SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

CORAL ADVISORY PANEL
DEEPWATER SHRIMP ADVISORY PANEL

Webinar

November 10, 2020

TRANSCRIPT

Coral AP Members

Jocelyn Karazsia, Chair
Dr. Henry Feddern
Dr. David Gilliam
Ken Nedimyer
Stephanie Schopmeyer
Dr. Sandra Brooke
Dr. Nicole Fogarty
Michael Merrifield
Kimberly Puglise
Joshua Voss

Deepwater Shrimp AP Members

Michael Merrifield, Chair
Nancy Jones
Marilyn Solorzano
John Williams
Laurilee Thompson, Vice Chair
Damien Solorzano
Lee Vogelsong

Council Members

Mel Bell
Steve Poland

Council Staff

Roger Pugliese
Cindy Chaya
Dr. Chip Collier
Kelly Klasnick
Dr. Michael Schmidtke
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
Kim Iverson
Cameron Rhodes
Christina Wiegand

Observers/Participants

Erika Burgess
Dr. Jack McGovern
Rick DeVictor

Other observers and participants attached.

The Coral Advisory Panel and the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on November 10, 2020 and was called to order by Mr. Roger Pugliese.

MR. PUGLIESE: I think we'll go ahead and get started. If Jocelyn and Mike feel that we should wait, let me know, or we can just go ahead and get started and identify individuals as they join.

MS. KARAZSIA: I'm happy to call this meeting to order.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Let's proceed.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay. With that, what we have is a meeting of the Coral Advisory Panel and our Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel today. We will specifically address issues relative to consideration of Coral Amendment 10. We do have materials that have been provided to the members. We only show the approval of coral minutes because the other meeting was a joint meeting between the Deepwater Shrimp and Golden Crab, and so the only one that technically needs to be approved at this time would be the Coral AP minutes, and the other ones are included, though.

I guess what I wanted to do is, before we get into detail, a couple of housekeeping issues. As individuals would like to speak or have questions, please use the raise-hand function, and we'll just call on individuals as they come into the queue. If you have questions regarding actually accessing or being able to get on or some technical issues, use the questions, and we'll be monitoring the questions section, and so that's the place to go ahead and load those in.

As part of the process, as we go into the opening session, we will be asking for any public comment, and then that also will be if anybody has a specific question, and they can ask that at that time. With that said, I guess the way today's process will go is I was going to walk through the Attachment 3 that has been provided, which is the scoping materials. Now, remember this is not actually an options paper, or a scoping document, but this is just the translation of the recommendations that had come in the past from the Coral Advisory Panel into some alternatives for consideration for discussion, and we'll start the process with that.

I am going to also go into a presentation, and then I really wanted to see us go down the shrimp fishery access area, because then it doesn't affect the integrity of the HAPC, and it just allows -- It's allowing for that occasional shift to the side, or something like that, so they can do this, and, I mean, if this is -- The way I look at it is -- Mike, are you addressing the group at this time? Do you have a question, Mike? The issue we have is that John is showing up as you.

MR. MERRIFIELD: He just called me, and he was having some --

MR. PUGLIESE: It was coming across on the main area, and just keep cognizant of the mute button on there. I didn't know if you were trying to make some comments to start with.

MR. MERRIFIELD: No, I was not.

MR. PUGLIESE: That's one of the biggest things, is make sure you are muted when you're not talking, so that we don't have sidebar discussions or things going into the record. With that said,

let's proceed, and, as I mentioned, we'll move forward with a review of what is included in the scope of materials, and then I was planning on going to an online system, to kind of walk through a little more detail and looking at what is being considered.

Now, this issue has been something that was developed a while ago, and so there have been a number of different discussions at the different advisory panels and in the building of the original Coral Amendment 8, and subsequent to that, and this is the follow-up, and so let me go into the -- Let me get ready to go into the scoping, but, before we do that, I would pass it over to Jocelyn with regard to, and Mike, for approval of the agenda.

MS. KARAZSIA: Roger, do we need a motion to accept the agenda as-is?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes.

MS. KARAZSIA: Okay, and so I'll make a motion to accept the agenda as-is.

DR. BROOKE: I will second.

MS. KARAZSIA: Thank you, Sandra. I think that was you.

DR. BROOKE: Yes, that's correct.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. From Deepwater Shrimp, I make a motion to approve the agenda. Is there a second?

MS. THOMPSON: I will second it.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay. If there is no opposition to the motions, the agenda stands approved. Jocelyn, we have the Coral minutes.

MS. KARAZSIA: I want to thank Kimberly from the Coral AP for bringing this to my attention, but there is a typo in the spelling of Josh Voss's last name. He is incorrectly listed as "Josh Ross" in parts of the minutes, and I believe that some of the comments that were provided by "Josh Ross" were attributed to "Steve Ross", and vice versa, and so how do you -- I think this is a particularly minor change, but how do you recommend that we address this, Roger?

MR. PUGLIESE: You can just provide those edits, and it can be an approval contingent on revisions based on your edits provided.

MS. KARAZSIA: Okay, and then I defer to the rest of the Coral AP regarding if there are any additional changes that you all feel are warranted.

MR. PUGLIESE: If there are any other ones, I would just say make sure that they get forwarded directly to you, and then we can make sure that gets in the final version of the approved minutes.

MS. KARAZSIA: Okay, and so I'm not hearing that any other changes will be needed, and so I move to accept the meeting minutes with making the changes that we discussed after this meeting closes.

MR. KLASNICK: Excuse me, Jocelyn and Roger, but I do see that Marilyn has her hand up.

MR. PUGLIESE: That's who I was just going to right now. Marilyn. Did you have a question, Marilyn? I am still not hearing you, Marilyn, but I think Jason also has a question. Jason.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: I was just going to say that I couldn't hear her, and so I guess she's probably having a problem.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and that's what we were waiting to see.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Okay. I take it, whenever she does get on, I will be able to hear what she has to say?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and we're not hearing -- We were waiting to see if that was -- I think Cindy is working with her right now, again.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Okay. Well, I will mute my back then.

MR. PUGLIESE: Thanks.

MS. KARAZSIA: Roger, would it be helpful if I make a motion to accept the meeting minutes with the changes we discussed, and, if Marilyn, who is having some issues with audio, has some additional comments, I would be happy to also incorporate those into the final meeting minutes.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay.

MS. KARAZSIA: Okay. I believe I need somebody to second that motion.

DR. BROOKE: I will second that, Jocelyn. I think that's a good idea, to move us along.

MS. KARAZSIA: Thank you.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay. Now that that is accomplished, do you want to open it up on the public comment? I am not seeing any hands raised. I will note, for the record, that John Reed did provide a written comment directly to Sandra, and we will include it in the record for this meeting. Okay. I am not seeing any additional public comment, and I would go directly to the actions today.

As I mentioned, what was provided is the draft options paper. As I mentioned, this is not an approved by the council options, and these are options that were built on the recommendations, alternatives that were built on the recommendations, that have been developed based on two different points in time from the deepwater shrimp fishermen.

Today, we're going to be addressing what is being proposed for Coral Amendment 10. The discussions on this come from the original work by the council in building the Oculina Bank Habitat Area of Particular Concern, which has its roots starting all the way back in 1982, with a number of iterations that have resulted all the way down through Coral Amendment 8. In 2014, Coral Amendment 8 was developed through the coordination between the Habitat and Ecosystem

and the Coral and Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panels, providing both conservation of the deepwater coral ecosystem and, essentially, the entire known distribution of Oculina in the South Atlantic region, and, at the same time, maintaining the operations of the deepwater shrimp rock shrimp fishery, specifically.

The deliberations on the coral amendment addressed a number of different iterations from -- Recommendations from the beginning of the efforts through a couple of different iterations. However, at the end of the approval, there was still some concern about the eastern edge of the northern extension of the Oculina Bank Area of Particular Concern, and it had to do with, at certain times, the fishermen had been fishing along the edge, and the boundary that was proposed actually had some areas that they had historically fished, and so this actually shows you what was compiled through Coral Amendment 8.

It added the northern extension of the Oculina Bank, which is in green here, a western extension, which is in blue, and then the light blue is the original Oculina HAPC, and, in combination, the overall distribution now of the Oculina Bank Coral Habitat Area of Particular Concern is represented in this image, which also does encompass the Oculina Bank Experimental Closed Area, which is also an MPA area.

Now, as I mentioned, and this has been discussed in the past, and, since there was concern to know more about this specific area, the council actually provided some recommendations for priorities, and the Nancy Foster, in 2017, provided, as one of the legs of the mapping and characterization cruise that was accomplished, did a map along an edge that we had identified that was being under consideration and discussion for looking at a potential shrimp fishery access area.

That was accomplished through Leg 2 of the expedition by the Nancy Foster, in response to our request, and what also was accomplished at that time is they were able to collect connectivity, temperature, and depth casts in two different locations, north and south, of the area, and so this did provide some baseline information on the area adjacent to the area, and it was really encompassing anything that had been in discussion, and so what you're seeing in these first maps are the area that was mapped that's right along the edge of the Oculina Bank, on the northern extension, and this is the upper half of the area, and the color contours really are from the -- You don't see the full range, because it only encompassed a narrow band, and it's from about 107 or 108 meters to about -- In this case, it's really about ninety meters. The deep red would have gone if it had gone all the way into really shallow waters, and it didn't do that.

The southern portion of this is also showing the mapped area, and it primarily is showing that there was no high-relief areas identified in this mapping effort that was accomplished in that area, which is, to a great degree, thought to occur -- The area was really considered as the base, which would probably be coral rubble areas, and then extending, as we you move further from the base of the pinnacle systems, into mud systems and the areas that have been targeted by rock shrimp fishermen for the fishery in the past.

Specific to that, the catches of rock shrimp over time have been variable in the past. In the 1980s and 1990s, there were some higher catches. However, over time, the fishery has been prosecuted, and it has had some fairly low areas, such as the 2014 area, and that actually was one of the higher catch areas that was in that edge system, but then, in 2017, one of the highest catch rates in a while

had occurred, with 2.7 million pounds of rock shrimp, accounting for about $4.9 million to the fishery.

What the issue in this document really addresses is the consideration -- It had been requested that the eastern edge of the northern Oculina be reviewed and determined if some of the historic trawling areas can be reopened to rock shrimp fishing. The industry had met, and has, through the different deliberations of the Deepwater Shrimp AP, earlier in discussions with the Coral AP, but then, I think the last effort was really when they had the joint meeting and provided two different areas that could be considered along the edge of the northern extension of the shrimp fishery access area.

What you see, following this, to at least mirror what the recommendations for consideration in the first discussion was, were two different alternatives under either -- Status quo was do not develop an action to address the issue, and that would just maintain the existing boundary, with no consideration for an access area at this time.

Option 2 would be to create a shrimp fishery access area along the eastern edge of the northern extension, and the reason the shrimp fishery access would be effective is it provides access by the fishery and the occasional times that you would be able to -- That you would need to be moving into that area closer, but it would retain the integrity of the designation of the HAPC and really focus on the rock shrimp gear access to the area.

The first one is based on coordinates provided by the industry in 2019, and so you have the core coordinates provided that would represent a shift, basically an eastern boundary of the shrimp fishery access area, and that, combined with the present western boundary coordinates that are already in rule, provides you this Alternative 2a, and so you have the coordinates that represent that, and then, in 2013, there was also a recommendation, and I believe it provided that originally, and that also has been translated into the same type of thing, using those coordinates, and then the eastern boundary coordinates of the existing HAPC.

Then what it provides is the two different areas under consideration, both the 2014 and 2013, and I will get in closer, so that you can see a little bit more of the detail in this, but just, relative, you can see that the Alternative 2b essentially has more area going into the inshore area of the Oculina Bank.

One of the things that happened in the past that we did do is go ahead and look at the vessel monitoring information up through that timeframe, and, in April of 2015, we did an analysis of the available information, and we did find out that, once you combined all of the information, that there was -- It actually reduced the overall, once we got the full year of 2014, to about 1.76 percent of all fishing points that occurred within that area, and this is prior to the closure that was subsequent.

However, I will note that, in 2014, some of those points -- There was a higher percentage that occurred inside the area originally, and it was, I think, upwards of 8 percent, but now you have to remember that also was one of the lowest points in the year, and that was a consideration, and so that's what this image shows, is the northern extension and the fact that you did have occurrence along this southeastern portion of the Oculina in the past. Now, this was all pre-2015.

This gives you a little bit better indication of how this lines up with the existing area. What you do have is some scanned bathymetry that was used provided in the past that shows the boundaries and then shows the existing areas that were under consideration, and so this shows you the shrimp fishery access area, Alternative 2a, and how that aligns with the area, and, of course, the concern has been how close you actually get to some of the pinnacle systems that exist within the system, and so it shows you how those align with the overall area, and that's the southern portion of Alternative 2a.

Then, as I mentioned, Alternative 2b actually goes in a little further to the east, in some areas, along that edge, and so you see the northern portion and then the southern portion, and you see the point coordinates that this is based on.

What you have is the areas that have been considered, and the timeline would -- The council, in the September council meeting, readdressed this, because, originally, when the amendment was being considered, it had a lot of other things. If individuals remember, it had the transit provision, and it had the additional potential for golden crab areas, and those were all removed from here, and there was two focus areas to be considered, one being the potential area relative to the eastern side of the northern extension, and then some of the other lophelia deepwater coral actions in this amendment is focused on specifically the eastern boundary.

What is being moved forward is the Habitat Advisory Panel had addressed this and looked at some of the activity, and both the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel and Coral Advisory Panel will be discussing this and reviewing this today, and providing some input to the council, and the Habitat and Ecosystem Committee, during the December council meeting, will be considering the issue and possible approval of options for scoping, and so the stage we're at right now is considering options for scoping, and so this is the early stage of development.

Scoping meetings would occur via webinar in the winter, and the council would address those at the March council meeting, and then the consideration of development of a public hearing document. It would be set for public hearings in the fall, and then advance it to the council through the September and December, and now this is just based on where the council is right now, and they make those decisions first of if and what is going to go to scoping and then what the real timing is, and so this is just a draft of what potentially could occur in the development of this amendment.

What I wanted to do was jump from that, before we get into the specific areas and have a chance to zoom-in a little bit, before everybody has a chance to talk, and I think this will maybe also provide a little better clarity about the area, the mapping that has been accomplished, and then maybe some of the specifics to the issues relative to the proposal and the habitats that are being discussed.

If you bear with me, what we see right now is this is the Oculina Bank Habitat Area of Particular Concern, as I mentioned, and the northern extension and the southern portion and the overall HAPC, and what I was going to do is go ahead and show you the more detailed mapping information. Let me turn off a couple of things, so you can see it. Otherwise, you'll be overwhelmed with -- This is a tool that I've been working with our partners at FWRI and Tina Udouj to build, so that we can look specifically at these areas.

Hopefully that will do it, and let me turn this on, and what we should see here is the mapped habitat that was accomplished in 2017 relative to the HAPC. What we're seeing is the southern portion of the HAPC, and the area along the edge is the mapped area that was in 2017, and one thing that I did do is I went back and pulled from the Coral Amendment 18, the proposal that was brought forward, and there was detailed mapping done in 2011 that provides an even finer resolution for the area.

I will zoom in some here, and this is one area where they were able to map all the way down to the pinnacles system along the edge of the area, and so what you can see is the mapping that was accomplished to-date and then the previous mapping relative to that, and let me see if I can get the bathymetry to actually show up, too. There were go. What you see is the area along the HAPC boundary, and then this area right in here is the detailed mapping that was accomplished in 2011, and so what you see is how that relates to the mapping, and then the final thing is to bring in the actual proposals that are under consideration at this time.

If we look at the 2014 boundary, you can see how that area -- Here is the HAPC boundary right now, and then you can see the area that is being proposed under the 2014 alternative that's being recommended, and what we can do to get -- This is the pinnacles systems as they occur, and they match pretty well with even the historic, the old, bathymetry, and these pinnacles were aligned fairly well with those old bathymetry, and so it did provide a very effective way of seeing how they aligned with the present boundary, and then we can also look now at how they align with the existing boundary and the proposals.

One of the quickest things that I can do too that helps with this is to look at say from the pinnacle base and what the distance to the existing boundary is, and that's about 1,300, almost 1,400, meters to the existing base, and, under Alternative 2, it's about 760, 770, for that area, and so, if we look at -- If we turn that off and then put Shrimp Fishery Access Area 2, we can do the same thing, and this gives you another -- Again, it's that same indication of -- In this case, that would be the same for here, which is about 1,370, and, in Alternative 2b, which is 2013, it's actually pushing it all the way up to about 350 meters in that alternative.

Let me back out, and I'm going to pull us down to the northern area, because we have similar -- I am going to zoom in on this, and this will give us also the same type of a consideration. Let me back out of that and put in 2014, and, again, this is a high-resolution bathymetry that was accomplished in advance, and it was done in 2011, and it provided the support for the designation, and, as I said, if you look at this, it does a good job of representing the bathymetry in the past, and so, if we look at this area here -- Again, let's go back and look at it, and there is the 2014 proposal that is on the table, and, here, if you pick these, you're looking at the occurrence to the existing boundary is about 560 meters, and this is really bringing it up to one of the closest areas of consideration, and this is about 311 meters, when we're looking at this area.

Now, of course, there are areas where it's further in, but those are some of the closest points where this does adjust. Now, if we go to the 2013 proposal, we can do the same thing. We are really literally 100 meters away in some areas on the 2013 area, and I think that's why the 2014 was actually proposed, because it -- If I put both of them there, you will see the differences. The line pushes it a lot further offshore than the existing one, but I wanted to do that, so that it gives you a lot clearer indication of the area.

Let me back it out, and it does really give you a better feel, and with some real numbers, about the distances to the high-relief habitats, and, as you can see, along the edge, these are the pinnacles, and they're a little further in some of the southern area, but, as you move up into this northern area, there is a jog to the east on that.

I did want to walk through that first and provide both the scope of what was put together for the scoping discussion as well as some detailed review of what has been done, in terms of mapping in the area. As I mentioned, this mapping is -- It's high-resolution, but it still does not capture the low-relief types of habitats that do exist within the area, and so the thing it does do is verify that there's no high-relief in those habitats.

That's pretty much all I was going to try to do, is to provide that as the background for the information and the point that we're at, and, as I mentioned, there has been deliberations and discussion, and this is picking back up to have a consideration and provide input from both the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel as well as the Coral Advisory Panel on what some of these considerations may be as the council considers looking at options for scoping, and, with that, I can pass it over to -- I think the way we have it set up is that what we'll do is see if we can go ahead and -- Mike, I will pass it over to you, as the Chairman of the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel, and open the discussion and considerations and thoughts about where the fishery is and the proposal and where we go from here. Mike.

MR. MERRIFIELD: I do have one question. Is there a way to overlay VMS points on what you just illustrated, on the charts that you just illustrated?

MR. PUGLIESE: Not on that one. That does not have the VMS in that system. What I can show is two different things. One is the original -- I think that's the original VMS that's associated with the area. However, that is the complete VMS, and that is not the fishing areas. The coordinates are the fishing areas, but that represents where there have been occurrences. Now, that could be both transit, and it predominantly is transit, through the area. The other one is actually the area that we identified, and it showed, within that boundary, that that would be VMS points within that boundary, but, no, we do not have it live on the other system.

MR. MERRIFIELD: So the red indicates the area of high VMS dots?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, the occurrence of the VMS within that area.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Got it.

MR. PUGLIESE: I think Jason had a question first, and then I'll pass it back to you, Mike.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: I guess you all were focusing on that eastern edge right there, and it is -- I know this year, when I was working it out there, predominantly the circles are on the northern end this year, or actually northern and western, and I know they've got the western box up to the north, and I could bring my computer over here and get the coordinates for it, but I was wondering if there's going to be any discussion about that as well.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Actually, Jason, this was really focused on --

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Just the eastern edge.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Just the eastern edge, because this is what came up as part of Amendment 8, and we went through iterations with 8, and then there was --

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Well, I'm just saying that, I mean, it seems like we're going to come back and come back and piece all this stuff together, and, I mean, we should all save each other a whole bunch of time here, and it looks out they had mapped out a certain small space, and they did, and it looks like they've got pretty accurate mapping, and so they could go back and run the whole bottom. I mean, that's how we found the bottom that we're working off of, is running it off of our machine. We didn't have no satellite to tell us, and so, to readdress it that way, I mean the whole thing, starting all the way from the south end, the original Oculina Bank, and it would save us all a headache here, but I don't want to be an asshole, and so I'm just saying.

MR. MERRIFIELD: I think that if we want to address other areas that we ought to --

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Yes, because, I mean, even like the satellite boxes and stuff off the Cape, which, I mean, this is fine, but a little bit further south is -- Some of that bottom that we used to work before, because a lot of that we did. You know, we were running off years ago, and we worked it, and it just got closed right up.

MR. MERRIFIELD: You're talking about the original.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Not the original, but the extension to the original, because the original one I think stops at the 500-line, and I've got my GPS, and I could probably open the -- But, I guess, north of it, and like that stuff off the Cape where they have the two satellite boxes, and so offshore of that, in that 180 to 300, and it was all decent stuff, and then they added those, but nobody has brought that in to address it.

MR. MERRIFIELD: This particular -- We're getting together really just to talk about that eastern boundary of that northern expansion, and, if you want to --

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Yes, I get that south end of the northern, the new one, just north of the satellite boxes.

MR. MERRIFIELD: But, if you want to look at other areas, I think that we can bring that up as alternatives for another time, and I think this was really designed to pinpoint --

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Right, and, I mean, it's almost like kids went up there with an Etch-a-Sketch and went, this right here, we're closing it down, without actually going there and physically, hands-on in the field, looking at the bottom. I mean, I get that we have the VMS and stuff that they track us with, and I understand that, but that data is only for a certain period of time, and, I mean, we've got -- We've done it longer than what we've had the VMS.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Right. I think, at this time, that we're going to focus on that southeastern edge of the northern expansion, and then, if you want to, at the end of this, we can bring up that we would like to review, or take another look at, some of these other areas. Actually, at our last meeting as well, there was that we would like to look at some of the areas that were removed.

Regarding this southeastern edge, we'll just kind of look at that and kind of determine if there's a way that we can open up the bottom without getting too close to the pinnacles or structure on the Oculina Bank. If I can pick it up from there, at our last meeting, which was April of 2018, we actually developed -- We developed some motions at that point, but I don't know, and Roger can fill us in, if they ever really made it anywhere. I mean, apparently, they did not, and so they didn't make it for the council, or they didn't get out of council.

MR. PUGLIESE: They made it to the council. The council has had all of this material. The focus is on the original issue that occurred following Amendment 8 in addressing the request from industry to look at this specific area.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Right, and so there were two motions that came out of that meeting in April of 2018, or sub-motions, I guess, and one was to look at modifying the boundary, and, Roger, I believe two of those coordinates were given, and so we submitted a set of coordinates, and I believe there were some concerns about how close those got to the structural bottom, and so that's where you have your two versions there, where one is a little bit further away than the other, but still both of them are further west than Coral Amendment 8, and is that where those two come from?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and those are the directed coordinates that were provided in the recommendations, and you're correct that the 2013 was there, but then I think you all actually did work on adjusting it further to the east, to address some of the high-profile areas, and so that's where the 2014 came from.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay, and so I think what we're really looking at is the 2014 -- I guess adjustments to the original 2013 that took into consideration some amount of distance from the structure, and that's how you came up with the 2014 version, and then there was two motions, and one was to alter the HAPC boundary, and the other was to create the fishery access area. If you could just speak to that just for a second, just so everybody understands the difference and what that means, just quickly.

DR. BROOKE: Mike, are you asking Roger to clarify, because I am not hearing anything, and I don't know if Roger is muted.

MR. MERRIFIELD: That's what I was asking, yes, just to clarify it, and I understand what the difference is, and the boundary stays the same, but there's an allowable fishing area within the HAPC, versus changing the boundary and one preferred over another.

MR. PUGLIESE: The shrimp access area provides access to the area for the industry, and so it's very similar to what we did when we looked at the shrimp fishery access area on the western boundary of the Stetson-Miami Terrace, where it allowed access to the area to fish, and it was to address, in that case -- It was to ensure that there wasn't going to be an issue on compliance, because sometimes the vessels moved a little bit further to the east in that situation. This is to look at and address the specific rock shrimp issue of being able to fish in the area. It retains all the other protection measures that the HAPC has, but it provides access to the area at those times that the industry would be fishing closer or the shrimp would be moving closer to that area.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay, and so do we just keep this as two alternatives, one as it moves the boundary and one as a fishery access area, or are we specifically -- I mean, this thing is titled --

MR. PUGLIESE: It was laid out as a shrimp fishery access area and alternatives based on the coordinates for the fishermen to access the area, and so the intent is to address this specific issue of the industry and provide the access.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay, and I guess I need some input from the Shrimp AP on the coordinates, as you presented them, for 2013 versus 2014. Is there any objection to going with the 2014 coordinates that give a little more distance between the trawl area and the structural bottom? We need to hear from the Shrimp AP members.

MR. PUGLIESE: There is Marilyn. Make sure you unmute yourself, Marilyn. I am not seeing any additional raised hands, Mike. I guess it comes down to some of the question is -- Is the advisory panel -- Is this an important issue for the advisory panel for the council to continue to bring to scoping, based on the recommendations in the past? I guess that's what it comes down to.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Well, I think it is. I have been approached numerous times about pursuing this since Coral Amendment 8, and it was said that we would come back and revisit this, and then it was brought up again in 2018, when we met as an AP to discuss this and present -- We presented motions then, and so can you tell me whether the motions just -- Was it a matter of they were not a priority or that they were just of no interest in proceeding with the motions?

MR. PUGLIESE: With regard to the other areas? I guess what it comes down to is the council had the option to look at a suite of things provided to them, and the focus was on the specific request on the eastern boundary of the northern extension, and there was an additional request about opening other parts of the Oculina in an emergency action, and the council did not take action on that.

MR. MERRIFIELD: I am not -- I didn't understand that answer. So they looked at it in 2018, when those motions were presented, and there was no interest in proceeding or they just -- What's the result of -- What happened when those last motions were presented to the council?

MR. PUGLIESE: Well, the council had requested beginning to look at a subsequent follow-up, and last time they discussed this as a scoping and to proceed with addressing the request relative to the northern extension, and so I think that's what they -- Those were as part of the discussion, but, at the September council meeting, it was a very specific recommendation that the council develop information and get input from both the Habitat, the Coral, and Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panels on the development of shrimp fishery access areas for the region, and so that's where we are, and so, yes, all of this information has been provided in the past, and this is what the recommendation from the council -- It's to provide input into advancing this to scoping.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. I am just trying to find out -- If this went to the council, and there was no interest in proceeding, why are we here? That's all I'm saying. If that's not what happened, and they are really interested in looking at this, then we can finally move forward and present these motions, or these options, and do you understand what I'm saying?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and, well, that's -- I mean, all I said was reaffirm the request, and this captures what was provided, in terms of the coordinates for the area of concern, and, I mean, you could leave at -- No input means that they're good with moving to scoping with what's provided.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. All right. So let me see if I can get some agreement on this, and then we can start discussing it maybe with some of the Coral AP members, but if we went -- I am going to need input from members of the Deepwater Shrimp AP here, but, if we say we want to move forward with the 2014 version, which is an alternation of the numbers that we originally gave, and I believe we worked with the staff to come up with the 2014 version, knowing that it was too close, in some areas, to structural bottom, and so I'm going to just go with -- Unless somebody tells me that they don't want to, that we're going to go with the 2014 coordinates as the area that we would like to have either the boundary moved to or the shrimp access area opened up to. Is there any response to that? If we have a hard time with the audio portion of it, there is a question box that you can comment in.

MR. PUGLIESE: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you. I apologize, and I have to leave to go to a doctors appointment that I couldn't get out of, but I support the 2014 version. I think that those guys have been fishing there for many, many years, successfully, and they weren't damaging the coral, and they need to be able to have that bottom, because the shrimp move around, and I think that that bottom should be opened back up again, and so I am in support of the 2014 version.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. Roger, do we need a motion out of that that we can -- At what point do we try to get some input from the Coral AP members on this?

MR. PUGLIESE: Well, the Coral AP will address this immediately after you all, and so, I mean, we're going to go directly from your discussion and directly into their discussion, and there could be comments.

MR. MERRIFIELD: But we can have open discussion about it with the Coral AP members as well, right? I mean, this is not like a separate --

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and we're just starting with the individual panels providing comment, and then it's open for that. We do have a question from Erika.

MS. BURGESS: Hi, Roger. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. This is Erika Burgess with Florida FWC. Jessica McCawley, who is the council member for Florida, is unable to be on today, but I did want to offer some thoughts from FWC's perspective for this conversation, because this has been a high priority for our agency, and I know some other council members are on this webinar listening in, and I want to be clear that I am not speaking for the council, and I am speaking for FWC here.

Mike, and the rest of the Deepwater Shrimp AP and the Coral AP, I think we would be interested to hear some of what you had to say today for rationale on what is currently in the document, or if you would like to see something else in the document. From FWC's perspective, your input and your rationale is very important, and so, if you could flesh that out for the council to have discussion on, it would be very helpful at future meetings. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

MR. PUGLIESE: Thank you, Erika.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Thank you, Erika, and the rationale was that -- I mean, we've all heard that, in Coral Amendment 8, there was a third iteration that came along too late to get into the amendment, and so it was just set aside and said that we would address it later, and, well, that's what we're trying to do.

The reason that that third alternative came up was because there was a number of VMS points that were engulfed by the new -- By the coordinates that went forward with Coral Amendment 8, and there were several fishermen that came back and said this is an important area, and so the rock shrimp show up in different areas at different times of the year at different degrees, and so the northern part of the eastern extension of the -- I will call it northern and southern to keep it straight here.

The northern section of the eastern border of the expansion will sometimes be very important, or the southern portion may be important, or the inshore side of the Oculina Bank will be important, and you just never know which year, from year to year, which one is going to show up. There were comments made, at one of the council meetings, that maybe closing this -- Then we had a big year after it was closed, and that maybe closing it was what had such an impact on the volume of shrimp that were caught that year, and that's not the case.

It's so variable, and it's extremely variable as to what's going to happen from year to year, and that's why it's hard to put a value. I know, Roger, in the past, you've tried to put a monetary value, or a productivity value, on a specific area, and that's really hard to do, because, from one year to the next, it varies immensely.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes. Mike, I would like to add in that Marilyn is still having some issues with her mic, but she wanted to make sure that it's on the record that they support reopening the access area.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Reopening the access area. Okay. She probably is talking about further south.

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, I would assume, the shrimp fishery access area that's in the alternative.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay, and so I'm just trying to give Erika and FWC and anybody else that is interested some kind of a reason for this action that we're here talking about this. I developed a lot of the coordinates for Coral Amendment 8 with different fishermen, and not everybody -- It's hard to get everybody involved, because everybody is working, especially the times of the year that it seems that we want to develop these amendments, and it's the time when everybody is out working, and so it's very difficult to get everybody's input. I missed some input, and that's why we're back here looking at this, to move that northern expansion eastern boundary slightly to the west, and that's -- It really isn't about productivity, and it's not every year, and it's selective.

A lot of the bottom -- There is some ground there that is very important to the fishery. If there's any questions about that aspect, I would be happy to answer what I can answer, and that should give us a -- That's a good start for a reason as to why we're here and why we're looking at this.

As far as moving forward here, Roger, do we want to -- Should I put together a motion and see if somebody will second it, or do I need somebody else to put this motion together?

MR. PUGLIESE: It would be good if you were able to get one of the -- You can put it together, but having another member make it would be good.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. I think what we're looking for is a motion that says that we want to take the 2014 -- Laurilee kind of alluded to this, and I don't know if she's still on or not, but we're looking for an amendment, or I mean a motion, that says that want to have either the boundary move or fishery access, and that's probably going to be two separate things, to allow the rock shrimp fishery to access within the coordinates from the 2014 version that was developed by staff and fishermen. Who do we have? Let's see who we've got on to make a motion.

MR. PUGLIESE: Jason, I think you had a question, or a comment.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: I just sent some coordinates, and that was one of the things that I was talking about for when we didn't have VMS on the boats and some of the areas we worked. I mean, that was kind of just a north line to a south line point of bottom that was worked a long time ago that should be open, and so it's offshore of the satellite boxes.

MR. MERRIFIELD: We're talking on the eastern side of the northern expansion, from about halfway up towards the south.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Oh, I know. I know exactly where you're talking about. I worked there, and I would have caught more if I could have gotten further inshore, but I couldn't, because the line was there. That was kind of a hindrance for us. I mean, it was fortunate that we were finding a little bit of shrimp on that north end up there, but, again, we were tight on that box, and we have VMS data, and, if I was at home on my laptop, I could pull it up, because I can see the VMS stuff here and track myself, but, I mean, we worked that edge this year, me and my brother did, and we could have done probably better if we could have gotten a little bit further in there, but, again, we don't want to get in trouble.

MR. MERRIFIELD: So you support a motion to --

MR. J. VOGELSONG: But, then again, that's the northwestern edge, on the second-half of what I was talking about, but, yes, from the northern eastern edge, or the southern eastern edge of the northern extension, and, I mean, we've got so many norths and souths here, but, yes, that, I guess, I approve of what we had talked about before, I guess the 2014, but, I mean, what is the distance that you all are wanting us boats to stay away from it? I mean, is it fifty meters or a hundred meters? I mean, when our stuff is out and spread, it's not spreading a hundred meters. We don't have that kind of equipment.

MR. MERRIFIELD: I think that's a good discussion to have with the Coral AP members that are on this call at some point here. Once we get a motion going here, we can probably have some discussion about that.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Yes, because, I mean, if we're looking at fifty meters, a 150 -- If you look at our trawl size, even if you're right on that line, what are you talking about, twenty meters,

maybe? I don't even think you're going to get that of that side of the spread, but I will mute myself, and I will let everybody continue on.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Do you want to make this motion then to accept the 2014 coordinates that were devised by Lee and staff?

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Yes, and, I mean, but, again, I mean, we're just going in there with a magic eraser or whatever and just kind of drawing another line. Hard evidence, to me, is saying, okay, we need to stay fifty meters away from this here, and so we draw the line, the box, at fifty meters, because the bottom is -- You know, we've got old paper fathoms that were -- I mean, it's obsolete today, and we were able to find the bottom then, and they were working without tearing this stuff up, and so that's the thing I'm getting at.

If the bottom is ran off, good, and you say, okay, we're going to do a fifty-meter line off of this bottom, the way it sits, the way it exists, and not a go in there with an Etch-a-Sketch and just draw what you feel like, but, if we're going to do it, let's do it right and get it done the first time, so we don't have to keep coming back and coming back.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Okay. I will mute myself.

MR. PUGLIESE: I think we had a couple other comments. Nancy.

MS. JONES: **I was just going to make the motion that we go ahead and move the eastern boundary west to the coordinates of the 2014 thing that Lee and the staff had put together, or open the fisheries.** That was it. I was just going to get it going.

AP MEMBER: I would say open the fisheries, too.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Do we have a second?

MR. PUGLIESE: Marilyn seconded it.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. All right. Roger, according to what you were just saying, I wrote some things down here, and that was about 770 meters to the north or -- No. It was like 300 meters to the north.

MR. PUGLIESE: You're talking about distances? I mean, it was variable throughout the area, and so I think you're talking about the distance from the pinnacles to the -- Because, in certain areas, it was over -- It was close to a thousand meters, and then the really close area got within I think 300 or 400 meters.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Which version was that, the 2013 or 2014?

MR. PUGLIESE: The 2014. Up on the far end, to the top, it got close on both, and it was even shorter than that, I think, on the --

MR. MERRIFIELD: 300 is what I heard you say, and I don't know if that was the 2013 or the 2014 version, because you were comparing the two, correct?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and the one that was within like fifty meters was the 2013.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Got it. Okay. That was fifty meters.

MR. PUGLIESE: But that was only in that far northern area. Most of the area was further than that.

MR. MERRIFIELD: But the 2014 was 311 in that same close area.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: But was that VMS data that was fifty meters from the --

MR. MERRIFIELD: No, this was the coordinates that were developed in 2014 by Lee and staff, and so, in the ones that he originally submitted for the 2013 version were very close, like within fifty meters or something like that, but, the 2014, I understood it to be like 300 meters.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: But how did their VMS data match up to that line?

MR. MERRIFIELD: Well, I mean, it's encompassing -- The red line showed the VMS data, and so I would say -- I would say that I think most of that VMS -- Most of that area is going to be opened up, and I don't know that the closer will be, because it's not like the old days, when you knew where it was and you could go close, but this is -- There's going to be a line, and you're going to have to abide by a line.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: I certainly understand that. I mean, there's not an issue with that. My whole concern was getting down to brass tacks, and it was like, how far do you want us away from it, and then let's work it out, and we'll get the bottom mapped out.

MR. MERRIFIELD: We're in discussion, correct? Are we in discussion about this motion? Maybe this is the time that we could ask somebody from the Coral AP about the distance.

MR. PUGLIESE: Let me type the motion, and I will get it out on the thing, if you can just restate it, and I'll go ahead and --

MR. MERRIFIELD: **The motion, for Nancy, was to take the 2014 coordinates as developed by Lee Vogelsong and staff, and I don't know if you want to put names in there or not, but -- Industry. There you go. As proposed, and then we may have to duplicate this, because you're going to have one as a proposed boundary move and then one as a proposed fishery access area.** This is just to kind of get it out there. We can fill in all the details about where we're talking about, just in terms of the eastern boundary of the northern expansion. I mean, we all know what we're talking about here right now.

MR. PUGLIESE: **How about if we just said "to use" or "to adopt", instead of "take".**

MR. MERRIFIELD: **Sure.**

MR. PUGLIESE: I think Sandra had a question and then Mel.

DR. BROOKE: It wasn't so much a question as it was going into discussion, and I've been bobbing my hand up and down in response to comments about how far away is far enough, and so I don't want to preempt any discussion, and so we can wait until we actually go into the discussion portion, if you're still working on the motion.

MR. PUGLIESE: Let me get Mel. I think Mel had a comment.

MR. BELL: Thanks, and I appreciate you all helping us with this in this format. I know this is a difficult way to try to look at things and communicate, but I had a question, just because I'm trying to come in and absorb some of this, but, when you make reference to the 2014 coordinates, does that correspond to what is in the draft document there as like Alternative 2a, where it mentions, under 2014, some coordinates, and are those the coordinates that you're talking about, or are there other coordinates that you guys may be aware of? I know you can probably visualize all this stuff in your head off the charts, but I'm just trying to make sure that we understand exactly what you're asking us.

MR. MERRIFIELD: This might be a good time to bring that back up, and I hope you still have that, Roger, and just kind of show the difference between the two.

MR. PUGLIESE: I will do it. I think, to Mel's point, and maybe you could add that to the second one.

MR. BELL: You guys may be clear on this, but I'm just looking at the document and trying to figure out what you're saying and make it kind of work within the context of what I'm looking at, and so we want to just make sure that we're on the same page with you and understanding exactly what you're specifically asking about.

MR. MERRIFIELD: That's a good point, Mel, and for all the members of the Deepwater and Coral APs as well.

MR. PUGLIESE: What you have here are the coordinates. If you go to -- That's the first coordinates from 2014 that were provided by industry, and then what it did is it translated using the eastern boundary of the existing HAPC to create what is Alternative 2a, and 2a is represented -- The northern section of 2a is represented by the green area, and the points, those points, are specifically the industry points that provide the boundary, and then the southern area -- Those, again, are the industry points that provide the eastern boundary of the alternative.

The reference to that in the 2014, those are the same coordinates, essentially for both, but one talks about a boundary move, and the other talks about the shrimp fishery access area that's been proposed in this draft options.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Can we look one more time at those distances on the charts that you had up there, or on your tool?

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay. I need to go on my --

MR. MERRIFIELD: Is that too -- I didn't mean to --

MR. PUGLIESE: What I was going to say is maybe we could get into the discussion with the Coral AP, because then I can open it up, as they're discussing that, and look at those boundaries. I mean, will it affect this?

MR. MERRIFIELD: No, and I think we're looking at trying to move forward with these 2014 coordinates, and those are pretty good depictions right there, because the green is the area that would be opened up for shrimp fishery access.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay. Yes. I want to take a chance to get Marilyn, and I think she finally got her mic on. Marilyn. Maybe. Maybe not. Okay. We did have a question from Jocelyn.

MR. KARAZSIA: Hi, Roger, and I was wondering if you wanted us to kind of share some of our thoughts and perspectives on this question about how far fishing activities occur from important deepwater habitats and about impacting them, or are you okay if I help facilitate that conversation with the Coral and Shrimp AP?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and I think that's what we wanted to kind of move -- That's why I was getting a little clarification from Mike, and I think what they have on the table won't necessarily get affected by the -- This is the time to have those comments, and then they can consider this too, and so moving into getting some of the Coral AP comments and recommendations would be -- This would be the time, and it feeds right into this discussion and insight from members on the questions that have been raised so far, and so yes. A long answer to a short question is yes, and so, if that's okay, Mike, and I think that kind of gets to what you want to do. As long as you're good with what we have here at least, that at least can open the discussion, and then we can get into kind of some of the -- We can answer some of the questions that have been raised.

MR. MERRIFIELD: That's great, because we're making some headway. Good.

MR. PUGLIESE: Here we go, and, to that, I will go ahead and pass it over to Jocelyn.

MS. KARAZSIA: Thank you. I mean, I want to thank Mike Merrifield and the Deepwater Shrimp and Coral AP for your participation today, and I just wanted to note that this particular item is fairly well articulated in the public comments that John Reed had provided to us before the meeting, and, with that, there is a concern about a need to have a sufficient protective buffer in place to protect the corals from sediments that become suspended in the water column as a result of the fishing gear interaction with the mud bottoms, in particular.

Presumably the muds are composed of clays and very small particles that can become suspended in the water column for considerable distances. I am aware of -- I will refer to them as maybe one-off studies, where these sediment plumes can travel up to twenty kilometers, and allowing fishing gear interactions within 100 to 2,000 meters would be putting these corals at risk, in my opinion.

I also wanted to note that, in looking at the multibeam maps, there is a lot of yellow and green hues, which could indicate the presence of low-relief, like less than one-meter, hardbottom communities that are providing EFH for deepwater species managed under the Snapper Grouper Fishery Management Plan, and so I recommend that the protective buffer that we identify would

be protective of the Oculina pinnacles, but also this lower-relief hard bottom as well, and I know that Sandra had some comments, and so I will turn it over to her to say her comments now as well.

DR. BROOKE: Thanks, Jocelyn. I was just going to sort of really say what you just said about the sediment plumes, and, also, these are very high-current areas, and I'm sure these guys know what they're doing, and they've been fishing for a long time, but I think, if you're only 100 meters away, and 100 meters deep, there's a margin of error there that is a bit close for comfort, from my perspective. I would also be curious to know -- Well, let me go back to that.

In terms of how close is too close, it depends on a lot of different things, but 300 meters, in my mind, is too close. I would not be comfortable with anything less than 1,000, but the work hasn't been done out there, and so we actually don't know. Given that, we should err on the side of caution, if we're trying to protect a fragile habitat that's already been badly damaged and is trying to recover. The other question I would have is -- It pertains to how valuable these areas are. I understand that you can't necessarily translate these VMS dots into productivity, but do we have a sense of how many VMS pings occurred in the areas that the fishing industry would like to reopen?

MR. PUGLIESE: To answer your question, the last time I did an analysis of this, we had -- When we finished the amendment, we actually didn't have the complete 2014, but, completing the 2003 through 2014, for the entire area, it was like 1.76 percent of what would be classed as fishing points, which are between two and four knots for the area, and so that was what was identified as fishing, versus steaming or anchored.

Those were identified for the whole area. However, on I think it was 2014, as a partial, it originally showed like 16 percent for the whole area, and then, when we got the full year, it was showing about 8 percent of some of the VMS in that -- It was primarily occurring down along that southern edge of the HAPC.

Now, it was a year where there was only 300,000 pounds of shrimp landed, but it was a higher percent relative to that area, and so, for the whole area, it's been very variable, and that was the only year that it was that high, and so that's at least what we've been able to get from the original VMS information, because we did move and move and move that a number of times, to try to capture as much of the fishing area in the past, but, as Mike has indicated, there was still this -- That southern area, at certain times, is providing some of these different points. There has been some fishing along that edge in the past, which is what the discussion is about.

MR. MERRIFIELD: There is some indications of the VMS points in Figures S2 and S4 in the appendices, and you can see what were VMS patterns along that edge over those periods of time, and I think S2 is -- Well, it doesn't have dates on it. S4 is -- They don't have dates on that either. Here is it. It's 2003 to 2013 on S4 and the same times for --

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Not to interrupt you, Mike, but, for what Sandra and Jocelyn was talking about, the -- When you get out there in this area to go to work and set down, you want to set down, and there is three to four different types of currents. You know, you have the east current, and you've got the west current, and you've got the north and south, and, the majority of the time, that stuff is running three knots and faster, and so, for anything that sits still and just actually stays

there -- It's not sitting in a bathtub and the bathtub is sitting still. You have a hard current, and sometimes quite a few of them, and --

DR. BROOKE: That's true, but, if you can imagine trolling in the south, and where is that stuff going to go? It's probably going to go north and right over the pinnacles.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Well, it depends now, because sometimes the tide will be running north at the top and south at the bottom, and there is different stages that -- So like, if I'm sat down, and I'm going against the tide, and I'm only going to make like two knots dragging, but then, as soon as my stuff gets on the bottom, I'm making like three knots, and so I know the tide is actually going the way that I'm going and the surface tides.

DR. BROOKE: So you don't know where it's going. You don't know where the sediment is going, because the --

MR. J. VOGELSONG: As soon as my stuff is set on the bottom, I know, by the way my rigs react, which way the stuff is going, as far as the bottom current, because my cables are -- Like if my portside cable is getting close to the boat, I know I've got a cross tide. If I know like -- Most of the time, before I set out in that deeper water, and the tide is running, there's a certain speed that I have to make before I even set out. If I don't make that speed, I have rig failure, and we have to -- So I have to gauge the speed of the tide before I set out. Once I'm set out, once my rig is on the bottom, when we're actually pulling tension on it, then I know which way the tide is.

DR. BROOKE: Okay, and I understand that, but the thing is you don't know ahead of time exactly where your gear is going to go and exactly where that sediment plume is going to go, and so this is why we need a margin of error, because, if you get snarled up, or the current is not running the way you think it is, or it's stronger than you think it is, or you have an upwelling, or any number of things go wrong --

MR. J. VOGELSONG: (Mr. Vogelsong's comment is not audible on the recording.)

DR. BROOKE: That buffer is the thing, and I know it's hard working out there, and, you know, we've been working out there, and, you know, what you said earlier about the mapping, I would give my firstborn, and not that I have one, but I would give a lot to --

MR. J. VOGELSONG: I've got eight.

DR. BROOKE: To map the Oculina Banks, and we just -- It's hard. It's really hard to get money to go out there and map those banks, and so it does look like an Etch-a-Sketch, and you're right, but this is as good as we've got, I'm afraid.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Yes, I know, and that's the only thing that kind of -- I don't want to be aggravating, and I don't want anybody to think that I'm aggravated, but we've spent a lot of time out there, and, I mean, we don't have the top-notch, top-grade equipment, like I'm sure the government has, but we've had enough to where we've been able to map it out and know where to stay away from and stuff like that.

I mean, we would never intentionally try to hurt it, because, I mean, that's kind of the equivalent of driving a Lamborghini through the damn trees. You just wouldn't do it. I mean, you have value -- I value my nets, and I value my equipment, and I value the ocean, because I live on it, and I probably live out here more than I do at home, and so this is my home, and, I mean, I don't want to destroy it, but we also want to be able to cross it, and, I mean, I enjoy feeding people -- Anyway, I will leave it at that, and I will let you all carry on.

MR. MERRIFIELD: One other thing too is that, when they first set out, they're not setting out on the line. There is too much margin of error, and so they're going to set out in an area that is more open.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Yes, and, typically, when I set out, I'm going to set out a half-mile away from the line and then be able to work my way into it, so I know exactly what my rigs are doing when it's time to -- When I get to that point, because you don't want to set out -- Like you said, you set out, and say if I wanted to make a 5.2 on my set out, I am probably going to roll my rigs up, because I like to make at least 5.5. If I do that right next to the line, and I have my rigs rolled up, then I know I'm going to be probably inside that line before I get my rigs up, and so, yes, we think ahead of things like this, because nobody wants to get in trouble, and I know I don't.

MR. MERRIFIELD: So what I got, Sandra, is you would like a thousand-meter --

DR. BROOKE: Well, that's kind of arbitrary, Mike. I mean, this is why this is so hard, is that we just don't know, and so, using the precautionary principles that are in Magnuson-Stevens, you try and put buffers around things, to account for the unknowns, and so, I mean, I would not want to put a number on it, because it's just -- We just don't know what number that would be, and so we're in this kind of situation where we have to, as Coral AP, have to try and judge how much impact what these amendments -- The impact of these amendments on the corals and how it could potentially affect them, and being close, this close, just makes me, personally -- It makes me a little nervous, because we don't have all the information we need in order to tighten those boundaries and still keep a margin of error.

I think we have a margin of error at the moment, especially in those northern areas. The boundaries seem pretty close already. Further south, maybe, but, up north, it already looks a little bit tight, to me, but I would welcome comments from the other AP members, and I don't want to dominate this.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Well, one other thing, though. I mean, how do they control the sediment that comes out of the Okeechobee and drains the swamp? How is that controlled, because, I mean, I'm sure it's bleaching and killing corals, because they destroyed most of the lime rock when they dug the canal.

DR. BROOKE: That's a whole other nightmare, Jason.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: The lime rock was the filter for all the sediment, but I will mute myself.

MR. PUGLIESE: I think Ken has a question, or a comment.

MR. NEDIMYER: A comment. I agree with Jocelyn and Sandra, and I think we need a substantial buffer there, and I'm not quite as concerned about the actual impact of the gear on the coral, but I'm concerned about the impact of the fishery activity on the coral ecosystem, and it is an ecosystem that we're trying to protect and not just the coral itself, and the ecosystem consists of fish that would graze in the area that's being dredged, and possibly other critters that graze there, and so it's important to protect the whole ecosystem, and having a buffer, a substantial buffer, around the ecosystem we're trying to protect would ensure that it's being protected.

One of the mistakes we've made here in the Florida Keys, and elsewhere, when we tried to create these marine protected areas, is they're too small, and so everybody fishes right up to the edge, and the result is that the fish populations inside the protected areas are no different than the fish populations outside the protected areas, and the result is that we've not accomplished anything, other than maybe reducing some impacts from fishing gear. I am concerned more about the impacts to the ecosystem than I am to the impacts from fishing gear or from sediment, but that's my two-cents, and I felt like I needed to pop it out there.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Thank you, and, just in response -- Well, I will let you guys continue here, if you have other comments about -- If anybody else on the Coral AP has comments, and then I will chime in afterwards.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Just for the record, we're not dredgers now. We drag, and we don't dredge the bottom. We're not trying to get mud now, and so let's keep that in mind. As long as my rigs stay off the bottom, and I'm not catching all that junk, and it ain't tearing my nets, and so I'm not dredging.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. If there's no other comments --

DR. VOSS: I do. This is Josh, and I've had my hand up for a while. I actually have six points that I want to make, and I will try to be quick. The first thing is that, whenever we're starting to talk about what's relatively high relief and low relief, like in Figures 1.5 and 1.6 of the draft amendment here, high and low, without any context, are pretty arbitrary, and I would suggest we put numbers on those, to provide greater context and more information.

Number two is, when the distances were measured today between the new proposed fishery access area boundary and where the reef resources were, those horizontal lines were being drawn between the pinnacles and those proposed boundaries of the fishery access area, and, really, we should be drawing those lines from the bases in that area where we know there is still living oculina habitat that is really important for snowy grouper and other important fishery species in that area and not just from the pinnacles, and so it's not just the distance of the boundary for a buffer, but where we're drawing that buffer line from I think needs to shift.

I will echo the comment about suspended sediments particularly being a problem in high-current areas, and, because those currents tend to parallel the reef structure, that means that the spatial impact of those sediments may be much greater than you would anticipate, and then, lastly, I will go back to a couple of points that I have made previously relative to the uncertainty about the location of the rig on the bottom.

National Marine Fisheries Service data indicates that the ratio of scope to depth for shrimp trawls is typically somewhere between a 3.0 to 4.3 ratio, in these kind of depths and these kind of currents, and so, taking a conservative estimate, that means that the horizontal distance between the boat and the rig can be anywhere from about 230 meters to 510 meters, and so, in addition to other uncertainty that we're talking about, that distance between the VMS points and the location of the boat, versus the rig, is something that I think we should keep in mind as well, and so I will echo what I said before, which is, if we had track points on the rigs, and the location of the rigs at all times could be identified, then the level of precision would be increased, and that's all.

MS. SOLORZANO: Can you all hear me?

MR. PUGLIESE: It's Marilyn.

MS. SOLORZANO: Hi, everyone. I'm so glad to finally get a voice in this. I've been listening and listening, and you all know I'm not a good listener, and I'm a better talker. Hello, everyone. We do know where our rigs are going on the bottom, and so, for any information that we don't know where we're putting them, and that there's this huge margin of error, that's just not true. There is not a huge margin of error.

We know where we're going with this, and so we just -- I am in favor of, obviously, extending from the 2014, and I believe my paper might say 2013, and I was having trouble getting it to clarify, as I've been messing with mics and whatever and so forth to get on, but my son was here, and he just finally had to leave, Damien Solorzano, and so he's been present for the whole meeting too, until we just finally got this, and we're both in agreement to expand and to second the motion to extend the 2014 boundary to the west.

We also -- As my other son, Jason, said, we would like to get more bottom, but I'm sure we're going to have to work on that later, because, you know, one step at a time as it goes, but, for those that are confused as to we don't know where we're putting our bottom down and there's a huge margin of error, that's just not true.

DR. VOSS: Hi, Marilyn, and thanks. I wasn't implying that you didn't know, but I'm just talking about the distance between the boat and the rig itself and not that you don't know where your rig is at all.

MS. SOLORZANO: No, and I understand that exactly, and I think it was the lady that was on earlier, and I didn't get her name, and she was saying how -- You know, it was a similar thing, and I think there's a little bit of misconstrued information as to how far we are being from when we set out, you know, and so, with the boundary that we're getting in this 2014, there is plenty of room for any margin of error that we may have. We know where this stuff exactly precisely is, because it's a day-to-day and month-to-month and year-to-year, and we use a couple of months at a time, and we know where we're going with this and where we're putting things down, and so, anyway, we're just trying to get a little more working area in, and we're not there to destroy any habitat, because we definitely need it as well.

DR. BROOKE: Just to follow-up, and I'm not being argumentative, and I'm being clear right here, but how do you know exactly where your rig is?

MS. SOLORZANO: Well, because we know the distance of the cable that's going down, and we know the distance that we move north and south, along with the stream out there, and it tends to run north and south, and so we know the direction we're moving when we set out, with the wind and the tide and set and the drift is going, and so, if there's any distance off, it would not be but by feet. It would not be by large distances that it appears as though what you are thinking is occurring, and I could be wrong, and I'm not trying to decipher what you're thinking, but I'm just stating that it's not hundreds of feet off. It's much closer than that.

DR. BROOKE: Well, Jason just said that you never quite know, and there is different currents down there, and, again, I'm not being argumentative, because this is something that we've wrestled with. When we put VMS on a vessel, it goes on the vessel and not on the gear, and the gear is what could potentially damage the habitat, and so it's an ongoing problem, and we have tried to think of technologies that we could use to map where it is, and so, really, we don't exactly know where this bottom-tending gear is. You probably have a fairly good idea, within a margin of error, and the other problem, of course, is we don't exactly know what is on most of this bottom, or a lot of this bottom, and so, again, we --

MS. SOLORZANO: I don't mean to interrupt, but I think that's where the issue came in, is that you all were thinking we were further off than what we are. Like we could drop our gear down, and we could put out 900 feet of cable, and we would be a long way off the bottom. We would not be a long way off the bottom.

We're moving north and south, and we don't drag east and west, because we're moving up and down along the contours of the bottom, and this is what we do for a living, and so we know, within a very close margin, and it's not hundreds of feet off, because you've got the cable to get down, and it's not that far from the boat, the way that maybe some are thinking it is. It's a lot closer to the boat. Where the boat is sitting, the cable is not that far from the boat, and it's going to be hundreds of feet off. We are not dragging miles of cable behind us at all.

DR. BROOKE: No, I don't think we're thinking that, and so how much scope do you put out in a hundred meters of water?

MS. SOLORZANO: I am going to let my son answer that question. It's three-to-one. It's three feet to every foot of water that we're going to drag in, and so then you're going to realize that that's only going to be maybe two foot from -- Two-times the distance of the boat, and so it's not that far from it, and we know where it's going to go down.

DR. BROOKE: Actually, it's 300 meters and not 300 feet.

MS. SOLORZANO: Yes, well, meters or feet. Sorry about that, but it's three to one is what we were saying.

DR. BROOKE: Right, and so it would be --

MS. SOLORZANO: Three times the cable to the foot of water.

DR. BROOKE: So you're talking about a thousand feet of cable, more or less.

MS. SOLORZANO: Yes. If you're in 300 foot, you would have a thousand foot of cable going out, but you would not be -- You've got to realize the distance of the boat. The rigs are going to be approximately 500 feet behind the boat, and they go straight down behind the boat, and so we know where those rigs are going down when we put them down.

I mean, we drag very close to lots of the destructions and things, and we know. We're keeping our equipment safe, and we don't want to damage the habitat or the bottom at all, and we're just asking to get a little area back in that we know where there is no coral there, and we've known that, and I think the Coral Committee knows this as well, and this was all in agreement in some previous meetings that we had, that they would allow us to have some of these areas back. We have never had any luck at getting any of these areas back, and that's all that we're asking for. It's not to damage coral, absolutely not, and we want the habitat there.

DR. VOSS: Just doing some simple math, based on what you just provided, or you and your son, Marilyn, if you're in 100 meters of water, and you put out 300 meters of scope, that means that the horizontal distance between the boat and the location of the rig on the bottom would be around 280 meters, or about 760 feet, away from the boat.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Directly behind the boat, is what you're getting at, and I get what you're saying with the scope, because it is at an angle, probably at a 30 to 35-degree angle, and so, yes, it is behind the boat, and it's not exactly straight up underneath the transducer, like you're trying to assume that it would be, and that would be virtually impossible, due to the fact that the tides we're running, and so -- Go ahead.

MS. SOLORZANO: We're not in a thousand meters. We're in at thousand feet, and so maybe there was a little misconstruction on wording there. We're in say a thousand feet and not meters.

DR. BROOKE: Yes, we know.

MR. MERRIFIELD: I think a lot of discussion has been occurring here, and, historically, their lives have depended on this, and they have to know -- By obstruction, she means that, if there is a container that gets dropped on the bottom, and it's a new structure on the bottom, they know how to avoid that structure. I mean, there's just -- It's their livelihood and their gear.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Go ahead and say it, Mike. We're that good. We're that good.

MS. SOLORZANO: It costs us too much money not to be.

DR. BROOKER: I don't think that anybody is saying that you're intending to do anything, but, you know, there's a big umbrella of it happens out there, and we've had the same conversation with the guys working in the canyons. They say that we know how to avoid these habitats and --

MR. MERRIFIELD: Somebody needs to be muted, please.

AP MEMBER: The VMS coordinates would show if we got in there by accident, and the only VMS coordinates are transits. Even if we accidentally screwed up, our VMS would show --

DR. BROOKE: It would only show where the vessel is. The VMS only shows where the vessel is, and this is the problem with VMS. It does not show where your gear is.

AP MEMBER: Right. Exactly. So, if we're on the line, if our GPS is on the line, and the pinnacles on what you all are proposing are still, at the closest point, a hundred meters away, on the new line you all are proposing. The old line, we're talking about we've got a thousand meters away. If our boat is on the old line, the closest our rigs can be -- Even if our rigs -- It's straight behind the boat. It's straight behind the boat. Even if there was a side current and a thirty-knot east wind, it's not going to be --

MS. SOLORZANO: This is the thing that I just brought to their attention, is we drag north and south and not to east to west. Our rigs are directly behind the boat, and they are not to the side, and so there's no way we're going to get to that oculina coral, because it's behind us and not beside us, and so we're dragging up and down along the sides and not across.

AP MEMBER: We're never going to have more than a thousand feet of cable out. We can't.

MS. SOLORZANO: Well, I've been trying to tell them that, and we know where we're putting it down.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. We can -- Roger.

MR. PUGLIESE: We have some more questions. I think Henry had a question first, and then Josh.

DR. FEDDERN: Since the current is going parallel to the pinnacles, and the draggers are dragging east of the pinnacles, then any sediment they bring up, inadvertently, is going to stay away from the pinnacles, and it's going to drop back down onto the soft bottom, and so I don't see how the sediment problem in the midwater is going to be a problem with the pinnacles.

DR. VOSS: Can I respond to that, directly? Just based on hydrodynamic drag, if you had a -- Even if the prominent direction of the current was exactly parallel to the reef feature, the fact that the reef feature is there causes drag, which is going to create eddies that would spin off on the left, or western, side of any plume. That would cause entrainment of particles up onto the reef, even if you were dragging off in the soft bottom east of the reef.

AP MEMBER: I am -- I am sure there's going to be some, obviously, and I'm not going to dispute that, but the whole way the gear has to be set up is to have as little contact with the bottom as possible, and so you don't have a big cod end of the bag that's dragging the bottom. That would burn the bag out, and you have lost all your shrimp, and so the whole point is to float the bag. The idea is that you have -- You have as little contact as you can. I am not sure it's as much of a sediment plume as you might think. I mean, I know there are studies on this, and you may have had a chance to look at those.

MR. PUGLIESE: Do we have any other comments from the Coral Advisory Panel? We're starting to bump up against the edge of our meeting, but we'll just go until we complete this discussion. Sandra.

DR. BROOKE: Management is always a balance between trying to conserve something and trying to allow industry to make a living, no matter what that industry is, and we recognize that, and so, you know, we know that -- We understand that this is a balance, and this is a discussion, and so I think the question here, in my mind anyway, is are these areas important enough to industry to open up a discussion of potentially allowing impact to an area we've decided is worthy of protection, and I think that's what it comes down to in management decisions, and it's that balance, and so I just wanted to make that comment. I'm not sure where that leaves us, but we do acknowledge that.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay, and I think we've kind of had some good discussion about that, and we understand your concerns, and I think, from the industry side, we're trying to address some of those concerns with you and just let you know that this is not -- I mean, there is as much concern about affecting that coral as -- We have that very concern as well, and, by the way, this offshore side is not -- This is not for rookies. This is an experienced-captains-only side, and you don't generally have anybody over there that is -- Or you don't have anybody over there that's new at this. It's not for people that aren't experienced.

What the industry side is just trying to say is that we understand your concerns, and we're trying to tell you what we do and how we operate, to try to quell some of those concerns, so that we can try to come up with what is this buffer zone between the coral or the habitat, and I think Josh mentioned the buffering habitat, and, by the way, the rock shrimp that are caught are caught in soft substrate bottom, and so we're not interested, and there's no -- If it's hard bottom, that's not an area where there is rock shrimp, and so you're not going to see these guys out there in the hard bottom.

We have kind of discussed all these things, and I think we have a motion on the table, and we've just kind of put our discussion out there as to that we're good with a small buffer zone, and then the Coral AP will have to put forward what their concerns are about that buffer zone, and then the council is going to have to come up with -- Is that right, Roger? Is that how we would proceed from here, or is this a thing where we can come back with adjustments, or is this a thing where we go with --

MR. PUGLIESE: What you've got on the table for a motion is something that's been developed for the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel, and the Coral Advisory Panel has been weighing-in on comments relative to the overall what's on the table for scoping. Right now, what is being really brought forward is just the consideration for scoping and reaffirming what the positions are and the concerns over the potential impacts, and I think that's what's been building, and so this is specific to -- The motion is specific to the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel, and I think that's maybe what you raised. The comments from the Coral Advisory Panel are going to be provided, also.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Marilyn, did you have something else?

MS. SOLORZANO: Yes, and I just wanted to say that we respect everything the coral people do, and the bottom that's there, and all the work that's involved, and we want that coral protected as well. My question is it takes -- How long does it take for that coral to regrow back? Does anybody know that?

MR. J. VOGELSONG: I thought they were doing studies where they were making coral, and they were putting tile down to have coral grow to it, and I thought they were doing studies on that, to see if they could actually grow it.

MS. SOLORZANO: That test failed, the failure to grow, but the coral from years back, it never grew, those tiles or whatever they put down, and they never did take place, from all the stuff that I've seen, but how long does it take for that coral to come back out there? If it's not there, how long would it take it to grow?

MR. PUGLIESE: Go ahead, Sandra.

DR. BROOKE: That's a really good question, and so the growth rates, the actual growth rates, on oculina are not terribly slow. It's like these you hear of a millimeter every decade, or a millimeter a year or whatever, and oculina grows reasonably quickly, for a coral. The problem is recruitment, and so what we've seen on the banks is that the recruitment is very spotty and very low, and I was actually part of that project where we deployed a whole bunch of reef balls and patio stones, and we seeded them.

We put transplants of living oculina on them, that we got from a wreck a little further inshore, and we went back there to have a look at them, and we couldn't find some of them, and we probably didn't have the right tools, but we don't actually know what the outcome of that experiment was, because we didn't see many of the reef balls. The ones that we did see had fish associated with them, but the current was running so strong, and then we had an upwelling, and then it all goes dark out there for a couple of days with an upwelling, and so we don't know whether those reef balls worked or not, but what we do know, from dives that we've done since we knew the area was damaged, is that it's not coming back very quickly, and, when it does come back, it tends to come back on these little marginal areas around the main pinnacles.

This is why we want to protect the bases of the pinnacles, because that seems to be where it starts coming back, and, you know, when you knock a species down to the extent that the Oculina Banks have been knocked down, you don't have the population there to produce the larvae to bring it back quickly, and so it's going to take time. It's a slow process, and so we're trying to give it the best chance we can.

The other thing is that we have not been able to look at everywhere in the banks, and this is why these boundaries keep getting extended, because, with more research, we find more places where there is still some live coral, and so we're not just being spiteful in annexing these pinnacle areas. It's because we have found more coral out there, and so I hope that at least partially addressed your question.

MS. SOLORZANO: Well, that kind of does address my question, and then it leads to -- We have been working those areas. For many, many years we've been working those areas, until they keep taking more and taking more and taking more. The rock shrimp only live in a very small marginal area as well, and so where do we balance out where we supply for the food chain, for the food industry, and provide necessary food to protecting this coral that keeps needing more area to grow, yet isn't growing, and so we need to come to a more amicable agreement, because the fishing industry has given and given and given and given, and they keep taking and taking and taking, and we're just asking for a tiny little area back that we know hasn't had coral in many, many years,

and clearly it isn't growing any, or at least that's what you all were telling us, and so that's all we're asking, is to get this back, so that we can use that area to be productive with.

DR. BROOKE: Okay. Well, you said that rock shrimp don't live in hardbottom areas, and so corals don't live in mud, and so those two are mutually exclusive, and so, if we take areas of hard bottom, that theoretically doesn't affect the rock shrimp fishery, but it's the boundaries, or the buffers, that are affecting it, right?

MS. SOLORZANO: Yes, and it is absolutely the buffers that are affecting us, but the shrimp are along the buffers that are close to the edges of those boundaries, and so the buffer keeps getting bigger and bigger, and that's where we're concerned. We want the buffer to get -- Every few years -- I have been on this fishery management plan, shrimp management council panel or whatever, and I can't even talk, for -- Since the 1990s, when we first started this stuff.

Way back in 1996, I was attending the meetings, and I have seen this stuff just go and go and go, and it's not -- It just seems like they need more and more and more and more buffer, and that's where I stand on that. We're just trying to get a little shrimp area back, and we would like to ask you all to be a little cooperative with us. We always feel like we're giving and giving and giving, and we get told that, when we go to meetings, you be prepared to get ready to give something, and what about getting something? We've been giving for twenty-five years now.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: And no one ever seems to address the issue of like, again, the Okeechobee drainage. Does anybody ever wonder why the coral might be moving north and migrating? Because they are trying to get away from the dirty water and pollution that's coming from land.

MS. SOLORZANO: So, anyway, let's just get on with addressing this meeting, because time has run out, I'm sure for everyone, and we want to get this over with and done and at least move to the next step of addressing this, and there will be plenty of time for more discussion, I'm sure.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Roger, do we need to take a vote or anything on this?

MR. PUGLIESE: Well, I mean, that's your -- It's pretty clear what the position is, and you can go ahead and vote. I mean, you've got the motion on the table, and you have a second and whatever, and this can advance as part of the comments from the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel. It's in the record regardless.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. I don't know how we -- Do we just do a show of hands thing or how do we take a vote in favor?

MR. J. VOGELSONG: I've got like five minutes and then I've got to run.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. Do you want to just take both motions or take them separately?

MR. PUGLIESE: I think you have it as alternatives.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Alternatives, right.

MR. PUGLIESE: You can do it that way and just acknowledge that these would be alternatives for consideration for scoping.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. **All those in favor, indicate somehow that you are in favor, say aye or, I guess, raise a hand.** Is that what you want them to do, is raise a hand?

MR. PUGLIESE: The easiest way would be that the motion is made. If there is -- Are there any opposition? Raise hands if you oppose, and that would be the simplest thing.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. Any opposition to this motion?

MR. PUGLIESE: From the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Right. **Seeing none, the motion passes.** We've had a lot of discussion about it, and I thank you, Coral AP, for your input, and I think we understand what your concerns are, and you understand what ours are.

MR. PUGLIESE: I think Ken had an additional comment.

MR. NEDIMYER: I was just saying that I was opposed to it. I thought we were raising our hands.

MR. PUGLIESE: This was a Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel recommendation, and this is not the Coral AP's motion. This is a Deepwater Shrimp AP comment. You all have made a number of different recommendations with regard to buffers and with regard to the consideration of the ecosystem considerations relative to the areas, and those are also here in the record.

MR. NEDIMYER: Okay. That's good enough.

MR. PUGLIESE: Specifically the coral recommendations, and those issues are of concern, and they will be forwarded.

MR. NEDIMYER: All right.

MS. KARAZSIA: Roger, so we don't need to make a motion if we wanted to recommend the status quo, Option 1?

MR. PUGLIESE: You can. Go ahead. I mean, the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel has made their recommendation, and the Coral Advisory Panel is more than welcome to provide -- You provided discussion and comments, but they provided specific recommendations, and it's fine to do that, too.

MS. KARAZSIA: **I mean, I certainly welcome further discussion on this, but, based on what we've heard today, I would like to recommend that we consider Option 1, which is keeping the boundary as-is.**

AP MEMBER: I would second it.

AP MEMBER: I agree.

AP MEMBER: I agree as well.

AP MEMBER: I agree as well.

AP MEMBER: I agree as well.

AP MEMBER: Agreed.

MS. SOLORZANO: I disagree. Do I count?

MR. PUGLIESE: This is a Coral Advisory Panel comment**. I think it passes with a majority.**

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay. Are we finished with that section?

MR. J. VOGELSONG: You all just voted to --

MS. SOLORZANO: Jason, that was the coral people.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: I was just saying that their word counts. Me being out here on this damn ocean doing this damn work means nothing and my opinion?

MS. SOLORZANO: No, no, and it has to go further.

MR. MERRIFIELD: So we go to scoping, and is that where we go next, or what's the next --

MR. PUGLIESE: Well, the council is going to be looking at the comments from the Habitat Advisory Panel and from the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel and the Coral Advisory Panel and considering options for scoping, and so that's where they will be at in December, and they will be making a determination of what and if they move forward, and so they need to still have deliberations on addressing this at the December meeting, on what to move forward.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay.

MS. SOLORZANO: Excuse me again, and I know we're all ready to be done with this. At the December meeting, is that a public meeting, or a webinar meeting, or can anyone go, or can we listen in or do comments, yea or nay?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes, and that's a council meeting, and it will be the Habitat and Ecosystem Committee that will be deliberating on this and reviewing the input from the panels and looking at the consideration for scoping, as part of the agenda.

MS. SOLORZANO: Okay, and is that held somewhere, or is it just a webinar?

MR. PUGLIESE: No, the whole meeting is a webinar, and so that's going to be online, and you will be able to, just like you did here, register to listen in for that meeting.

MS. SOLORZANO: Okay. This is my first time doing a webinar, and so it took me to the very last fifteen minutes to get in, and so I'm way behind the times with webinars. I did a Zoom doctors appointment though, if that matters. That was good for me.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Okay, and so, unless things change, this will be a purely webinar meeting.

MS. SOLORZANO: Okay. Good.

MR. PUGLIESE: I guess one thing for the record I would like to clarify is that, while you all created those options over there, and I know we worked with you to identify some of the high-profile areas, but that was actually still an industry proposal, and so I'm not sure -- I just wanted to clarify it for the record, because we have it as it's a staff proposal, and it's not. That is still an industry proposal.

MS. SOLORZANO: We thank you all for listening to us and giving us this time, for sure.

MR. PUGLIESE: Jocelyn or Mike, do you have any other additional comments or thoughts?

MR. MERRIFIELD: Regarding this?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes.

MR. MERRIFIELD: No.

MS. KARAZSIA: No, and, I mean, I just wanted to thank everybody for sharing their perspectives today, and I know we all prefer these peer-to-peer conversations that we have on a more daily basis, and this more formal setting and the technology can present challenges, but we do value everybody's input, and thank you for listening to us today.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: I appreciate it, and I hope that I didn't come off as a hard-head. I do appreciate everything you all are doing, and we really do, and I just wish we could all work in agreement, but I appreciate you all listening to us and taking the time, and I hope you all eat seafood, and I hope you all enjoy it. I'm still working hard for it.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Thanks, Jason. Thank you, Jocelyn and the Coral AP. I appreciate the input and the discussion, and we should -- We will see how it goes from here, and this is the second time we've done this, and so --

MS. SOLORZANO: I think it's like the seventy-fifth time we've done this, and we always lose.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Are we done with that portion of the agenda?

MR. PUGLIESE: Yes. Jocelyn, any other thoughts or comments? If not, we can move into Other Business, if there is any.

MS. KARAZSIA: Yes, I'm okay with moving to Other Business. If you need a motion to do so, I will offer one.

MR. PUGLIESE: No, and I think that's fine.

MS. SOLORZANO: So are we done?

MR. PUGLIESE: I think Mike had one issue. He just wanted, for the record, to raise something that's in the back of --

MR. MERRIFIELD: For the record, I just wanted to bring up one Other Business item, and that is the operator cards in this rock shrimp fishery, and there's been some interest from NOAA to eliminate operator cards, and we just wanted to go on record, from the industry, to say that we support operator cards.

MS. SOLORZANO: Yes, we do.

MR. MERRIFIELD: For their original intent and that it --

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Yes, I definitely support it.

MR. MERRIFIELD: The violations go to the operator of the vessel with an operator card, and it carries a history of that person's actions and/or violations or whatever, and we think that it's a good thing. That's all.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Yes, I agree with you, Mike, on that. I agree with you 100 percent.

MR. MERRIFIELD: I just wanted to get that on the record.

MS. SOLORZANO: Thank you.

MR. MERRIFIELD: That's all the Other Business that I have. Anything else from the Deepwater Shrimp?

MS. SOLORZANO: No, and I think that pretty much sums it up for today, in my -- Damien just left. He had to go pick his children up from school earlier, and so he was here for most of this meeting, except when we finally got to talk.

MR. PUGLIESE: I appreciate all the efforts from both the Deepwater Shrimp and the Coral Advisory Panels and bearing with walking through a lot of the trying to crosswalk between some of the technologies and to be able to at least get as much information on the table, so people could advance the discussion, and I think there was a lot of good input for the council, and we do have a number of council members that have been listening in, and so a lot of the detail is available already.

MS. SOLORZANO: All right, everybody. Have a great week. Happy Thanksgiving, you all.

AP MEMBER: Thank you. You too.

MR. J. VOGELSONG: Don't forget to eat wild-caught shrimp.

MS. SOLORZANO: I bet they all do. I'm sure of it.

MR. MERRIFIELD: Thanks, everybody.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on November 10, 2020.)

- - -

Transcribed By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thompson
November 29, 2020

Attendee Report: Coral AP & Deep Water Shrimp AP Meeting

Report Generated:

11/12/2020 07:59 AM EST

Webinar ID	Actual Start Date/Time
922-492-723	11/10/2020 12:17 PM EST

Last Name	First Name
Bell	00Mel
Brooke	Sandra
Brouwer	01Myra
Burgess	Erika
Chaya	01Cindy
Cheuvront	01Brian
Clarke	Lora
DeVictor	Rick
Feddern	Henry
Fogarty	Nicole
Foss	Kristin
Gilliam	David
Helies	Frank
Hourigan	Thomas
Iverson	Kim
Johnson	Alison
Jones	Nancy
Karazsia	Jocelyn
Klasnick	01Kelly
McGovern	Jack
Merrifield	Mike
Miller	Nicole
Nedimyer	Ken
O'Donnell	Kelli
Poland	00Stephen
Puglise	Kimberly
Rhodes	01Cameron
Schmidtke	01Michael
Schopmeyer	Stephanie
Solorzano	Marilyn
Thompson	Laurilee
Udouj	Tina
Voss	Joshua
Wiegand	01Christina
Williams	John
collier	chip

vogelsong jason