

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

HABITAT PROTECTION & ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Webinar

September 16, 2021

TRANSCRIPT

Committee Members

Steve Poland, Chair
Mel Bell
Chis Conklin
Judy Helmey
Jessica McCawley
Spud Woodward

Dr. Carolyn Belcher, Vice Chair
Chester Brewer
Tim Griner
Kerry Marhefka
Tom Roller

Council Members

Lt Robert Copeland
Laurilee Thompson

Andy Strelcheck

Council Staff

Myra Brower
John Carmichael
Dr. Chip Collier
John Hadley
Allie Iberle
Kelly Klasnick
Roger Pugliese
Dr. Mike Schmidtke
Suzanna Thomas

Julia Byrd
Cindy Chaya
Dr. Judd Curtis
Kathleen Howington
Kim Iverson
Dr. Julie Neer
Cameron Rhodes
Nick Smillie
Christina Wiegand

Attendees and Invited Participants

Rick DeVictor
Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Genny Nessler
Dr. Clay Porch

Dewey Hemilright
Trish Murphey
LT Pat O'Shaughnessy
Monica Smit-Brunello

Other attendees and invited participants attached.

The Habitat Protection & Ecosystem-Based Management Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on Thursday, September 16, 2021, and was called to order by Chairman Steve Poland.

MR. POLAND: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome back from lunch. I will call the Habitat Protection and Ecosystem-Based Management Committee to order. The first item of business is Approval of the Agenda. Are there any modifications or additions or deletions to the agenda? Hearing and seeing none, the agenda stands approved.

Next, we'll move to Approval of the June 2021 Committee Minutes. Are there any modifications, additions, or deletions to the committee minutes? Hearing or seeing none, the committee minutes stand approved. I am going to turn it over to Roger to walk us through Coral Amendment 10. Monica, while Roger gets that up, I know you have something you wanted to discuss with the committee, and so go ahead.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Thank you. I wanted to do this before you got into your discussion for Coral Amendment 10, so it wasn't disruptive, and so I really would like to advise you on a question that came up regarding a specific council member's ability to vote on the final action for Coral Amendment 10, and a recusal determination, and that's what we call these investigations, sort of, looking into the regs, doesn't come up very often for this council, and so I would like to give you kind of a brief summary of what is required under the Magnuson Act and then the Fisheries Service implementing regs.

Under the Magnuson Act, it's Section 302(j), and council members, certain council members, and I will get into the specifics, are required to disclose financial interest, and, in certain situations, they are not legally required to vote on an action. Kind of the bottom-line shorthand is that no affected individual may vote on any council decision that would have a significant and predictable effect on a financial interest disclosed in his or her financial disclosure report, and so what does that mean?

The Act requires that an affected individual who -- Actually, that means -- An affected individual, in this circumstance, is a council member who is nominated by the governor of a state and appointed to the council by the Secretary of Commerce. Those council members are required to disclose financial interests, and they do it annually, or update as needed, and shall not vote on a council decision which would have a significant and predictable effect on the individual's financial interest.

A council decision, in this case, is something like Coral Amendment 10, which is an approval of an FMP amendment. It also can cover finding that an emergency exists involving any fishery and comments to the Secretary on FMPs or amendments developed by the Secretary, such as HMS, but it does not include a vote in the committee portion of the council meeting by that council member.

What does a financial interest mean? Financial interest concerns interest in harvesting, processing, lobbying, advocacy, or marketing, and those are specifically described and specified in the

Magnuson Act. These, I guess, five things, harvesting, processing, lobbying, advocacy, or marketing, must be reported on the council member's financial disclosure report, and I believe that's actually probably called a statement of financial interest, but, anyway, not all of those financial interests that are required to be disclosed are financial interests that could trigger a recusal from voting.

The criteria for recusal are limited to these affected individuals, those specific council members, whose financial interests are directly linked to harvesting, processing, lobbying, advocacy, or marketing, and, if you'll remember, I said it's a significant and predictable effect on a financial interest, and so what does that mean?

That means that a council decision will be considered to have a significant and predictable effect on a financial interest if there is a close causal link between the decision and an expected and substantially disproportionate benefit to that council member's financial interest in harvesting, processing, lobbying, advocacy, or marketing, or that council member's spouse, minor child, partner, or any organization, other than the council, in which that individual is serving as an officer, director, trustee, partner, or employee, and this is all relative to the financial interests of the other participants in that same gear type or sector of the fishery.

What is an expected and substantially disproportionate benefit? That means a positive or negative impact with regard to a council decision that is likely to affect a fishery or a sector of the fishery in which that affected individual, that council member, has a significant financial interest, as indicated by a greater than 10 percent in the total harvest of the fishery, or sector of the fishery, affected by the council decision or a greater than 10 percent interest in the marketing or processing of the total harvest of the fishery, or sector of the fishery, affected by the council decision or a full or partial ownership of more than 10 percent of the vessels using the same gear type within the fishery, or sector of the fishery, affected by the council decision. If the council member is recused, they could still participate in the council committee deliberations, and may state for the record how she or he would have voted.

In this specific case, and I have talked with Council Member Laurilee Thompson about this, and we both suggested that I should address this on the record, but she owns a restaurant, or portion of a restaurant, that serves a lot of rock shrimp, and, if approved, Coral Amendment 10 would allow an additional area for the harvest of rock shrimp, but, after reviewing Ms. Thompson's financial disclosure report, and analyzing it under the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and the Fisheries Service's regulations on that matter, there are no legal reasons for recusal, and so Ms. Thompson is not recused, and she is legally allowed to vote on Coral Amendment 10. Thank you for your time, and I appreciate it.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Monica. I don't see any hands for any questions, and so we'll turn it back over to you, Roger, to start to walk us through Amendment 10.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay. Good afternoon, and what you've been provided pertaining to Coral Amendment 10 were three attachments. A1a is the decision document, the full revised draft amendment, and A1b, and then, in the late materials folder, the codified text under A1c. What I'm going to go through is the decision document for the establishment of the shrimp fishery access area along the northern extension of the HAPC.

That is what Amendment 10 of the Fishery Management for the Coral Reef, Coral Reefs, and Live Hardbottom Habitats of the region proposes to establish, is a shrimp fishery access area along the eastern boundary of the northern extension. The document you have before you provides the foundation from the original action taken in Coral Amendment 8 was to expand and create a northern extension of the HAPC and western extension of the existing, which resulted in an overall approximately 634 square miles of a new expanded Oculina HAPC that you see represented in Figure 2.

For today's meeting, let me -- The objectives for today's meeting are to review and potentially approve the revised purpose and need, to look at and review the Coral Amendment 10 and consider recommendation for approval for formal review, and that's reflected under the amendment timing. Let me -- Before we jump into the purpose and need, I want to touch on what the changes are relative to the overall amendment since the June council meeting, and there are some minor edits that you'll see under the purpose and need that were provided by IPT members, and we'll review those in a minute.

Additionally, the description of the history was expanded, and it includes some of the past council discussions. The coordinates on the tables are verified to be compatible with the codified text developed. We are going to update some of the applicable figures to track the same formats, and I think we have degrees, minutes, seconds, and, ultimately, they're going to go into the rule, and so that will just be some cleanup on that.

Biological effects were updated to further describe potential direct and indirect impacts from the action, most notably effects from potential sedimentation, and, also, additional information related to optimum yield of the rock shrimp fishery portion of the shrimp fishery was included and information on monitoring, compliance, and enforcement, specifically the existing VMS requirements applying to any allowable fishing within the shrimp fishery access area.

In addition, summaries of additional public comments received during the June 2020 meeting to-date are provided, as well as a regulatory impact review, reg flex analysis, and the fishery impact statement. What I will do is bring us back to the first discussion, which was with regard to the revisions to the purpose and need.

As stated, and you can see the highlighted areas, where some wording was added to the existing both purpose and need, and so the existing purpose now is the purpose of the Coral Amendment 10 is to consider establishing a shrimp fishery access area along the eastern edge of the northern extension of the Oculina Bank Habitat Area of Particular Concern where the fishermen who have a valid limited access commercial vessel permit for the rock shrimp South Atlantic Exclusive Economic Zone would be able to fish for and possess rock shrimp.

The need for the action, the need for Coral Amendment 10, is to help achieve optimum yield in the South Atlantic rock shrimp portion of the shrimp fishery and increase the economic and social benefits to rock shrimp fishermen by increasing access to historic rock shrimp fishing grounds while maintaining protection of the Oculina deepwater coral ecosystems. That is brought forward for consideration by the committee, and a draft action is provided.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Roger. So, if there's no comments or concerns about the modified purpose and need statement, I would be looking for a motion to approve the revised purpose and need. Mel.

MR. BELL: **Steve, I move to approve the revised purpose and need statements in Coral Amendment 10.**

MR. POLAND: We have a motion by Mel. Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: I was going to second it.

MR. POLAND: We have a second by Carolyn. Is there any discussion on the motion? **Is there any opposition to the motion? Hearing and seeing none, the motion stands approved.** I will hand it back to you, Roger.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay. Moving on, I noted the changes in the amendment, and I would like to highlight one wording change in the preferred alternative, and that was just to add in the word "vessel", and so the Preferred Alternative 2 is to establish a shrimp fishery access area that is twenty-two square miles along the eastern edge of the northern extension of the Oculina Bank Habitat Area of Particular Concern. Allow a shrimp vessel with a valid limited access commercial vessel permit for rock shrimp (South Atlantic Exclusive Economic Zone) to bottom trawl for rock shrimp within the established area bounded by the following coordinates. As I noted, these are going to be transferred into degrees, minutes, seconds, to track the codified text, and that's the same with Alternative 2. It's just adding in the wording for "vessel".

The preferred alternative, as noted, will establish a twenty-two-square-mile area, and it has a boundary that essentially ranges from about ninety-two to ninety-five meters, and the outside boundary -- That would be the inside western boundary, and the outside boundary is the boundary of the existing HAPC, which is about ninety-eight meters in depth. The difference between that and the Alternative 3 is that the inside boundary goes into about eighty-eight or ninety meters, versus the ninety-five.

Now, I would like to touch on some specific explanation of Table 1, and with regard to specifically the VMS. As we know, the vessel monitoring system is required in the fishery, to fish for deepwater rock shrimp, and the VMS is the source of our information for understanding operations, and, as a proxy for fishing, what we've used in the past, and in this table, was vessels -- This was actually provided through coordination with the industry, but vessels operating between two and four knots is the proxy for fishing activity.

Prior to 2014, the area was closed to harvest for rock shrimp, and the eastern boundary is what we're focusing this discussion on today. Rock shrimp fishing inside the eastern boundary accounted for about 1.76 percent of all fishing points between 2003 and 2014, and about 2.2 percent of the points during 2013, and then what we do have, and this is where some of this came up, is an increase up to 8.5 percent of the points in 2014, based on historic trawling operations.

That's the table that I was representing in terms of -- This is what was provided when we analyzed and reviewed this back actually in 2015, advancing the council discussion on development of the amendment. One thing to note in this discussion is that part of Coral Amendment 8 included a

requirement that, when a vessel was in the Oculina HAPC, that there was a requirement of a ping rate of one ping per five minutes, which is different than the thirty minutes that exists in the overall general fishery, and so that was something that will be -- That still stays in place whenever a vessel is within the boundaries of the HAPC.

Just running through -- These have been presented in the past, showing the widths and the comparison between Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, showing the widths in Preferred Alternative 2 ranging from 183 meters to 692 meters, and Alternative 3 is between 1,035 meters and 430. In addition, some comparison showing the overlap, or the area that was excluded by moving further out away from the habitats on the inshore areas.

Now, when we look at Figure 6, that shows the VMS points within the overall northern extension of the HAPC, and what I did want to do was distribute it, and this was provided -- We generated some new maps, just to give you a better image of kind of the footprint of the overall fishery, and these will be integrated into the final document, and these are high-resolution JPEGs, and so you can actually zoom in, and what I just wanted to show is the close association of the entire fishery and that edge boundary, and so what you can see -- It also gives you a clear indication of the high-resolution mapping that was done in 2011 and the mapping that was done in 2017.

As you move through here a little bit more, you get a better indication of how tightly packed the fishery operates along that boundary edge, and that's the northern section, and let me jump to the southern. Again, it's packed right along the area, and, obviously, you can see the high-relief habitats. Even though this is mapped, you can see some of the other areas along that edge, but, again, that fishery is operating right along that boundary edge, and it doesn't go real far beyond the overall area.

Now, I will reiterate that these are all VMS points, but it does give you at least an understanding of how the fishery is operating there, and you can actually even see the different tiers, and this is rock shrimp tier, rock shrimp inshore of the areas, and, actually, when you look even further out, this is actually the royal red shrimp fishery. There's a pretty distinct difference between the operating fisheries, and so I just wanted to highlight that those are prepared, and we'll integrate those into the system.

Now, what I wanted to do is walk through the overall effects and highlight some of the modifications. The biological effects, not establishing a shrimp fishery access area would have no negative biological effects, impacts. Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 could result in negative direct and indirect biological impacts to the deepwater coral habitat within the proposed shrimp fishery access areas, as they would allow intermittent bottom trawling for rock shrimp.

Habitat mapping for the proposed area shows only low-relief bottom, with no high-relief habitat in either Preferred Alternative 2 or Alternative 3. Although no recent visual surveys have been conducted, it is possible that low-relief hardbottom, coral rubble, and coral recruits on hardbottom and rubble are possibly present in that area.

Given the narrow width of the proposed shrimp fishery access area, we created the split images, and, as you saw, that's how I tracked that into the VMS information too, to show that same type of zoom-in effect, so that you could actually see it. When you do look at the areas, I do highlight some of the width differences, and I have already noted those here. Direct biological impacts from

bottom-tending gear on coral habitat, as a result of Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, are known through positive habitat mapping and habitat characterization available in the area. No high-relief habitat bottom was mapped in the area, and rock shrimp occurrence and fishing in the area is variable.

Fishermen are expected to target rock shrimp in the areas where previously captured, and, thus, already impacted from years of previous trawling on low-relief bottom, and any recovery of those ecosystem services that occurred since the last trawling event could be lost. With no visual surveys having been conducted, it is not possible to know if the low-relief coral colonies susceptible to trawling are located within the proposed shrimp fishery access area.

Indirect effects on coral could result through influx of suspended benthic sediments created while trawling on the bottom. Increased sedimentation can cause smothering or burial of coral polyps, shading, tissue necrosis, population explosion of bacteria in coral mucus, and, in general, reduces recruitment, survival, and sediment of coral larvae.

Fine sediments can have a greater effect on corals than coarse sediments, and the coral experts, or the members of the Coral Advisory Panel and the Habitat Ecosystem Advisory Panel, indicated that potentially establishing a protective, possibly thousand-meter, buffer between the known coral habitat and the fishing grounds would be prudent, to prevent adverse impacts on coral colonies. However, research has not established exactly what the optimal buffer should be. Active dredging operations found sediment particles can travel and impact coral over 700 meters.

The spatial extent of impacts from dredging can be variable, and, in the severe case, water quality impacts have been detected up to twenty kilometers away from the dredging activities when oceanographic features included unidirectional flow during a project, and that's specific to active dredging. Depending on the direction and magnitude of water currents in the affected area, shrimp trawls could create similar sediment plumes during fishing operations. Potential negative impacts to the affected environment relative to Alternative 1 would be the greatest under Alternative 3, the largest proposed allowable area, followed by Preferred Alternative 2. These are just the original images, split images, showing the habitats and the distributions north and south of Alternative 2, as well as 3, and there is no change in the previous areas.

I would like to get to the economic effects. Not establishing a shrimp fishery access area would continue to disallow additional fishing access to rock shrimp vessels within the northern extension of the HAPC and would result in no change in economic benefits. Not establishing a shrimp fishery access area would result in foregone landings of rock shrimp, and, thus, foregone economic benefits associated with these landings compared to the Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3.

Preferred Alternative 2 would result in net economic benefits, by potentially increasing landings of rock shrimp through access to an approximately twenty-two-square-mile area. The use of this area would likely vary from year to year. However, participants in the fishery have indicated that rock shrimp have historically been caught in the proposed area and will migrate into the area at times.

Increases in catches of rock shrimp would be expected to increase direct net economic benefits. Given the likely variability in the use of the area, as well as the exhibited variability in the overall participation in the regional rock shrimp fishery, these economic effects cannot be quantified. The

economic effects of Alternative 3 would likely be similar to those of Preferred Alternative 2, but the economic benefits under Alternative 3 would be higher, since the alternative would allow access to an additional ten square miles of fishing grounds.

The economic benefits for the commercial rock shrimp vessels would be higher under Alternative 3, followed by Alternative 2, and then not establishing a shrimp fishery access area, Alternative 1. The economic effects on the individual vessel owners cannot be determined with available models from the Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, and it would depend on each vessel's owner's profit maximization strategy, their dependence on the rock shrimp and seasonal fishing behavior, and their propensity to fish for rock shrimp in the new area, compared to the existing open areas.

On average, nineteen vessels with valid limited access commercial vessel permits for rock shrimp harvest rock shrimp in the South Atlantic annually from 2015 through 2019, and there is a table included under the economic information that follows. Rock shrimp dealers are indirectly affected, with increases in gross revenues expected to indirectly benefit dealers. On average, eight dealers purchase rock shrimp in the South Atlantic annually, from 2015 through 2019.

Participation in the rock shrimp fishery by vessels with the rock shrimp limited access permits was highly variable from 2015 through 2019, ranging from a high of twenty-six vessels in 2017 to a low of twelve vessels in 2018. Thus, only 12 to 25 percent of the vessels with rock shrimp limited access permits have been active in the fishery in recent years. Further, the average number of vessels, which is nineteen, is considerably below the average number of vessels between 2003 and 2007, which was approximately 126, and the maximum number, which was 150.

The table provided lays out -- Now, as always, this is a coordinated effort between all of the IPT members, and the economists provided input on this, and social scientists have, and so the team put this entire document together, and this is what has been added in pertaining to landings and revenue statistics for active vessels with the South Atlantic rock shrimp limited access permits, and it breaks out, specifically, information relative to the reliance on rock shrimp for the South Atlantic in landings.

That moves us into the social effects. Not establishing a shrimp fishery access area would likely result in minimum social effects, because the fleet is already harvesting in open areas and prohibited from working in the closed areas. Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 directly address stakeholder concerns regarding access to historically-important fishing grounds and may improve the stakeholders' perceptions of the management process. Preferred Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 are expected to have greater social benefit than Alternative 1, no action. As such, Preferred Alternative 2, the most recent recommendation by the South Atlantic Council's Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel, is expected to have the greatest social benefit, followed by Alternative 3, and not establishing a -- Then by not establishing a shrimp fishery access area.

What follows are the recommendations that were provided from the Deepwater Shrimp Advisory Panel, the Coral Advisory Panel, and the Habitat and Ecosystem Advisory Panel, as well as the summarization of impacts from hearings and the most recent addition, as I mentioned previously, were the additional comments provided during the council meeting, the June 2021 council meeting, and beyond, and, also, the link to those, the Wufoo form, directly.

In addition to that, the links to the Wufoo form for this meeting, for the September council meeting, was provided to members, as well as the ability to listen-in on the public comments that were provided specific to this amendment in the public input session that was held last night, and those constituted the information provided to the council, public input and recommendations. In addition, any comments that were received via email since the June -- That followed from the June council meeting, those were provided to members directly and are loaded into the coral comments folder within the Habitat and Ecosystem folder online.

That brings us to initial information on a draft council rationale for the amendment. The council did recommend moving response in response, partially, of the Presidential Executive Order 13921 on seafood competitiveness and economic growth. Some council members viewed the action as a technical correction to establishment of the eastern boundary of the northern extension of the HAPC, because the information on economic impact and value in various years was discussed late in the development of the coral amendment.

Council members, during the June 2014 meeting, determined that, after hearing from the industry, the monetary value of the shrimp fishery in the proposed shrimp fishery access area was greater than they thought it was, and rock shrimpers worked through the AP chair and verified that they had been using the area, and they claimed that the highest amount of revenue from shrimping in the particular area was the year before, in 2013, and the year of the effective date of the regulations that implemented the closure of 2014.

In addition, Coral Amendment 10 will help achieve optimum yield in the South Atlantic rock shrimp portion of the shrimp fishery and increase economic and social benefits to the rock shrimp fishermen, by increasing access to the historic rock shrimp grounds, while maintaining protection of the *Oculina* deepwater coral ecosystems. Trawling would likely occur where rock shrimp were previously caught, in low-relief bottom already impacted by past rock shrimp activities, and fishing effort in the area, as established through the analysis of VMS data, was historically low, and the economic impact is not expected to be large.

That provides -- Now, those are just initial information, and this is the opportunity for the council committee members to discuss the overall rationale and refine and add and expand the rationale for the action, and so that brings us to the council -- A draft on review and rationale and modify, as appropriate. With that, I will pass it back to Steve.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Roger. Can you scroll up just a little bit, to capture all of the rationale on the screen? Thank you. All right. Laurilee, go ahead.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. If you all don't mind, I would like to take a few minutes of your time and kind of go through a history of the fishery and give my view of how we ended up where we are. The first thing I want to do is to thank Roger and the team. You have done a really, really nice job preparing this decision document, and as well as working with Mike Merrifield and the industry years ago, during Coral Amendment 8. Your patience was very much appreciated, and your expertise, in putting together all the VMS documents and everything, and it's very, very well appreciated.

Some of you may not know a whole lot about the rock shrimp industry, and it was basically started around my mother's kitchen table in the late 1960s. At that time, there was boats fishing out of

Port Canaveral, and they were night fishing for brown shrimp, which were also found where the rock shrimp were, and the rock shrimp were found where the calico scallops were, and so you had this fishery on brown shrimp, and you had boats that were catching tens of thousands of pounds of rock shrimp every night, and they were shoveling them over the side and picking out like 300 or 400 pounds of brown shrimp.

My dad thought that was horribly wasteful, and he spent a lot of time sending rock shrimp to the New York fish market, Fulton Fish Market, and then getting a bill from the trucks that had to take them to the dump. There literally was no market for rock shrimp, because you couldn't get into them to get to the meat. They're called rock shrimp for a reason.

Actually, it was me that figured out one year, and I think it was about 1967, that you could take a knife and split open the rock shrimp, and the shrimp tastes like lobster, and you can broil it like a lobster, and the result was pretty good, and so that is how we ended up, every day after school, processing rock shrimp in Mom's kitchen, and the first rock shrimp that were sold were sold in bars and grills up and down the Indian River Lagoon, because that was the first place we tested them.

We maintained a small fishery for ten years out of Port Canaveral, and we had about a half-dozen boats that fished for us, and one family, Captain Sam Vona, and then his sons and step-son and a few other boats, and we processed about ten million pounds of rock shrimp for ten years, and then the market changed when two brothers, very creative, modified a Laitram peeling machine by putting larger diameter rollers on it with heavier-duty sandpaper, and they were able to mechanically peel and de-vein rock shrimp.

That's when the floodgates opened, because now the mechanization of the rock shrimp industry - - All of the processing we did was all done by hand, and so now you've got mechanization of the industry, and the Gulf peelers entered the market, and they all modified their Laitram during rock shrimp season, so that they could peel the rock shrimp, because they could buy them from the boats, and they were initially buying them for like twenty-six-cents a pound, and they were underselling the P&D penaeid shrimp market by leaps and bounds, because they could buy the rock shrimp so cheap, and dozens of monster boats from the Gulf came over and basically invaded our little family operation. The rock shrimp landings skyrocketed. I mean, you want to talk about overcapitalization, and we went from a half-dozen boats to 150 boats in just a few years.

In the meantime, the calico scallopers were wiping out the scallop beds, and they had wiped out everything from the Carolinas, and they had worked their way down towards us, and they had taken out all the scallop beds in the process, and none of those beds have come back, by the way, and so they got to the scallop bonanza off of Cape Canaveral, and they set up camp there at Port Canaveral, and so you had -- In addition to all these rock shrimp boats, you also had over a hundred scallop boats working too, at the same time.

They were dragging up the bottom, and everybody was working inside the Oculina reef, and the scallopers were vacuuming up the bottom and bringing it to shore, and they weren't allowed to take the shells back out, which would have made sense, because they ended up dragging up like ten feet of depth of the bottom, and it's now dirt roads here in Brevard County, and there was nothing for the calico scallop spat to cling onto when they bred, and so they pretty much destroyed the calico scallop beds.

That took out the rock shrimp habitat, and the last thing that happened before the calico scallopers completely annihilated themselves is they started banging into the Oculina reef with their scallop dredges, and I don't know if you all know what a scallop dredge looks like, but it looks like a bulldozer blade with a tail bag tied to the back of it, and so they were able to -- The Oculina is a very fragile, dainty coral, and they went into the reef, and they dragged trails alongside the pinnacles, and they called them the goat trails, and then the Gulf shrimpers didn't have the respect for the reef that the east coast shrimpers did, and they followed the scallopers into the reef.

I, at the time, was longlining in the Gulf of Mexico, but, when I realized what was going on, I was horrified, and I told my dad, and I said, you've got to do something. You know, if you want to have rock shrimp to sell at your restaurant in the future, you need to stop the boats from going in the reefs, and so Dad started working with the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council staff, working to establish the original Oculina HAPC, and work on putting the brakes on the number of boats that were in the fishery, because, like I said, we had gone from a half-a-dozen boats to more than 150.

The rock shrimp industry, they weren't happy with this concept of establishing a place where they couldn't fish, and they didn't like not being told where they couldn't fish, but Dad and the council staff persevered, and, in 1984, the very first deepwater MPA in the United States was established, with the original Oculina Habitat Area of Particular Concern, and then the requirement for a rock shrimp boat to have a permit, and that was the first limited access permit program in the South Atlantic, and so the fishery is pretty historic, you know, for setting precedents.

When the coordinates came out, finally came out, for the HAPC, the rock shrimpers felt betrayed, because most of the coral on the northern end wasn't even included in the HAPC. It missed the coral. Instead, the entire roll-down on the offshore side of the area where they fish, all the way from Fort Pierce to Cape Canaveral, was taken away from them, and this is bottom that had zero coral on it, none, and the only coral that was included in the northern end of the HAPC was that that was contained in two satellite areas, and these were little tiny areas that extended to the west.

They actually had coral in them, and I sent an email, a couple of nights ago, that had some diagrams in it, and I don't know if you all had a chance to look at them, but you can see, in these diagrams, where the coral is, where the rock shrimpers were working on the offshore side of it, and that's the yellow lines, and you can see how much bottom -- There's sixty miles of bottom that they had been working that were instantaneously taken out in that establishment of the 1984 HAPC.

Then there's also another map that shows the entire HAPC now, with the northern extension and the original HAPC, and you can see -- I have red magic-marker lines that show where the boats were fishing, and so you've got to look too at the way that the bottom contour works. The roll-down is wider on the southern end of the HAPC, and so the original HAPC, south of Cape Canaveral, had a wider area where the rock shrimp boats could fish when the rock shrimp moved over to the offshore side, and that's another thing that we need to talk about too, is what the rock shrimp do.

They typically -- It's different every year, but they typically start out on the inshore side of the reef, and they putter around there on the inshore side of the reef for a few months, and I think what happens -- I mean, we really don't know a whole lot about the rock shrimp industry, but what

happens in our area is the Gulf Stream shifts closer to shore in the fall, and that's why we get the king tides. It pushes the water level up when the stream moves closer to shore.

During the beginning of the rock shrimp season, in the early fall, the shrimp are on the inshore side of the Oculina reef, and, when the Gulf stream kind of shifts further offshore, the shrimp follow it, and so, during the last half of the season, the shrimp are on the offshore side of the reef and not the inshore. They move over, and they start trailing off down the offshore side of the reef.

As you go north from Cape Canaveral, that offshore side of the reef, where the boats were fishing, it gets narrower and narrower the further north you go, and so, the further north you go, the smaller the area where they're able to shrimp becomes, and so that's another thing that happens, and so we got this thing established, and, meanwhile, the scallopers are doing their damage, and the scallop industry collapsed. The habitat destruction, combined with the loss of the offshore roll-down, caused the rock shrimp landings to plummet, and we lost some of the Gulf boats then.

Then, in 2003, VMS became a requirement for the rock shrimp vessels, and they weren't real happy about that, because VMS is expensive, and monitoring and paying for the pings is expensive, and the specter of always being watched by the government didn't sit real well with the industry, but they were told that, if they put VMS on their boats, that would show where they were fishing, it would prove where they were fishing, and they wouldn't lose any more bottom if there were future expansions to the deepwater coral protection areas, and so, in 2003, we get the VMS.

Then Coral Amendment comes along to establish a northern expansion of the reef, and it also included a western expansion of the northern part of the original HAPC that finally included the coral areas in the southern part of the HAPC. We went along with that until we realized that some of that northern part, that offshore area, that can be very productive, or it can be zero, and it's different. Every year is different with the rock shrimp fishery, but, when we realized that the northern expansion was going to take out that southeast corner, where it is very valuable to the fishery in certain times, that's when we started working with Roger and trying to get the line changed before Coral Amendment 8 got passed.

That wasn't possible, and we were cooperative, and we were told that, if we would allow Coral Amendment -- That it would take two years if they had to go back and change everything, and so they said, if you just hold your horses, and give us an opportunity, and let's get Coral Amendment 8 passed, then we'll come back and re-adjust the line on that southeast corner. Well, here we are now, many years later, and that's what we're looking at. I don't know how much time I'm allowed to have, but I would like to go into responding to some of the corals of the Coral AP now, if that's okay, Mr. Chair.

MR. POLAND: I appreciate your comments, Laurilee, and we'll certainly get to them. I will let Chris speak, and then, once we go back and start debating the action, you can certainly go into those comments.

MS. THOMPSON: Thank you.

MR. POLAND: Thank you. Chris, go ahead.

MR. CONKLIN: I was just going to maybe put a motion up, so we could get some more discussion after the motion. Do you think that would be a little more appropriate?

MR. POLAND: Well, I wanted to ask the committee if they had any further comments or additions to the draft rationale, and, if not, then, yes, we can move back up to the amendment and entertain a motion. Chester.

MR. BREWER: I have a question.

MR. POLAND: Yes, sir.

MR. BREWER: We've got the area that's been identified as the, quote, pinnacles, which is the higher relief, and then we have the area that's been identified that would be -- If this passes, that it would be opened up to rock shrimping. I have had I don't know how many contacts about this, and the concern that a lot of people have raised is with regard to sediment. Roger, here is my question. How much of a buffer is there between the area that we're contemplating opening up and the, quote, pinnacles? What is the distance? Thank you.

MR. PUGLIESE: Chester, thanks. Just as a follow-up, I did provide all the background information on sedimentation that was requested. It kind of links into the discussion in the actual amendment, but let me scroll up to that question specifically. Let me scroll up to the areas, and I've got that actually in an image.

Actually, the wording right here is the approximate distance from the western boundary of Preferred Alternative 2 from the Oculina pinnacles mapped in 2011 is there is a number of different points, if you go to Figure 8 and 9, but they're between 750 meters on Point 5 and 700 meters west of Point 8 and 310 meters west of Point 2, and let me go to the figure that those correspond to. Those are the areas that I had identified.

MR. BREWER: Steve, if I might, a follow-up question.

MR. POLAND: Yes, a follow-up.

MR. BREWER: Do we have any solid information as to what the bottom consists of, and I know we know it's low relief, but, apparently, different types of sediment will drift different I guess you would say distances in the Gulf Stream, and, obviously, we all know that the Gulf Stream is flowing from the south to the north there, although there are times that you do get reverse flow and sideways flow, but do we have any idea of where we might expect the sediment plume, if we want to use the words that I have been hearing, how far that would extend from a rock shrimp trawl? I will be quiet after this.

MR. POLAND: Do we have any information to address that question, Roger?

MR. PUGLIESE: There isn't specific information on -- That's, I think, one of the issues on rock shrimp trawls themselves, and we did as much information on the operations and the way that the trawls operate, and, really, the information that was included was connecting it to discussions relative to dredging, and you're going to have to take that how you can, because direct dredging,

versus trawling, is somewhat different. However, that was some of the implications, to at least give an idea of what some of those implications may be.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Roger. All right. We've got a list going now. Carolyn, go ahead.

DR. BELCHER: Thank you, Chair. I just had two things that I was going to bring up, and one was relative to one of the comments that Roger had on page 14 that talked about the recommended buffer from the Habitat AP, and there is a paper, and I sent Roger the citation for it, and I apologize for not having read it, and I can't get a hard copy of it, but it was published in July of this year, that talks about the edge effect relative to MPAs, and that paper does in fact conclude that you should at least give a kilometer buffer around your MPA, and, again, kind of direct people there, if you want to look at that, because that does at least kind of at least give a little bit of empirical, or at least study, evidence of potential effects on especially areas of no fishing.

Then the other thing was I just wanted to ask the group, in the context of the Thirty-by-Thirty that we're dealing with from the federal government -- I know it's not a large area that we're talking about, as far as the twenty-two to thirty-two square miles, but, relative to not knowing what our directions are going to be under the Thirty-by-Thirty edict, is that something that we should be considerate of?

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Carolyn. I don't have the answer for the Thirty-by-Thirty question, and certainly others can weigh-in, if they want to. Tom, go ahead.

MR. ROLLER: Thank you, Steve. As a new council member, I have tried to learn as much about this fishery and amendment as possible, but kind of an open-ended question here. Is there any information on or concern about impacts to managed grouper or snapper species in this fishery?

MR. POLAND: Roger or staff?

MR. PUGLIESE: What has been highlighted in the past is, yes, there is extensive use of the interior. The information we have on -- This was included from the first iteration of even the options paper, but the work that was done in 2011 highlights all the different species that are using especially the high relief, but not only the high relief, but the areas associated with it to the west of this area, and so it's really associated with the pinnacles and then multiple pinnacles together, and they did ROV, and it did show numbers of different council-managed groupers and some other species within the snapper grouper complex that utilize those areas, and that's something that's been known in some of the rationale for discussions in the past, is the conservation of the overall area, and that's why the experimental closed area, in the southern portion, is actually a snapper grouper MPA.

Yes, they do utilize the area, and the discussion, in the more recent times, is the potential of either juveniles or other species working along the edge of those areas, and so that's where some of the discussion has occurred.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Roger, and I think Tom also asked about the fishery, and is there any information on interactions with the rock shrimp fishery and any of our other managed species, such as bycatch of snapper grouper?

MR. PUGLIESE: From the original work that was done, it was really limited, in terms of what -- There was a significant amount of bycatch, but it wasn't necessarily council-managed species. It was a lot of other species associated with some of the areas.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Roger. Andy, go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Steve. I wanted to kind of break this down into kind of three areas. I think, like many of you, I spent a tremendous amount of time between the last meeting and this meeting to understand more of the details of this topic and, in particular, the public comments that we came in were super helpful on all sides, and I found it very informative, obviously, to hear from the shrimp industry as well as the coral and habitat communities.

What we do know, obviously, is this is a historical area important to shrimpers, and, on the opposite side of the coin, we also know that *Oculina* is a very fragile, slow-growing species that provides important habitat for many of the other species that we manage in the South Atlantic.

I think one of the key questions that kind of still remains is is this area a suitable, viable habitat for *Oculina*, and, because of the many comments that were coming in, some of which were pointing towards our Science Center, and work that we had done in the *Oculina* Habitat Area, I reached out to Clay and team, and I spoke with some of the experts that work in this area, and there is a paucity of data and information with regard to the shrimp fishery access area, and so we just don't have eyes on the ground, so to speak, or eyes on the bottom, to really know what, at this point, kind of exists within this shrimp fishery access area.

That, to me, has been kind of troubling and problematic, because there is some data and information from the Deep-Sea Coral Program that does indicate that it could be suitable for *Oculina*, and, in fact, it's highly suitable for *Oculina* in certain areas of the shrimp access area that we're considering opening up.

The other two comments that I wanted to make regarded sedimentation and direct impacts to the reefs themselves. I think, with the direct impacts to reefs, I don't have strong concerns about that, and these are professionals that have been working in this area for quite some time, and they operate using VMS, and they know the area very well, and so I think those risks exist whether we're opening this area or not, because they're having to trawl around a closed area on a regular basis.

Then, with regard to sedimentation and what Chester had mentioned, this is a tough one, and I think it's more of kind of just a risk mitigation approach, where Carolyn mentioned, and the Coral AP mentioned, obviously, greater buffers would be potentially beneficial to reduce impacts, and we do know that, the finer the grain of sediment that is stirred up, and the stronger the currents, the farther that will travel, but the information that I have been able to obtain for this area indicates that the currents are highly variable in this area, and I think the granularity of the sediments, in particular, probably gets finer as you go farther away from the reef, and so it's really hard to know what impact that may or may not have on the *Oculina* reef.

With all that said, I think the biggest challenge I've had with making a recommendation on this is simply the lack of information that we have with regard to suitable *Oculina* habitat in that area and

knowing full well that the shrimp fishery did operate in this area successfully prior to the closure. Thanks.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Andy. I am going to jump to Clay, because I'm assuming that it will be to build on Andy's comments. Go ahead, Clay.

DR. PORCH: Sure. Thank you. Actually, Andy made a lot of the points that I was going to make. With regard to sediment dispersal, there have been some current meters placed in the vicinity, and, while the surface currents generally are pretty strong and northerly, it's not this strict laminar flow, unidirectional flow, especially near the bottom. We found that the currents are variable, and sometimes had fairly strong east-west components to it.

Perhaps more importantly, just listening to all the testimony and reading all the materials that we had, it's pretty clear the issue is not whether this area has been trawled before, or even if there is much coral there now, after, of course, some years of trawling, but the issue is whether it's good *Oculina* habitat, and, as far as I can see, from all the materials, the jury is still out on that, and there are some habitat models, as Andy alluded to, that suggest that parts of the area may be prime habitat, and, of course, you've heard some testimony from coral reef experts that suggest the same, but we don't actually have a survey of that area.

What we do know is, if there is coral there, it would be destroyed by trawling, and so we've thought about it quite a lot, and we would like to propose sort of a know-before-you-go strategy. We think it would be prudent to invest in a survey of the area and take some video and establish, once and for all, if this is a good *Oculina* habitat. I think, by this time next year, we could have that survey complete, and all the results from it, and you can make a more informed decision.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you for that, Clay. Laurilee, go ahead.

MS. THOMPSON: I think I can set your minds at ease on this buffer, and I appreciate Carolyn and her comment that a kilometer would be, perhaps, a suitable buffer for a HAPC, and, also, coming out of the Coral Committee, one of their bullets says that fishing less than a thousand meters from the coral habitat is too close. However, work has not been done to know exactly what the optimal distance could be. Then, further down, it says that members supported establishing a substantial buffer of possibly a hundred meters from the known habitat as an approach that would account for uncertainty, blah, blah, blah. Okay.

So, a couple of nights ago, Mr. Merrifield sent an email with a really nice drawing of a shrimp boat and the nets, the outriggers, where the nets are positioned, and we have talked extensively with the shrimp boat captains, and we have been told that there is no way that they are going to get any closer to the HAPC boundary than two-tenths of a mile, and they're putting in their own buffer, to ensure that there is not some kind of failure with the VMS or something that might cause them to ping inside the HAPC boundary, because it can be incredibly costly for them.

I mean, if they get inside the boundary at trawl speed, they are immediately instructed to go to the dock, and their fish hold is locked when they get to the dock, and their catch is auctioned off and sold, and then they have tremendous fines, and so they're not going to risk that happening. It could cost them hundreds of thousands of dollars, and so they are basically fishing two-tenths -- A minimum of two-tenths of a mile away from the HAPC boundary.

That two-tenths of a mile is 370 meters, and so the closest distance to the pinnacles in the proposed fishery access area is -- Let me find it here. It's 310 meters, I think. Yes. Point Number 2, the closest distance to the pinnacles, is 310 meters. If you take the 370 meters, and you take away the thirty-nine meters that is the distance from the outrigger to the -- I mean, the outside of the net to the center of the boat, which is where the VMS is, you end up with 331 meters.

When that shrimp boat is fishing two-tenths of a mile away from the HAPC boundary, it's 331 meters away from the edge of the boundary, and so, if you take that 331 meters, and you add it to the 310 meters at the very closest point to the pinnacles, you get 641 meters. Well, that's pretty darned close to 700 meters, and so you're almost at a 700-meter impact point at the closest place where the boundary is -- I'm sorry. To where the boundary is closest to the pinnacles.

If you add the 331 meters to the average distance away from the boundary that most of the points are, which is 700 meters, and you add the 331 meter-buffer that the shrimp boats that are imposing on themselves, and you are greater than the thousand meters recommended by the Coral AP and through this study that Carolyn just cited. You're at a thousand meters away from the Pinnacles, and so, if you shift the boundary a little bit to the west, and allow this very slender fishery access area to exist, those boats are still going to be fishing, other than at Point 2, which is like a weird place where one of the Pinnacles sticks out a little bit more to the east, you're at a thousand meters or greater away from the impacted area. Thank you.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Laurilee. Mel, go ahead.

MR. BELL: Well, when I originally raised my hand, Carolyn had, I thought, kind of asked a question about the Thirty-by-Thirty concept and all that we're dealing with, and my understanding, through some of the CCC discussions, is that it's still -- We still don't know how that's going to shake out, but, at first glance, I mean there's no assurance, quite honestly, that this entire area would be even considered for that, and so what we're talking about is potentially allowing twenty-two square miles of access out of the overall 634, I believe it was, which takes you -- It's about a 3 or 4 percent reduction, but the overall area, related to that Thirty-by-Thirty question, might not even be eligible for consideration, but, again, that is still to be determined, but that was just based on initial discussions.

Then Andy and Clay covered a number of other things regarding sediment transport, or particle suspension, and it's a factor of particle size and velocity, and so it depends, at that moment, what the velocity of the current is and what the exact bottom type is that you might be disturbing, and so the smaller particle sizes, obviously, will transport farther, but I did have a question, since Clay brought that up, about the possibility of actually getting some detailed survey information about there within a year.

We've been struggling for a while just trying to get our existing MPAs mapped, and realizing that resources like that, that are capable of that, are limited and have competing uses and things, and so, I mean, what is the actual likelihood of that, given that it's kind of been difficult for us to get things mapped that we already have, and have had for quite some time, and is that really a possibility, and how would that come about and become enough of a priority that we could do that?

MR. POLAND: Clay, to that point?

DR. PORCH: Thank you. I think this is different. One, it's a one-time deal and not a prolonged survey, and, two, there are some assets available, some ship time, that might not normally be available, just because some things feel through, and some things may be related to COVID delays. We had some folks look into it, and they put together a plan. It would cost somewhere in the vicinity of \$200,000 to do the survey, give or take, and so I think it's quite doable, and it's just a matter of scraping up the \$200,000 or \$230,000, or so to do it, and I would hope, between us, the Regional Office, and the council, we could do something like that, but I think that it's certainly quite doable, and, if the council wanted to go in that direction, we could explore it a little further and start putting the machinery in motion.

MR. BELL: A follow-up, Steve?

MR. POLAND: Go ahead, Mel.

MR. BELL: Are we talking like high-definition multibeam and ROV, or particularly ROV, and realizing that's smaller areas, but is that what we're talking about?

DR. PORCH: Certainly ROV, but I think we can do the high-definition multibeam work too, and I will check into that. I don't have the particular details open to us, but what we would need, most of all, is the ROV, just to establish if we've got ten-centimeter or so colonies of coral growing there in any abundance, because that would establish whether it's really good habitat or not.

MR. BELL: Right.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Mel. Thank you, Clay. Jessica, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: I was going to try to respond to the Thirty-by-Thirty comment, and I agree with everything that Mel said, that this area might not qualify anyway, and I was on a panel about Thirty-by-Thirty at ICAST recently, and the devil, of course, is in the details on Thirty-by-Thirty and how you count, but, at this point, they are still establishing baselines, and spoiler alert, but, depending on how you count, Florida might already be over the 30 percent already, and this area is off of the State of Florida, but it might not even qualify, and so, even within this area, Florida might be over the 30 percent.

Just to respond to that survey, when I heard Clay, just a second ago, talk about it, it sounded like they don't have all the money for this, and maybe they're going to be asking for funds from the council to pay for this survey, and I guess that -- I think the Executive Committee maybe starts looking at the budget in October, but, yes, this area has already been trawled in the past, and I feel like it takes many, many years in order for coral to grow back, and I don't know that you would see anything, but maybe you could find something that would indicate, but we're just talking about reopening an area that was previously trawled, that has the buffers, like we've discussed, that ranges from 310 to 750 meters.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Jessica. Chester.

MR. BREWER: Clay answered my question. I've been in the queue for a little while, but Clay answered my question. Thank you.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you. I see Clay has his hand up. Is that to respond to Jessica?

DR. PORCH: Yes. Thank you. I just want to say that we've done the calculations based on their growth rate, and we would expect, by now, even if all the coral had been trawled out, that there should be a fair number of colonies up to ten centimeters across, and so that's three-and-a-half inches or so, and so it would be visible on a ROV survey, and so, if it's good habitat, you should see a fair number of colonies like that. If you don't see any, even taking into account the fact that it had been trawled years ago, then maybe it's not such good habitat, and, of course, you would also see how many other fish and other organisms are out there, and, like I said, it would just give the council a little more information to work off of.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Clay. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: The first time I heard Clay float the idea of know-before-you-go, I liked it, because that is the only thing that I am struggling with. Andy really broke down sort of the three issues, the whether or not it's suitable habitat, whether or not there will be direct impacts and, of course, indirect impacts, and I do not believe there would be direct or indirect impacts that would outweigh letting these guys in this area.

I did have some thoughts about whether or not this is suitable habitat, and, initially, I liked the idea of sort of waiting and let's see what the survey is, but I want to play devil's advocate for a second, in that we promised -- Not we, and we weren't all here, but these people were promised this action seven years ago, and they built a lot of trust in us throughout the entire process of establishing the area, and I don't know what trust they would continue to have if we say, oh, just give us one more year, after we've said all of this, and so that gives me a lot of pause.

It gives me a lot of pause that we're just hearing about it now, and I have a lot of questions, as far as sort of who will determine exactly how much has to be there for it to be qualified as suitable habitat, what happens if we're still in a COVID situation next year, and so they can't do the cruise, and so then the fishermen are put off for another year, and I think the devil is in the details with this concept of know-before-you-go, and I just wanted to register that.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Kerry. Everyone has -- A lot of people have already spoke, and so I'm going to jump to Tim, since we haven't heard from him, and then I will come back to Laurilee and Chris, and so go ahead, Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I understand the know-before-you-go, but I think this is the perfect opportunity to go and then know. There is no survey, and we don't have any video presentation, and so this is a perfect time to do this research. We've got boats that are willing to go out there and do this, and they're shrimp boats, and so I think this is the perfect time to take advantage of the expertise that these captains in this industry have and obtain some data while we're out there shrimping, and so I don't really think that it's necessary to put this off any longer, and I think we can gather the data we need while we're doing this. If we then see that there's a problem, I trust these guys are professional enough that they would stop their own selves. Thank you.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Tim. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I just wanted to provide some comments about the reef itself that have come out of research. This is a quote from John Reed in 2007, and he says, during the 1980s and 1990s, bottom trawling within the Oculina system was the primary cause of major habitat destruction. However, I've got another quote from Mr. Reed in the 2006 report to the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council, in the Oculina Evaluation Team Workshop, and he says the exact causes of the extensive areas of dead coral rubble on modern deepwater coral reefs, including oculina and lophelia, is yet unknown. Extensive areas of dead coral on the Oculina reefs, as well as its lophelia counterparts, may be due to a combination of events, including the natural evolution of the mound, along with degradation through bioerosion, hydrodynamic stress from currents, and, in some regions, from dredging and trawling and trawling activities by fishermen and scientists. The scientists did a lot of trawling around in the 1970s, when they were doing research on the reef.

In the original Harbor Branch surveys of the Oculina Bank in 1975 through 1977, they found that there was more dead Oculina coral cover, which was 31 percent, than there was live Oculina cover, 19 percent. The only explanation for this data is that some force other than trawling has historically resulted in extensive Oculina die-offs, and that could be just the way the reef works.

While there may have been some damage from trawling, or damage attributed to trawling, the fact is that this is an extremely volatile environment that is impacted by numerous natural episodic episodes that impact the coral, as well as numerous other anthropogenic causes, such as, and we have pointed this out numerous times, the billions of gallons of gray water released every day by Dade, Broward, and Palm Beach Counties, and the moratorium on that dumping has been postponed, due to litigation, cruise ship dumping, and the Lake Okeechobee overflow releases through the St. Lucie River and into the Atlantic. This latter event created a brown algae bloom that suffocated the bottom and eliminated rock shrimp fishing south of the original HAPC for more than five years, and that most likely had a devastating impact on the Oculina corals inside the closed area.

I think that the damage that has been done to the reef -- I mean, you can go to the south end of the reef, and you don't even get any bycatch. The boats don't even fish down there anymore, because there is no point in fishing, and that was not done by trawling. That was done by sewage coming up from the south part of the state, and so the effort that we are putting on trying to stop a little handful of boats from fishing where they have fished for fifty years -- I think that \$200,000 would be much better spent trying to figure out how to stop the sewage from ruining our ocean, rather than trying to delay these boats.

We've been fishing there for fifty years. When they did the deepwater research dives in 2018, they saw plenty of live coral in the northern extension. If we had impacted that area from trawling in it for fifty years, there would have been a lot of dead coral, and our sediment would have smothered the coral. I think that this is just -- The money could be spent better somewhere else. Thank you.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Laurilee. Chris, go ahead.

MR. CONKLIN: Thanks. I know I'm not the chair, Mr. Chair, but so what do we do? Do we put the motion up and get a vote, or do we wait and like put this off and wait on a survey that may or may not ever get done? I also am wondering why it hasn't already been surveyed, if the Fisheries Service knew that this was coming up, you know, the we should have known before we voted kind of thing, with all due respect. I know it's been a tough couple of years here for all the agencies, but so what do we do? Do we put a motion up and vote, or do we wait, and, if it fails, are you still going to survey it or what? That's what I want to know.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Chris. It's the pleasure of the committee, and you're a committee member, and so, Roger, I will get you to scroll back up to the action and the alternatives, the committee action. Jessica, go ahead.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Thanks. I was going to go ahead and make the motion. **We already have selected a preferred here, and so I would move that we approve Amendment 10 to the Fishery Management for Coral, Coral Reefs, and Live Hardbottom Habitat of the South Atlantic for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate and give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document/codified text and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text.** I know that this would require a roll call vote when get to Full Council.

MR. POLAND: Yes, and so the motion is on the table by Jessica. Is there a second? Chester.

MR. CONKLIN: Second.

MR. BREWER: Actually, I had a question, and I was not raising my hand to second. I had a question before the motion was made.

MR. POLAND: Let's get the second. I think I heard Chris second it.

MR. BREWER: Yes, but I still have a question.

MR. POLAND: All right, and so back to you, Chester, for the question.

MR. BREWER: Okay. Thank you. Clay, this is directed to you. If this passes, would you all still be inclined to do the survey, or would you say, well, what the hell, they've opened it up, and why would we spend our money and resources there now?

DR. PORCH: Thank you for the question, Chester. We certainly would look into it as a priority. I think what we would also do is take advantage of observer coverage, and so, that way, we could see if the trawls are actively pulling up corals. There is a requirement for observer coverage anyway, and so I think we could take advantage of that, and that gets to a point that was raised earlier, and so, essentially, the shrimp vessels themselves, by virtue of trawling and potentially pulling up some *Oculina*, if they're there, would be doing a survey, but, yes, we would probably also try to do some sort of survey while the trawling is going on. Obviously, the priority would be a little bit higher if it was done in a way that was sort of know-before-you-go, since, once the fishery starts, if there are *Oculina* there, the damage would be done, but the bottom line is, yes, it would still be a priority, but just maybe not as high of a priority.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Chester, and thank you, Clay. Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: I just wanted to comment that we have offered to take the researchers out numerous times, for free.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Laurilee. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: That was a residual hand-raise.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Chris. Any more comments or discussion? We've had a very thorough discussion of the action, or the issue. Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: I am going to offer a substitute motion.

MR. POLAND: Go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: **The substitute would be the council moves to table action on Coral Amendment 10 for no longer than one year to allow the Southeast Fisheries Science Center to conduct necessary surveys within the proposed shrimp fishery access area.** If I get a second, I will explain the motion.

MR. POLAND: All right. Does your motion read correct on the board?

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Andy. Is there a second? Mel, is that a second?

MR. BELL: That was actually a hand, but I will second, for purposes of discussion.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you. The motion has a second. Go ahead, Mel.

MR. BELL: Thanks. Well, actually, it's -- So, my question would be -- Well, my question was, if -- Not with the substitute, but, if we actually moved on it and opened the area and conducted the survey, and also, as Clay has suggested, did the ride-alongs and all that sort of stuff, and the observation, and we found there was an issue, does SERO have the authority, through some sort of emergency action, to shut it down, or would we have it open until we dealt with it again through another plan amendment? Are there any mechanisms to, if we found there was what we might call a problem, are there any mechanisms available to remedy that quickly? That's my question, and that's more in the context of the original motion.

MR. STRELCHECK: Mel, Monica raised her hand, but I'm not thinking of anything kind of immediately, but Monica might have other thoughts with regard to authority that we might have.

MR. POLAND: Go ahead, Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Mel, if your question is, if the council opens this area up to rock shrimp trawling, and coral is pulled up, your question is, is there anything that can be done at that time to prevent access into that area? That's a question back to you, before I answer your question.

MR. BELL: Yes, that's what I was getting at, is just, if we follow the original motion, and we do open it up, and then we do conduct some sort of survey work and realize that that wasn't the greatest idea, if there a quick remedy to that, or would it be a matter of having to go through this process all over again?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I have thought about this a little bit and looked into what the current regs allow to be done, and I didn't find any kind of quick action authority in that situation. I guess what could happen is the information could get brought back to the council, and you could think about an emergency rule.

Certainly, depending on the information, it very well might meet the criteria and justification for an emergency rule, because it would be newly discovered information and those sorts of things, and so I -- In thinking about it, an emergency rule under the Magnuson Act is the one thing that pops into my mind. Again, would you -- You would have to wait for a council meeting, unless a special meeting was called, and those sorts of things.

MR. BELL: Okay. Well, thank you. That exists.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Monica, and I'm going to go back to Andy, because he requested to explain his motion, as the motion maker, and so go ahead, Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Steve, and so a couple of components. First of all, I don't have the benefit of the prior discussions back in 2013 and 2014 and comments and decisions made by my predecessor, Roy Crabtree, and so I am certainly getting up-to-speed on this issue, and I am sympathetic to all sides, and I think what really resonated with me is kind of the know-before-you-go mantra on this, and we might very well get out there and find nothing, which is the ideal situation, and we open up the whole area, and we might find something, and then we need to reconsider kind of how that alternative is structured, but I feel like that's an important component, and I think this council has shown the importance of protecting and valuing habitat and would find it important to, obviously, have that information in hand before making a decision.

I also wanted to tie it to a time requirement, because of concerns that people have expressed about, well, what happens if this doesn't get done, and so this puts the onus on the agency, the Regional Office, to make sure that it gets funded and that it's a priority for us and that we make this happen and are able to bring that information back to the council, and, although it is an impact to the shrimp industry by not opening for another year, to me, it's valuable information that will be important to, obviously, reach a decision on this and have that habitat, detailed habitat, mapping and ROV surveys within the shrimp access area. Thanks.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Andy. Tom, go ahead.

MR. ROLLER: No question. I just had my hand up because I was going to second it for discussion purposes. Thank you.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Tom. Chester.

MR. BREWER: Monica, I have a question, and I may already know the answer to it. If this area remains closed, albeit for just a year, if you were to want to go in there and do trawls and have observers, to see whether you pulled up any *Oculina*, which, to me, sounds like the cheapest way to do this thing, you would have to go through the EFP process, wouldn't you, because you're fishing in a closed area, and I would appreciate your thoughts.

MR. POLAND: Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, Chester, I believe you're right. I mean, that is one quick way to do -- Well, quick is a matter of, I guess, debate, but one way to do it would be to establish and set up an EFP and allow certain rock shrimpers, whoever was -- An EFP, and sorry, for other council members, is an exempted fishing permit, and so, in this case, that would exempt the fishers, whoever is chosen in the EFP, from not being able to trawl in the closed area, and it would allow them to trawl in the closed area, and so I agree with you, Chester, that an EFP would be another way to go at this.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Monica. Laurilee, go ahead.

MS. THOMPSON: I am trying to think how to word this. If there is coral out there, it wouldn't be out there had this area never been closed, and so I kind of feel like the goalpost is getting moved, or Lucy is pulling a football out from underneath me, because, had this area never been closed, the coral wouldn't be there, and so we close an area, and we leave it alone for seven years and the coral grows back.

Well, of course, the habitat is going to start trying to recover itself, and that's what it does, but I feel like that's moving the goalpost, because, had the area never been closed, which was the intent, and it's what we were working on before the Coral Amendment 8 was hurriedly approved, and there is no -- I mean, they wouldn't be dragging out there if there was coral. I mean, it's not coral bottom, but I just -- I feel like -- I don't know, but, like I said, I feel like the goalpost is getting moved. Thank you.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Laurilee. Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Thank you. Can we add an action? Is it too late to add an action in this document that would allow for some sort of measure where we could quickly close the fishery if suitable coral habitat is found?

MR. POLAND: Monica, is it to that point?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, it is to that point. Sure, Kerry. You could add an action in here that would allow you to do that. In fact, I think there are some examples in other parts of the country where they have that kind of authority. Then I would ask you not to take final action on it at this meeting, but you could look at it at the next meeting, and I do understand, and this is just one thing that I want the council members to consider as well, but I know that this has been going on, this idea of opening up this area back up, since Coral Amendment 8, and the council brought it back up and revived it as an action, and let's think about this, a year ago.

The first time you saw an options paper was last December, and then the first time you saw a more fleshed-out amendment, partial amendment, and it's still draft, obviously, and it's draft now, but you saw a better version in March, and then you saw another version in June, and then this version, and so, if you wanted to add that kind of action in there, I'm not sure whether staff could get it done by the next meeting, and maybe they could, and I would let them speak to that, but it's definitely possible to put it in this amendment.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Monica. Tim.

MR. GRINER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just a couple of clarifications, and maybe a point of order here, but are we meeting as a committee of the whole right now, or is this the Habitat Protection and Ecosystem Committee?

MR. POLAND: This is the Habitat Committee.

MR. GRINER: Then, as a point of order, I don't think we have a substitute motion, because I don't believe that Andy is on the committee.

MR. STRELCHECK: I think you're correct.

MR. POLAND: Andy is on the committee. He's listed as a committee member on the agenda.

MR. GRINER: He's not listed as a committee member on the minutes of our March 2, 2021, is he? Maybe I am confused.

MR. POLAND: For the agenda for today's committee meeting, Andy is listed as a committee member, and I will look to Myra to address that. Go ahead.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Steve. Yes, there were some changes that were made recently, and the Habitat and Ecosystem-Based Management Committee now is a committee of the whole.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Myra. John, to that?

MS. BYRD: John, it looks like you're unmuted on your end and our end, but we can't hear you. Hang on. He's switching his audio around.

MR. POLAND: Okay.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I was just going to clarify that it's not a committee of the whole, as it's called, and it's a committee that all of the council members serve on, and I think that Andy was one of the few people, because Roy had not served on this committee, the last time we did it, but, if you recall, we do updated committee members every year in August, when we get new council members, and so that's why we recently made changes to a number of the committees.

MR. POLAND: Thank you, John, and so, to address Tim's point of order, this motion is in order by Andy? I was looking for an affirmative.

MR. BELL: Should be.

MR. POLAND: All right. Go ahead, Mel.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Steve. Related to the substitute and the survey we're talking about, I just have some concerns about the survey, kind of an undefined survey, and the parameters of what we would use to judge good results and bad results of coral, too much coral, too little coral, no coral. In other words, it's very open-ended, in that let's say you encounter a rock, or a piece of hard substrate, with a coral colony on it, which I suppose is possible, and you've got twenty-two square miles that you're concerned about here, and what's the threshold for, oh, that's too much coral, or, yes indeed, that is coral? Do see what I'm saying? There is no -- We do the survey, and we get the results, and we analyze the results, and then we turn the results into a decision.

We might find ourselves in the same spot, where, well, yes, there's a little coral in there, as Laurilee mentioned, that might have colonized on some prior substrate and there it is, but, you know, and so there's coral, but does one coral colony shut this down? That's part of it, and I would also say that Clay is absolutely correct about the ROV and eyeballs on the bottom being the -- That's what you would love to have, but I have a good bit of experience in survey, and not multibeam, but a lot of side-scan survey and a lot of large-area search, and ROV work, and ROVs are great, but they're not -- You can't examine, with an ROV, huge areas of bottom.

The way it's typically used is you're looking for something, some sort of relief, some target, and you're trying to get eyeballs on something that you have detected on your large-area search, through your multibeam or through your side-scan or whatever you're using, and so it's a huge area, twenty-two square miles, and I am just -- You know, in twenty-two square miles, you drop the ROV down at different places, and you do the dive.

ROVs are much more sophisticated now than they used to be, and your camera quality is amazing, but I am just wondering how effective this survey would be, for \$200,000 or whatever it was, in enabling us to say anything really definitive on a larger scale about this twenty-two square miles. I mean, you could certainly -- If you pinpointed a couple of targets, and you made the dive on them, yes, there is a little rise here, a little mound, with the proper hard substrate to support the colonization of coral, and there you go, and so there's one mound, two mounds, a couple of little spots, but this area, as Laurilee and others have mentioned, has been historically dragged and dragged and dragged, and I would just be surprised if there's really anything much at all sticking up above the fairly flat bottom there.

That's my problem with this just saying we're going to do a survey, or necessary survey, is the defining the parameters of the survey and also how we utilize the results of the survey to make a decision a year from now of go or no-go, and that's just my concern with that, but I do appreciate the offer, and I appreciate where we're going with this, to try to have a better picture, but, even in taking that picture, I'm not sure, a year from now, it would be a sufficient picture for us to feel any more comfortable with assuming the -- Allowing the trawling to resume in there, and so that's it. Thanks.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Mel. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I mean, I kind of get what you guys are saying, and I fully agree, and I don't -- I mean, if I want to get this substitute motion taken care of, do I request to call the question, or do we need to vote on it, so we can try to move ahead here?

MR. POLAND: Parliamentary inquiry to John and staff. To call the question requires a vote, correct?

MR. BREWER: If I could answer the question, Steve, yes, and, since you're taking action to stop discussion, I believe it takes a super majority, or 60 percent.

MR. POLAND: All right.

MR. GRINER: Yes, two-thirds.

MR. POLAND: Chris, are you making that? Are you calling the question?

MR. CONKLIN: No.

MR. POLAND: Okay. Andy, go ahead.

MR. STRELCHECK: I think we're getting to the end of the discussion, and so a couple of points. Mel, I appreciate your comments, and I thought about that as well, in terms of then what do we do in terms of using this data, and I guess my point now is we are operating in the absence of information, and I fully expect that a large portion of this area is likely not suitable for coral habitat, and that's why the shrimpers have operated there for extended periods of time.

What I want to know is, if there is areas suitable for coral habitat, do we need to take a look at those, and, if so, are those then areas that we need to kind of reconsider, in terms of the footprint of the shrimp access area? I would rather know that it's not there, or is there, and make my decision than base the decision off of the information we have today.

In terms of the actual research work, Mel, your point about ROVs is also well taken, and the Science Center can talk much better than I can to this, but, in the Gulf, we recently completed the Great Red Snapper Count, and they employed a whole host of new technologies, one of which was a device used by Steve Murawski out of the University of South Florida that was kind of a towed camera system that could be done -- The transects could be used, and so there is no definitive determination as to what could be done or what equipment would be used at this point, but I think we have a lot of options that could help us potentially cover a large portion of this area, and it would be kind of up to the Science Center to decide that and find out what's available and determine, obviously, expenses to be able to conduct work like that.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Andy. Unless there are any others who wish to speak that have not already spoke to the motion, let's go ahead and take a roll call vote. Since this is a substitute motion, we'll have to vote for the substitute motion to become the main motion, and, if the substitute motion carries, then we'll have to vote again. If not, we go back to the main motion.

MS. BROUWER: I would be happy to do that. I will go ahead and start calling, starting with Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: No.

MS. BROUWER: Bob Beal. I don't see him. Mel.

MR. BELL: No.

MS. BROUWER: Chester.

MR. BREWER: No.

MS. BROUWER: Tim.

MR. GRINER: No.

MS. BROUWER: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: No.

MS. BROUWER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: No.

MS. BROUWER: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: No.

MS. BROUWER: Tom.

MR. ROLLER: No.

MS. BROUWER: Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: No.

MS. BROUWER: Judy.

MS. HELMEY: No.

MS. BROUWER: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: No.

MS. BROUWER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes.

MS. BROUWER: Lieutenant Copeland.

LT. COPELAND: Abstain.

MS. BROUWER: **We've got eleven no and one abstention and one yes.**

MR. POLAND: Thank you, Myra. We're back to the motion to approve Amendment 10 for final approval. Since this is a motion for final action, we do not have to take it up here at the committee, and we can take it up at Full Council. Is that correct, council staff?

MR. CARMICHAEL: If you would like to Full Council, you could. I mean, you have a motion on the table for now, and so you could vote to delay this until Full Council, because you do have a motion that's been seconded.

MR. POLAND: It's been seconded. Okay. Well, let's go ahead and dispense with the motion.

MS. BROUWER: Did you want to do a roll call again, Steve?

MR. POLAND: Yes, but let's go to Chester first. Chester.

MR. BREWER: I was just going to say you would have to have a separate vote to hold off on it until the main council meeting, because this is now a motion that belongs to the committee.

MR. POLAND: Yes, that's right, and I forgot that it was already seconded, and so my apologies, but, yes, let's go ahead and have a roll call vote, Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Okay. I will start back up with Carolyn.

DR. BELCHER: Yes.

MS. BROUWER: Bob is not here. Mel.

MR. BELL: Yes.

MS. BROUWER: Chester.

MR. BREWER: With a lot of reservations, yes.

MS. BROUWER: Tim.

MR. GRINER: Yes.

MS. BROUWER: Kerry.

MS. MARHEFKA: Yes.

MS. BROUWER: Jessica.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Yes.

MS. BROUWER: Spud.

MR. WOODWARD: Yes.

MS. BROUWER: Tom.

MR. ROLLER: No.

MS. BROUWER: Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: Yes.

MS. BROUWER: Judy.

MS. HELMEY: Yes.

MS. BROUWER: Laurilee.

MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

MS. BROUWER: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Yes, with reservations.

MS. BROUWER: Lieutenant Copeland.

LT. COPELAND: Abstain.

MS. BROUWER: **That is eleven yes, one no, and one abstention.**

MR. POLAND: All right. **Thank you, Myra, and so the motion carries.** Roger, I will turn it back to you, if there are any loose strings that we need to wrap up with Coral Amendment 10 before we move on.

MR. PUGLIESE: Other than we do have the codified text that has been circulated that is part of that, and it's available for everybody, but I think that's part of the entire package.

MR. POLAND: Yes.

MR. PUGLIESE: So nothing other than that.

MR. POLAND: All right, and so I think we're ready to move on to the blueprint update, whenever you're ready, or do people want to take a five-minute biological break?

MS. MARHEFKA: Can we take a break?

MR. POLAND: Yes. Five minutes. A real five minutes.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. POLAND: All right. It looks like we're still missing just a few, but we'll go ahead and ask Roger to get started, since we're over our time.

MR. PUGLIESE: Okay, and so I think the way we're going to proceed is Myra is going to walk through some of the core activities pertaining to the habitat blueprint, and I will add is as we move forward, and so I'm going to pass it over to Myra.

MS. BROUWER: Thank you, Roger. I will refer you to Attachment 2a, which is what's displayed on your screen, and so, basically, I will just give you a quick recap of what the habitat blueprint is, for new council members and those listening in from the public, and what the progress is to-date on that project.

The council directed staff to begin working on this project in December of last year. There was a workgroup that was formed, and you can see the membership there on your screen. There is council members and staff, and we have been meeting periodically throughout this year to mainly prioritize information needs, review the material that is generated, and bring anything that needs review or approval to this committee and the council at regularly-scheduled meetings.

Here is a list of the main tasks for this project and where those stand right now, and so we've been busy getting a lot of this information together, and then below that is a very general outline of what the blueprint will look like, and so this is intended to be a very concise document with several appendices that are going to contain the more detailed information, mainly summarized in tabular format, and so we're trying to make this a handy tool for the council, for staff, and habitat partners to refer to.

If we scroll down to the timeline, this table here basically shows you the various meetings of this workgroup that have occurred thus far and what was accomplished at each of those meetings. The most recent one was in September of this year, and so we got through just a couple of the two items noted on that table, and we did not get around to talking too much about outreach and communication goals, and that's going to be for the next go-round. We focused on developing a draft -- Like a job description, of sorts, for the Habitat AP, and that document is still being cleaned up, and the Habitat AP will have a chance to review it at their upcoming meeting in November, and the intent is for that to become a part of the blueprint and become adopted at the same time as everything else, when the council looks at this a little bit later, and it looks like spring of next year, but we'll get to that in just a second.

The next task, as I said, is going to be devote some time to this outreach and communication strategy and goals, and so we'll engage other council staff to help us with that and get feedback from that advisory panel in late November, and you see that as noted in Item 1 under that table, and we also have a note there to remind us to get you thinking about the option to possibly discuss the blueprint at a special council meeting, maybe in conjunction with another topic, such as the allocation decision tree, and this has come up throughout the week, and certainly it's something that is going to get discussed in more detail when you have your workplan, our workplan, in front of us tomorrow.

Attachment 2b, I am just going to refer to, and, basically, it's just the notes from the July workgroup meeting, and we wanted to sort of give you an idea of the topics and what was discussed at that meeting, and so I will just note a couple of the items that were discussed. We talked about how comments are developed for projects that have the potential to affect essential fish habitat in the region, and we talked about what the steps are, who is involved, what is the development of all that, who reviews it, and we sorted all that out, and so that's going to be detailed in the blueprint.

We also discussed a process for tracking the council's comments and the need to have the ability to do that and also look at the outcomes of the various EFH consultations, and so we're working on that. The workgroup also suggested that NMFS Habitat Conservation Division give regular updates at Habitat AP meetings on EFH consultations in the region, to keep the council continually informed on that, and, as I mentioned a minute ago, we also discussed this job description, of sorts, and this is something that I think has been fleshed out for the SSC as well.

We also, in September, talked about how to evaluate the various online tools that have been developed over the years to support the council's mandates and activities relative to EFH and other habitat-related needs, and so the workgroup will likely need to continue that discussion a little bit more, to determine what changes are needed, especially in light of the upcoming website revamp, and it seems that accessibility has been more of the issue, and so we would like to make some of those things easier to find and make them more relevant to the council's activities, and so that's what I have for an update, and, Roger, if I missed anything, or if there's anything else you would like to add, please go ahead. Thank you.

MR. PUGLIESE: Thank you, Myra. Other than this is going to be a real good opportunity to not only compile all this and understand how the council deals with habitat, but it will also provide a really good context of how much the council has done over time, with designation and conservation and protection, et cetera, and so I think it's a real good opportunity, plus it's really already expanding some of the coordination with habitat conservation directly, and so these things are already slated to happen, and with full engagement of the AP in the review and development, and so a lot of good things for the council I think is going to come from this, and so that's all I would like to touch on, and I think that was really all we wanted to do, is to kind of catch everybody up to where we are in the development process, and you all have had some discussions, in terms of timing and coordination on this, especially possibly the individual meeting to be able to do this and maybe another item for the council.

MR. POLAND: All right. Thank you, Myra. Thank you, Roger. If anyone has any comments or questions or additional guidance for the workgroup, and I am not seeing any hands. Thanks for the update. As far as the remaining agenda item to review and approve topics for the Habitat and Ecosystem AP meeting this fall, I will make a suggestion to move that to Full Council, and we will provide that guidance during the committee report. With that, is there any other business to come before the Habitat and Ecosystem-Based Management Committee? Hearing none, and seeing no hands, that concludes our committee meeting for today. Thank you, Roger. It's been fun working with you the last three years as a committee chair, and you've done a great job. Chairman Bell, that concludes the committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on September 16, 2021.)

- - -

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
October 12, 2021

Council Meeting

Attendee Report: (9/13/21 - 9/17/21)

Report Generated:

10/13/2021 08:15 AM EDT

Webinar ID

262-125-515

Actual Start Date/Time

09/16/2021 08:00 AM EDT

Duration

9 hours 25 minutes

Attendee Details

Attended

Yes

Last Name

BROUWER

First Name

MYRA

Yes

BYRD

01JULIA

Yes

Badolato

Matthew

Yes

Belcher

Carolyn

Yes

Bell

00-Mel

Yes

Berry

James

Yes

Bianchi

Alan

Yes

Blough

Heather

Yes

Brame

Richen

Yes

Brennan

Ken

Yes

Brogan

Gilbert

Yes

Brooke

Sandra

Yes

Bruce

James

Yes

Calay

Shannon

Yes

Carmichael

01 John

Yes

Carnes

Justin

Yes

Chaya

01Cindy

Yes

Clarke

Lora

Yes

Coleman

Heather

Yes

Collier

01Chip

Yes

Conklin

00 THE REAL Chris

Yes

Copeland

01 Robert

Yes

Corey

Morgan

Yes

Cox

Derek

Yes

Cross

Tiffanie

Yes

Curtis

Judd

Yes

Dale (NMFS SERO)

David

Yes

Dantuono

Bill

Yes

Darrow

Jamie

Yes

DeVictor

Rick

Yes

Dixon

Michael

Yes

Doten

Madeline

Yes

Finch

Margaret

Yes

Fitzpatrick

Kelly

Yes

Flora

Corrin

Yes	Flowers	Jared
Yes	Foor	Brandon
Yes	Foss	Kristin
Yes	Franco	Crystal
Yes	Gentry	Lauren
Yes	Gill	Bob
Yes	Glasgow	Dawn
Yes	Glazier	Ed
Yes	Godwin	Joelle
Yes	Gore	Karla
Yes	Gorham	Bill
Yes	Griffin	Charles
Yes	Griner	00 Tim
Yes	Hadley	01John
Yes	Hart	Hannah
Yes	Hawes	Rachel
Yes	Haymans	Doug
Yes	Helies	Frank
Yes	Helmey	Judy
Yes	Hemilright	Dewey
Yes	Herrera	John
Yes	Howington	Kathleen
Yes	Hudson	Rusty
Yes	Iberle	01Allie
Yes	Ingram	Jamal
Yes	Iverson	01Kim
Yes	KELLY	BILL
Yes	Karazsia	Jocelyn
Yes	Keener	Paula
Yes	Killer	Ed
Yes	Kramer	Rob
Yes	Laks	Ira
Yes	Laney	Wilson
Yes	Latanich	KATie
Yes	Lee	Jennifer
Yes	Lewis	Savannah
Yes	Marhefka	Kerry
Yes	McCawley	00 - Jessica
Yes	McCoy	Sherylanne
Yes	McGovern	Jack
Yes	Meehan	Sean
Yes	Mehta	Nikhil
Yes	Mendez-Ferrer	Natasha
Yes	Merrifield	Mike
Yes	Merrifield	Jeanna
Yes	Murphey	Trish
Yes	Neer	Julie

Yes	Nesslage	Genny
Yes	Newman	Thomas
Yes	O'Shaughnessy	Patrick
Yes	PHELPS	MARK
Yes	Package-Ward	Christina
Yes	Pannell	John
Yes	Patten	Willow
Yes	Phillips	Charlie
Yes	Pierce	Brett
Yes	Poholek	Ariel
Yes	Poland	00Stephen
Yes	Porch	Clay01
Yes	Powell	Jessica
Yes	Prewitt	Brian
Yes	Pugliese	01Roger
Yes	Puglise	Kimberly
Yes	Ralston	Kellie
Yes	Ramsay	Chloe
Yes	Rapp	Amber
Yes	Records	David
Yes	Reichert	Marcel
Yes	Reynolds	Jon
Yes	Rhodes	01Cameron
Yes	Roller	Tom
Yes	Sanchez	Nacho
Yes	Schmidtke	01Michael
Yes	Seward	McLean
Yes	Shervanick	Kara
Yes	Smillie	Nicholas
Yes	Smit-Brunello	00Monica
Yes	Smith	Duane
Yes	Spurgin	Kali
Yes	Sramek	Mark
Yes	Stemle	Adam
Yes	Stephen	Jessica
Yes	Strelcheck	00-Andy
Yes	Sweetman	CJ
Yes	Thompson	00Laurilee
Yes	Travis	Michael
Yes	Trego	Marisa
Yes	Vara	Mary
Yes	Walia	Matt
Yes	Wamer	David
Yes	Weissman	Dani
Yes	White	Geoff
Yes	Wiegand	01Christina
Yes	Wolfe	Wes

Yes	Woodward	00 Spud
Yes	Zamboni	Katharine
Yes	Zoodsma	Barb
Yes	Zou	Chao
Yes	brewer	00chester
Yes	crosson	scott
Yes	emery	jeff
Yes	locke	charles
Yes	moss	david
Yes	sminkey	thomas
Yes	smith	douglas
Yes	thomas	01suz
Yes	thompson	mary jean
Yes	walter	John
Yes	wilber	pace