seine category. However, we looked more closely at where the longline leases were coming from, and a substantial portion of long leases were from inactive vessels versus active vessels.

And so under dynamic determination of shares every year, you're getting rid of your inactive vessels. So if the active vessels are more hesitant basically to lease quota, you are changing the dynamics and undermining the leasing system by both getting rid of the inactive vessels and cutting down the amount of leasable quota by not including purse Seine category.

So at the risk of getting overly wonky and technical of the nuances of the IBQ Program, basically in order to facilitate a healthy leasing program and a robust IBQ Program, they're included in the reallocation. I'm going down the IBQ rabbit hole here, excuse me.

So to back up a step, changes to the bluefin allocation percentages as a result of the Purse Seine category. The General category, and
this -- actually this table reflects both that small adjustment for the 68 metric ton change in methods, as well as the Purse Seine reallocation. The General category will go from 47.1 percent to 54 percent. The Angling category from 19.7 to 22.6; the Purse Seine from 18.6 to zero; Longline from 8.1 to 15.9; Harpoon from 3.9 to 4.5; Reserve from 2.5 to 2.9; and the Trap essentially the same rounding. It's not exactly the same, but it rounds to the same figure.

With respect to switching gears again, the directive category measures, we're finalizing the same measures as proposed, and in many cases I'll note that these are the no action alternatives. We analyzed a suite of alternatives and options for each of these fisheries, but in some cases determined that no action was the best course.

So for the General category, we analyzed various different ways of modifying the subquota periods and the associated quotas, but are finalizing as proposed no action. For the General
and Charter/Headboat categories, again we analyzed some modifications to allow for gears, but are finalizing no action. And with respect to the Angling category, we proposed and are finalizing a relatively minor modification to the trophy areas and allocations.

Specifically, that Trophy North area, which is in blue, the old Trophy North area north of the green area depicted, will be split into the Gulf of Maine Trophy and the Southern New England Trophy area, to allow for increased opportunity in these northern areas, and a slight increase in this Trophy North area allocation. For the Harpoon category, we proposed no change to the allowable gear type and are finalizing the same.

For also the Harpoon category, we proposed no change to the allowable gear type, and are finalizing the same. For also the Harpoon category, we had proposed a retention limit. You'll recall the Harpoon category targets the giant bluefin greater than 81 inches, and there is a restriction on the amount of large medium
currently with a default of 2 and a range of 2 to 4. No change in that size category.

We had proposed a combined trip limit of the very largest fish and the large medium of 10. We made a slight change for final, which is that this combined retention limit of 10 fish would have an associated flexibility such that we could -- the default be 10 fish, but it would be an inseason adjustment capability between 5 and 10 fish just as a tool in the toolbox.

It's kind of parity with the other categories, the way we manage in-season and provides some flexibility to address potential future issues in the context of, as Brad mentioned yesterday, some increasing amount of landings over time of the General and the Harpoon categories, as well as some increased participation. This inseason flexibility helps to provide a tool for potentially slowing down the fishery in season and align for more opportunity throughout the year.

The Harpoon category, no change to the start and closure date as proposed, and then lastly
an administrative measure applying to the open access category permits, to allow permit holders to change permit types within a full year, provided the vessel has not landed bluefin. This allows applicants to change categories if they make a mistake on the permit application. It can be confusing, you know. Do I want a General, do I want a Charter or do I want an Angling, you know.

And so current rules allow changes within 45 days. This liberalizes it, so that a vessel can change an error any time during the year, provided they have not landed any bluefin.

And so that concludes the measures.
This is a related piece of information folks might be interested in. The National Fish and Wildife Foundation recently announced a grant and a request for proposals, and so this is a funding opportunity that applies specifically for electronic technologies. So it would be available to pelagic longline or other fisheries that are interested in electronic technologies.

However, the deadline for this proposal
is coming up fairly swiftly, and there's information listed here on how you learn more. And with that, we have ample time for questions and discussion. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Great, thanks Tom. That was a really good presentation. What we want to do, as Tom said, we have ample time. We have a chunk of time before the break, and then we're going to come back and have another 45 minutes after the break.

So what I'd like to do is for the next 15 or 20 minutes or so, let's focus the conversation around clarifying questions, making sure we're all understanding what Tom just ran through, and then once we sort of work through all the clarifying questions, then we'll open it up more for discussion and comment.

So I've got 1-2-3-4, five comments up in the room here, and if the folks online raise your hands too. I've David Schalit so far online. So I'm going to wait for a couple more folks to gather up online. Let's start in the room here, and then
we'll work down the line. So we'll start with Bob and then to Dewey and then to Jason. Bob.

MR. HUMPHREY: I think this qualifies as clarifying, and if not you can boot me into the next section. But my question is regarding page 11, the chart. If I do my math right, it looks like everything is roughly a 13 or 14 percent increase except for Longline, which is a 50 percent increase, and you may have addressed this with your rabbit hole comments, but $I$ just didn't -- it didn't register with me, why the disparity?

MR. BROOKS: And yes, that is a clarifying question. Nicely done.

MR. WARREN: Yes. So this slide, which is at the back of the presentation that $I$ didn't discuss, shows the breakdown of the source of the percentage changes. So basically the disparity is because the Longline category was previously getting basically 68 metric tons off the top of the quota.

What we did was just translated that amount of quota that they got every year into
percentage. So it looks like they proportionately got more, but they've been getting that quota in the past anyway just in terms of fixed amount, by translating it into percentage day. It appears they got more from the Purse Seine but they didn't. So this table shows the change. So in the third column, you'll see revisions from simplified method. So this breaks down that changing that method instead of taking 68 metric tons off the top, you convert that into percentage. Basically, the various quota categories, they all go down. The Longline goes up, but basically that math is because they were contributing 68 metric -- a portion of the 68 metric tons anyway in the past. So $I$ hope that clarifies.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks.
MR. BLANKINSHIP: Could I just --
MR. BROOKS: Yeah, go ahead.
MR. BLANKINSHIP: I just want also just kind of add, to build off of what Tom was saying, is that that column he was referring to, the third column from the left on the screen right now is --
that exercise is reflective of what happened in the Amendment 7, in order to account for that 68 metric tons for each of the other categories, that then was, you know, made available to the Longline category.

That is a simplification of the calculation of what happened in Amendment 7. So that represents a big chunk of what's happening with this change.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Let me just note for folks online, I'm seeing the chat around some sound cutting in and out. We will keep pushing at it. Just a question, when I'm talking am I cutting in and out, or is it just Tom?

Just throw that in the chat, and I think for speakers just stay as close as you can to the mic and really project, and we'll see how that works. Let's go over to the Dewey, again clarifying questions. Thanks Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Yeah, thank you. Can you go to your slide that shows your Vessel A and B please? And my question is when you're doing this
math on Vessel A and B in these calculations about the totals, the fishery total over a three year period of six, the hypothetical of 16,629 , is that from the pelagic longline industry for over the year?

MR. WARREN: Over the three-year period, based on VMS data, yes.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Okay, all right. Now does any of that include multi-day sets, multi-sets in a day? Is that going to be included in that fishery total, or has that been taken out?

MR. WARREN: To be honest in that example --
(Off-microphone comment.)
MR. WARREN: Okay. That hypothetical example is just a hypothetical. That total probably reflects overall without taking out.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Well, in the final implementation of this, wouldn't you take any multi-sets days, multi-sets so it's not adding to that total that would decrease people's quota?

MR. WARREN: Yes, and so the relative
amount of the multi-sets is about three percent of the Atlantic sets, and two percent of Gulf of Mexico sets. So overall, it wouldn't hugely impact the numbers, but it would bring those down a little bit, yes.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: And I have some -- that was a clarifying question, but I have other questions on the next session, questions about the presentation. Thank you.

MR. WARREN: Sure.
MR. BROOKS: Thanks, thanks Dewey, and again it does seem like if we talk right into the mic and raise our voice, we're giving our online participants the best chance to hear. So just if everyone can try to do that. Jason.

MR. ADRIANCE: Thanks. I think the two slides I have questions about are clarifying, but you can keep me in the queue for later for comments as well. I'm going to start on Slide 7. I'm curious what the basis is for that Gulf of Mexico low threshold, the five percent? Was that based on any analysis of the historic low of effort? Is this
folks at HMS throwing darts at a dartboard? Where did it come from? That's the first question.

MR. WARREN: Sure. We didn't throw any darts. This was from based on a hypothetical number of vessels fishing. So basically a radical reduction in the number of vessels fishing, because that's likely what would cause in part such a low number of sets. Also it was based on the average landings of bluefin, or catch, excuse me bluefin from the Gulf that would need to be accounted for.

So basically taking a hypothetical number of vessels, hypothetical landings, how much bluefin quota that would take, how much vessels we need to use to satisfy the requirement that they have 551 pounds in the first -- for the first trip in each calendar quarter.

And then adding a little bit per vessel as a, as a buffer so to speak, because vessels will not lease unless they have a little bit of quota. So basically we did a hypothetical.

MR. ADRIANCE: Okay. So it's landings-based, not sets like everything else? Is
that --
MR. WARREN: Well, the threshold is based on the number of sets, but again in association with a particular number of vessels fishing and amount of quota. It's -- basically it's analyzing a level of fishing effort and associated quota, where there's not enough quota. I'm not explaining it real well. It is in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Let's go online for a minute --

MR. ADRIANCE: Actually, I had a second

MR. BROOKS: Oh, you have another one Jason?

MR. ADRIANCE: I had a second clarifying question on Slide 9. The measuring grid, is that -- will that come from a standardized vendor or will there a standardized grid, or is this just up to each vessel to decide what the grid will be? Thanks.

MR. WARREN: This will be a standardized
from the vendor, a standardized size, you might say, in terms of the intervals in the grid, but flexibly adapted to each vessel, you know. So there will be a standard protocol that can be adopted. MR. BROOKS: You good Jason? MR. ADRIANCE: Yes.

MR. BROOKS: Okay, great. Let's go online. Let's bring in David Schalit. Then we'll come back into the room for the four remaining speakers, and we've got about ten minutes left here, so if folks could be focused in questions, that would be great.

MR. SCHALIT: Thanks, can you hear me?
MR. BROOKS: Yes, we can David.
MR. SCHALIT: Okay, great. Tom, thanks very much for that comprehensive presentation. With regard to page 11, bluefin allocation, and I suppose it's also page 21, it's -- there are 20 nations that harvest Atlantic bluefin tuna under ICCAT, and of those 20, one of them is the European Union, and they actually have six nations that harvest bluefin tuna.

None of them, with the exception of the United States, have any significant quota left over at the end of the year. The United States has developed what you might consider a codified under-utilization of quota due to regulation, okay. So what I'm -- and this is obviously not in the best interest of the nation.

We will always leave quota on the table, and of course $I$ know that there is a (10-percent rollover, but this doesn't really mitigate the circumstance. So what we seem to be doing here is we are increasing --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MR. BROOKS: Hey, David, I want to just jump in for -- David. That's fine. I want to get to the clarifying questions for this portion.

MR. SCHALIT: I'm sorry. I missed what you said.

MR. BROOKS: Just this portion, we're really trying to get just clarifying questions out on the table if we can.

MR. SCHALIT: Yes, here's my question.

Have you considered other alternatives that we've not increased this under-utilization, annual under-utilization of quota? Thanks.

MR. WARREN: Thanks David. So I'm not sure exactly what the clarification is. The alternatives did include, and as was proposed, not including the Longline category among those categories getting reallocated Purse Seine quota, if that is the heart of your question.

MR. SCHALIT: That's not concerning. The issue is that the Angling category has not fully utilized its quota for at least a decade, maybe more, and I'm not saying that they should be deprived of this opportunity to have more quota. I'm saying that there could be a better way to manage it on the basis of need, you know, annually, and I'm wondering if that has been -- that was considered when this decision was taken?

MR. WARREN: In setting the scope of the Amendment 13 alternatives, we did not flesh out the objective, so to speak. We did not address the objective of looking at the overall quota category
divisions and allocation percentages. That was outside the scope of Amendment 13. We kept basically within the current roadmap and historical percentage distributions when analyzing the alternatives.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Tom. Okay. Let's come back into the room and finish up on clarifying questions. Again, we'll just go George to Marty, to Mike, then over to Peter. MR. PURMONT: Good morning. Tom, congratulations. That was an excellent presentation, and congratulations to Highly Migratory Species on elimination of the Purse Seine quota. It's something that I felt strongly about for a long time, and it's good to see it go. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. That's going to be a rhetorical clarifying question, George. (Off-microphone comment.) MR. BROOKS: Marty. MR. SCANLON: Yes, I have several here.

I have three things here. Number one, on Slide 7
there, the five percent of the Gulf of Mexico sets, that is based against the overall amount of sets made by a prior fleet, Atlantic and Gulf; is that correct, right?

MR. WARREN: Correct.
MR. SCANLON: Okay. Number 8, the 25-percent total shares that can be held, is that the same as can they also -- is that the same as what they could actually utilize, you know? I mean is there a difference between holding it and utilizing it? What's the difference here? Is there a difference in that?

MR. WARREN: There's a difference. The holding basically means the amount of shares an entity would be allocated for the year, based on their shares associated with the permit. So a permit holder say holds $X$ number of permits and associated shares. That's what's being measured and capped, not the amount a vessel may lease in or out or utilize.

MR. SCANLON: So you can lease more than 25 percent if need be?

MR. WARREN: Yes.
MR. SCANLON: Okay, and my other question here is with the -- pertains to the green-sticks. If you were green-sticking and catching bluefin here, that would not count towards sets; is that correct? You know, that activity would not be considered. If a vessel was, a PLL vessel was out fishing and wasn't setting PLL gear but was green-sticking, that activity would not count towards set, you know, allocation, you know, IBQ allocation; correct?

MR. WARREN: Correct.
MR. SCANLON: Okay.
MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Marty. Mike.
MR. PIERDINOCK: Thank you Tom for your presentation. The slide with all the different percentages on it, the question $I$ have is for the Angling category, $I$ mean as you know there's a sub-category there with different percentages. Now those, there's quota associated with each percentage. Is that an ICCAT-driven percentage and breakdown, or is that domestic?

MR. WARREN: I believe it's ICCAT-driven, but I might defer to Randy or Sarah. MR. BLANKINSHIP: No, the total breakdowns are not ICCAT-driven except for the limit of ten percent on school. But there's a history on the rest of it. That's not ICCAT-related, domestic history.

MR. PIERDINOCK: So if I understand that correctly, the school category could change up or down by ten percent? Is that -- or am I not interpreting that correctly?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: No. We have a tolerance like we discussed yesterday, a tolerance of ten percent school of the total U.S. quota. So we can't go over ten percent of the total U.S. quota that can be made of school fish, school-size fish. But the other size category are not related to an ICCAT guideline or requirement.

MR. PIERDINOCK: So lastly if the bag limit was changed, it's almost it fits within the percentage, that can be done here domestically? It doesn't require an ICCAT revision?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: That's correct.
MR. PIERDINOCK: Thank you. One last question. With the new electronic monitoring program, it's noted that specifically there's going to be outreach to the Pelagic Longline. Since this is in the proposal phase, would it also include outreach to the General category boats, Charter/Headboat as well as recreational to participate in the process? Because if it's not in the proposal phase, the proposals would only just address longlines.

So I'm just interested in whether it will address those other monitoring means and methods that could be further refined to be reflective of catch and release and location of fish. Thank you.

MR. WARREN: You're referring to that funding opportunity?

MR. PIERDINOCK: Yes, the new electronic monitoring program.

MR. WARREN: Yeah. I'm going to punt on that one to the folks who administer that request
for proposal. I'm not familiar with the details of that, if that's your question.

MR. PIERDINOCK: So while the objective, as it was noted earlier, is that it would be specific to pelagic longline, and there's -- as we all know there's the need for General category, Charter/Headboat, and recreational reporting to also participate and provide better data and information.

So I wanted to make sure -- or the question is are they included in it, or it's just specific to pelagic longline?

MR. WARREN: Kelly?
MR. BLANKINSHIP: So that funding opportunity is through the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, which is external from the agency, and it is open to anybody to apply under the guidelines for that request for funding or proposals. And I will mention that we have a NFWF, or National Fish and Wildlife Foundation representative actually sitting -- Craig, I'm getting feedback the closer I get to this, sorry
-- sitting in the room with us. If we want to have a sidebar conversation after outside this meeting, we can direct you to that person.

MR. PIERDINOCK: Thank you.
MR. BROOKS: Okay. Let's try to get in two more questions before we go to break. Let's go to Peter, and then we'll head over to Christine. Peter.

MR. CHAIBONGSAI: Tom, great job. That was really well done. I just have, I believe like I said, a clarifying question. Just in terms of the new subcategory, the new categories or the breakup of the northern, the northern region for Trophy quota in Angling, does that mean that now that we have four different sections, those are all divvied up, and does that mean that the three current, the North, the South and the Gulf, does that mean that they reduce the amount of quota that they have because of this fourth that has been added?

MR. WARREN: The relative amount of Trophy quota is being increased to accommodate the
new area, and that quota's being taken, so to speak, from the large and medium Angling category size class, because we track the size classes of that, of that quota to make it all fit, so to speak.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, and Christine, I'll give you the last question before we go to break.

MS. KITTLE: Okay, thank you. So this is my first time using the microphone. So thank you Tom for those clarifications. I have two questions if that's okay. The first is about the green-stick gear. When the pelagic longline vessels are using that, is whatever is caught off that, is that quota towards the General category? Like do they need to get an additional permit for that, or would that go towards their pelagic Longline quota?

MR. WARREN: That would be accounted for using their IBQ. It's intended as an incidental catch, you know. They'd be targeted yellowfin tuna, and so they would need to report those sets through VMS where they have interactions. So we
wouldn't be looking for a census; there wouldn't be reporting all green-stick gear sets, but just those sets where there were interactions, and that would count against their individual bluefin quota.

MS. KITTLE: Okay, and the second one was more of a timeline question. With this going into effect next year, the three years, would that be started at 2023, like I mean wait three years to do the shares, or would it be like for 2020 through 20, the end of this year? And is there any concerns with like how quota affected the fishermen in their catches?

MR. WARREN: It would be for the three years running up to January 1. So we wouldn't be going through December say, but it may be October of this year back three years. So 2021 and '22, maybe a month or two of 2019 so to speak. But 36 months as close to 2023 as we can, we can you know do it administratively and communicate to folks, etcetera.

MR. BROOKS: All right. I've got a few
more people in the queue, both in the room and online. I'm going to suggest we go to a break, and just sort of stick with our schedule, and then when we come back from the break, we'll just pick up.

So when we come back, I'll throw it over to Amy and Jeff in the room, then David online, and then we'll come back and I know there are folks who already wanted, who wanted to make some comments. So let's go to break. We'll be back at quarter of. See you then. Thanks.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:33 a.m. and resumed at 10:54 a.m.)

MR. BROOKS: All right. Again, if we can get everyone to take their seats, we'll get going. Thank you very much. All right. So we've got about a little more than a half hour for some additional discussion, and I just want to remind everyone, you know, we're -- this is now an EIS that's being, that's been finalized.

So the conversation this morning is really around, you know, if you all have some
reactions to the Final EIS that you'd like the agency to hear, great. If you have thoughts related to implementation of the rule, that's also going to be really helpful. So just sort of keep that in mind as you think about any thoughts you might want to share.

So let's go back to the queue that we had, and we'll start with Amy and Jeff, and then we'll take it from there. Amy.

MS. DUKES: Thank you, Tom. Great presentation. Just a quick clarification for dealers and their reporting changes. It is to eliminate the need for dead discards, and to eliminate the need to list the vessel PIN; correct?

MR. WARREN: Correct.
MS. DUKES: And that's the only two modifications?

MR. WARREN: Yes.
MS. DUKES: And lastly, just for my purpose and clarification, I am all for the change in permit categories. I think that's a great addition for this amendment. That 45 days is rather
restricting. Can you just tell us what the driving force behind that was? Was it public comment? Was it documented instances where you couldn't change the permit?

MR. WARREN: Yes. I mean we get these -- we get these, you know, requests and legitimate errors, no bluefin landed, and it would just seem overly burdensome to say no, you can't do it. It's, you know, 50 days past, and it was just one of those requirements that over time didn't stand the test of time, didn't make sense, so we modified it.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Jeff, you were next up.

MR. ODEN: I spoke with Brad during the break. I'm good, thanks.

MR. BROOKS: Perfect, all right. Dewey, you had wanted to jump back in before.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Yeah. I think an interesting comment that Tom made and a word that Brad's always used is "dynamic," and Tom said the IBQ is so dynamic, it's hard to know who, who will need quota. And it looks like that if you put --
what happens if swordfish or the revitalization of the swordfish industry happens, and 136 vessels go back fishing, and there's probably on the disk that the 70 IBQ vessels will be given permit, will be given quota and all of the sudden there's 136 that's going to be, or another 60 that's going to be needing quota? It will be reducing the quota that's given to the, under this scenario.

And as bluefin tuna increase and the potential or could be interaction with bluefin tuna. I just really fear a conundrum and a dynamic of what could happen, very plausible, and at the same time is where -- if I'm fishing and I land my IBQ, I don't know where to go, to a system or somebody to where do $I$ go to get more quota from, and nobody knows that.

Nobody, I don't know if -- how's that going to happen? So given that there's some good things maybe with this Amendment 13, there's some other things that, really plausible actions that very well can happen as with a couple of scenarios I've laid out here of where's quota going to come
from if you need it, who's got it and what's going to happen? Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Dewey. Tom.
MR. WARREN: Thanks, Dewey. So with
respect to the first aspect of your comment, I agree that the future, if a lot of vessels enter the fishery and the pie is divided among more vessels, things get tighter. It would take more cooperative behavior and a fluid leasing market, and to that point, we are working on a web app or web aspect that will show folks where IBQ is and contact information possibly on how to obtain that. And Brad can elaborate more on their efforts to develop such a tool. So more information will be available. We realize that folks need information and on how and who from to lease.
(Off-microphone comment.)
MR. HEMILRIGHT: Yeah, and on your page about you based the boom theory on Hawaiian longline boats, it's my thought process that the Hawaiian longline boats are probably 80 and 90 foot steel boats, and maybe even larger. Our vessels,
a lot of them are 45 foot or 40 foot fiberglass boats.

So it's a lot different in application on a 90 foot steel boat than it is a 45 foot, 1 mean a 45 foot fiberglass boat saying -- I would venture to say it's not, it could be more than $\$ 1,000$ to do some boom configuration on a smaller vessel and modifications. So --

MR. BROOKS: Dewey, do you have any thoughts on how to deal with that through implementation?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Well right now, I've got a camera on the side of my boat that's on the thing, and so I don't see what's wrong with it now. It shows the side of the vessel. Is this going to happen where you're going to have to have a boom, or is it going to go look at species by species if you need a boom?

MR. WARREN: Not necessarily species by species.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I meant vessel by vessel.

MR. WARREN: Vessel by -- yes. It would be done in conjunction with historical data on okay, how is the view? For this particular vessel, are we getting an optimal view of the rail area, and in a lot of cases, in most cases the answer would be no, that just putting the camera out on a boom or a telescopic device would increase the angle and get a better view.

But again with respect to your point, this would be customized. So we're not looking for a tungsten steel boom, something that would achieve the goal and be cost-effective would work.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Well your key word was "customize," and with customized, it costs some money. So it ain't just something that you plug and play. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Dewey. Let me go to the online folks for a minute, and then we'll come back and sweep down the table here. David Schalit, your hand was up right before the break. I don't know if you still want to jump in, and then we'll go to Stephen Getto. David. Okay. Steven

Getto, let's --
MR. GETTO: I have a question on the biological impact of shifting quota of above 73 inch fish to fish that are below 73 inches, and was that considered in the decision to take commercial quota and move it a recreational sector? Thank you. Brad, you weren't counting on anyone to hear that, right?
(Off-microphone comment.)
MR. BROOKS: Okay.
MR. WARREN: So would you clarify your question please? It's what shifts from where to where? Are you referring to reallocation of Purse Seine quota or some other shift?

MR. GETTO: Purse Seine quota, which is a quota of fish that are above 73 inches. Was the biological impact of that, moving it to a recreational sector, considered? So now we're going to be taking a cottage of sub-73 inch fish.

MR. WARREN: I'd have to look in the FEIS and see frankly off the top of my head. I'm not sure whether we address that nuance or not. My gut
reaction is that given the size of the quotas, it wouldn't have a meaningful impact.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. We'll give you space to come back later if you have something more to add on that. Let's go to Walt Golet online, Golet. Sorry Walt, Golet online and then we'll come back into the room.

DR. GOLET: Hey, right. Thanks Bennett. Hey Tom, thanks. Great presentation as always, and I just had a question. I guess it's, I guess it's around the Trap category. You know, historically looking back, it's hard to find much data I guess before 2016 maybe in like the SAFE reports.

But from 2016 to 2020, it looks like the Trap only landed .8 out of about 6.4 or 6.5 metric tons. Moving forward, is that -- is that still a category that the agency intends to keep, or is that something that might be considered as a category that hasn't been really participated in the fishery and maybe that's something that just comes off the reserves, since it's such a small amount of quota?

I think the last five years, $I$ think
there's only been one year that actually had any landings. And again, forgive me if I'm not as familiar with this category or how it's allocated or utilized. But just a general question on kind of that history and thoughts about maybe utilizing that quota moving forward, because it seems to be there every year. Thanks Tom.

MR. WARREN: Thanks Walt, and that's a great point. That's something we can look into. I haven't frankly given it much thought, it's such a small amount. It's, you know, I guess can be considered a de minimis category that may be, as you said largely historical. But we'll look into that. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Great, thanks. Let's come back into the room. Let's here from Katie, because I don't think you've been in yet this morning, and then we'll go back to Jason and Marty and Jeff.

MS. WESTFALL: Thank you, Bennett. So just a couple of quick comments, largely to express my gratitude for the agency's work on Amendment 13 and the responsiveness to the feedback you all
received. IBQ was an incredibly innovative approach and the reduction in bluefin tuna by catch has been a really compelling conservation success story.

I think all of the iterative work that you guys have done to make, to continue to improve the program has been really incredible, so I want to thank you for that. And especially related to getting quota to active fishermen, $I$ think that was an issue in the beginning, and I think all of the improvements that you've made have been really good.

I also appreciate the move away from designated species to the set approach to the customized share approach. I think Tom he laid out some of the problems that folks communicated with the original approach. So I appreciate the responsiveness there. I'm also really heartened by the dynamic nature of this approach, and the authorization to potentially create a set-aside program.
I think that will be incredibly
important, given how critical it is to have an economically viable Pelagic Longline fishery, and to make sure that there aren't large barriers of entrants, for new entrants into the fishery.

On the EM booms, $I$ will mention that the Gulf of Mexico, the fishery has done some testing of the booms on some potentially smaller vessels. So as we move toward implementation, you all might want to work with Mote Marine Lab, who's tested some of the boom approach, to make sure that what's implemented isn't more expensive than it needs to be and is as effective as possible. But that boom has really provided a camera angle that is better for seeing some of the species.

Lastly, I did want to also say Tom I'm great, it's great to hear that you're looking to an online tool or online marketplace for quota. There was a National Academy of Science report on limited access privilege programs, and one of their recommendations was to make sure that data about allocation and leasing is publicly available, to really facilitate the function of that market. So

I'm really glad to hear that's in the works. So thank you all.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Katie. Jason, you had a comment from earlier.

MR. ADRIANCE: Yeah thanks, and I don't think I thanked you for the presentation Tom, before I threw darts at you. Sorry about that. This is probably something I've said every year, and it's a little disappointing in the Trophy category, that there isn't an increase for the Gulf of Mexico. I know obviously just got some not that long ago, but as I've always said, whether that western bluefin dies on the way to or from the Gulf of Mexico or in the Gulf of Mexico, it's still a dead fish, and why not provide that opportunity in the Gulf of Mexico given the reductions that occurred and interactions and dead discards overall. Thanks. MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Jason. Marty. MR. SCANLON: Yes. Well first of all, I think possibly in the future that we need to establish, I think we've discussed this already here, but there needs to be some sort of a threshold
to how much IBQ an individual vessel can fall into, what kind of IBQ debt it can fall into at any given time before it has to make, you know, ante up, so to say, so we can avoid, you know, the scenario that we're facing right now. So that's something that we may be able to look forward to in the future. We've all agreed on that.

As a question on the booms here, 1 still have my concerns at safety at sea with anything extend beyond the footprint of the vessel. I really do not understand the need to put anything out over our heads that will be extended outside the footprint of the boat. It's extremely dangerous, and who's going to be liable for that when somebody gets hurt as a result of that, which is inevitably going to happen?

I mean, you know, if you've been on my boat and taken some of the shots that I've taken over the years, you would understand that fully, you know. I mean we've had, I've had my windows taken out of that damn boat three different times. So I mean, $I$ don't need to get smashed in the face
or my crew get smashed in the head with some boom, because somebody wants just a little slightly better angle.

I mean, my vessel, the camera's mounted within six inches of the rail. So I mean how much more do you need to actually see? The fish swim in a circle. They don't just come up directly alongside of the vessel. There's ample opportunity to see what that fish is. I think that's overreach.

I mean we're, we're already over, you know, we already have a level of accountability that far exceeds everybody else in every other category in this room, and to be looking to continually build on that accountability to me is, you know, is beyond understanding.

As far as the mat on the deck, that's another thing. I really don't understand the purpose of the map. I mean we measure all the fish. I mean there isn't -- we don't have an issue of us bringing in undersized fish. So what's the purpose of adding another thing that we have to deal with, another cost to the industry?

I mean you know, and if they do, it's not going to be a set placard like you do with the placards now, where you hand out these placards. Is the government going to hand us a placard to put on the deck that's going to have to be continually maintained? The deck is continually resurfaced, you know. That's another issue. So those placards are going to be continually have to be replaced throughout the year.

The other thing I want to add here is that in answer to Dewey's question, unless we go forward with spatial management and get access to the swordfish bottom that we've been denied since 1996, there is going to be no revitalization. The key to the revitalization of the fishery is not to increase our access to bluefin tuna areas, but it's to add access to the swordfish that we've been denied. Unless we get that, there will be no revitalization, end of discussion.

So that's about all I have to say at the moment. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Marty. Anything
you wanted to respond to there, Tom?
MR. WARREN: Yeah, just to clarify briefly the purpose of the mat is, I agree. You measure your fishing from your purposes. That works. But from the electronic monitoring program perspective, whereby either a human analyst or a computer is trying to identify an unknown fish, size is one of the characteristics used to identify species.

Relative position of the fins, et cetera, could help identify a yellowfin from a bigeye depending on the size, et cetera. And for future development and cost savings for the program, artificial intelligence would be great, and artificial intelligence needs assistance in terms of size, hues, et cetera.

MR. SCANLON: Do you realize that we put those fish on the deck and then we go to clean and dress those fish? Those fish don't just sit on that deck still. Those fish are in constant motion, and the butcher or the guy that's assigned to clean those fish, he's in a constant struggle to maintain
the stability of that fish.
So I mean like I said, to me how are you going to keep them and, you know, this is -- to me, this doesn't make any sense. I mean I just don't see the purpose of it, I mean, and we don't have a problem with us landing undersized fish. I mean we report the fish. I mean, you know, what more accurate than taking a ruler and measuring it? I mean you're still going to have to eyeball it for whether it's exactly on the line or it's not exactly on the line. I mean are you going to build a box that is going to be set in the box. I mean how much further do we need to go with this? I mean, you know, how many more hoops do we have to jump through, you know, to be able to fish? I mean especially with the level of accountability throughout the rest of the industry. I mean, you know, how much more do you want out of us?

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Thanks, Marty. Let's take two more comments in the room, then we'll go back out online and then we'll come back to Charlie. So Jeff, and then over to Shana.

MR. ODEN: Thanks. It's good I get to follow Marty because, you know, the disparity that our industry, you know, endures is just mind boggling, and to add, you know, a third camera or a boom or whatever on our industry when you have -- you don't even require reporting in other HMS fishery that's corrected, General categories.

I'm not trying to throw them under the bus, you know. They're a great industry, but our industry is valued at 60 percent of the HMS fishery, and instead of trying to, you know, throw us under the bus, you should be trying to daggone help us land, you know, what we do. What we supply this nation is very important, and we're treated like the red-headed stepchild.

That's unfortunate, and if you want to add a camera or a boom to us and I understand what you may be after, but are you after that short that's going to get gaffed on a General category boat? Why don't you put one on their boats? If you want -- let's be, let's be equitable with this. Hey, we've got cameras, we've got observers, we've
got tablets to call in our bluefin that are caught that day.

How many is -- like Marty says, how many more hoops do you want us to jump through? I mean you are here to manage the fishery to the best sustainable use for this country, and you're doing everything you can to throw us under the bus. And hoops and weather that most people aren't out in -- like, especially Marty. Well, Marty will be out there when most of us aren't. But it's like he says: trying to daggone run a fish across the tape when the guy -- it's all he can do is keep his footing and --

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Jeff. And I just -- I hear the frustration and just remind us to -I don't think Tom's trying to throw anybody under the bus. So it's just trying to not personalize things as much, and $I$ of course hear the frustration, Jeff. Shana.

MS. MILLER: Thanks Bennett and thanks Tom. You know, I know that a lot of work went into this amendment from you and your team, and thanks
for presenting it today. You know, congratulations for getting this across the finish line but, you know, it is, it was frustrating to see the relaxation of the IBQ rules in the Gulf of Mexico. Under Alternative B3, you know, we've seen this week what can happen when regulations are relaxed and, you know, hopefully it won't come back to haunt us, you know.

Arguably, that 35 percent allowance for the Gulf of Mexico is too high, and the change to Alternative B3 should have been to lower that rather than to, you know, lift it, but the five percent or less. And you know, I know that I'm always talking about the Gulf of Mexico and, you know, it's different. It's absolutely different.

It's the only spawning ground where there are only western fish. The sloped sea is a confirmed spawning ground. I said it but it has, you know, the genetics have shown that it's western and eastern fish that are there. The Gulf of Mexico is just -- your computer -- is just Western fish and, you know, that's why ICCAT is prohibited
fishing there for 40 years.
So it's different. It deserves to be treated differently for both the recreational and the commercial fishery, and yeah, I'm probably going to keep harping on the Gulf of Mexico. But great job, other than that point was disappointing. Thanks.

MR. WARREN: Thanks Shana. To clarify though, the Gulf of Mexico, Amendment 13 both retains the default 35 percent cap, the ability to reduce that cap if necessary, and under the conditions where there was that five percent threshold, we would still have a cap on catch.

So although the Gulf of Mexico designated IBQ is the proxy for catch, it's the tool, in that case we would still have a cap on catch. It might be at the default 35 percent, or if it had been lowered, that would still be in place. So we feel that it's as protective of the Gulf of Mexico, if not more overall than the status quo.

MS. MILLER: Thanks for that Tom, and
it sounds like 1 need to read that more closely, because that's not how $I$ understood it. But the 35-percent cap is what, you know, we were really hoping to see lowered, even as the default. I understand it can be lowered from there but yeah, I'll re-read that five percent, because it does sound like I misunderstood that. Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Let's go back to Panel members who are online. I'll start by just reading a chat from Walt Golet. It says "Tom, I think my thought was around the cumulative totals of the Trap category. Over ten years it would represent 13.4 metric tons and I'm sure other gears would be welcome to utilize. I'd be happy to chat about it further," and Walt if you want to fold in on that anymore, please just raise your hand. But for now, let's bring in Tim Pickett online.

MR. PICKETT: Okay. Thanks Tom for the presentation. This is just kind of adding to Marty's thing in -- with the grid, I see the -- you know, a grid as being a very subjective thing in terms of enforcement. You know, I just don't know
how they would quantify somebody saying okay, well your grid's too worn out. You need to replace it or you need to buy a new mat or, you know.

It just becomes a subjective thing in terms of, you know, how you implement that, how you tell somebody that their grid isn't correct or is there a fine with that if that gets worn out or something happens? $I$ just see it as a very difficult thing to quantify? You know, using the Hawaiian Longline fleet as an example, as was said by Dewey. You know, they're kind of a -- they're very centrally located. It's easy to observe the entire fleet and to treat the whole fleet kind of as a whole because they all do essentially the same thing, and they're all in one place.

So it's -- I would just exercise caution in the future in terms of comparing the two fleets, because our fleet is a lot more dynamic. There's a lot of different things and is varies in size, in vessels and techniques and approaches and things like that greatly, compared to that fleet as a whole.

So that was kind of a question and comment, you know, on the firsthand with the grid and, you know, how that comes about enforcement-wise and stuff like that. Some clarification on that, and then just a general comment about, you know, comparing the East Coast fleet to the Hawaiian fleet. Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Tim. Let's stick with online, take one more comment there from Alan Weiss. Then we'll finish up in the room and then we will probably shift to talk about recreational data. Alan, your line is open. Go ahead, Alan.

MR. WEISS: Okay, thank you. I want to echo some of the earlier comments in regard to the camera boom and the grid, that I think they're in -- well obviously this has already been finalized, so you're not going to be making changes at this point.

But the manner in which this is implemented should be done very carefully, because first of all in regard to the booms, anything that you have around the side of the boat and over the
side of the boat can get in the way. These guys are handling live fish, and you know, when you're talking about swordfish and bigeyes, you're talking fish that could easily be a couple hundred pounds.

When you're talking about bluefins, now you're talking about something could be caught 100 pounds or more. The guy holding the leader isn't determining where the fish goes. The fish is taking the guy around the boat, and so if the guy gets -if a boom, a camera on a boom gets in the way of the guy trying to go with the fish or the leader gets tangled in it or something of that nature, you can imagine this can present a disastrous safety problem.

The other thing is in regard to the grid on the deck. Again, you're talking about oftentimes this is a rolling platform. Guys are trying to maintain their own stability so they don't fall and get hurt. You're dealing with a live fish, potentially a substantial size, very strong live fish, and it's not going to just lay there and
let you pose for the camera like someone who caught a fish sport fishing and hangs it up at the dock.

So the last thing I wanted to mention is in regard to the discussion about the Gulf of Mexico and catching a bluefin tuna in the Gulf of Mexico. I'll point out as $I$ have in the past that the whole management program for bluefin tuna, as well as every other species, is all about controlling fishing mortality.

Fishing mortality is just the number of fish that you kill. It has nothing to do with whether you catch them in the Gulf of Mexico or the Straits of Florida on Georges Banks or at the Grand Banks. Every fish that you take out of the population counts as a fishing mortality, and it doesn't matter where it takes place. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Alan. We've got just a couple of minutes left and $I$ want to get in the last few comments here. Let's go over to Charlie, then to John and Marty. Is your card leftover or back up?
(Off-microphone comment.)

MR. BROOKS: Okay, great. So let's see if we can squeeze in these last few. Charlie.

MR. BERGMANN: Mine's just a quick thing about the mat like you've heard others talk about, and if the mat is there for a size comparison of the fish. There are other venues that could be size comparisons, such as the crew member standing on the deck. He's in front of the camera all day long. It's very easy to get a size comparison without having to paint something on the boat or put something there that's going to wear out, somebody's going to slip and fall.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks Charlie. John.
MR. DEPERSENAIRE: Yeah thank you.
First I had a question. The 22.6-percent increase that's going to the Angling category, will that be implemented in the 2023 fishing season? And if so, will revision to recreational measures be discussed at the fall HMS AP meeting?

MR. WARREN: I'm not sure we'll be on the agenda in the fall. However, we do anticipate these measures, including the new quotas being
implemented in 2023.
MR. DEPERSENAIRE: Okay, thank you. I guess I just have a quick question too. I know the comment was made earlier about the Angling category not being fully utilized, and I really do think that is a function of in many cases the regulations and what those regulations provide in terms of that cost-benefit incentive that a lot of people have to weigh when they want to target bluefin.

But if there's discussion moving forward about how we utilize this increase to have new regulations, one thing I would like to discuss is how we, how can we get to that, to that full utilization of the Angling category.

Specifically too, I'd like to also have a discussion about bringing back in some of the historical participants of this fishery who were pushed aside by some of the regulations, where they couldn't take advantage, particularly talking about like the head boats, which historically were always a part of this fishery.

But regulations have kind of forced
them out of it, and as you know, those boats really provide some members of the public the only ability to access the HMS fisheries. People that can't afford to go out on a charter or don't have their own boat.

So I think that's an important element, and I know that ties in with the discussion you guys plan to have tomorrow about social environmental justice. So I think that's a discussion we should have, if the AP has it in the fall, about how we utilize that new, that increase for the Angling category. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, John. Marty, I'll give you a last quick final word here.

MR. SCANLON: Well the one thing is I want to just comment that I believe that the five-percent threshold is a little low. I mean that's not, you know, I would think it would be more in line with ten percent, because ten percent would be, you know, more in line with the third. That would be about a third of the 35 percent that would be eligible to be caught out of there.

The 35 -percent threshold still protects the Gulf, but you know, the ten percent we give a little bit better access to, you know, in case it was needed. I mean if we dropped down to five percent, it would take almost forever to build up the, you know, access to the Gulf at five percent, if it reached that threshold.

It also it doesn't necessarily mean that it would trigger the agency to give us access. It would just give them the ability. So I think that that threshold should have been raised a little bit higher to maybe ten percent, to give the, you know, NMFS the ability to give us the access that we're looking for there, in the event that that was to take place.

And to go back to the boom type of thing, I understand the agency's need on some vessels to get a better view, because 1 see how some of these boats are configured as far as the cameras are concerned. They've got, you know these big boats, they've got -- their rigging is inside of the, you know, the outer portion of the boat by as much as
ten feet at times.
So I can understand that you want to have a camera closer to the rail. On the vessels that the camera's within six inches or a foot of the rail, I mean the increasing danger to the fleet and the individuals far exceeds the need to bring it out that much further. I mean to me that's just not realistic.

And in regards to the mat, if you're going to make those mats, which apparently you are, then that mat should be in a form of a mat. We clean those fish on a carpet, to keep them from sliding on a fiberglass or a steel deck. So when we lay those fish to clean them, they're being clean on some sort of a mat that has some sort of a carpet surface, and we clean that mat. Otherwise, the fish just slides back and forth.

So if you were going to make those mats, they have to be in a carpet form, so that the fish can be put on there and stabilized to the best extent possible, all right?

MR. BROOKS: Marty, and thanks everyone
for the good discussion here. You know, I think just to wrap it up here, there were a number of comments that sort of touched on things like Gulf of Mexico allocation and I think we heard a range of comments there, some comments to rethink the Trap category allocation, a little bit on Angling, comments on needing to address the situation where you have an IBQ deck for any individual vessel as sort of in -- as a future issue.

But for the most part, the comments centered on first of all, nice job and responsive; I think that's important to call out. But then obviously a number of comments really focusing on from folks around the table that the details for the Pelagic Longline piece section seemed some combination of sort of lacking parity and problematic.

Things I heard, some sense that there are safety issues. There's a piling on, lack of equity and subjectivity to some of it, obviously focused mostly around the mat on the deck and the boom, and a sense that without revitalization
that's really underpins all of it. So thank you all for the good conversation.

At this point we're going to move right into a conversation around recreational data and we're going to hear first from Yong-Woo Lee, who's going to give us an update on the Large Pelagics Survey, and then Cliff Hutt will talk to us about progress on priorities on the 2017 Regional Implementation Plan and then share some ideas moving forward. So we'll -- this will take us to lunch at 12:30, and again we'll spend about 20 minutes on the first part and then 40 after that, so stay tuned.

DR. LEE: Good morning. My name is
Yong-Woo Lee. I currently serve as LPS task manager as well as LPS statistician. So thank you for this opportunity to tell you something about the LPS redesign project and the current status.

This table was presented back in May, no actually September 2018 to this AP meeting, and to complete this new LPS design, we estimated that it would take seven years, and tasks that are
involved to make this new design starts from baseline assessment, and put the -- and develop new design and put the new design into a field test, and all the way down to MRIP certification and full calibration of historical estimates.

And currently, we are in 2022 and we are in the Phase 2 and Phase 3 of the project. And good news is that we have been able to meet the timeline in original plan. So the cells with diagonal line indicates that tasks that are completed according to the schedule, and currently we are in the final year, third year of the pilot testing and we're sort of -- we are in the process of getting up to speed with MRIP certification, and know about what it will take to file MRIP certification.

So let me tell you something about the pilot surveys that we have been doing. So this year 2022, we are about to start pilot testing in these three states, New Hampshire, New York, New Jersey. Last year, we were able to complete pilot testing in the states of Mass, Rhode Island, Connecticut and Virginia, and in 2020, which is the year of
major pandemic events, we were able to complete pilot testing in Mass, Delaware and Maryland.

And then from these pilot testing and pilot testing surveys, not only we are confirmed the validity of the new design, but also it would provide benchmarking data to calibrate the old estimates, basically make the historical estimates in the common currency, if we are going to adopt new design as official design.

So let me step back a little bit and tell you about why the new design was needed. So number one motivation was the MRIP certification. MRIP stands for the Marine Recreational Information Program, and it is a state-regional-federal partnership that creates a national network of surveys, to join the national network of surveys and establish several rules, several guidelines and standards to be certified.

Because these surveys provides the essential input data for this thorough assessment, it is critical to be validated and certified by the MRIP program, and join their national network. And
also back in 2018, Atlantic HMS Implementation Plan, which was published in 2018, it indicated and identified that LPS redesign is the number one top priority.

So why the HMS Implementation Plan identify the redesign as top priority? Because it recognized some problems, some issues to be certified by MRIP, two categories. There are two categories. One, the first category is departures from probability-based sampling of current existing LPS design, and second category is the mismatches between design and the estimation part.

So I will elaborate a little bit more about these two categories. So number one, the first category, departures from probability-based sampling in current LPIS. So there are some examples. First one is a multi-site clusters, and cluster is defined by group of sites. Some clusters can be single site, and some clusters have multi-sites, and currently to make the sampling more efficient, meaning that they will encounter more returning vessels, the samplers are
instructed to move freely between the sites, if they are assigned on a multi-site cluster.

Also, samplers can stay, you know, given assignment as short as two hours, and depending upon the fishing activities, they can stay even longer than eight hours. So the sampling duration currently varies. And because the returning vessels tends to be afternoons or late afternoons, samplers are deployed mostly in the afternoon time. And it's been criticized that, because of that nature of the sampling, the current LPIS misses the morning time and night time.

So these things create coverage gaps and variability of the sampling, too much of flexibility in sampling, that couldn't be, that cannot be, statistically accounted for in the estimation. And it's been criticized that these factors could create potential for bias in the estimation.

Another category of the criticism is the mismatches between the design and estimation. The current LPIS design is characterized as
complex, stratified, multi-stage with a site cluster approach. And also for the sample draw process, it uses the unequal probability sampling, and because of that the PGS sites (phonetic) is drawn more frequently, so that it will encounter intercepts more anglers.

And also, depending upon the fishing activities, samplers can stay longer than eight hours. However, these design features are not reflected in the estimation, and estimation currently ignores these complex design components. And also it assumes equal probability, rather than unequal probability of the samples. And also it doesn't use a weighting process for the estimation. So these mismatches, again, were criticized as potential factors for the bias.

So we need to make some improvements for the design. And main goals were to make those areas that were criticized, so that we make the design to be more statistically more valid and robust. At the same time, we wanted to make the sampling productivity close level with the current LPIS
design. But these two things are -- it's like running rabbits in two opposite directions. It's hard to incorporate.

So in order to improve, there was too much of flexible area. We wanted to make the, abandon the multi-site approach and go with a -we decide to go with a single site approach, and also rather than having the samplers to choose to longer hours, we fix the time intervals for three hours for each assignment.

One other amazing improvement was that as I spoke, you know, maintaining sample productivity for this type of rare event officially is really problematic. So we wanted to allow certain amount of flexibility. However, at the same time we wanted to have that flexibility be accounted for during the estimation.

So we set aside 25 percent of the assignment to be flexible, and to be moved depending upon the fishing activities, weather conditions, and also changes in regulations. This type of adaptive sampling should help maintain
productivity. Preliminary data suggests that it's been working out, and because this adaptive sampling feature is kind of structured in the beginning of the design, the inclusion probability can be estimated in a statistical model.

We have conducted a lot of compare simulations with external and with the consultants, and it's been confirmed based on the compare simulation that it produces unbiased estimates with relatively high precision. So according to the original time-frame, time line over the project, 2024 is the year that we are targeting to complete redesign projects and implement new design, if it is certified by MRIP program.

Of course, there are certain factors that could delay the full implementation in 2024, so I list here some of the "what if" scenarios for potential delays. So if the pilot testing data suggests that we need more data, so that could be a delaying factor and what if for the calibration. What if data from the pilot surveys suggest that
we need more data, we need more sample size, then that could be another delaying factor.

Also state of Maine has not been included in this pilot testing because of this state's inherent challenges, long coastlines, sparse distance between the sites and also very low productivity. Even with a very flexible current LPIS design, the sampling productivity in Maine has been pretty low.

So we didn't want to test out this new design because we believe that it's not going to work. At the same time, we didn't want to have state of Maine becoming a bottleneck over the whole process. So we decide to leave out the state of Maine, and so questions come up as like okay. Since state of Maine has not been tested, will it be a factor for delaying the MRIP certification?

And recently we had a conversation with MRIP staff about the certification process, and they were telling us that if the new design shown to be valid in the areas or states that are tested, then they can go ahead and certify the new design
as a new official MRIP certified design. State of Maine can be filed. For the MRIP certification, state of Maine can be filed later on if we come up with another design for that particular state.

So we are still hopeful to meet this target deadline of 2024, to have the MRIP certification on those states that are tested, and have this new design as official MRIP-certified survey design in those areas, those states. If you have any questions, 1 will happy to be -- happy to answer.

MR. BROOKS: Great, thank you. We've got about five minutes for questions. Let's start online. David Schalit, why don't you come on in?

MR. SCHALIT: Thank you for your presentation, thank you very much. With regard to the Large Pelagics Survey, one critique that you mentioned resonates for me, which is the unequal, I think you put it this way, the unequal probability of sampling. I remember Clay Porch has said many times that every fish must have an equal opportunity to be sampled, in order for sampling
to be properly done.
Now I think the problem in this, with this project is -- with regards to the Large Pelagics Survey is that it comes down to the word "highly" in highly migratory species. In other words, the spatial distribution of bluefin, in particular juvenile bluefin, yellowfin and bigeye, creates a big challenge for the Large Pelagics Survey. It changes yearly in many cases.

Now to ensure coverage of fishing events, in order to achieve a spatial distribution of sampling would require a dynamic approach to resource allocation. When I'm referring to resource allocation, I'm referencing the dockside interviewers, because we can't have dockside interviewers from Eastport, Maine to Key West, Florida, you know.

They would need to be shifted relative to where the fish actually show up, in order to obtain this spatial distribution that we're looking for. So I'm kind of, I'm kind of agreeing with you on this issue, that this is something that
needs to be looked much more deeply into, and I believe that this reporting scheme or a reporting scheme, let's put it that way, is definitely more advantageous and more accurate in addressing this particular problem than the Large Pelagics Survey. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Thanks, David. Let's, I've got two other people online and a couple in the room. Again, we've just got a couple of minutes for this, so if folks can be as focused as possible in their questions, that would be very helpful. Jimmy Hull.

MR. HULL: Yeah, thank you. I think, you know, we're talking about the Angling sector here and they have to have an HMS Angling permit to do this, harvest these animals. So why aren't -- since we know who they are, why aren't they required to report, or at least a portion of them required to report? Seems to me that would be a much more accurate way to get at what you're trying to get at here from the Angling sector.

I have lots of other questions. But
that's the main point. If they're required to have a permit now to do this, you're halfway there. Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Jimmy. Any answer to that Cliff?

MR. HUTT: So the Angling category is required to report their landings and their discards of bluefin tuna, as well as landings of billfish and swordfish. The LPS collects a lot more data just beyond landings data though, and it collects data on other HMS species like the yellowfin and bigeye tuna, as well as the pelagic sharks, and it's key for collecting a lot of effort data. But we don't at this point have like, you know, logbook requirements for angling, although that is something we may be discussing in the future. That's for the next presentation.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Lisa online.
DR. KERR: Thanks. Yeah, it is very interesting to hear about these proposed changes to the survey design, and I assume that there's been some conversations with folks who use the data for
stock assessment purposes and estimating indices of abundance. But just was curious what the conversations have been like of how these either very large changes would be accounted for, for the continuity of the use of the data for stock assessment.

So when there's large-scale changes in surveys, it's often dealt with, the break in the time series or calibration factors or model standardization. So just looking to hear how these might be accounted for.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks Lisa. Any quick response on that?

DR. LEE: That's why the process
includes the calibration effort, but until we have the data indicating that the calibration is needed, we don't need -- we don't need to take on the major calibration. But yes, we need to do a lot of analysis to be clear about need of calibration and if it is needed then yes, we need to bring the old estimates to be aligned with the new estimates, so that the time series will not be broken.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Yeah Cliff, you want to jump in?

MR. HUTT: Yeah, this would be very similar to what they did with MRIP when they adopted the new Fishing Effort Survey, and over the last, you know, two years and this year they have been conducting the old LPS survey alongside these pilot surveys, so they can do that calibration testing as needed.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Let's take a couple and then I think we'll probably need to bump to the rest, next presentation, then we can come back. But Amy, why don't you jump in and then we'll go over to Mike.

MS. DUKES: Thanks for that additional information on the calibration. You hit one of my questions. The second was with the Maryland catch cards and doing the Maryland pilot study in 2020, were you able to do any validation between those two data streams to see if there was consistency?

DR. LEE: The new design is not to test or validate the catch card program. However, we
did some analysis with the existing LPIS data, and they track pretty closely. However, some analysis -- we didn't conduct analysis, but in the past, based on the past analysis, it says that -- it indicates that about compares rate of the catch card is around the 80 percent or 85 percent. But when we look at the trend, the good news is that they track each other pretty closely.

If I may, may I respond to the first comment? I brought up the slide talking about unequal probability sampling. This is statistical jargon that can be confusing or misleading, but I still need to use this jargon so that we are on the same page. But unequal part means that again, we want to send the samplers more frequently to bigger sites.

That's where this unequal probability sense comes in. We don't want to send everybody equally to every site. We want to send more samplers more frequently to those bigger sites. That's where this unequal concept comes in, and for the second comment about being flexible, yes we
recognize the need of that. That's why we wanted to combine the fixed component of the sampling, which is probability-based with adaptable components.

So that samplers can be adaptive, depending upon the weather condition and fishing condition. That's the way that we are hoping that sampling productivity can be maintained. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Mike, I'm going to let you jump in quickly, and then we're going to shift it over to Cliff.

MR. PIERDINOCK: Okay, thank you. If I understand this correctly, you went to these various sites going back to 2020. You did your interviews. You took that information and then you plugged it into the models, and then you ran the models and you had an output.

Now with that output, if I understand you right, you did validate that appears acceptable. Were they all within acceptable standard deviation and so on for use, or does that
require further calibration, because on Slide 12, it's noted you need more data, you need additional benchmark field surveys, which -- is that a result of issues with the input?

And I note with that, with the need for more data, we just had a previous presentation and the fact that the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation's coming out with a proposal, and that could be a mechanism to help fill in some of these gaps that are here.

But and then the last question, since this is kind of dated and it started in 2018 and we've seen and continue to see the impact, the climatic shift of our stocks when they move into New England sooner, stay there longer and leave later, would that change the outcome, because this is kind of influx of when this is taking place. Thank you.

DR. LEE: I'm not sure if I really have all the questions, but so this slide, the vectors for potential delay of the certification process, these are the what if scenarios. These are the
states that we put the new design in to test, and the data coming out of this pilot testing will confirm that design is valid. And we did a lot of simulations on a lot of different scenarios, and this computer simulation indicates that design is working.

Now for this -- your point of what if we need additional data or additional testing. Because of this component of estimating weights for the flexible adaptive components of the survey, we need the data from all three years, and we are doing some preliminary analysis based on past two years of data.

It's looking positive, but we need a whole set of all nine states or all LPIS areas except state of Maine to be able to make sure that design and estimation process is working, as we are hoping.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. I know there are more questions around the table. I've got a queue here, but we've got to get the mic to Cliff, and we'll see if we have a little more time. As it is,

I think we'll probably run about ten minutes into lunch, just so we make sure we have some adequate time for this next conversation. Cliff, over to you.

MR. HUTT: Good morning everyone. I'm
Cliff Hutt with the Atlantic HMS Management Division, and today I'm going to be presenting on our plans to update the MRIP Regional Implementation Plan for the Atlantic HMS Region. The regional implementation plans are meant to identify recreational data needs and provide recommendations for programmatic improvements, for HMS, our primary focus here are on MRIP and the Large Pelagics Survey.

But we also use this plan as an opportunity to conduct a comprehensive examination of our recreational data collections. The first Atlantic HMS plan was developed in 2017 and published in 2018.

For today, my goals are kind of to give the AP an update on our progress towards the various priorities that were identified by that plan; to
put forth agency ideas for additional improvements to our recreational data collections for HMS; and to solicit your input on additional recreational needs and priorities that we may have missed.

Basically, Atlantic HMS recreational data needs are largely the same as what they were five years ago, with some minor changes in the margins. As we have heard repeatedly, we are seeing tuna show up in the LPS regions and the recreational fisheries for them beginning earlier than they had in previous years, and in some cases extending later into the year than historically.

So there are, there is a potential need for adjustments to some of those survey periods for like the LPS. For billfish and swordfish, we're seeing deep drop fisheries expanding into new areas, thanks to improvements in technology, and we still need to reestablish MRIP in the Caribbean, which was discontinued after the 2015 season thanks to basically damage due to hurricanes and changes in how the survey is going to be organized and governed down there.

In the recreational shark fishery, we have Amendment 14 coming up, which is going to be calling for active management of the recreational shark fishery, and we're still having questions about our ability to quantify the shore-based fishery for large sharks, especially at night. And we're having increasing reports of depredation up and down the coast, as you're all well aware of.

Major changes to our recreational data collections over the last year, as Yong-Woo just reported the LPS is entering the final year of its pilot testing for its new design. MRIP has fully transitioned to the new Fishing Effort Survey to replace the Coastal Household Telephone Survey, and they have new data standards coming out next year.

For-hire logbook reporting programs have sprung up and down the Atlantic and Gulf coast, so that now all federally permitted for-hire vessels are required to do logbook reporting, with the exception of HMS Charter/Headboat vessels. We are now selecting all HMS tournaments for catch
reporting with greater than 90 percent of those tournaments now reporting electronically through the new ATR system.

So an update on where we are from the progress we've made on the priorities that were identified in the last plan. Yong-Woo's presentation pretty much covers the priority of the LPS redesign. I will just say that will continue to be a top priority for us moving forward. The next priority was expanding Atlantic HMS recreational fishery data collections to the rest of the Atlantic HMS region. The LPS covers Maine to Virginia, but we wanted to see improved sampling North Carolina through Texas.

Main options that were identified by the plan last time were either expansion of the LPS or increasing offshore sampling in surveys like the APAIS, which is the dockside survey under the general MRIP survey, the Access Point Angler Intercept Survey.

The Modern Fish Act provided additional funding for increased sampling in APAIS to improve

PSEs, and through the South Atlantic in particular a lot of states have chosen to use a lot of that additional funding to increase sampling of offshore fishing trips, which essentially accomplishes this priority.

In the Gulf, we've also seen expanded offshore sampling of recreational trips through the various state surveys that have been designed to kind of deal with red snapper management down there and surveys like Louisiana Creel, which has a designated offshore stratum that's resulted in more consistent estimates of HMS catch in the state of Louisiana.

The next priority was including, the inclusion of Atlantic HMS charter head boats in federal for-hire electronic logbook data collections. As I said, all federal for-hire vessels in the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico, excluding HMS, are now required to do logbook reporting.

We estimate a little over a third of our for-hire permitted vessels are captured by those

Council logbook reporting programs because of the dual permitted issues. Our division is planning an omnibus electronic reporting rulemaking in the near future, that's looking at both commercial and recreational electronic reporting issues.

One of the things we will be considering as a part of that rulemaking would be expanding the logbook reporting requirement to all HMS Charter/Headboat permitted vessels. That rulemaking will also look at the possibility of expanding such logbook reporting to the Atlantic Tuna General category, and the Swordfish General Commercial Permit as well.

The next priority identified in the original plan was to identify ways to reduce reporting burden for HMS permitted vessels. The main way we have done that, as Randy mentioned in his presentation yesterday, we have integrated HMS catch reporting into ACCSP SAFIS eTrips system, both their mobile and online systems.

So any of our for-hire vessels that are having to report through logbook reporting, if they
are using SAFIS eTrips, they only have to submit one trip report now and they don't have to worry about doing separate HMS catch reporting, because that data will be captured through their eTrips report.

We are committed to advancing the One-Stop Reporting initiative that was started by GARFO, and we are actively kind of working to try to get our HMS data elements implemented in GARFO's eVTR and Bluefin Inc.'s VESL reporting systems, which are two of the other major systems used for that for-hire logbook reporting.

Another priority was developing integrated estimates of effort and catch for species encountered by multiple surveys. We occasionally have issues where both MRIP and the LPS are generating separate estimates for some of our species, although the LPS ones are much more precise as a general rule. But that does cause issues from time to time. HMS has standard accounting procedures for combining catch data from multiple surveys, and reporting programs
develop our estimates of total HMS catch for ICCAT reporting.

But we are continuing to monitor some discussions, particularly in the Gulf, where they are dealing with this same issue because you have MRIP overlapping with these state reef fish surveys that's causing issues. They're working out ways to try to integrate that data to create, you know, unified reports of catch and effort, and we are monitoring those discussions because we think that could set precedents for dealing with, you know, conflicting report estimates between LPS and MRIP in the future.

The next priority was evaluating and combining an expansion of catch card harvest reports, tournament landings reports. Starting in 2019, HMS began selecting all HMS tournaments for catch reporting. Previously we had just been selecting billfish tournaments, but now we're selecting all of them. Maryland DNR has also been considering going electronic for their catch card reporting program, and the fact that we are now
including HMS catch reporting in SAFIS eTrips does develop the potential for some duplicative reporting with state catch card programs.

If you're a for-hire vessel in Maryland or North Carolina that has a council charter party permit that requires you to do logbook reports, you're still going to be required to submit your state catch card reports. So there is a -- there is basically going to be a duplicate reporting stream going on in those two states for the for-hire categories.

So this is something we're keeping an eye on to make sure -- a little closer, okay. This is something we're keeping an eye on to make sure that we aren't, you know, getting duplicate numbers in our catch reporting for ICCAT is something we're going to have to pay attention to in the future, especially if once we expand the logbook reporting requirement of all HMS Charter/Headboat permitted vessels.

The next priority was improving and expanding our data collections of our recreational
shark fisheries. Sharks are among the species identified in the South Atlantic to see improved PSEs from that increased APAIS sampling. So that is something we are going to be monitoring and evaluating over the years to come.

We still have the issue that approximately half of all discarded sharks reported to MRIP are not identified to species. They're just identified as sharks or maybe hammerhead shark, because people can tell the difference between a pointy-nose one versus a hammerhead. But you know, that's something we want to improve.

We are working with some researchers, particularly right now Texas A\&M, on their developing an app that uses artificial intelligence, where you take a picture of a fish and hopefully it can suggest what species it likely is. So developing technology is like data we hope in the future can help improve some of the species identification on our recreational discard data.

We still have a lot of uncertainty in
terms of how well our data collection methods are capturing things like shore-based fisheries for large trophy sharks, especially at night. It is a complicated issue because technically those are state-managed fisheries. HMS permits are not required to fish for sharks in state waters or from shore.

But it is an issue that we continue to work on and want to partner with states where that is particularly popular, like the state of Florida to improve our data collection on that. And there is potential for expanding HMS mandatory catch reporting to include pelagic sharks in that omnibus electronic reporting role. That is something that is being considered largely due to the ongoing issues with mako.

If there's ever a chance to open mako back up for the recreational fishery, it will probably have to come with a provision of mandatory reporting of any of those landings. So that's something we're looking to for, you know, if it's needed in the future.

The next priority that was identified in that plan was revising the HMS Charter/Headboat permit category to distinguish for-hire vessels that fish commercially or just recreationally. That's why we put out the commercial endorsements for charter/headboats so we could identify vessels that had an interest in fishing commercially. Approximately 45 percent of them are getting that endorsement now.

And finally we had evaluating opportunities to revise the Large Pelagic Biological Survey to allow for increased biological samples of all HMS species. That is still, still just collecting bluefin tuna is the only species that is triggering opportunistic assignments for that. But in the future, we're going to continue to look at opportunities to expanding that to other species.

And as I said, we need to get MRIP
re-going in the Caribbean. Currently, our Southeast Regional Office and Southeast Fisheries Science Center are in discussions with the agencies
in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands to establish a new governance structure that will get MRIP going again in the Caribbean region.

Now new major data collection priorities that we are considering. There is the need to potentially expand the sampling of the LPS into new months, because we are seeing these tuna being caught earlier and earlier. Currently, the LPS begins in the month of June in the Mid-Atlantic and Massachusetts. In the other states it starts in July. We might consider in the future expanding, you know, starting the LPS as early as May, maybe starting it in June in some of those other New England states.

We're definitely interested in hearing the AP's opinions on that, and if they think that expansion would be -- even more expansion may be needed. Our thoughts is initial assessments of that could be done with data from things like the HMS catch reporting program, the state catch cards and the Large Pelagic Telephone Survey, which is used to collect effort data. It would be much
easier to increase and expand that sampling before we expand the dockside sampling.

We also need to assess how that increased APAIS offshore sampling, how that's affecting our PSEs for our species in the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. As I've already hinted at multiple times, you know, we've got that electronic reporting rule coming up and the potential to expand logbook reporting to our HMS charter/headboat vessels. This would not necessarily exempt them from participation in surveys like the LPS, but it could eventually do so.

> At minimum, we would need a period of overlapping logbook and survey reporting, so that we could calibrate those time series of data as some of the previous questions issued. That would be a major concern, to make sure we have that time series of data for our stock assessments. Surveys can also collect a level of detailed data that is difficult to accomplish with logbooks, particularly on like fish size data.

And that rulemaking rule, as I said, we'll also be considering potential logbook reporting for the Atlantic Tunas General and Swordfish General Commercial vessels.

Another major issue is this need to quantify shark depredation events. We see a number of different options for collecting data on shark depredation. One option could be the development of a mobile application for self-reporting of depredation events. This would give us a bit more control over the data elements included and the scope of them.

However, you have the con of relying on self-reported data, when really what we need is a more quantitative assessment. One way to get a more quantitative assessment would be to add questions to the existing MRIP and LPS surveys about depredation. The concern there is if you add too many additional questions, that affects the efficiency of those dockside surveyors and how many surveys that could get done within an assignment.

So if we added any questions here, it
would probably be a very minimal number, say did you experience depredation. If so, how many fish did you lose, what species do you think were involved, and that would be about it. An option for you would be a hybrid approach. Having a few, possibly a few additional surveys added to MRIP LPS with a self-reported data app that could be used to collect more detailed information from people who actually do experience depredation events.

Other things to consider, expanding HMS catch reporting to pelagic sharks as I mentioned earlier; continued efforts to maximize our reporting compliance for our HMS catch reporting, and evaluating the use of efficiency improvements in some of our dockside sampling for the Large Pelagics Survey, namely potential use of tablets within that survey. ACCSP and GulfFIN have adopted the use of tablets for the MRIP dockside surveys, and reported significant improvements in survey efficiency.

And Quantech, the contractor that conducts the LPS dockside surveys, began assessing
the use of tablets last year. With that, some topics for discussion, this is my last slide. You know, did we miss anything? Are there any other major recreational data collection developments pertaining to HMS that we may have missed the AP might want to bring to our attention?

Do the priorities of the 2017 plan still reflect our data needs? Are there any major recreational data gaps that still need to be addressed or are newly emerging, and does the AP have any thoughts on the best framework for quantifying sharp depredation?

MR. BROOKS: Thanks Cliff, and why don't we leave that slide up there, so people could focus on it?

MR. HUTT: Yes.
MR. BROOKS: Let me ask the folks who have their cards left over from before just to put them down. I have it captured; I've got John and Jason and Charlie and Amy, and if we have time, we'll come back to that for the LPS survey. But I'd like to see what kind of questions or comments
folks have related to presentation that Cliff just gave us, and let's just start over with you Jeff? DR. KNEEBONE: Sure. Thank you very much to both of you for great presentations. I don't know where to begin, but $I$ will start with my biggest theme for this meeting, which is offshore wind. So as you know, more lease areas are popping up and many of not all of them encompass really productive and popular recreational fishing areas for HMS.

Moving forward, I would just stress, there's an extreme need to figure out ways to mend MRIP, the LPS, explore new mechanisms to improve data collection, to allow us to monitor the impacts of offshore wind on both recreational fisheries, charter fisheries, as well as commercial fisheries. Just looking at the LPS data from 2002 to 2019 in a 1, 500 square mile area in Southern New England, that has been leased for offshore wind development.

There's only 300 observed LPS trips with as few as five observed in individual lease
areas. So that just exemplifies the extreme need to amplify the amount of data that we collect. That will allow us to begin to monitor. So we'd love to talk to you, anyone, about ways that we can increase productivity, data collection productivity.

And then a couple more than I'll fire off here. You mentioned adding questions and difficulty that may come with adding questions to the LPS relating to depredation. So if we think about offshore wind and we add those questions, are there any existing questions in the survey that maybe don't provide the amount of data that they once did, or are basically $I$ guess the best word would be "expendable." Are they less valuable than collecting information on depredation or offshore wind?

I have more, but I want to be conscious of other people's time, so I'll stop there.

MR. BROOKS: Much obliged, thanks. And there's, you know, definitely come up to Cliff during lunch and --

MR. HUTT: Yeah. I mean all the questions currently included in the LPS are there for a reason and have a purpose in the intercept survey that are primarily designed to get at that estimation of harvest of HMS species and discards of HMS species in the recreational fishery.

One thing I will point out, you know, unlike MRIP, the LPS does collect location data on where people are fishing so we can actually have identification of trips in these sites, which the MRIP currently cannot do at all. So I mean it would definitely be beneficial if we could get location data on, you know, vessel trips from MRIP added.

Beyond that for the LPS, it would probably take just more sampling, you know, to increase those numbers. And another thing, you know, we expand logbook reporting to our charter/headboat fleet, that will come with location data. So that should substantially improve that data, at least for the charter/headboat fleet.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks Jason. Let's go
over to you then Bob, then John, then we'll go online.

MR. ADRIANCE: Thanks, and I will keep it to this presentation, even though I think the two are part and parcel. I won't go back to the first one. Thanks to the both of you, thanks Cliff. Thanks for the shout out.

In relation to questions, you say they all have -- while they're all designed to get at something, one thing we looked at when we went to LA Creel is what is absolutely necessary for management and quantifying the fishery, and we reduced the survey to that.

It was less of a burden on the anglers. We were able to put -- we were able to get more surveys quicker, and we did switch to tablets. We do it exclusively on tablets, and I think that's something that greatly improves efficiency.

You know, if your anglers are more willing -- so your PSEs, how are they really going to go down? It's number of samples. The more interviews you get, the more fish you touch, the
better those PSEs, and $I$ think that's something to strive for. Thanks.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Jason. Bob.
MR. HUMPHREY: Thank you both for your presentations. Cliff, LPS definitely needs to start sooner and linger longer, and second comment, if you think that there might be some value, greater value in a more intensive sweep of data coming from tournaments, grab me and we'll talk aside.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Over to you, John.
MR. DEPERSENAIRE: Yeah, thank you.
Yeah, very interesting presentations, both of them. $I$ have a question about the first presentation, but you know, $I$ think it carries over and I can make it part of this discussion. So I was curious how you dealt with the issue of the LPS intercept surveys, because $I$ understand they are what drives catch composition, and how you deal with vessels that dock at a private dock wherein, a surveyor may not have access to that dock or that boat that's engaged in the HMS fishery.

Obviously with some species being
mandatory, you know, marlin, swordfish, bluefin tuna, you know, you capture that information there. But I guess that's a data gap. I mean I guess I'd like to know a little bit more how you, how you guys plan to deal with that.

DR. LEE: I will answer quickly about the potential data gaps because of a lack of data coming from the private dockets, and because of that concern about ten years ago, before my time with this LPS, science -- LPS statistician conducted a bootstrap type of analysis, checking out those types of gaps.

And for the important major species like bluefin tuna, it shouldn't be much of a concern, but it is within our radar to update the analysis with the most time series of data.

MR. HUTT: And you know, to that I'll add, unlike MRIP, the LPS does get access to some private docks, but you know, what they did with that study was basically kind of coming to the conclusion that the difference in catch rates weren't all that different between, you know,
vessels fishing out of public versus private docks. We are still getting data from those vessels through the telephone survey, which is the effort survey. So we're finding out how many -we're still finding you how many trips they're taking, and unlike the MRIP Effort Survey, we do add some questions to that on did you catch and harvest any bluefin, any of the billfish. So we are getting some catch data from those guys, so that we can continue to evaluate and make sure that we're not getting biased estimates by not being able to include them in the dockside intercepts.

MR. DEPERSENAIRE: Thanks. So I guess the only follow-up question $I$ had was that -- so I guess you've done some analysis you found the avidity and I guess the skill level is relatively the same across both the dock at someone's house as opposed to a public marina. And as long as you capture it through the HMS permit framework, I guess, you can make those relatively fair assumptions that it's captured.

MR. HUTT: Yeah. That was basically the
conclusion on that study from ten years ago, and really it may getting about time to update that, but --

MR. BROOKS: All right. Let's grab two folks from online, and then we'll come back into the room and finish up with Amy and Dewey. So and then we'll get you off to lunch. So if our remaining speakers could be focused, that would be helpful. Lisa.

DR. KERR: Yes. Thanks for the presentation. Yeah, I had a question, I guess, regarding the changes that have been seen in the fishery with an influx of more inexperienced fishermen and what the impacts could have on kind of, you know, quantification of catch rate, you know, with the idea being hours fished for an inexperienced, you know, the effort metric for an inexperienced fishermen is going to mean something different than for an experienced fishermen.

So I didn't know if there's an easy way that that's, you know, there's a real question that that's accounted for and if you're kind of thinking
about how to track that. Thanks.
MR. HUTT: I'm assuming you're talking about the kind of, the increase of fishing effort we've seen the last two years during the pandemic. I would say, I mean we're not exactly collecting data to determine their experience level, but the way the survey is designed to estimate catch rates. If the experience level of the fishermen is changing, it really shouldn't bias those estimates.

I mean we may see catch rates, you know, catch effort on average going down because there's more inexperienced people in the fishery. That might be a more concerning issue for say some of those stock assessment indices that are being generated, you know. That's something that they would have to adjust for.

But if they're using those, you know, as we're using those as an index for recruitment, excuse me. But it really shouldn't bias the estimates of total catch, the way the survey is designed.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. David Schalit. Lisa, sorry. Did you want to -- did you have another comment?

DR. KERR: Oh just yeah. I guess in reference to that, that was my concern, used for indices of abundance because for exactly the reasons you stated. I think if there were a model that could account for that, if there were a question that classified experience. So I'll just leave my comment there, but I think yeah, there would be ways. If the data were available, there would be ways to account for that and adjust.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Lisa. David.
MR. SCHALIT: Yes. Actually to Lisa, like any survey, it all comes down to the confounding elements, right. But Cliff, thank you very much for this very interesting presentation. I'm a bit shocked actually, because $I$ was completely unaware that there's a -- that this LPS redesign was being worked on, and I'm pretty sure - -

You may be aware that after the 2020
assessment for bluefin tuna, there was, there was a very strong reaction on the part of ICCAT Advisory Committee people and others regarding the results, which were, you know, which showed data that was completely unlike anything we were experiencing on the water.

And the noise was basically deafening from this conversation and it lasted for almost a year, and this -- this resulted in a calamitous situation in which we had a quota recommended of 1,680 tons through 2021, and then we had another assessment which in the following year, in which our quota was 2,720 tons.

So and to a certain degree, these results would -- were dependent, I mean the very issues in these results were dependent upon estimates of recruitment. So what I'm saying here essentially is this, is that I think we need to be looking at the fundamental reasons why we're collecting this data. I mean obviously NOAA needs to know how many fish are being caught, how many of each species under HMS, that's for sure.

But then the rest of it has to do with ICCAT okay, and we have a burning need to get a handle on that as quickly as we can and as accurately as we can, because we have two other nations that are entirely dependent upon U.S. data for recreational, for recruitment estimates. So what I'm suggesting is this. We're not going to get to the bottom of this or even close to the bottom of this in this conversation.

So what I'm suggesting is that we set up a meeting, a Zoom meeting with you guys, and with anyone who's interested in the -- from the HMS AP, and anyone who's interested from the ICCAT Advisory Committee to attend, to have an initial discussion which allows for an exchange and discussion regarding data collection protocols and objectives.

So my suggestion to you guys would be to speak with Pete and with Brian to the IAC. They can send out an email to the committee members of both of these committees, and that we look with a view toward having a meeting in the near-term, let
us say for example within the next ten days. Thanks very much.

MR. BROOKS: Thank you, David. Cliff. MR. HUTT: I will say the, you know, the effort to update the Implementation Plan is largely about doing that. We had a meeting a couple of months ago with the team that was involved in drafting the initial plan, which included stock assessment scientists from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and various other internal and external agency partners.

And we'll be having another such meeting some time over the summer. But I mean we can definitely take into consideration having a broader meeting with more people like including folks from the AP at some point. I can't promise turning that around in ten days though. MR. BROOKS: Thanks Cliff. Let's go, come back in the room and see if we can punch through the last questions and then get you to lunch. Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. I was
wondering on your second bullet point there about the priorities of 2017. Is there something in the 2017 plan where they've been achieved, and meaning I see a lot of the discussion and stuff going on and happening, but I'd like to see where something's been achieved, and I didn't -- I haven't seen that achievement except for maybe the redesign of the LPS survey going forward, and I've got one other question after that.

MR. HUTT: I mean I would say major achievements include, you know, the progress that's made on the LPS redesign, getting our HMS, you know, catch reporting data elements included in SAFIS eTrips to reduce that duplicative reporting burden, establishing the commercial endorsement on our Charter/Headboat permits so that we have a better handle on how many of them are attempting to commercial fish.

But I mean for most of these, it's an ongoing process, you know. The recreational fishery is always evolving. The data needs and the technology are evolving. So I mean it's really the
case where something is like fully complete and done, and we don't have to worry about it anymore, you know. It's just like we're always having to evolve and continue to adapt and improve.

MR. BROOKS: Good.
MR. HEMILRIGHT: Yeah, I mean we're in
2022. Anybody that fishes from a vessel that fishes for HMS species should be having to be permitted that vessel in some type of app, which seems to be more readily available and faster than all this paperwork stuff, to show the effort there.

And on the other part, even though the LPS survey is from Virginia North, we're still not talking about the MRIP and the PSEs, and how one or two fish can produce 100 metric tons of mako sharks in the winter in North Carolina. So that has to be used as the best available data, and there's problems with it.

So how are we going to fix, and the only way you fix that is more samplers, but yet we don't have no money according, from what I heard earlier today, really tight budgets and all this stuff,
stagnant or straight budgets. How are we going to increase that to get them PSEs down?

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Dewey.
MR. HUTT: As I said, you know, the Modern Fish Act did provide funding for increasing sampling in the MRIP surveys and in the South Atlantic they have been putting a lot of that towards sampling of offshore fishing trips in the hope of improving PSEs like that. You know, next year MRIP has new data standards coming out, among which is they will no longer be releasing estimates to have PSEs of greater than 50.

MR. BROOKS: All right.
MR. HEMILRIGHT: Can I have one follow-up to that? I mean what's the -- why wouldn't you release it to the public for transparency to show that? That just is kind of crazy if you say we're not going to release and show what the PSE is if it's above 50?

MR. HUTT: They will be reporting that there was data, but because the PSE was greater than 50, they're not going to be releasing the catch
estimate, with the proviso that it's not reliable enough for science and management.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Let's push on. I've got to --

MR. HEMILRIGHT: But the point is they're still using that. I know a PSEs of 75, 80 percent and we're using those best available science. So is that going to change? If it's above that 50, that means we will no longer be able to use that PSE for the best available science, or will it be a twofold, where we will only use it as not for management as it shouldn't be done already?

But I'm just confounded by what you're telling me, is because it's the best available and now we're not going to get a PSE, publicly given out there for transparency. We're just not going to -- we're going to keep under -- if it's under 50, we'll tell you about it. If it's over, we ain't going to talk about it.

MR. HUTT: It's not just that they're not going to release the PSE. They're not going to release the catch estimate.

MR. BROOKS: All right. I'm going to jump in here and invite you guys to pick this up as you head to lunch, which I really want to get us to. Amy, Peter, if it's burning, jump in. If not, let's get a break going on here. Amy, you good? Peter? Okay, great. Thank you all very much. We will reconvene at two o'clock.

So we're taking ten minutes from lunch. For those of you that might have had a question that you left, please feel free to connect with Cliff and Yong-Woo lee during the break here at lunch or at the later afternoon break. We will start at two o'clock sharp with offshore wind. Thanks everybody.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at $12: 39 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. and resumed at 2:03 p.m.)

MR. BROOKS: All right. We are a little bit after two o'clock, so we should get going here. Just to remind ourselves, this afternoon we're making a quick change to the agenda, just because of availability. We're going to jump in first to
the Pelagic Longline Take Reduction Plan Final Rule, get a status update on that with Erin Fougeres. And then we will shift to Offshore Wind and over to Brian Hooker with BOEM.

After break, we'll come back in the afternoon. We'll talk about the electronic monitoring cost allocation policy. And as I mentioned as well, we're going to add to the agenda a brief conversation around HMS permit issuance, and particularly as it relates to the Southeast Region. And we will have public comment for any members of the public who are on at 4:15, and then after wrapping up we will adjourn at 4:45.

So, with that, Erin, I'm going to hand it off to you. Erin Fougeres is with the Southeast Regional Office, Office of Protected Resources. Erin, you're up.

MS. FOUGERES: Okay, thanks so much. Can everyone see my screen?

MR. BROOKS: We can see the screen and we can hear you.

MS. FOUGERES: Okay, fantastic. Well
thank you for having me here today. I'm going to be giving an update on the Pelagic Longline Take Reduction Plan. See if $I$ can make it advance.

MR. BROOKS: Erin, if you wouldn't mind speaking up just a little bit, that would be helpful.

MS. FOUGERES: Sure, no problem. So today I'm going to go over the proposed rule elements, including the scope of the plan, the regulatory and non-regulatory elements and the current status. So in the scope changes that we proposed back in December 2020, we proposed removing Risso's dolphins and long-finned pilot whales from the scope of the take reduction plan for the pelagic longline fishery, and that was primarily because both species have been below the zero mortality rate goal or ten percent of PBR since the implementation of the original plan back in 2009.

And there has been some additional research since that time to determine that the species primarily impacted by the pelagic longline
fishery are short-finned pilot whales. So we are removing Risso's and long-finned from the scope of the plan. We are, however, leaving in short-finned pilot whales. The mortality and serious injury incidental to the pelagic longline fishery has exceeded at ten percent of their PBR since the plan was implemented. In some years it kind of bounced around, bounces around some years to exceed PBR. So for the regulatory elements of the proposed rule changes to the Pelagic Longline Take Reduction Plan, we would be removing the Cape Hatteras Special Research Area, along with its special observer and research participation requirements for fishermen operating in that area. That was the same as the consensus recommendation from the Pelagic Longline Take Reduction team. We are also modifying the mainline length restrictions in the Mid-Atlantic Bight, such that no more than one mainline can be in the water at any one time, and the total mainline length cannot exceed 32 nautical miles. So previously the mainline length restriction was 20 nautical miles.

So now there can be no more than 32; however, of that 32 there can be no more 30 nautical miles of active gear or gear with the leaders and hooks, and you can't have a single section of active gear that is more than 20 nautical miles.

So sections of active gear have to be separated from other sections by at least one nautical mile. It's what the team was calling a hookless line interrupt, and that was the same as the consensus recommendation from the team. We did also include in the proposed rule some language related to accidental parting, so if the gear breaks apart after setting the owner or operator has to make every effort to remove the additional portions of gear as soon as possible.

There are also terminal gear requirements proposed. They include implementing terminal gear requirements for the EEZ portion of the Florida East Coast, South Atlantic Bight, Mid-Atlantic Bight and Northeast Coastal fishing areas. The goal of those regulations are to make the hooks the weakest part of the terminal gear.

So the terminal gear requirements include requirements for hooks, such as circle hooks need to have a straightening force not to exceed 300 pounds, and a round wire diameter that can't exceed 4.05 millimeters of $60 / 0$ and 4.4 millimeters of 18/0. The leaders have to be made of monofilament nylon. No other light material like wire can be used and crimps and chafing gear are allowed though.

This terminal gear requirement recommendations are the same as the consensus recommendations from the Take Reduction team, and then also include an exception for transiting through the area, as well as an exception for research.

There are also non-regulatory elements that were recommended by the Take Reduction team including convening a Safe Handling and Release Work Group to potentially update those protocols, as well as updating observer and fishery -observer protocols and fishery observer forms, to increase information collected.

So during the 60-day public comment period, we received comments from a number of organizations listed here, and all of those comments can be found on regulations.gov at this link. And the current status is that the final rule is -- has been drafted and is in review, and we are anticipating that it will publish this summer or potentially early fall. That's all I have.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Thanks, Erin. Let's open it up to any questions or comments around the table, or in the -- in the online participants, and let me go first to Charlie and then over to Marty.

MR. BERGMANN: Hi Erin. Thanks for the presentation. I have a question for you. If my memory serves me correctly, the weakest point, the hook was based on the -- what the folks in Hawaii did with the false killer whale, and they found subsequently that that didn't work out well. They had to change their leader configuration to remove all the wire, and I don't know what they did about the hook.

But as I told the folks in Virginia, that particular hook is about three times as strong as the hook that folks use here in the Atlantic. So I don't know how you're going to address that.

MS. FOUGERES: Yeah, thanks Charlie. So the idea for the terminal gear regulations did come from the Hawaii fishery. However, the configuration of the gear proposed in our rule is significantly different in terms of the hook strength and the leader strength.

So we don't anticipate that we will have the same issues. We do know that the false killer whale team had to go back and revisit theirs. However, their hook was significantly stronger than the hook we're proposing, and we did base all recommendations, the team based their recommendations on primarily research from Bill McClellan.

The straightening force for a variety of different hooks when they did some tests using pilot whale heads and how the gear would interact with the pilot whale heads. So they did a number
of measurements using straightening forces and things like that. So the idea did come from the false killer whale, but the actual recommendations were substantially different. So we don't anticipate that we'll have the same issues.

MR. BROOKS: And just a note, there was a new weak hook study done out with the Hawaii longline fleet as well in the last year or so. You might want to look into that. Marty.

MR. SCANLON: Yes. Well, thank you for the update Erin. One thing $I$ want to ask is how long after the publication of this rule will the implement -- can we expect the implementation be?

MS. FOUGERES: Actually, we did solicit public comment on whether and for how long there should be a delayed implementation for some components of the rule, because we do recognize that for the terminal gear requirements, there will be some time required for manufacturing and then stocking and being able to purchase those different components of the gear that will be required.

I can't speak to what the final rule
will say, but we did solicit comments on that and weigh the timelines that were suggested in coming up with the final rule recommendations.

MR. SCANLON: Right, and will there be a -- did you anticipate, you know, a timeframe to, you know, for implementation of these weak hooks or the change in hooks there to give the tackle dealers the opportunity to supply those hooks? I mean that's a -- you know, we brought this issue up and you're well aware of it there that, you know, it may not be as easy as, you know, said to make the changes that may be in this rule.

I'm hopefully that will be in consideration when you put the final rule together, and that's been published.

MS. FOUGERES: We specifically
solicited comments on from manufacturers and the fishermen, and the tackle dealers. So that's definitely something that we're weighing in the final rule, and expect that the fishermen will be able to get the gear based on what the final rule recommends.

And then we also did have separate phone calls with Finstem (phonetic), with Kundalini (phonetic), and some of the industry folks, talking about the current supply chain issues and we're aware of that as well. So we have spoken with the folks about what we anticipate might happen with regard to the terminal gear requirements.

MR. SCANLON: Okay, and one final question here. Do you have an update on the work being done on the changes, potential changes to the serious injury criteria?

MS. FOUGERES: No, I don't have an update. I'm sorry, we did have that meeting with headquarters. That's a headquarters-led process, and so I recommend contacting Kristy Long if you would like an update on those.

MR. SCANLON: Excuse me, I didn't quite hear you there.

MR. BROOKS: She said recommended reaching out to Kristy Long at headquarters.

MR. SCANLON: Right.
MR. BROOKS: For an update on that.

That's a headquarters, a headquarters-led process.
MR. SCANLON: Okay. Thank you.
MR. BROOKS: Great. Any other questions or comments, either in the room or online?
(No response.)
MR. BROOKS: Erin, I think we're going to give you an extra half hour back in your life here.

MS. FOUGERES: Okay, thank you everybody. Have a good meeting.

MR. BROOKS: Yeah, thanks for calling in. Appreciate it. Okay. Let's shift then to Offshore Wind, Brian Hooker with BOEM is here. Brian, if you want to come on up. Do you have a presentation?

MR. HOOKER: Yeah, there it is.
MR. BROOKS: Okay, great. All right. So we'll -- I think Brian's got a presentation to walk through. You want to just walk through that before you take questions Brian? Would that be best?

MR. HOOKER: Yeah, that's great.

Thanks.
MR. BROOKS: Okay, great.
MR. HOOKER: Okay. So good afternoon. My name is Brian Hooker, and I'm the Biology Team lead with the Office of Renewable Energy Programs at the Bureau of Ocean and Energy Management. We're based out of Sterling, Virginia, and I'm here to day just to give you an update on some of the activities that we have going on.

I will note that part of the presentation does touch on some new initiatives being undertaken by the Gulf of Mexico, and I will do my best to answer those questions. But I might have to refer you to the Gulf of Mexico for more specific details there.

So again, here's some of the things I want to cover. Atlantic Project updates, our Central Atlantic Call for Information and Nominations, which was just published, an update on Gulf of Mexico leasing, and then just a very brief update on ongoing and completed studies.

So again, where we are now. We've
completed, you know, nine lease sales. We have about 18 active commercial leases. I think that plus six in parentheses is the New York Bight-lease sales, which have now been executed, so that plus six is now in the total column.

And we've approved now two construction operations plans. The construction operations plans or COPs are really the plans for the commercial development of a facility. So that was for Vineyard Wind 1 and the South Fork facility. Under the general activities plan approved, that's referring to the CVOW project, to two test turbines off of Virginia.

And as we noticed and I'll get into more, we have several more of these areas under consideration, and again there our first project in federal waters was the commercial Virginia Offshore Wind Project, which was completed in 2020. But in addition to that, we do have the Block Island Wind Farm that's in state waters.

So I thought the easiest way to, you know, kind of go through the Atlantic projects is
kind of, you know, just kind of walk through them one by one. As I mentioned, Vineyard Wind and South Fork have been approved, and they're currently in the, you know, the process of really doing a lot of some land-based work and getting ready for construction in the 2023 timeframe. We are really close --

MR. BROOKS: Brian, just if you can get even closer and speak up, that would be helpful. MR. HOOKER: All right. We are getting very close to issuing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Ocean Wind Project, and that will kick off a round of public hearings and public comments on that construction and operations plan. That project is off of New Jersey. Following that project, we have the Revolution Wind Project off of Rhode Island and Massachusetts, and then following that we have the Empire Wind Project, which is in the New York Bight. Then you can see the other projects and their anticipated time lines on when we anticipate publishing those Draft Environmental Impact

Statements.
All the information on this slide is also publicly available on that link at the bottom. These are all what we term "Fast 41" infrastructure projects. So there is a federally-maintained permitting dashboard that lists, you know, where the project is under all the various statutes, whether we're talking about NEPA, the Endangered Species Act consultations, the consultations for Essential Fish Habitat.

All the milestone dates for each one of those projects is listed at that link there. So even myself, $I$ oftentimes wonder where are we here with this, and that's the link. Just select BOEM on the dropdown list of agencies, and it will give you all the BOEM projects, and I'm happy to answer any questions about these at the end of the presentation.

I think the newest one that I mentioned at the very beginning was the New York Bight auction. So these are the newest leases that we've issued on the Atlantic. So we held that auction
back in February. 14 companies participated. This does say still -- I apologize, I didn't update the slide -- they're no longer provisional winners, that they're actually executed leases now, and it was noted for its competitive winning bids totaling over -- totaling $\$ 4.37$ billion, the highest-grossing competitive ocean energy lease auction in history. And then on the right, you can see a color coding of which entities received each of those leases.

So now I'm going to pivot to the leasing process that we have ongoing in the Central Atlantic. As I mentioned, we just published on April 29th the Call for Information and Nominations for this area. This was unique in that prior to the publication of the Call for Information and Nominations, we held a series of meetings to gather stakeholder input on these areas prior to going out with the call.

Usually that call is our kind of first public opportunity to get public feedback, which the comment period is currently open, and in this
case we decided to frontload a comment or stakeholder workshops prior to Call for Information and Nominations. After we receive all the information on the Call, we will look toward developing an Area ID, going through an area identification process, and the term "Wind Energy Area," which some of you may be familiar with, is what happens at the end of the Area ID process. From there, we do an environmental assessment for the purposes of issuing leases, and then we have a proposed sale notice, and there's notice and comment on the proposed sale notice, and then after that the final sale notice. At each point in that process, we identify additional concerns and opportunities to further winnow down the areas.

I think a great example of that is what occurred in New York Bight with one of the energy areas that were initially proposed going down through Area ID, and then even rolling even further down and that proposed sale notice. So as of right now, those six call areas for the Central Atlantic
are shown on the screen. They total about 3.9 million acres and when we talk about whole and partial blocks, those are basically three nautical mile by three nautical mile offshore lease blocks. That's how we do our leasing is in lease blocks.

And again, we'll take time. I'm sure I'll have some questions about that at the end of the presentation. So again, links for everybody who is interested. The regulations.gov comment information is the top link. We have additional supportive information on the Central Atlantic. I've got a second link, and then also we did put a kind of project-specific GIS online as well.

That's called the Experience Builder.
It has multiple different layers of information that went into the, delineating the call area, and that's available on our website as well.

So the next steps is there will be a -- well, we already have the task force meeting in February. We published the call. The end of the comment period is June 28th, so that's coming up next month. We then plan to complete the area
identification process. Again, that's the wind energy area designation in September, and then after that, as I mentioned, the proposed and final sale notices would follow sometime after that.

So now pivoting to the Gulf of Mexico, this is -- the Gulf of Mexico went with a very large call for information and nomination area to solicit public comment, as you can see here. There has been a lot of public gatherings to date. No, actually you get to that on the next slide, and they are currently in the process of evaluating all the information they received on this area to identify wind energy areas. They're now in that area identification phase.

This is the -- so this is the map that went out with the call, and the fed-state boundary for Louisiana starts at three nautical miles and for Texas it starts at nine.
(Off-microphone comment.)
MR. HOOKER: So -- oh, yeah, sorry. It's the -- well, that's the planning area. So it's basically this entire area, but within federal
waters.
MR. BROOKS: So, Brian, they're not seeing your cursor move.

MR. HOOKER: Oh, they're not seeing it?
MR. BROOKS: Now we got it. Now we see it.

MR. HOOKER: Okay. So the call area goes out to the -- about the 400 meter water isobath, and so it's about 30 million acres. So it's pretty much this whole area that you see here, obviously exclusive of state waters. It was a large area that we -- that they started off with. I mean again the -- I'm sorry. The 400 meter water isobath, not all the way out to the deep.

So where we are now, we are in the area -- like $I$ said, they're in the area identification process there, which is anticipated this summer, to identify wind energy areas, with a proposed sale notice in -- some time later in the summer of 2022. Again, we have maps on that web link at the bottom of this slide that you can really get into more information. I think we also publishing an atlas
that has a lot of the information that will be used in the area identification process as well that will be posted to that website.

So another initiative that we're working on is guidance for lessees for mitigating impacts to fisheries. Back in November, we published a request for information to request information on the scope of our initiative to develop this guidance, specifically offshore wind injury impacts to commercial and recreational fisheries.

We received about 100 comments, and again the topic areas that we were soliciting feedback on were just around the general approach to mitigation, mitigation around siting, design, navigation and access, safety measures, environmental monitoring and financial compensation.

Obviously, $I$ think the bulk of the comments are around the financial compensation piece, and there's a lot of discussion that will be in the guidance around the financial
compensation piece.
Regarding environmental monitoring, I want to clarify that that was really focused on monitoring fisheries' performance versus biological environmental monitoring. We have lots of other guidance out there, the Responsible Offshore Science Alliance and other -- the Regional Wildife Science Collaborative.

All have, all are working on different biological monitoring standards and guidance across the board, and this isn't meant to, you know, focus on that side of things. It's more on the fisheries performance monitoring.

So where are we now? As I mentioned, we did the request for information. We held a state-federal working group to really dig in on just primarily focused on the Atlantic for data and methodology available for the fisheries compensatory mitigation development. So that was
-- that information from that working group is used by BOEM in developing the guidance.

The guidance, I think I neglected to
mention, is a national level guidance, but there is, you know, specific information just for the Atlantic because of where we are in the leasing process on the Atlantic.

So we do anticipate soon publishing that draft guidance for notice and comment. We anticipate a 60-day comment period on that draft guidance, and then with final guidance issued this summer. We do plan to try to publish that guidance in a way that it can be incorporated into the Ocean Wind DEIS, so that they're kind of going in tandem with our next round of environmental reviews.

Again here, for your reference, we have a link to where you can find more information on that initiative. So lastly, I did want to just briefly touch upon BOEM's environmental studies program. We do have a studies development program and a studies development plan that we update annually. We are always looking for input from the public on study priorities and study ideas.

Usually that occurs, that solicitation occurs every winter, and then we look through
what's in the plan and select which ones we can move forward with and develop a national studies list. And then we also have those reviewed by an independent committee that is convened by the National Academy of Sciences.

The results of these studies are very important to our, kind of our feedback loop on the assessment for NEPA, and then using the best available information that we have from our studies and from other sources to improve the analyses in those, in those assessments.

So just real quickly some of the studies I wanted to highlight. We do have a lot of work that we've done over the years on baseline fish telemetry studies, both in Southern New England, which is ongoing currently, New York, Delaware, Maryland and Virginia, which wrapped up within the past couple of years, and again some links there for more information on those studies.

We've also published recently a hydrodynamic impact model for Southern New England, and we've also done several studies to
date on electromagnetic fields, including species such as skates, lobsters and eels. The most recent one on eels was just published last year.

So again, all this information and a host of other studies that we funded are found on that link at the bottom of this page, and again I can probably, be happy to answer any other questions you might have there.

So that's the end of my presentation, and I'm happy to take any questions at this time.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Thanks Brian, it's a great overview. I know this is an issue, a topic that's been of interest around the table in the past and I'm sure is now. I think our main goal today is both for you all to be caught up to speed as to what's going on, if you aren't already, and for Brian to have a chance to hear what kind of issues are top of mind. Obviously BOEM is front and center on this, not HMS, but we want to take advantage of having this conversation here.

So let's open it up. Let's start with -- we'll start online. Evan Hipsley, you asked a
question which I think is a little, got a little bit of a typo on there. But basically the question was, you know, wanting to better understand the square miles and are the structures physically secured to the bottom? So maybe Brian you could talk, talk about that and Evan, if you want to weigh in with a bit more of a question, feel free.

MR. HOOKER: Yeah. No, that's a great question, and the answer depends on the water depth at which the facility is built. So for example, in the Central Atlantic call that I mentioned, there are two of those call areas, if I can go back up to it, what we refer to as -- I think it's $F$ and $E, E$ and $F$. Those are, those are deep water sites. So those would have to use floating technology.

The other sites that you can see that are actually up on the shelf, we do expect those to be fixed foundations. So but even when I talk about floating, they're not free floating all over the place. They are secured to the sea floor. There's a variety of different mooring systems, whether we're talking about tension leg platforms
that are, you know, directly underneath the platform or catenary cables that secure it.

But the structures themselves are floating on the surface, but they're secured through a variety of different possible mooring systems. Again on the shelf, those are going to be like monopiles or jacket structures that are, you know, more traditional types of foundations.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Alan Weiss online, why don't you come on in?

MR. WEISS: Okay, thank you. Brian, thank you for the presentation. The areas that I'd like to talk to, and I'm glad you have this slide back up, are those Areas E and F that are offshore of the shelf break in the deep water. Those areas that are outlined at least at this stage are rather expansive and it's a little hard to see the ocean bottom features and locations precisely on the bath that you've got here.

But it looks like it would be the area offshore of Wilmington Canyon down to the area below Norfolk Canyon, offshore below Norfolk

Canyon. So that's a rather large area. I know there's a little break between Areas E and F, but in total, the two cover a tremendous amount of ocean. The pelagic longline fishery typically, as was mentioned in the previous presentation, can set up to 32 miles of gear and typically does just that. So putting wind turbines in these areas will be particularly problematic to the longline fishery. Now the fishery doesn't operate in all of these areas all of the time, but as you and I have discussed, the fishery is basically opportunistic. The boats fish in the areas where the fish are at any given time, based on oceanographic features.

And when temperature breaks or warm eddies push in to certain areas at certain times, that's where the fish are going to be. That's where the boats are going to be fishing, and of course you have multiple boats fishing in a productive area. Each one of them is putting in the neighborhood of 30 miles of gear in the water and once you start putting fields of wind turbines in
here, it would become completely untenable.
I think the hope for the fishery is that there will be a reconsideration of these areas because the pelagic longline fishery doesn't work in the same way that some others work, where sometimes with some fisheries you can say well, we're putting the wind turbines in this area. You can go over there and fish, you know, in some area just a little bit away from them.

Here, if the water is pushing into the area where the wind turbines are, there's no place else to go. I mean it's like telling you you can go and buy your groceries anywhere you want; you just can't go to a grocery store. So it -- you know, I've given this quite a bit of thought and it's hard to imagine.

I don't know if you may have come up with anything, but it's hard for me to imagine any scenario in which you could put a field of wind turbines in here that wouldn't be quite disruptive of the pelagic longline fishery during any times where that's the place where the fish are.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. I'll let you wrap up just so we can get some more people in.

MR. WEISS: Also, if I can just quickly ask, can somebody provide the AP members with Brian's presentation, because it wasn't attached to the agenda like the other presentations were, and it would handy to have some of the information on it. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, and just so folks know that that is actually now up on the website. So if you go there, you should be able to see that.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MR. HOOKER: And that was my fault for a delay in my getting it over to them.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Let me go to David Schalit, and then we'll, got a bunch of cards up in the room here.

MR. SCHALIT: Thanks Brian for that presentation. This, you know, I'm sure you're aware that you are -- well, you're attending, you do presentations for the councils regularly I'm pretty sure, and but you know, you're no doubt aware
that the -- that this division, Highly Migratory Species Management Division is not managed through the Council.

So we haven't been getting the benefit of the information the Councils have been getting, and I'm wondering if you would be in a position to ensure that we receive more of these presentations in the future.

I can't recall having received a presentation from BOEM at this, in this fora before. That would be my request, that you put us on the list of entities that needs to get these presentations regularly so we can keep updated.

The other question, the other issue that I wanted to mention was that are you -- are you working with the essential fish habitat that the Highly Migratory Species has and updates every five years as I recall? This would give you obviously some guidance as to where the fish are located. Is that, are they -- is this data being taken into consideration?

MR. HOOKER: Yes, absolutely. All the

EFH layers, regardless if it's coming from a council or from the -- or from NMFS for EFH are considered.

MR. SCHALIT: Thanks. Okay, so that's a good answer.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, and just -- just so you know David, maybe you were not at the meeting. I know Brian has been here at least once for a very long conversation, and $I$ can't recall if there was a second as well.

MR. HOOKER: Yeah, and I'm, you know, more than happy to come. It's at the discretion of the AP, so if the AP would like me here, I'll come.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Thank you, Brian. All right. Let's go into the room. Let's go first to Charlie, then Dewey and then Jeff, and then we'll move on from there. So Charlie, you're up.

MR. BERGMANN: Thank you Brian, for the presentation. I've got two questions, or one question and a statement, and it pertains to the Gulf of Mexico.

The floating rigs and over half the rigs or turbines set up so they're proposing out there will be in the deeper water and will be floating, from what I understand. How much cable will be exposed in the water column of those floating rigs, and what environmental effects do those cables create?

MR. HOOKER: Now that's a great question, and I think you know at this point where we are in the planning process, we haven't even identified if we're going to move forward with deep water sites in the Gulf of Mexico. There may be entities or groups that have expressed interest that, you know, in floating. But ultimately we won't get to that point until $I$, that construction and operations plan is actually submitted.

So once we actually identify a lessee, they have time to evaluate the site and then eventually they submit a construction operations plan. It's not until that time that we actually review, you know, what is actually being proposed. So like how many turbines, what type of, you know,
floating or dynamic cabling system will be in place.

So all that is, won't be known until, you know, pretty far down the path. Generally speaking, you're correct that the -- what we term "inter-ray cables" and a floating design don't go down to the seabed. They are floating between the turbines, and to some depth where an offshore substation might be, and then likely from that offshore substation to shore, it will take a more traditional transmission route and be buried from the substation to the shore.

But at this time, we don't have an estimate on, you know, the number of lease areas, the number of projects, the number of turbines. I can say that the number of turbines is actually beginning to decrease a little bit because the size of the generators are getting larger. And so they're able to meet their electricity power purchase agreements or demands of the state with fewer turbines, because the turbines are larger.

As far as environmental effects go, as

I mentioned we do -- we have done a lot of studies on both direct current and alternating current cables, to look at $E$ and $F$. To date again, all the studies to date, you know, most animals are able to detect magnetic fields, but there doesn't seem, appear in any cases to be any type of barrier to animal movement across them.

I think that's, that's -- again, there's probably a lot more if you go into different effects with cables that are floating, but I guess bottom line is there will be an environmental assessment at the time we would get a project that will actually evaluate that.

MR. BERGMANN: And one other thing. The depth that you're -- of range, the area in the Gulf. You say it's going out to 400 meters?

MR. HOOKER: Correct. That's the -- the call area is out to 400 meters. Whether or not they actually elect to lease any areas out in the deep water remains to be determined.

MR. BERGMANN: Okay. Well, I brought this up in one of the meetings or one of the phone
calls. There are cases of pelagic longline vessels that are fishing in the Gulf of Mexico, and as Alan pointed out, as the water column moves, that line moves. And if the loop current pushes up in the western part of that area and it will create a problem if boats are fishing in just arbitrarily if they're at 200 meters.

That line's still going to float up into that area and be problematic. I know there was some mention about the height from the wind turbine itself or the blades to the sea surface. Was it 55 feet?

MR. HOOKER: I think it's something like that, yeah.

MR. BERGMANN: That can be problematic on some of these bigger boats with their antenna structures and stuff like that. The commercial boats are not going to be able to get around those rigs with that type of scenario without something really bad happening.

MR. HOOKER: Yeah. No, I think and I didn't really have a chance to respond to Mr. Weiss,
but I think there definitely are some challenges with, you know, the way that the pelagic longline operates, and not being able to identify, you know, potentially specific locations being in the dynamic.

And then, you know, my response at this point is that we, the first, the steps that we're at right now is, is there any commercial interest in those areas at all, and then if there are, then we can proceed with a, okay, which areas, you know, have the least amount of impact. We recognize that all these areas, including in-shore areas, overlap with fisheries.

And the pelagic longline challenges are new, in that we haven't really leased deep water sites yet. So we're definitely open to trying to figure out what can be done. If there's anything that in the design or the location that can minimize that, you know, that's the kind of thing we want to hear in the comment period, and hopefully I think, you know, during the comments that were already received on the Gulf.

So I don't, I don't have a solution yet, but I'm all ears on what if anything can be done on the siting and design to minimize those effects. MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Go ahead, Charlie. Brian, just a quick follow-up questions which I'm not sure whether you can answer or not or know. But if in looking at Sections $E$ and $F$ and thinking about how in other areas you've moved from a call to an actual leased area, what is -- is there sort of a percentage shrinkage that one would see from what you see, sort of the -- as sort of the large crude first cut to a final leased area?

MR. HOOKER: Yeah. I mean we, our rule of thumb is that a viable size is about 80,000 acres to support like an 800 megawatt facility. So that's a lot less than 2.9 million acres, and so it really depends on again what are the goals of adjacent states, because again there's -- the states are saying hey we need, we want more areas where we can buy offshore wind power. What are the goals that we're trying to meet, you know, from a megawatt perspective? What is the commercial interest in
the area, and then we begin to shrink down.
That's exactly the case that happened in the New York Bight. I think, you know, we go down into, you know, they're not going to be large contiguous pieces like this. They will again, probably be in that, you know, 80,000 acre range for each individual one, and depending on again, the interest and our goals with meeting state demands, the number of facilities, of lease areas will be a portion of these call areas.

MR. BROOKS: Great, thanks. Let's go to Dewey and then over to Jeff.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you for your presentation. December, probably the 7th is the first I've ever heard or seen these call areas, and even though you may have been before HMS before, there's never been nothing showing these particularly Central Atlantic call areas by design. I serve as a Mid-Atlantic Council for North Carolina and liaison to the South Atlantic Council, and it's never come across this until December about 7 th, when $I$ was made aware of it by email,
these particular areas, and I'll focus on E and F.
Also, when y'all went out for public comment or meetings in that time, the pelagic longline industry wasn't even included until some emails were sent to make y'all aware that the U.S. pelagic longline fleet even existed in this area. And you've talked about going out, you know, to see if there's an interest in these areas first, and then you go from there.

Well, you know maybe one of the things you should have looked at first was the U.S. pelagic, U.S. interest of fishing in these areas. Pelagic longline and floating windmills do not co-exist together, period. I don't see it, how it exists, and what's particularly frustrating is if in these areas windmills were to be put up, floating or otherwise out there with pelagic longline fish, it's going to really financially hurt folks and not only that, it's also going to reduce our seafood production in the United States.

And so what happens when the U.S.
seafood production happens in the United States?

We get more imports, because presently now the imports that come in here don't have to meet the same standards by which U.S. fishermen fish by. So therefore, we could be opening ourselves up to more turtle interactions, all other different things that these countries presently do that don't have to use the same gear.

It is to the 60 or so longline boats left and a few of us that are right here in these areas in $E$ and $F$, it's particularly troubling that potentially our livelihood could be gone. And when you talk about, you know, people talk about compensation, is that compensation for the life of 20 years or so potential impacts?

> I mean it really needs to incumbent upon

BOEM, when they look at these stuff future, you should be going to National Marine Fisheries Service or the Councils to see hey, in these areas, what areas are fishing taking place? Not after you've already went out to see how much money you're going to get for these areas or potential, how interest is.

But how about the people here in the United States, the seafood we produce and it's coming out of these areas? So I would really hope -- I've probably got a lot of other questions, but I'll stop while I'm ahead or my talking. These areas are not conducive for pelagic longline and these wind areas. I see no way for that to happen.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Dewey.
MR. HOOKER: I think my only, you know, my primary response there is I think your time line was right. I think December is right around the time when we first went out to the public with at that time there was a pre-call areas. And we have, we have task forces that are set up to look at these. They're intergovernmental with federal and state representatives. In this case it's a regional task force.

We get information from all those state and federal partners, and Mr. Curtis is here, you know, to my right and they're working on HMS logbook data to get that to us in a better format that we could use in our planning process. But that's
continuing to make an ongoing project so that we can have, you know, the best available data that we can get in evaluating these areas.

So again I, you know, thank you for the comment and I know that from a pelagic longline perspective, this does present challenges.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Jeff Oden.
MR. ODEN: Thanks Brian, and ditto what both Alan and Dewey had to say. As a pelagic longliner, $I$ stand to be one of the displaced. But recently $I$ read a book, it's called the "Gulf Stream Chronicles," an interesting book from a boater's perspective, and a month ago $I$ believe I read in, you know, PBS had an issue when New Mexico I believe where 187 eagles were killed and the wind farm was fined $\$ 5$ million to pay for it.

But what confidence, secondly back to the book. Anyway, in the Gulf Stream Chronicles, it spoke -- it was from a boater's perspective, and it spoke of even NORAD, for instance, picking massive migrations of birds in the Atlantic flyway, and right where these wind farms are going to be.

What confidence do you have that this is not going to be the next DDT?

MR. HOOKER: Avian strikes is something that we'd look at. We've actually worked with a different part of NOAA on modeling, you know, where the highest densities of birds are. For our in-shore areas, they're generally you know, offshore of that in-shore flyway.

Obviously there's another one around the shelf break, and as you can see from this map, we did try to avoid the shelf break itself where the highest upwelling, upwelling is, and we actually moved some areas at the request of the Fish and Wildlife Service that overlap with some endangered birds.

So we not only look at where the birds are, but the flight height of those birds, the wind tip speed of the different turbines what -- those early models on land had a much faster rotational speed than these larger turbines that are spinning at a slower rate.

But all the said, it is definitely part
of the environmental review that we do for -- will do for each one -- well, we have done for the projects that we've permitted, and we will be doing for any future projects, so yeah. The experience on land is definitely informing what we do offshore.

MR. ODEN: Can you tell me what the wind turbines on those turbines tips, the larger ones, offshore ones are?

MR. HOOKER: I'd have to get back to you on that. I know we have, it is published, what that -- the blade tip speed is. We do have that information. I just don't remember off the top of my head.

MR. ODEN: It's something like 150 mile an hour on the land-based ones, so you're telling me it's less than that or --

MR. HOOKER: What I'm saying --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MR. HOOKER: The tip speed -- yeah, I will get back to you. But the tip speed is different than like the hub speed, and I think that's what

I was trying to get at. The whole windswept area has a different dynamic than what's on the shore-based facilities, the older shore-based facilities.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Let me bring in a couple of other sectors. Let go to, over to John, then over to Jeff Kneebone, and then we'll round it out.

MR. DEPERSENAIRE: Yeah thanks. I appreciate the presentation. Just from a recreational perspective, I think we've been extremely frustrated with the lack of interest in gathering real empirical information about how the recreational sector moves in and around these areas, and it's particularly poignant, you know, being at an HMS meeting and looking at all these lease areas, how they fall in between some of our prime fishing grounds and ports, and so we're going to have to transit through this.

You know, and I think it's important too to kind of be sympathetic to the industry, both commercial and recreational, just looking at all
this area. The extreme burden that we have, trying to keep up with each individual lease area and project and where they are in the permitting process, it's just an extreme challenge, you know.

I wish BOEM had taken more initiative to kind of look out for the interest of our sector or at least force the developers to look out, or do more things to make sure that they're addressing our concerns, because $I$ just -- I think that's a failure quite frankly.

But $I$ do have a question. I'm interested, and this is the first time I've heard this. I'm interested about that study development plan that you mentioned. How does that work? How do we, how do we influence the research priorities? How do we actually submit proposals to do research? Could you give me more information on that? MR. HOOKER: Sure, and that might be easier to follow up with something I can send to the whole AP. There's, there is a link on our website. It's -- the Environmental Studies Program usually publishes, well always publishes every
winter, and it's around the December timeframe, a notice to stakeholders where they're soliciting ideas for the upcoming studies development plan.

And so I think you have to be receiving note to stakeholders, and so I encourage everyone to click the Note to Stakeholders, you know, sign up on the BOEM website. But also you could check on there. We always post all the Note to Stakeholders, and then it's just submitted via email what the study ideas are and that then goes into the BOEM review process to look at what we want to prioritize and what we want to find in that next cycle.

MR. DEPERSENAIRE: Thanks, appreciate that.

MR. BROOKS: Great.
MR. HOOKER: And real briefly, I did want to mention that, you know, we recognize that it is a challenge. It's a challenge for all ocean users to be able to follow the process both from, you know, the pre-leasing, where we are now with some of these areas, to post-lease and active
construction operations, plan development. You know, we try to do our best as an agency. We work with the lessees to, you know, to -- we have measures where they have to have fisheries communications plans in place.

We actually for the New York Bight, actually added new terms of the lease that require some type of, you know, coordinated approach and reporting back to BOEM how that interaction is going. So as now part of their reporting requirements back to us, they're reporting back, you know, annually, you know, how that interaction's occurring, because previously it was just the requirement for the Fisheries Communication Plan, but they didn't have to report like on the progress of the execution of that Fisheries Communication Plan.

Now on the new leases and I think all leases going forward, they'll have a provision of reporting back to us how that engagement is going. But $I$ do recognize that it's a challenge for everyone.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Jeff Kneebone.
DR. KNEEBONE: Hi Brian, thanks for the great presentation. I'll just say as a comment that it's nice to see that we're learning from some of the mistakes of New England and seem to be addressing some of the concerns, and it's -- but the process is improving.

But I'll ask a question. Can you update me on what's the maximum depth now for the monopiles? Like is there a transition zone between when monopiles become irrelevant and you have no alternative to floating? Thank you very much.

MR. HOOKER: Yeah. I'm not the engineer, but it's -- I think it's somewhere between like 60 meters and 100 meters is when, you know, you have to have it deep enough. It has to be, you know, you can go directly from, you know, like 61, and all of the sudden you move to floating. It has, I think it has to be another 100 meter depth range, and then again the depth for, you know, fixed is around that 60.

But you know, facilities and
foundations are getting stronger and wider, and they can go I think deeper than that, but not too much deeper. So if you want something specific, I'm going to have to get back to our engineers and see where that cutoff is. But there is a gap between the deepest fixed platform and the shallowest floating.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. I've got about five people and we've got about ten minutes. Rick, we've not heard from you all day. Why don't you jump in?

MR. WEBER: Thank you. Brian, my core comments, I've made them and I'm going to keep making them. I'm terrified that these things that we see as permeable fences get turned into solid walls at some point because of some form of exclusion zone. What is driving me insane on this process is it's never the right time to discuss. The right people are never in the room.

When you get a question, it's we can't discuss that until there's a COP. By the time there's a COP, we're three or four years down the
path, and then it's we've been working on this for four years. It's just, it's maddening. It feels like it is designed to move forward almost regardless of comment or concerns, and I don't even know who I'm upset with.

It is just so large and has taken on a life of its own that $I$ don't know when's the right time to address these various concerns, because when we ask about, will we be able to pass through -- well, really that's going to be a Coast Guard and Homeland Security issue that we'll deal with sometime after there's a problem, and it's too late.

Supporting the longliners through all of this, and what I wrote here was everything seems to be not yet knowable or not under my control, like oh that's a very serious concern, but it's not something that I'm going to control in the long run. It's just the whole process is trying -- it just escapes us. Every time we try to make a comment, it's not the right time or not the right people.

I think saying that the longlines are
a challenge is a massive understatement. It is not a challenge. What they are saying is that it is incompatible. It's not we'll have to work that out. It's just flat incompatible to put something that's free-floating next to something that is anchored. So the one thing you said that caught my attention was that you consulted with Fish and Wildlife, who because an animal might go away asked you to remove areas. There are 60 longliners that might go away. Was NMFS given the same opportunity to pull areas and say this will destroy an asset of the United States? Are these 60 people being given the same opportunity as the wildlife?

MR. HOOKER: Yeah. I mean yes, I will say that was absolutely considered and we have removed areas for fishery in the movement from the pre-call to the call. Again, the pelagic longline information, it did as Mr. Hemilright mentioned, it did come in later in the process, and where we are now is as you said, there is no area that we could identify to say let's remove it. It's either kind of all or nothing.

So the decision at that time was, you know, let's continue to talk and investigate further. Now the answer at the end of the day may still be all or nothing, but is there, is there -we'll look and see what the comments are and the call, and we'll make additional removals at that time. But and I can't pre-suppose if that, if the answer is okay, the whole area is incompatible so therefore it comes off, or that there's an attempt to minimize to the maximum extent practicable what that impact is.

But definitely there is area removed due to fishing. There were more of the in-shore areas.

MR. BROOKS: Rick, I'll let you be brief on your response.

MR. WEBER: My response is only to express sympathy, Brian. I know you're only the point of the spear. The frustration is real. My frustration is not with you, as I said. It's with the entire process, the process is so large. So thank you for coming, thank you for enduring this
and please do come back.
(Laughter.)
MR. BROOKS: Okay. Let's go to -- I've got Marty, then Bob, then Mike, then Charlie. And then we need to get to a break. And we've got about five, six, seven minutes. So, Marty.

MR. SCANLON: Well, my first question is what's the cost or value of these individual leases, so that everybody can hear for themselves? That's my first question.

MR. HOOKER: That's a good question. I don't know. You know, we just had a lease sale off of North Carolina that was vastly different than we had for New York Bight. So I think it really depends on what the market, what lessees feel the market will bear for the cost of electricity that they're going to be producing, and the cost of actually developing the site.

So yeah. I don't know what the value of these would be, and that's why you -- that's why BOEM has this auction process, because we're -- our staff chief says that we have to get the best return
to the government on the leases. So there's an auction, and then that's -- the market determines what the cost is.

MR. SCANLON: Well what was the cost of these two leases?

MR. HOOKER: These haven't gone through the leasing process yet.

MR. SCANLON: The cost of the last lease that was approved?

MR. HOOKER: I don't, I remember for the six leased areas for New York Bight, like I said it was $\$ 4$ billion, 4.37 billion. For the North Carolina one, $I$ don't remember. I don't have it in my presentation what the cost was for two leases. Do you remember?
(Off-microphone comment.)
MR. HOOKER: 300 million for two leases off of North Carolina.

MR. SCANLON: Now I see where you did studies, electromagnetic field studies on eels and lobsters and some other things, but I don't see where you've done them on HMS. All HMS species,
all tuna fish, they migrate under electromagnetic fields, and there's no study -- like you're talking about putting the horse before -- the cart before the horse.

You haven't done that study, to see what the long-term effect is going to be on all of these tuna fisheries, and here you're moving forward with this, all right. So what I'm looking at with these charts here, you've got to understand something. We have been promised the revitalization of the PLL industry in this country. We've been promised that since I've sat at this table. I've been promised that since $I$ 've been in the fishery for the past 30 years.

Here we are, we're dealing with full-time closures along the Straits of Florida. We've got a time area closure in the Charleston Bump. We just politically got a New England marine monument, where we lost 4,700 square miles. Each one of these 80,000 acres that you're talking about is 125 square miles. This is essentially another closure to the pelagic longline industry.

We cannot survive another closure, and this is a closure. It's like Rick, I want to thank him for his support. This is a closure. You can't put -- we have weather buoys that they stuck at Block Canyon, which has become a nightmare there. There's two of them. There's just two of them sitting there, and it completely disrupts the entire fleet and the way we have to fish there, and when the water is set up there, we essentially have a closure there now.

So I mean, you know, I don't see how you move forward with this, and I don't how we fight it, when you're talking $\$ 4.3$ billion for a lease, what's 60 longliners to you guys? I mean we have basically become enslaved to the political process in this country, this industry. We have no say in this. We are actually for sale. Our livelihoods here are for sale, they're for lease for \$4.3 billion.

How do we compete with that? Are you going to put the loss of our incomes, to us and to our families, are you going to put that in the price
of the lease? Because it should be, because when you lease that land out, that's what you're going to do to us. You're going to put these 60 vessels and their families, and it's going to affect the other businesses that depend on us, the dockside industries. You're going to put us all out of business.

This here is just a political wave for green, wind energy. That's what this is. It's shameful.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Marty. Let me, let me go to -- I really want to get the last three folks in. Bob, Mike and Charlie.

MR. HUMPHREY: Thank you. Thank you Brian for your presentation, for being a whipping boy for your agency. I'm sure you understand these comments aren't meant directed at you. You didn't mention much or anything about experimental arrays, and although ours is rather small in the grand scheme of things, we have one in Maine.

It essentially was a thinly-veiled effort to avoid some of the regulatory process by
calling it experimental. That having been said, fisheries again, like some of my colleagues mentioned, was sort of an afterthought, and all the after we raised enough stink that they said okay, you guys can come to the table. This is what we're going to do.

But if you have any comments and obviously we said why didn't you ask us before you decided this is where it's going? Ask us where it should go. More editorializing. I'll get to the point here. We, I'm on the Governor's Energy Office Fisheries Working Group for Wind Energy, need to document use and then possibly impact, and we're really struggling with that.

You've heard from the longline fishery. They have fixed gear. I'm trying to do this for handgear, rod and reel, harpooners. We have no eVTRs. We have no documentation of where we're fishing and what the level of effort is and what could be lost if these things are built. Do you have anything specific that we could take to the table, to demonstrate some level of impact and give
them a subjective number?
MR. HOOKER: I mean my recommendation and after just working through the Data and Methodology Working Group for the fisheries compensation process, is that you know, we work very closely with the Greater Atlantic Fisheries Office, with NMFS headquarters and with the commissions. I mean all those different entities may have in some way, shape or form information that you can help bring to the table to show your effort.

I don't have any more than what those entities that actually manage the fisheries might have, but I think when we do publish the fisheries mitigation guidance, there is an appendix in there that, you know, 1 think details a lot of different information sources that can be used to support, support a claim. I don't, it probably doesn't go as far as you'd like, but I again would encourage you to reach out to your state and federal managers and fishery managers and see what information they have.

But I'm sure you've already done that,
but $I$ don't have anything above and beyond that.
MR. HUMPHREY: All right. Fair enough, thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Bob. Mike.
MR. PIERDINOCK: Thank you, nice to see you again Brian since we met in that dusty old building in New Bedford six years ago. Fortunately or unfortunately, I've been involved in the process since the beginning, and $I$ hear the same frustrations of many around this table.

To address what Bob Humphrey's noted and some others noted with the frustration of recreational data or for-hire data and information, me and others have had to participate in the process to assess use for compensation. And what we had to do is to do that at each, each Orsted or each company that owns it. We have to work with them directly. It's not through BOEM. It's through each one of them directly.

I have to say that there's a person at this table that helped provide good research data, Dr. Kneebone, and the company he worked for, that

I think should be done on the entire east coast as well as in the Gulf, that he went in and looked at the database to assess recreational use and for-hire use in every area for pelagics or groundfish or other, you know, fish within those areas.

He also then got the recreational community through magazines and so on to participate in surveys. That then was used as a baseline to assess use. He's then taken it to the next step, that he's doing tagging studies to assess pelagics up at Coxes Ledge, all the way to Gordon's Gulley down to The Dump to assess the fish within those areas.

> I point that out because we took the inspired Jeff Kneebone's data in comparison with the data that is the National Marine Fisheries Service. It's the data on the Atlantic coast of all recreational use up and down the coast. If you take that in combination with his work, and then at a state level where we've got cooperation from Mass Division of Marine Fisheries, to send out a
survey as well as for us to send out the word to the recreational community and for-hire community for use, to fill that data and information out. We just filled one out the other day for turbines, you know, at Coxes Ledge for another company. But you can take that and it kind of works with what the percentage economic value would be. We used that as the basis then for negotiations and came up with a number that was reasonable to the Woods Hole group that was working on behalf of them. Now, I found that very positive, but then the disconnect is, is that the competition's going to be during construction.

After construction, it's concluding that there's not going to be, no detrimental impact after construction, and that's where me and many others around this table don't necessarily agree with that. The studies may not necessarily be in place at this point, to assess whether there will be a detrimental impact.

Because when you come up with a compensation number, it was reasonable for
construction. But after that, it's to zero. So I want to point that out, because it's very frustrating. It's very confusing to everybody because I think they think I've got to go to BOEM for this compensation issue. But really it's at each developer's level that reaches out to the community through the state, and then we've had it work best for the Massachusetts, or Mass DMF there. You work with them then to help with that number. So sorry for that long-winded situation.

One thing $I$ want to note. The Gulf of Maine area, it may be a miss that it didn't get up there. I also question Slide 9, and maybe it's just I don't have enough knowledge for Slide 9 and the Gulf of Mexico. The proposed areas there, where do the bluefin breeding grounds, as well as the suspected yellowfin tuna breeding area in the Gulf of Maine, where do they fall within the proposed wind turbine areas? Do they fall within these areas?

MR. BROOKS: And let me ask whoever's going to jump in now. We need to be pushing on,
so a quick answer --
MR. PIERDINOCK: And that's it, because if it's within that area, then there's a concern.

MR. BROOKS: Anybody able to respond to that?

MR. HOOKER: I'll have someone from the Gulf of Mexico Office get back to you. I'm sure that was it, one of the layers that went into it, but $I$ don't know off the top of my head.

MR. PIERDINOCK: Well, it's evident why there would be a concern to place them there, and whether they'd have an impact ultimately on either reproduction or, you know, whether they'll die, whether they'll live or so on. So that's why I present the question, okay.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Charlie, the last word here.

MR. BERGMANN: Okay, I'll be quick. I believe there's a Fishermen's Fund for gear interactions or gear loss. Is that going to fall into play with the wind turbines as well?

MR. HOOKER: So the Fisheries

Contingency Fund, which NOAA administers, was authorized under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, but unfortunately it doesn't cover alternative uses. It only covers the oil and gas program. So again, with one of the purposes of the guidance document that we're developing is I think to address that to some extent.

As Mike just said, it's instructions for the lessees to develop, you know, kind of an equitable process across the board. So it's not just if you happen to be from Massachusetts you're getting one deal; if you're from Rhode Island, you're getting another, and from New York another. But the short answer to your question is that no, the Fisheries Contingency Fund does not apply to the renewable energy program, only to the oil and gas program.

But I know if you're interested, I think there are probably several federal legislators, representatives in Congress and the Senate who'd love to hear from you if you want to advocate for a new statutory authorities.

MR. BROOKS: Brian, last quick question form the chat from Evan Hipsley. Army Corps of Engineers certifies, certifies offshore aquiculture sites. Is it similar for these?

MR. HOOKER: So the Corps of Engineers is what we call a co-action agency on our, all of our environmental reviews. They do issue a permit for these, but BOEM is the lead permitting agency for the actions.

So yes, the Corps of Engineers does have permitting authorities in it, but BOEM is the lead agency. But we'll work very closely with the Corps to ensure all their actions, all their permit issuances are covered in our environmental analyses.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Thanks, Brian. Thank you so much for coming here. These are always good and lively conversations, and they're really important. There's a lot of issues that got raised.

The two headlines for me are sort of front and center, the message of incompatibility with the pelagic longline fishery, and obviously
lots of comments around that, and that a number of that were really to me around the message to BOEM around how it communicates and what their process is. It needs to be better, it needs to be sooner, it needs to be clearer and that, sort of as Rick said, it's never the right time to engage a question.

I think to the extent these are intended to get that flow of conversation both ways, whatever you can do to share those messages back I'm sure will be appreciated around the table. So thank you.

MR. HOOKER: Not a problem, and I'm happy to follow up with anybody with any additional questions you might have, and definitely encourage everyone to submit a comment on the Atlantic call area by June 28th. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks again, Brian. Let's go to a break. We're a couple of minutes late here, so we'll trim both the break and we'll trim, be a little bit off. So let's come back at 25 of. We'll take a ten minute break. Thanks.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at $3: 25 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. and resumed at $3: 35$ p.m.)

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Let's get going. We've got a few things still to cover. I'm going to hand it off to Randy here to give us a bit of a presentation on the Electronic Monitoring Cost Allocation Policy. We'll see what time that finishes up. We'll either then just sort of roll into the conversation around HMS permit issuance, or we'll go to public comment and then double back. But Randy, over to you.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Thank you, Bennett. So I will be talking about electronic monitoring, and we called this in the agenda, I think, "Cost Policy" to keep it short. But this specific to the cost allocation procedure, and this is as much as anything a presentation that's intended to be a heads up for facilitating an ongoing discussion in the coming months and years, as we work towards implementing this policy that was developed.

And so, specifically, this policy is
referred to as a procedure directive. It's entitled "The Cost Allocation and Electronic Monitoring Programs for Fairly Managed U.S. Fisheries." And it is something that we have guidance from under this procedure directive, that we will be working towards implementing for electronic monitoring nationwide, and it certainly affects our Atlantic HMS management as well for electronic monitoring.

In the presentation, there is a link to the PDF for this procedure directive. So I encourage folks that are interested to follow that link, and you can see and read the procedure for yourself. The procedure was developed over a period of time leading up to its release in May of 2019, and it implements the 2019 update of the Policy Directive on Electronic Technologies and Fishery-Dependent Data Collection.

It establishes a framework for allocating cost of electronic monitoring programs between the agency and industry, and it is intended to -- and it even has some mention in there,
recognition of some of the benefits that exist from an effective electronic monitoring program.

Specifically, the procedure specifies that in instances where federal funds cover initial start-up of an electronic monitoring program, the program must be designed to cease, or be adjusted should federal funds no longer be available, and to work to develop a transition plan for industry to cover costs when federal funds are not available. So for Atlantic HMS, it is the case for an EM Program that is called the -- that is an integral part of the individual bluefin quota program, that costs for that have been covered by the federal government from inception through current.

There was some discussion earlier today of course about some of the costs that will be taken on by industry under Amendment 13 for booms and grids, so that is beginning to change. But it the case that under this policy procedure, that the agency intends to transition costs further towards being covered by the industry.

And a primary part of that under the cost allocation policy is the principle that NMFS will not approve a program if the provisions of -- I'm sorry, if the provisions of a program create an unfunded or unsustainable cost. Given limited budgets, as we heard a little bit earlier at the beginning of the day, it is the case that costs are limited and it is not a situation where the federal government will definitely be able to cover all of the costs of our electronic monitoring program.

So under this cost procedure directive, there are some specific, some specifications about how costs can be covered and what costs specifically are covered or could be covered by industry and by the government. And so this table on this slide gives some examples of two types of cost as specified in the policy procedure.

One is sampling cost and the other is administrative, and I'll talk a little bit more about the differences between those in the coming two slides. But related to options for covering
these costs, there are several. The procedure describes for sampling that industry could cover cost that NOAA Fisheries could cover costs under models where the fees are collected from industry, and it gives as an example the North Pacific landings fee.

It also where NOAA Fisheries could cover costs under the sampling category for some federal programs. For instance, where electronic monitoring covers requirements under the Endangered Species Act or Marine Mammal Protection Act, or other programs where electronic monitoring might be required. So the other function that or category of costs is under administrative, where NOAA Fisheries would cover those costs, or there's other options that have been looked at nationally, that include fees collected from industry for this, and under administration as well.

The example given here is the West Coast Cost Recovery Program. So specifically about different categories of costs, for sampling costs which under this policy procedure would be covered
by industry, that includes the hardware of the systems itself, including cameras, the purchasing and lease of the equipment, maintenance, replacement, those types of things, training for captain and crew, development of vessel monitoring plans, which we use certainly in the Atlantic HMS Electronic Monitoring Program.

Video data transmission to reviewers, initial video review and storage, in-service provider fees and overhead, and these are listed not to be comprehensive, but really as examples that may or may not be applicable in the Atlantic HMS Fisheries. They are provided under the policy procedure as examples. Similarly, provided under the policy procedure as examples are examples of administrative costs covered by NOAA Fisheries, and those can include program administration support, services associated with that on the scientific side of things, on the enforcement side of things, and on management itself.

Reviewing of vessel monitoring plans, troubleshooting issues managing vessel selection,
basically overall administration, certification of electronic monitoring service providers and program performance monitoring, as well as data analysis and storage of federal records, as examples of some of the things that constitute administrative costs.

So with that introduction, it is once again intended to at least put this on the table for the Advisory Panel to be aware of, because the topic will come up again over the coming months and years, as we begin to work towards developing a plan for transition, in full recognition of working also towards further developing benefits that electronic monitoring can provide to the industry.

And so where some of the context of this discussion may come up first are in things like spatial management initiative as we talk about that coming up over the next several months. With that, I'd be happy to -- oh, actually I forgot one last slide.

Timing. The policy directive indicates implementation or development of a transition over
a course of about five years, and that we will or it can be those transition plans reflected in the Region Electronic Technologies Plan. You might remember that last year we worked on finalizing the HMS Electronic Technologies Plan, and Brad McHale had provided a presentation about that.

The plan actually does not yet include a transition plan, but that would be one area where we would provide updates related to this. And then I also provide a link here to other policies that are relevant electronic technologies that you might wish to take a look at. Now with that, I'd be happy to take some questions.

MR. BROOKS: Great. Let's see if any questions for Randy on any of this? And looking online as well. Okay. If there's nothing on this, let's just roll forward into a conversation around HMS permit issuance. Randy.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: All right. So we had a request earlier in the meeting on a sidebar for some time to talk about permit issuance, and more specifically the question was coming up related to
some difficulties $I$ think that were being experienced with permit issuance for permits coming out of the Southeast permits shop, which is located in the Southeast Regional Office.

And so we wanted to at least provide some time to hear some of those concerns, and get some specifics about them. Certainly, that would facilitate us being able to let's say follow up on those issues if, if that is warranted. And so we wanted to basically provide some time to talk about that. The floor is open, intended just to hear what some of those concerns are, and once again trying to be as specific as possible.

MR. BROOKS: Jeff.
MR. ODEN: Thank you. Today I guess I had a little frustration this morning, you know, and part of it $I$ think stems from what $I$ had to go through just trying to get a permit to fish, you know. Those of us that have limited entry permits, what we have to go through through the Southeast Office dysfunction, that wouldn't be strong enough of a word for that office.

I don't mean to throw anybody under the bus, but there's not a fisherman in the room that I know of that hasn't had the same experience trying to get a permit. I recently bought a boat, I say recently back in July. It took me four months to get the permit for this said vessel, and two months later, you know, it's coming up time.

I've got two vessels and the corporation and it's coming. The end of this month I've got to renew again. So I started two months I had to renew, and I still haven't got two of those permits on it, the mahi and anyway, which I can do it. But the point being you can either do it online or paper, or used to could, and so many of us are not very computer savvy.

I'm certainly one of them, and you know, the frustration in trying to go online to get those permits was unfathomable, especially when you consider that four months after I finally got those permits for the other vessel, I've been trying to renew the permits for the upcoming year. The previous owner is still listed as the owner of the
vessel.
And so online when I do it, it says "deficiency." And so you try to get up with somebody in the office. There's one guy in particular every one of us has had to deal with a time or two. Dewey, Wimpy in the back, who I think may speak in public comment on this. Anyway, what we have to go through is the condescension is just hard to fathom anyway.

You call the guy up, he answers, you tell him your question, you wait 30 seconds and he still hasn't answered. You start wondering whether or not you need to hang up and redial, and then he finally chimes in with a rhetorical question. I mean this is not an isolated incident. I'm not the only one, I'm sure. Many others would love to come on here. I know Marty's got, he's had requests from permittees, you know, in our industry complaining about the office.

One other thing. It's not, it's not just the permit process. It's also reporting, which is part of the permitting process for us. If
for instance those in the Northeast that are non-compliant had to go through this office once, and endure what we do just to get a permit, you can believe one thing. They would get that report in. In my case, interestingly enough, we not only had to report our effort and to get your permits, it's got to be -- you've got to have every logbook done on time in a timely fashion, which is one thing, but on top of that and the agency knows when we fish because our fish house has to report, we have to do monthly no fishing forms, which you see, would think was pretty redundant.

I mean if you're not fishing, you know it by the fact that we haven't sent in a logbook form, which the fish house is going to report if we have. So why are we forced to do that. The irony is my wife, who insisted on being put on my permits in my corporation the other day, along with myself got a requirement to send in a no fishing form, my wife as well, and she's been with me three times in 45 years.

So I mean it's just mind boggling what
we have to go through with this office to get a permit, and any way. So that's my beef, and I'm sure Marty or Wimpy or somebody else will speak to it. But the dysfunction in that office, there's one individual that you always seem to get relief from, and he's the head individual. He usually helps you get it done, but those under him are problematic. That's all I can say. Anyway, thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks. I think Randy's got a follow-up question or two.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Yeah. So you mentioned that you were having trouble with the online aspects for renewal, and I wondered if you could be specific about what's the issue was that you're having with that?

MR. ODEN: Well, as I mentioned, the fact that I go, I went on there and even though I had been issued the permits to this new vessel that I've purchased, the previous owner is still listed as the vessel owner. So when I try to go online to do that, it kicks me out. So I finally ended
up going and doing a paper, a paper logbook.
I sent that in with my check. Well, that comes back about two weeks later and it says "deficiency." So I looked down there and it says well, the deficiency is they no longer take checks. So you've got to go online to do this, and it wouldn't let me do it before. So anyhow, you just can't make it up. Anyhow, thank you. That's one of many but --

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Jeff. That sounds awful. Dewey, and then over to Marty.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I had a little about this the same kind of scenario, a little bit of the scenario. I think what's happening between COVID and the new system that's being implemented down in SERO of online reporting, there's some stuff where there's some hiccups.

One thing that should be done is a tutorial, I'm probably not saying it right, video or something of exactly where somebody very similar to the way that maybe GARFO did with online on your app reporting, where there was videos of walking
you step by step by step on how to do it. That has not been done, and to the individual person that we get down there, $I$ don't know his last name but his first name's Mike, and he should not be speaking with the public, period.

It has not been very good in our discussions. He makes you feel like you're about this big, and I'm sure that he gets cussed out because of that. I didn't do that, but I'm just -- he should not be speaking with the public, and I believe that that staff knows that. But I just, it took a while where $I$ had to take some permits off the shelf and go back, go back to longline fishing. The new methodology online wouldn't work.

I happened to get out of the Flintstone age and got a new iPhone, and I -- you take a picture and you download it onto the application thing. Except my new iPhone, didn't know it, it wasn't in JPEG. And so when I took the picture to download it, it wouldn't accept it. And so I didn't know what I was doing and the lady said well, it's got to be in JPEG. I'm like well what the heck's that?

And then so I had to Google to see what that is. But I think between the COVID and this new online system and some frustrations of getting stuff worked out, and it is frustrating when it takes five, six, seven weeks and some different things and maybe an individual that when you call down there and if you get him, he's a -- it's interesting.

And so I just think that maybe that's something that once people get dialed into, because I'm for doing this stuff online instead of having to fill out 15 pages and all that other stuff. But it is difficult, so I think if that, if some type of video could be done that's very educational on how to do it, that might help.

But then again, this new system, it seems like when you get to talk, when staff talks to Kevin, they work through the glitches, and for my particular case I had to -- I wasn't allowed to do it. It wouldn't work online so I had to send in the paper. So hopefully the next year for me it will go a lot smoother. But that's just kind
of some different things that 1 see happening.
MR. BROOKS: Thanks. Thanks, Dewey.
You're definitely winning quote of the meeting with that last one. Marty.
(Off-microphone comment.)
MR. BROOKS: You did good.
MR. SCANLON: I first want to start by, you know, just stepping back a second, you know, taking the time which I didn't during the A13 discussion, it's in thanking you Randy and Karyl and Tom for the extra time that you gave us in discussing our concerns over A13. We certainly appreciate that you listened to us, but not only listened to us but heard what we had to say, and was as accommodating as possible in, you know, in your final approach to A13.

So thank you very much on behalf of the Blue Water and the pelagic longline industry for those considerations. We certainly appreciate it, and look forward to working with you moving forward.

The other thing I want to echo Mr. Dewey
here with the same individual, where $I$ had an issue last year renewing my permit. The problem I had was is that my logbooks hadn't been cleared, which they should have been cleared, they were cleared, but there was a glitch in the NOAA computer systems, and it wasn't allowing it to be cleared.

You know, went back and forth to the permit office over it, and I listened to a tongue lashing from my wife for about a month over it. After calling up and calling up and it was supposed to be done and it was supposed to be done, and I finally get ahold of somebody. It was a very nice girl, like Dewey says. You get ahold of some people, they're very, very accommodating.

Finally, I had to put the two of them together so they can resolve the issue, because it wasn't able to be done electronically. At the end of the day, my computer, my permits were supposed to be expedited immediately to get them to me. It was the -- my permits were overdue. I was going back to the boat and I needed the permits.

Well, a week later my permits still
weren't released, you know. My wife's checking on it every day. Of course she's giving me a hard time every day, and I call up there and I get this individual on the phone, and he tells me, well, listen, the mail don't go out until the end of the week. That's it, you know. I'm like hey listen, this is not what $I$ was told and this not my fault. This is a problem that you have, you know.

You can't expedite these permits? Uh-uh, he wouldn't mail them out until the end of the week. So I wound up having to leave my house, go down to the boat and I had to wait for the permits to be showed up and I had to have the permits faxed to me, which is really not the way you're supposed to do it. You're supposed to have the permit itself on the boat.

But you know, I had already been sitting at the dock for an extra five days waiting for my permits to be renewed. So you know, and I've had, like Dewey says, being the president of the Blue Water, I've had at least six or eight people over the past three months calling and complaining about
this whole process, which is, you know, to me most of the time --

My experience with NMFS and with everybody in the permit office is they're very accommodating, extremely accommodating. This is the first issue that I've ever had with any of them. So I mean this guy here needs to be dealt with, to be honest with you. I promised the people that I, have been calling me and giving me a hard time about it, aside from my wife, you know.

I promised that I would bring that up at this meeting. I'm glad that Dewey and Jeff had reminded me of that. One other thing I want to touch base on since we're on permitting here is that since I have multi-permits on my boat, I have Northeast permits on my boat, now I have to fill out what is called eTrips through SAFIS.

Now just so you know that that process for the longline is -- really need to be looked at. I mean it may work fine on trip by trip, you know, every daily type of trip basis, but those forms, the girls that work in the work portion of it there,
the support people, Allison is the one lady's name and it's her and her daughter that do it, and they could not be sweeter or more accommodating.

Let me tell you something, they've got the patience of an angel, the two of them. We spent literally, to get the first three of them done because when we started doing them, we couldn't get them done because the system wasn't compatible with my iPad. So I had wait for them to upgrade all of that. So now I had become behind like six trips, and it took me, no exaggeration, two hours of trip on the phone with them to fight our way through that, step by step, back and forth, you know. It's not as -- it's very, very difficult to navigate. So if we're going to move into that direction, that portion for us, the longliners, needs to be looked at, simplified and, you know, and when it's all said and done, if we have to go to that format, we have to be given some sort of a cheat sheet to help navigate it, because like I said it took the two of us or the three of us two hours at a time to navigate through this thing, to
get the information out.
So you know, I pretty much have it down pat now, but $I$ mean it was not very easy to do, and even now it takes a significant amount of time to fill out those reports and to email them to SAFIS here. So I'm just bringing that to your attention, all right?

MR. BROOKS: Thank you. Let me bring in Amy, and then we'll go online to Jimmy Hull. Amy.

MS. DUKES: Thanks, Randy for taking these comments from the industry. I have a little experience trying to help South Carolina fishermen through this portal. One of the largest disconnects for me is that when a fisherman comes in to ask for help, he does not or she does not remember their user name. There is not an option on the online portal to I forgot my user name, just I forgot my password.

So when we've tended to call and leave messages, sometimes it does take several days to get folks back, and then in addition to that, it would be nice to have a $I$ forgot my user name, so
they can send them an email, since there's an email associated with it. Also I know that there's also been a disconnect and hopefully this will work itself out in time, that users have multiple user accounts and they have to be consolidated.

It's bound to happen of course, but sometimes that can also just be a little bit of a disconnect too.

MR. BROOKS: Thank you. Let's open up online, Jimmy Hull's line. Jimmy, you're good.

MR. HULL: Thank you. Thank you for taking the comments. You know, for I agree with everything I've heard, and I've been dealing with the permits office with four to six different two permitted vessels for many years, and even when it was within paper form, it was always a nightmare, and it was a nightmare that you had to go through every 12 months when you renew.

You're on pins and needles, and you're trying to get, make sure everything's correct. Now we're moving into an online system, which we've had major problems with. You cannot do a transfer
online. We found that out. You have to actually do a paper form, send everything in. They will then scan it and then they'll put it in an online form for you and you'd have to have your account set up so that you can make your payment online.

So we learned that you can't do the transfers online yet because it's just, it just deficiencies you out and stop you in mid-action. As far as renewals, you know, it's still problematic. It still takes a lot of time. The only good thing about the online is it does retain a lot of information for you that you don't have to continue to re-fill out or make copies of your old paper forms. So there's some efficiency there.

In the office, I've never had any problems with anybody. I've only had people trying to help. Kevin McIntosh is the lead on that office. I've had to talk to him every, you know, with those problems. He cures them. Eventually it gets done. It does take a lot of time and cost you days fishing. The one way that can help you on your reporting that we've been doing, you can report no
fishing electronically, and it happens instantly. There's no, you don't have to mail. So you can do that. If you plan on renewing, you just -- just report no fishing, because you've got to have the current month, some type of either no fishing report or something in the system or they, you'll have a deficiency.

So just look ahead and hit no fishing, and then when you fish, that will take over the no fishing report. So there's problems here. It's part of the hoops and hoops and all the things that we go through to be food providers for this nation, and I heard today on and on. I thought that there was massive issues in the snapper and grouper fishery, but this looks like it's going to be even worse in the HMS fishery.

So we've got a lot of challenges ahead of us. Thank you for taking my comments, but we will never give up. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Jimmy. Jeff and Amy, your cards are both up. Is that just left over? No worries. Okay. Anybody else online want to be
weighing in?
(No response.)
MR. BROOKS: Okay. Randy, did you get the level of specificity that you were hoping for?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Yeah, this helps I think, and we can carry messages to Southeast and share what we've heard as well. $I$ had a note here, and $I$ somewhat know the context of this but not completely, I'm sorry.

MS. WILSON: Sorry. It was shorthand and trying to get back to mute the person online. I just wanted to mention that just to be clear for folks, if you have a GARFO fishing permit, you can do the no fish electronic submission. That no fish though, if you also hold Southeast commercial fishing permits, does not go to them. Can you not hear?
(Off-microphone comment.)
MS. WILSON: Okay. So if you have a Southeast commercial fishing permit, they have a separate portal that you do the no fish electronically. But $I$ just want to make it clear,
so people don't think you do your EBTR for GARFO and you do a no fish, and that will cover you for your Southeast. It will not. You have to go and do that in a separate place. So just, just to make sure that distinction is clear. Thank you, Randy.

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Great, thanks. That was Jackie Wilson.

MR. SCANLON: And that's in addition to my paper hogs and everything else that I've got to do. So that's just another burden on me, you know. I mean we talk about EMS, VMS, two paper logs, my state logs, don't forget them. I'm from New York State. You've got a log for them too, and now I fill out these eTrips for the Southeast too.

MR. BROOKS: Yeah. Let's allow Jeff to come back in. Jeff.

MR. ODEN: My point earlier. If we haven't fished, it shows up. So why do we have to 12 times a year send in the no fishing forms? I mean it's redundancy. I mean why?

MS. WILSON: It's a compliance. Just
to be clear, our office doesn't administer that, that logbook, okay. That's from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. But it's also compliance.

It's similar to the dealer reporting, where you have a no, a negative report. And so when we were in compliance for a week in the dealer context, if we see a positive report for that week, we assume you've reported what you've purchased.

If we see nothing, either you didn't purchase or you purchased and just didn't submit a report, and so the negative report in the dealer context allows us to run the compliance to know oh okay, they didn't actually buy this week. We're not missing something. In the Southeast, they have you do the no fish report.

GARFO got rid of that, because they've had more electronic and they have a more timely way of reconciling their dealer reports and fishing reports. The Southeast isn't there yet, and they still have a no fish report for running compliance, so that they know only that he did go out fishing,
he just didn't submit his logbook.
So it's there for a compliance issue. Doesn't mean it won't change in the future, when they have a way to do more timely reconciliation, and they're moving towards going to electronic reporting for the Southeast logbooks as well. It's just taking longer. But again, that is through our Southeast Fisheries Science Center, not through our office.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks, Jackie. Randy, you had one other get back you wanted to talk to?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: Yes. This is going back to the Amendment 13 discussion earlier today, and there was a question, $I$ believe it was from Steve Getto earlier about the ecological effects analysis related to shifting of quota from Purse Seine to Angling particularly, and the shift of harvest of commercial size fish to smaller fish under the Angling category.

And Tom correctly summarized at the end of his comments the bottom line of that ecological effects analysis from the FEIS, which is there's
not a significant impact or effect of that change in size selectivity. Most of that relates to the fact that the amount of quota that ends up being moved from Purse Seine to Angling is small.

It is 2.9 percent, which amounts to under the current quota amounts to about 6.7 metric tons. And so if you look at kind of like an assumption of what average size fish might be from a commercial fish, the number of commercial fish to let's say an equivalent weight and number of smaller size fish, making some assumptions, that equates from about 30 commercial size fish to about roughly 150 smaller size fish in the Angling category if those are 100 pound fish.

So that's a big assumption, but that just reinforces the bottom line, which is there's not a significant impact of making that change. So I just wanted to circle back to that, give a little bit more information, because we had dug into that a little bit more. So thanks.

MR. BROOKS: All right. We're a tiny drop ahead of schedule here, but $I$ think we can just
shift to Public Comment. So let's see who in the room would like to make any public comment, and if anyone online, if you want to make public comment, please just raise your virtual hand or throw something in the chat so we know.

So please come on up to the table and just a reminder. I'd just ask folks to keep their comments to no more than three minutes, and just stay on topic and engage in the same respectful way everyone around the table has. And if you wouldn't mind starting with name and affiliation, it would be great. The last thing is the intent of these public comment is really to hear your comments and it's not $a \operatorname{Q}$ and $A$ back and forth. You're on.

MR. SHIELDS: My name is David Shields. I'm a pelagic longliner. I'm recently an owner and an operator, and $I$ just wanted to re-elaborate on what Dewey and Jeff and Marty has frustrations that they've been doing. I bought the boat two years ago, and trying to get the permits and everything switched over, $I$ had to make my first boat payment before $I$ was allowed to go fishing.

I called numerous times trying to get things done, and I was told that you have 30 days to process my request, and it was not going to get done until them. And then reentering to reapply for my permits, to renew them this year, I filed everything online. Everything was taken care of, and when I called the fourth time to find out what was going on, the gentleman that I spoke to, I don't know who it was, within 15 seconds pulled up my documents, told me that everything was filled out completely correct, my money was there, and when the next 14 day period was up, he would process my permits and send them to me.

In which I had to sit at the dock again and was not allowed to fish, waiting 28 days to get permits. I just don't understand. If it took him 15 seconds to see that every single thing I had was taken care of and right, why did we have to wait 14 more days on top of me already waiting 14 days, and why do $I$ have to sit at the dock and not go out and make a living? Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks very much. A very
specific example. Appreciate it. All right. Any other members of the public? Glen, come on up. Oh, okay.
(Off-microphone comment.)
MR. BROOKS: And again, if you could please just start with name and any affiliation, it would be helpful.

MR. HOPKINS: Glen Hopkins, pelagic longliner from North Carolina. I just wanted to talk about the permit thing again also. I don't know how long I've had permits. This past year, 2021, I had all my stuff in. I think I had 26 days I'm thinking. Everything's cleared, 26 days. I'm like all right, that will be plenty of time to get my permit back. It might be close.

Normally there's two weeks there's -anyway, long story short, it was seven weeks before I got my permit. Missed three weeks of fishing and called them numerous times, where's it at? Oh, I don't know, you know, this, that and the other. But I've been told that everything was received. It was just a backlog and hopefully it was just this
past year. But it was a bad situation.
MR. BROOKS: Thank you very much. Glen Delaney.

MR. DELANEY: Yeah. I think Matt just gave me his three minutes and I'll use my three minutes tomorrow. You can't imagine how difficult it is for someone like me to sit in the back of the room for two days and not be able to speak. For those who know me are probably glad that's the case, but I'm sorry, I'm going to go over three minutes. If you want to throw me out, you can do that. Wouldn't be the first time.

I just wanted to make a couple of comments of advice, if you will, on the wind issue. I would really encourage all the fisheries to reach out to NOAA or any other source of your fishing effort data, ideally if you can get that in catch per unit effort. But what you need to do is work with NOAA, particularly I've been working very closely on behalf of the shrimp industry down in the Gulf of Mexico with the National Centers for Coastal and Ocean Science on their spatial mapping
efforts.
It's a very sophisticated, very high level expertise. They're collaborating directly with BOEM in order to map shrimp fishing effort data and other fisheries as well. But my point is if you -- you can't just anecdotally say we fish there.

You're going to have to produce some high level spatial mapping to really enter into the program and have a meaningful impact on not just sighting decisions up front in the process, but later on that same information can be used to value the piece of bottom or water column in terms of compensation. How do you put a, place a value on a piece of bottom?

That leads me to the second thing is, as Brian from BOEM correctly stated, they don't have the current statutory authority to establish or operate a fishermen's compensation program related to offshore wind energy development. But at the same time as the New England experience I think shows, we can expect individual fisheries to pursue private negotiations with offshore wind
energy companies.
I mean that's just a completely untenable situation for the fisheries to be expected to do that. It's a guaranteed insufficient compensation, unfair distribution of compensation, not going to work. You need a federal national program, probably implemented by NOAA.

I have organized at the very initial stages, early stages, bicameral, bipartisan group, a team of members of the House and Senate to begin and they have begun working on the very early stages of legislation to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, to establish a program for fishermen's compensation applicable to offshore wind.

If it's something you want to contribute to, be part of, please let me know. We're going to be soon at the stage of reaching out to other members of Congress and reaching out to other industry leaders. So I'm happy to serve as the point of contact for that, and get you plugged into that process. If you're interested in it, I would encourage that.

Moving to a totally different topic, if you could indulge me, a couple of things on Amendment 13. I just want to recognize that in my opinion, despite the fact that we obviously still have some challenges to work out, and they're important ones; $I$ don't mean to diminish it, diminish them, the agency clearly made substantial efforts to be responsive to the public comments on the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

You know, the final has definitely responded spot on to some of the issues. There's some details that need to be worked out. And to that point, a couple of things you heard, you might have heard what people didn't like so much, you know, the out, what I call outboard cameras associated with safety and cost.

Mats and grids on decks, again safety and cost, and the Gulf five percent threshold whether that's sufficient. There was some suggestion that maybe that should be higher, just to make sure that that stays fluid and operable and doesn't get frozen.

My question -- well, I'm not allowed to ask a question. But $I$ guess $I$ just raise a rhetorical question for you Randy and team is, you know, how and when would these, those particular items be revised based on actual experience? I mean they're basically untested, unproven. They're experiments. You're going to try something that's not been done before.

People have raised concerns that are valid about them. We kind of have to live with them to find out what actually happens as a result, and if there is a need for revision, what is the process that you have in mind for making those in a timely fashion? I mean what are we, seven years past Amendment 7, and we had a three-year review?

I mean plan amendments take a heck of a long time to do. So I don't know if you've built into this carefully enough any framework-able provisions or measures that can be more expeditiously addressed through a framework action and a plan amendment process? Also, like Amendment 7, is there a review process contemplated like the
three-year review of Amendment 7? So there's a couple of things that please don't answer, because then I'll get fired for asking a question. But please think about those questions and we can discuss them offline.

The last thing I'd like to say, thanks for your indulgence, is you know, as you know, a major focus of my own over the past couple of decades at least has been really to advance efforts to level the playing field for the pelagic longline fishery, but all U.S. fisheries that are, you know, unfairly forced to compete against imports of seafood that are, you know, produced with IUU fishing, forced labor using substandard bycatch conservation standards including marine mammal protection measures.

You know, the effective enforcement of federal statutes and programs such as the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Seafood Import Monitoring Program, the Section 307 forced labor import prohibition. You know, all those, effective
enforcement of those are maybe the difference between fisheries surviving or not.

And so I just wanted to emphasize that we do do work at ICCAT. As you know, most of my HMS work is dominated by the ICCAT world, and we do pursue those type of issues within the RFMOs. But these are all domestic U.S. statutes that are unilaterally established and implemented and then enforced.

And so I'd just encourage you to, you know, there's a lot of people in this room whose livelihoods depend on competing in the U.S. marketplace and, you know, updates and reports on that I think would be appreciated. I would recognize and shout out the agency, particularly on the implementation of the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act, which thankfully most people call the Moratorium Protection Act.

Their most recent 2021 biannual report was spectacular. I mean you've identified seven nations for IUU fishing, 29 nations for failure to
have comparable bycatch programs in place. That's unprecedented, a new breakthrough for the implementation of the program.

I had the privilege of helping to draft the original statute that created those authorities under the Moratorium Protection Act. That was in 2006 and '07, and it's taken until now to really for the agency to regressively implement and enforce the comparable bycatch measures, half of that statute, you know, the other half being the IUU and it's fantastic.

So I'm hoping, you know, it's a two-year process of consultations and all that. But updates on that and I think it would be encouraging for this industry to hear about those things that the agencies are doing to address that side of their business, because mostly all you talk about here are the dregs of regulations, and that's necessary in reality.

But there's something you can also bring to the table and speak to the industry about, and I will leave it at that. Thank you.

MR. BROOKS: Thanks Glen.
MR. BLANKINSHIP: Thanks Glen, and appreciate those comments, and just I know you know that's how they say it. Just for the kind of benefit of the larger group, some of the topics and the list of things that Glen was talking through are spearheaded by International Affairs, Trade and Commerce with NOAA Fisheries, and I hear you loud and clear for the request for potential updates or reports on those efforts potentially at future AP meetings I think is what Glen was asking for. So thanks. That's it.

MR. BROOKS: Okay. Are there -- I'm not seeing any other hands on line or in the room. I just want to double-check. Any other members of the public want to make any kind of comments at this point?

Okay. If not, then before we let you go, let me just one announcement and then just quickly review the plan for tomorrow. The announcement is here in Montgomery County, the community COVID level are updated every Thursday
evening at eight o'clock, and that's where they tell you is it low or medium or high.

So today at eight o'clock, we'll find out what the new level is. It's possible it could pop up to high. If it does, we'll still meet, no problem, but there will be a requirement for masks at that point. That's a, you know, that's sort of a local governmental requirement for public gatherings.

So we'll find out. We don't know. Are you planning to send a note out to everybody or how's that going to work?

MR. BLANKINSHIP: No, I don't think we are, unless Pete tells me different. But I think what basically is, is that we'll come tomorrow and be prepared if it happened to increase. It's currently at medium. Hopefully it stays there or maybe goes below. But if it happens to go to high, just be prepared to wear a mask.

If you don't happen to have a mask, we will probably have a few to give you. But we will still have the meeting tomorrow.

MR. BROOKS: Yeah. So all will go forward. Just have a mask at the ready, and then again for tomorrow, the plan is we will start tomorrow at 8:45, to please make note of that. 8:45 we will start up. We'll hear from leadership, so both Janet Coit and Sam Rauch will be here.

Then we'll have a conversation on equity and environmental justice as it relates to the HMS Fishery. After a break, we'll take up our last comment, which will be the last topic, which will be around shark depredation, and then we'll have Public Comment again at 11:30, and then we'll wrap up and get everyone out of here by 12:00. Any questions or last comments from anybody before we end for the day? Anybody online, anybody?
(No response.)
MR. BROOKS: Okay. We'll let you all
go. Thank you for a good conversation today, and we'll see you tomorrow. Thanks.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at $4: 28$ p.m.)
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