

GULF COUNCIL

SUSTAINABLE FISHERIES COMMITTEE

Hilton Palacio Riverwalk

San Antonio, Texas

August 25, 2025

VOTING MEMBERS

10 Kesley Banks.....Texas
 11 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
 12 Billy Broussard.....Louisiana
 13 Troy Frady.....Alabama
 14 Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
 15 Anthony Overton.....Alabama
 16 Chris Schieble (designee for Ryan Montegut).....Louisiana
 17 Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi
 18 Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS
 19 C.J. Sweetman.....Florida

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

22 Mike Allen.....Florida
 23 Brenda Ballard.....Texas
 24 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
 25 J.D. Dugas.....Louisiana
 26 John Marquez.....Louisiana
 27 Lt. Jackson Morton.....USCG
 28 Jason Osborne.....Louisiana
 29 John Sanchez.....Florida
 30 Ed Walker.....Florida

STAFF

33 Assane Diagne.....Economist
 34 Matt Freeman.....Economist
 35 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
 36 Sarah Gardiner.....Fishery Biologist
 37 Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
 38 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
 39 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
 40 Jessica Matos.....Administrative Document Editor & IT Coordinator
 41 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
 42 Ryan Rindone.....Lead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
 43 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
 44 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

47 Rick Burris.....MS
 48 Les Casterline.....TX

1 Patrick Gallagher.....USCG
2 Frank Helies.....NOAA
3 Jimmy Hull.....SAFMC
4 George Rau.....USCG
5 John Sherlock.....USCG
6 John Walter.....SEFSC

7
8
9

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Motions..... 4
4
5 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of November 2024 Minutes..... 5
6
7 Action Guide and Next Steps..... 5
8
9 Update on the Status of State Regulations for Wahoo..... 5
10
11 Summary of AP Recommendations and Public Comments on Executive Orders
12 14276 and 14192..... 13
13
14 Organization and Prioritization of Recommendations on Executive
15 Orders 14276 and 14192..... 13
16
17 U.S. Coast Guard Safety Requirements to Carry Observers..... 58
18
19 Organization and Prioritization of Recommendations on Executive
20 Orders 14276 and 14192 (continued)..... 68
21
22 Adjournment..... 85
23
24
25

- - -

TABLE OF MOTIONS

1
2
3 [PAGE 67](#): Motion that the council write a letter to the USCG
4 requesting that they certify Starlink as an acceptable satellite
5 communication device as soon as possible. [The motion carried on](#)
6 [page 68](#).

7
8 - - -
9

1 The Sustainable Fisheries Committee of the Gulf Council convened
2 at Hilton Palacio Riverwalk in San Antonio, Texas on Monday
3 morning, August 25, 2025, and was called to order by Chairman
4 Kesley Banks.

5
6 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
7 **APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 2024 MINUTES**
8 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**
9

10 **CHAIRMAN KESLEY BANKS:** We're going to call to order the
11 Sustainable Fisheries Committee. Members are myself, Mr. Anson,
12 Mr. Broussard, Captain Frady, Dr. Sweetman, Mr. Schieble, Dr.
13 Overton, Mr. Geeslin, General Spraggins, and Mr. Strelcheck.

14
15 We are going to change the agenda up a little bit. We're going to
16 start with Item Number VI, before we get into the AP
17 recommendations for executive orders, just for timing purposes,
18 and so, with that change in mind, is there anything we need to add
19 under Other Business, before I call for the adoption of the agenda?
20 Seeing none, can I get a motion to adopt the agenda with those
21 changes? Dr. Sweetman. Can I get a second? General Spraggins.

22
23 Moving to the Approval of the November 2024 Meeting Minutes, any
24 changes to those? Seeing none, can I get a motion? Dr. Sweetman,
25 and a second from Mr. Broussard, and then we'll move on to the
26 Action Guide. Dr. Diagne.

27
28 **UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF STATE REGULATIONS FOR WAHOO**
29

30 **DR. ASSANE DIAGNE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. For this item, Number
31 VI, it is the Update on the Status of State Regulations for Wahoo.
32 Essentially, staff and the states of Texas and Louisiana, the
33 representatives, will update the committee on their respective
34 requests for extension of wahoo regulations into federal waters
35 and summarize the responses received from NOAA Fisheries.

36
37 This agenda item is for information only, and further action is
38 not expected from this committee at this time. That's for the
39 action guide, and so, looking at the agenda prior to this, the
40 first one listed there was the representative from Texas to give
41 us an update on the wahoo regulation for the states.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Mr. Geeslin.

44
45 **MR. DAKUS GEESLIN:** Thank you, Madam Chair. This update will be
46 pretty short and sweet. Following the June 2024 council meeting,
47 in which we heard presentations from both Dr. Michelle Johnston
48 from the Flower Banks Sanctuary and Dr. Jack McGovern from NMFS,

1 I went back to the ranch, back to the headquarters, assembled our
2 team, gathered information, and, upon reviewing and conducting
3 analysis, reviewing information and conducting analysis, we landed
4 on, you know, not seeing the rationale and reasoning to move
5 forward with any type of state water regulations before our
6 commission, for a whole host of reasons.

7
8 Simply, we didn't have a lot of information there. There's no
9 fisheries management plan, and, typically, when we go before our
10 commission, which we don't take lightly, for regulatory action,
11 especially for mirroring federal waters regulations, the way we've
12 done that in the past is regulations come through the council, or
13 from HMS, in federal waters.

14
15 We then approach our commission, and, using the reason and
16 rationale of, you know, ease of enforcement, reducing angler
17 confusion within the various sectors, that makes it a lot easier
18 for our commission to approve those. Here, we would be -- You
19 know, we would be struggling outside of some of the, you know, the
20 value judgments of overharvesting from a few headboat landings,
21 and I can see -- I looked at our headboat landings, and, you know,
22 that's something we'd want to continue to monitor across the Gulf.

23
24 It appears, you know, Texas is leading the way with some of those
25 headboat landings, really exploiting those aggregations out on the
26 Flower Banks Marine Sanctuary, and so, with that, I do share some
27 of the concerns. Michelle Johnston and I had a great conversation
28 last week, and I do share some of the concerns of the lack of
29 information.

30
31 We know those fish are quick growers, mature at age-one, but I do
32 share her concerns, and she was rightfully disappointed in Texas
33 Parks and Wildlife's determination to not pursue this right now.
34 I do share some of the concerns over some of the sustainability,
35 what that level of harvest looks like, the frequency of occurrence
36 of that level of harvest from these headboats, what that really
37 means to the stock, and, more particularly, what that means to the
38 sustainability and recruitment and reproduction, and then
39 subsequently recruitment into that stock.

40
41 With that, I'm also reminded, from a letter, and I thought this
42 was well-crafted, and this was a letter dated, July 10, 2025, from
43 our Regional Administrator, Mr. Strelcheck, and this was in
44 relation to a recreational daily bag limit request for gag.

45
46 In summary, it says our analysis indicates reducing the gag bag
47 limit would have a small effect on catch rates relative to the
48 effort that would be required to get a bag limit reduction in

1 place. Although not apples-to-apples, I feel the same right now,
2 given the paucity of data and information related to wahoo, and
3 especially getting the state regs out in front of any federal regs.
4

5 We would prefer to see some federal initiation on this, whether
6 that's coming through a fisheries management plan, council action,
7 or even the sanctuary action. I think that would make it a lot
8 more conducive to us going before our commission to get that
9 approved, and so, with that, I'll entertain any questions.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** C.J.?

12
13 **DR. C. J. SWEETMAN:** Thank you, Madam Chair. A couple of questions,
14 Dakus, and I understand where you all are coming from, lack of
15 data, and so you said you had some information about landings from
16 headboats off Texas?

17
18 **MR. GEESLIN:** We do.

19
20 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I'm just curious, and you don't need to answer this
21 right now, but I am curious about the magnitude of that, and then
22 so I just want to understand clearly, and so I think, when we were
23 talking about this, it was the states were trying to get out ahead
24 of the Flower Garden Banks, so there wouldn't be like total
25 closures or anything along those lines, and, obviously, this area
26 is off Texas. Okay, and I just wanted to make sure. Okay.

27
28 **MR. GEESLIN:** No, and that's certainly one way of going about that.
29 Chris will speak to -- I'm sure will speak to another approach of
30 going about that.

31
32 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Just one more question, and so you would -- I'm not
33 saying -- I'm just trying to understand, and so you were
34 referencing some federal action, whether that's through an FMP,
35 and I think the council previously discussed that, and we decided
36 we didn't really want to go in that direction, right, and so then
37 the only other opportunity on federal action would be the
38 sanctuary.

39
40 **MR. GEESLIN:** Correct.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** All right. Any other questions for Dakus? All
43 right. Mr. Schieble.

44
45 **MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Bernie, when you get
46 a chance, could you pull up Tab E-6(b)(ii)? That's it. Thank
47 you, and so this is the same presentation that we gave to our
48 commission. It's just modified for this event here, and so,

1 essentially, the first four slides that I have in the presentation
2 are not ours. These were taken directly from the Flower Garden
3 Banks National Sanctuary presentation that we received back at the
4 June meeting last year.

5
6 As Mr. Geeslin mentioned, there was concerns about potential large-
7 scale harvest from aggregated catches, and so, you know, we've
8 received this presentation, and we thought, well, Louisiana can
9 potentially look into a state management option, and so a reminder
10 that the first four slides are just a recap, to show you how we
11 got to where we are.

12
13 This is just a simple map of where the Flower Garden Banks are off
14 the coast of Texas and Louisiana. They presented these images to
15 us of large-scale catches that are, as Mr. Geeslin mentioned,
16 mostly from headboats, and then they gave us some examples of data
17 from LA Creel, as well as the Texas Parks and Wildlife landings.

18
19 I had raised some concerns about this data when they presented it
20 to us, because it was LA Creel statewide landings of wahoo, but,
21 when you really drill down to LA Creel landings, the majority of
22 these are coming from the Venice area in Louisiana, which is about
23 400 miles from the Flower Garden Banks, and so it wasn't really
24 reflective of the true landings, in Louisiana anyway. We did not
25 have high numbers of landings of wahoo coming from the Cameron or
26 Calcasieu area, which would be closer in proximity to the Flower
27 Garden Banks, and so most of our wahoo are not coming from there.
28 They're being landed off the mouth of Mississippi River.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Just a second, Chris. We have a question. Never
31 mind, Chris.

32
33 **MR. SCHIEBLE:** It's a nervous response to the cold weather over
34 here, and so they presented a litany, or a list, of potential
35 management options that we could consider, which range from federal
36 management in the Gulf to the Gulf Council doing an FMP, and then
37 the final option was states put in their own regulations and manage
38 out into federal waters, and that is the course of action we chose
39 to pursue.

40
41 This is just a recap of Magnuson regulations that allow a state to
42 manage a fishery out into federal waters. If there are no
43 preexisting fishery management plans or federal regulations, the
44 state can extend their own laws into federal waters, and, as Mr.
45 Geeslin mentioned, wahoo are fast-growing, and fast-maturing. 50
46 percent of females are mature around one year old, and so just a
47 recap of basic life history here, just understand that, you know,
48 when we see these aggregates, or spawning aggregations, that a lot

1 of those fish are one year old, or potentially younger.

2
3 We did a bag limit analysis, looking at our LA Creel data going
4 back the past decade, through 2014, which is that table you see in
5 the upper-right, and, essentially, we really have less than 1
6 percent of our landings, or bag limit landings, are more than five
7 wahoo per angler, and so the upper-left graphic shows you the
8 majority of wahoo landed are one per person, really, but it can go
9 all the way up to potentially up to five, which is a very low
10 percentage, but we really don't have more than five per person.

11
12 We selected a bag limit recommendation to our commission of five
13 wahoo per person. It seemed to be the least detrimental to
14 anglers, potentially not removing opportunity, but also allowing
15 for the potential reduction of those large-scale harvests that the
16 Flower Garden Banks people seemed most concerned about when they
17 give us their presentation, which are during those spawning
18 aggregations in the winter.

19
20 Essentially, you know, we went through how we derive these bag
21 limit analyses, and the purpose of having state regulations to
22 potentially stave off more restrictive federal regulations, while
23 retaining state management of the species, and extending those out
24 into federal waters, and also to reduce the large one-time catches
25 during these spawning aggregations. A reminder that the five-fish
26 bag limit encompasses about 100 percent of the retained bag limits
27 that we've observed dockside, and so we really haven't seen more
28 than that.

29
30 This is the letter that's in your briefing pack that we submitted
31 to the Gulf Council, once our commission passed the state
32 management regulations for the five-fish bag limit, and our
33 intention is described in the letter, to manage the species out to
34 federal waters, and then the next slide, the last slide, should be
35 the response we received from the Southeast Fisheries Science
36 Center to the same letter that we submitted to them, identical to
37 the one the council received, acknowledging Louisiana's ability to
38 manage that species out in federal waters, in the absence of any
39 federal FMP or federal regulations. I can take any questions, if
40 you have any.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Any questions? Dakus.

43
44 **MR. GEESLIN:** Thanks, Mr. Schieble, and I certainly appreciate
45 what you were able to move through your commission over in the
46 neighboring state of Louisiana. Could you go back to that headboat
47 landings picture, real quick? That's the rather sensational one,
48 with all the fish on the -- There we go.

1
2 So here -- I understand this is gaining a lot of attention, and
3 what I understand is one, or maybe two at most, a handful of
4 headboats, again, are capitalizing on these aggregations, but,
5 Chris, you would agree that, even though with the five-fish bag
6 limit per angler on a headboat, you could very well exceed what's
7 seen here in this picture, and I haven't done a fish count, but,
8 if every angler on a headboat was able to land their five-fish
9 bag, you could end up with something even more sensational than
10 this picture, and would you agree with that, Chris?

11
12 **MR. SCHIEBLE:** Yes, and so I agree that, you know, if you had ten
13 anglers on a headboat, you could have fifty wahoo coming in, you
14 know, but, from a Louisiana perspective, we only have two
15 headboats, and usually one of them is really only in operation,
16 and so it wasn't a large concern, as far as our overall harvest.

17
18 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Yes, and I see that. You all's landings in
19 Louisiana, headboat landings, are much lower than ours in Texas.
20 Did you all, in your -- This just, you know, kind of inquisitory,
21 bit did you all think about a vessel limit related to landings?

22
23 **MR. SCHEIBLE:** So, again, the majority of our boats are six-pack
24 vessels, and, if the bag limit is five, really, a maximum right
25 now that we see per person, but the majority of that you see is
26 one, right? The largest, 87 percent, was one fish per person.
27 There's really six wahoo coming in per vessel currently, on
28 average, and so it didn't seem plausible to put a vessel limit on
29 a six-pack.

30
31 **MR. GEESLIN:** Thank you.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** J.D.

34
35 **MR. J.D. DUGAS:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Chris, first, I mean, I
36 want to thank the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries for
37 entertaining this, and our commission, first of all. Second of
38 all, I wanted to ask you, and put you on the spot a little bit,
39 because I know what you mentioned, that the majority of the
40 landings are in the eastern Gulf, or, sorry, the eastern part of
41 the state, around the river, and the Flower Garden Banks are, you
42 know, south of Cameron Parish, or the state line, and so the LA
43 Creel landings -- My question is what percentage would you think
44 is east versus west of the state?

45
46 **MR. SCHIEBLE:** I don't remember the exact number. I can look it
47 up, but it was significant. It was probably over 70 percent were
48 all east of the river, or around the mouth of the river, from that

1 area. I want to say it was like about twelve fish came from
2 Cameron. When I looked at the total number of fish, it wasn't a
3 lot.
4

5 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you. Any other questions for Chris, or any
6 comments or concerns regarding wahoo? Seeing none, Dr. Simmons.
7

8 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** Just, I guess, a quick
9 question, and so, as far as the sanctuary, still considering, you
10 know, whether they think these are conservative enough, and it's
11 still within their purview to recommend fishing regulations in
12 addition to what Louisiana has proposed, correct, within their
13 jurisdiction, and is that right, Ms. Levy and Mr. Strelcheck?
14

15 **MS. MARA LEVY:** I mean, yes, if the sanctuary thinks that fishing
16 regulations are necessary for the sanctuary.
17

18 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I believe with that though came an enforcement
19 question. If they put it in, they don't have anybody to enforce
20 it, and so they're heavily leaning on us, or the states, and I'll
21 look to my state counterpart there to confirm that.
22

23 **MR. GEESLIN:** You're looking at me?
24

25 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I'm looking at you.
26

27 **MR. GEESLIN:** Well, and I'm looking at Les there. I'll defer to
28 our Fisheries Law Administrator, Les Casterline, real quick.
29

30 **LT. LES CASTERLINE:** Good morning, everybody. Les Casterline,
31 Assistant Commander Game Warden here at Texas Parks and Wildlife.
32 Could you repeat the question?
33

34 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I believe, if the sanctuary was to put in
35 regulations, they would be heavily leaning on your team to enforce
36 those, if that's correct?
37

38 **LT. CASTERLINE:** That would be correct. Probably ourselves and
39 the Coast Guard. With the distance from shore, in most of the
40 banks, you're going to be at least a hundred miles offshore, and
41 so not exactly the easiest patrols to take on, and so, you know,
42 the coverage, as far as that would be a little bit more -- It would
43 take a lot more effort to do so, but, yes, at this point, the
44 majority of the federal-water patrols are going to be from either
45 the state enforcement or the Coast Guard, at this point.
46

47 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you. Lt. Morton.
48

1 **LT. JACKSON MORTON:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and, just to echo
2 everything that was just said, it is more difficult, just the
3 nature of the Flower Garden Banks being so far offshore, but it is
4 not impossible, and so, if regulations were to go in, we could
5 certainly enforce like bag limits and trip limits, things of that
6 nature. It's a little bit easier to get out there with the
7 aircraft, but, if you're doing enforcement with an aircraft, you
8 can't check how many fish there are.

9
10 You know, you can always query from the aircraft, just ask the
11 fishermen over the radio, things of that nature, but, to get hands-
12 on, at-sea boarding inspections, you have to go out there with a
13 surface asset, and it's not impossible to get out there, but just
14 more difficult.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you. Les.

17
18 **LT. CASTERLINE:** One of the other things is we do have a Flower
19 Gardens priority in our JEA, and I'll mention some of the hours
20 later in the week, but that priority has seemed to kind of lose
21 some of the funding that it's had in the past. In prior years, we
22 actually had a separate pot of funding that went with that, and
23 now it's actually just coming out of the normal JEA funds that
24 we're allotted each year, and so that is another mechanism for
25 what we do out there, is that funding can be provided.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you. Any other questions or discussion
28 involving wahoo? Seeing none, Mr. Chair.

29
30 **MR. DUGAS:** Thank you, Dr. Banks, and so we're going to have to
31 break early for lunch, and take a longer lunch. We have folks
32 scheduled this afternoon to be on a call at a certain time, and so
33 I don't think we want to get into the discussion of executive
34 orders at this point, and so let's break for lunch, stay on
35 schedule, and let's come back at 1:30.

36
37 (Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on August 25, 2025.)

38
39 - - -

40
41 August 25, 2025

42
43 MONDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

44
45 - - -

46
47 The Sustainable Fisheries Committee of the Gulf Council reconvened
48 at Hilton Palacio Riverwalk in San Antonio, Texas on Monday

1 afternoon, August 25, 2025, and was called to order by Chairman
2 Kesley Banks.

3
4 **MR. DUGAS:** All right. We're going to get started. I hope
5 everyone had a good lunch, long lunch. I'm going to turn it over
6 to Dr. Banks for Sustainable Fisheries.

7
8 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so we're going to jump
9 back in and finish out the agenda in the order that it was intended,
10 and so, Dr. Diagne, if you want to read our action guide and next
11 steps for IV and V, please.

12
13 **SUMMARY OF AP RECOMMENDATIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON EXECUTIVE**
14 **ORDERS 14276 AND 14192**
15 **ORGANIZATION AND PRIORITIZATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS ON EXECUTIVE**
16 **ORDERS 14276 AND 14192**

17
18 **DR. DIAGNE:** All right. Thank you.

19
20 For items four and five on the action guide, let's start with the
21 first one, and that would be a summary of AP recommendations on
22 these executive orders. For this item, we will present a summary
23 of the recommendation provided by the advisory panel members, as
24 well as the suggestions collected from the public during a separate
25 public comment session, and these meetings were held in July,
26 between the 21st and the 23rd.

27
28 The committee should review the information presented, suggestions
29 on these two executive orders, ask questions, and consider the
30 recommendation provided as it continues to discuss our, I guess,
31 end goal here, which is the council's response letter to be sent
32 to NMFS relative to this executive order by the deadline set, which
33 is September 30.

34
35 For the next item, and these two items really are intertwined,
36 because this is the organization and prioritization of the
37 recommendations on the executive orders, and so the committee then
38 will continue to review the suggestions and recommendations and
39 comments collected during the AP meetings and the public engagement
40 session, and, if the committee wishes to do so, we could bring
41 back a very informal list of recommendations that the committee,
42 you know, threw on the board, if you would, at the end of the June
43 council, only if the committee wishes to go through those as a
44 supplement to what it is that the AP members and the public
45 provided. We have those at the ready, if you want to see them.

46
47 Following the review, the committee would develop a prioritized
48 list of recommendations to be submitted to the council for

1 discussion, revision, and, finally, for inclusion in the letter
2 that we are going to write by the set deadline. Thank you.

3
4 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** All right, and so, next, we are going to look at
5 the actual recommendations by the AP for -- We're going to do this
6 piecemeal. We're going to go all the way through the
7 recommendations, and then we will talk about prioritizing each of
8 the EOs separately, and so we're going to start with Executive
9 Order Number 14276. Emily.

10
11 **DR. DIAGNE:** Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair, and, before Ms.
12 Muehlstein starts, I will just offer, perhaps, a little bit of
13 context on the whole thing here, and so we have two executive
14 orders, one looking at essentially improving competitiveness, I
15 mean, in short, and the other one looking at, you know,
16 unregulating, or deregulating whenever possible.

17
18 Of course, there is, I guess, you know, an intersection between
19 the two, because some regulations, should they be modified or
20 repealed, could possibly enhance competitiveness. We recognize
21 that, I guess, you know, intersection between the two, but, as
22 mentioned by the chair, we are going to go with these, you know,
23 one-by-one.

24
25 We'll start with the one on competitiveness, and finish that, and
26 have everything we need to write the response letter, because, in
27 NMFS' directive to the executive directors, there is no mention of
28 the executive order relative to unregulations. The only executive
29 order that is in there is the one that has to do with improving
30 competitiveness, and so our first objective really is to identify,
31 and prioritize, the elements that would allow us to meet, I guess,
32 that mandate and write that letter.

33
34 In saying that, also, you know, as a context, in 2020, there was
35 an executive order that is very close, if you would, to the new
36 executive order on improving competitiveness, and the new one here,
37 14276, could be seen really as a continuation of the previous one.

38
39 At the time, the council responded, and offered its
40 recommendations, and the recommendations included two parts. One
41 part included the general considerations, if you would, for items
42 that were outside of the council's purview, and, by the way, the
43 response is available to you all. It's in the briefing material.

44
45 The second part included the items that the council committed to
46 completing, looking forward, and that second part included two
47 items. The first item had to do with essentially the
48 implementation of commercial ELBs, electronic logbooks, and the

1 second one had to do with modifying some provisions of the permits,
2 so that permit owners who wanted to sell their vessels during that,
3 let's say, grace period when their permit was expired, but still
4 renewable, that one-year period, could still move forward and do
5 so.

6
7 Out of these two, I guess, commitments, we fulfilled the first
8 one, because, I mean, as a council, you guys did take final action
9 on the commercial electronic logbook program, and that document
10 was submitted to the agency, and, in short, it is in the works.
11 The second one is something that, in this new letter, we would
12 have to discuss in the sense that we will be working with the
13 agency to find a pathway to making that possible.

14
15 The final thing that I'm going to say here on, I guess, this letter
16 that we are looking for, as a context, is that our response will
17 include three parts. One part will be the update to the actions
18 that we committed to completing, and, essentially, those would be
19 the two things we just discussed.

20
21 The second part would be to propose new actions that this council
22 would be committing to completing in the future, and the third
23 part would be the general suggestions that are outside of your
24 purview, so that, should the Department of Commerce decide to do
25 so, they could reach out to other agencies and discuss those, as
26 they see fit, and so those three parts, essentially, that is where
27 we are going.

28
29 Some of the elements from the feedback from the APs will fit into
30 the second part, and some into the third part. The first part,
31 the update, we have that on our end, and so I'm going to stop here
32 and let Ms. Muehlstein go through the list of items and highlight,
33 I guess, some relevant items as she proceeds. Thank you.

34
35 **MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN:** Okay, and so just a question, and I'll just
36 see if anybody -- Does anybody need me to sort of go over sort of
37 what the Restoring American Seafood Competitiveness Executive
38 Order is asking us to do? Is that helpful context? That's a yes?
39 Okay. No?

40
41 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I'm seeing a couple of heads shake, and so maybe
42 real quick. J.D.

43
44 **MR. DUGAS:** Emily, I was going to maybe recommend, or suggest, for
45 new council members, to catch them up to speed.

46
47 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Okay. Okay, and so we're going to focus first on
48 this Restoring American Seafood Competitiveness. That's Executive

1 Order Number 14276, and, just as a brief reminder, before we sort
2 of dig into this, the Secretary of Commerce requested that each
3 council provide, within 180 days, as Assane has been telling us,
4 updates to their recommendations, and also look into suggesting
5 ways that we can reduce burdens on domestic fishing, increase
6 production, stabilize markets, improve access, enhance economic
7 profitability, and prevent closures.

8
9 The specific executive order also directs National Marine
10 Fisheries Service to do a number of things. I know, as you all
11 know around the council table, that is not something that is really
12 under our purview, but I'll go ahead and just give you the brief
13 list of what that is, so that you have a little bit of context so
14 that you understand like sort of the directives that NMFS has been
15 given under this executive order as well.

16
17 So, first, they have been asked to identify the most heavily
18 overregulated fisheries and take appropriate action to reduce
19 their regulatory burden. They've been asked to incorporate less
20 expensive and more reliable technologies and cooperative research
21 programs into fisheries assessments.

22
23 They've been asked to expand exempted fishing permit programs to
24 promote fishing opportunities, to modernize data collection and
25 analytical practices to improve responsiveness to real-time ocean
26 conditions, and to implement an America-first seafood strategy, as
27 well as develop a comprehensive seafood trade strategy.

28
29 While those are directives directly to NMFS, and not necessarily
30 to councils, they're probably things that we would like to keep in
31 mind, because anything that we suggest that's in our purview, that
32 would forward sort of any of those things, might be like double
33 bonus points, right?

34
35 Without further ado, we'll look at Tab E, Number 4, and what that
36 is is it's a summary of each of the individual advisory panels
37 that we hosted, as well as the public session that we hosted on
38 this, and then Assane has done a really nice job of putting
39 together sort of what I'll call an executive summary for each
40 executive order of what we heard, and so, rather than go over the
41 individual advisory panels, what I would rather do is sort of focus
42 this time on looking at the list of sort of themes that we saw,
43 and so, Bernie, if you can scroll to the second page, we'll start
44 there.

45
46 Okay, and so we've broken these up into sort of different themes,
47 and our first one is looking at domestic seafood competitiveness,
48 and what I'll do, as I run through these, is highlight sort of

1 which bullet points or suggestions we heard that are within the
2 council purview, which is to say, even if they're not, they are
3 something that you all can identify as something that is important,
4 and that, as Assane mentioned, there will be a portion of the
5 letter that is dedicated to us saying, hey, we're not in charge of
6 this, but we do find it something valuable that should be sought
7 after or, you know, focused on.

8
9 For this domestic seafood competitiveness section alone, I don't
10 identify anything that's directly within the council's purview,
11 but we did hear that we should implement tariffs, quotas, and bans
12 on imports from countries using forced labor or banned chemicals,
13 mandate country of origin labeling and authenticity testing for
14 all seafood, and promote domestic seafood through a national
15 branding and marketing campaign, and then also limit shrimp imports
16 to support the domestic recovery of the fishery.

17
18 The next sort of theme that we heard quite a bit was about council
19 representation, and there's only sort of one piece here that the
20 council has any direct purview over, and that is related to this
21 first bullet, which is balancing representation across all sectors
22 on both the council and the advisory panels, and so, obviously we
23 don't choose who sits at this table. That is chosen sort of at a
24 different higher level.

25
26 However, we do have control over the balance that we seek on
27 appointing our advisory panels, and so I just want to point that
28 out, that this is the one thing under this theme that we do have
29 some control over. We also heard that governors should appoint
30 qualified representatives from all sectors and preserve NOAA's
31 core function, such as stock assessments and permitting was under
32 here.

33
34 The third theme that we heard was changes to IFQ programs, and
35 there are a couple that are under our purview here, but I'll start
36 with the two that maybe aren't directly under our purview. The
37 first is improving the IFQ loan program to reduce the barriers for
38 fishermen. The second is increasing transparency in ownerships
39 and share caps.

40
41 Now, the next four that I'm about to read out are things that I do
42 believe the council does have direct influence over, and so the
43 first one being requiring active participation and permits for IFQ
44 holders. That's something that is already on sort of our docket
45 here. The next is creating a quota bank or marketplace for
46 allocation exchange.

47
48 Next is opposing reallocations to the recreational sector without

1 accountability, or better accountability, in that sector, and then
2 last was considering replacing the IFQ program entirely and going
3 back to the old trip-based system to improve our competitiveness.

4
5 Next, we'll move on to the theme of labor issues. Again, I didn't
6 see anything under this theme that was directly affected by council
7 action, but we'll go ahead and mention them, in case you want to
8 give them an honorable mention in the letter that we draft. First
9 is reforming the H2B visa program to increase availability, to
10 reduce cost, and to improve timing of the permit system, or the
11 visa system, and also to expand visa options, such as an H2A or
12 C1D for fisheries.

13
14 I guess that some of these are under the Ag Department, and so
15 some farm workers sort of experience some different, or more
16 lenient, regulations when it comes to visa options, and so they
17 were looking at suggesting that we follow, or fisheries follows,
18 more of those types of visa programs than what we are currently
19 using. The next is to remove citizenship requirements for crews,
20 and then, finally, support training programs for young fishermen
21 to address an aging workforce.

22
23 Next, I'll move on to management reform. This is another theme we
24 heard, and every other one of these does seem to be under the
25 council purview, and so the first one, eliminate the one-size-
26 fits-all management approaches, is certainly something that we can
27 consider, although somewhat vague, and I guess we would need a
28 little bit of direction on what that looks like.

29
30 The second one is applying sector-specific discard rates
31 independently, and this is sort of more of a Science Center stock-
32 assessment-level change. Next is streamlining reporting and
33 compliance through digital systems. As Assane mentioned, that's
34 one of the things that we noted in our first letter, for the first
35 go-round of this, during the last administration, and, you know,
36 we are already talking about, you know, replacing SEFHIER with a
37 new reporting program for-hire industry, and so this one certainly
38 could be within our purview.

39
40 Next is suspending ESA consultations for certain species until
41 more data are available, and then, finally, one that sort of
42 partially could rely on us is reevaluating sea turtle protections,
43 and also re-evaluating our gear requirements, and just a little
44 bit of a spoiler here, and the removal of the sea turtle gear
45 requirements is also mentioned under the deregulatory executive
46 order as well, and so that's kind of a double bonus point
47 situation.

1 Next, if you want to scroll to the next page, Bernie, we'll go
2 over economic support. We didn't identify any of these suggestions
3 to be directly under the council purview, but I will read them to
4 you, in case you want to put them in the letter anyhow. First is
5 supporting working waterfronts, with investments in docks, dry
6 dock facilities, and fish markets.

7
8 Next is distributing disaster relief funds to commercial fishers,
9 and then creating a federal insurance program for fishers that's
10 much like the crop insurance programs that they have. Then
11 securing funding for shrimp vessel tracking and data programs,
12 and, finally, redirecting the Saltonstall-Kennedy funding directly
13 for fishermen, or to fishermen.

14
15 The next theme we are considering is species-specific management,
16 and the first one is not under our purview, but the rest seem to
17 be, and so, first, we heard that we should open shark harvest,
18 remove the fin ban, and also transfer management of sharks to the
19 Gulf Council, and then the next three are sort of more directly in
20 our wheelhouse, and it would be support for opening the red drum
21 commercial fishery, raising the king mackerel trip limits, and
22 adjusting the season starts, and then increasing the red snapper
23 commercial allocation and removing commercial minimum size limits.

24
25 The next theme is enforcement and monitoring. Not within our
26 purview is the idea of reducing enforcement that targets commercial
27 vessels for minor issues. However, the next two, which is the use
28 of cameras instead of onboard observers, to reduce costs, and
29 streamlining economic surveys to reduce burdens, and both of those
30 are somewhat within our purview and things that we could consider
31 and work on sort of from this table.

32
33 Next, we'll move to research and technology, and the first one
34 does sort of fit under us, which would be embracing existing
35 technology for data monitoring and compliance, and then the next
36 two, to ground test shrimp stock assessment models before use and
37 pursue cooperative research to reduce lag between science and
38 management, is a little bit more in the NOAA Science Center
39 wheelhouse.

40
41 Then, finally, we did hear some environmental concerns, both of
42 which do not directly fit under the council purview, which is to
43 address windfarm impacts on shrimping grounds and ecosystems, and
44 also to ensure long-term competitiveness of ocean health in
45 regulatory decisions, and so that is a summary of what we heard
46 from all of those efforts, and I'll stop here, because the next
47 stuff is for the next executive order. I don't know if we did say
48 this, and sorry, Assane, but the council did start making a list

1 during their June meeting.

2
3 We do have that available, if you guys want to take a look at that,
4 or we can just sort of work from what we have here, and I'll let
5 you guys decide how to move forward.

6
7 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you. I would recommend, and I'll look to
8 the council, or committee, for approval, that we start with the AP
9 recommendations, and then add on anything that the council had
10 added in June that didn't fall directly within any of these. That
11 way, if we have overlap, we've already addressed the APs. I'm
12 looking around the table for head shakes or head nods. We've got
13 a couple. All right, and so we're going to move through the AP
14 recommendations first. I think we should take it bold topic by
15 bold topic. Does that make sense, Emily?

16
17 Okay, and so, under domestic seafood competitiveness, is there
18 anything anybody would like to add or remove from this list? It
19 would fall in that third category that Assane was mentioning, and
20 I see Assane's hand up.

21
22 **DR. DIAGNE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. So just, I guess, to have,
23 quote, unquote, a more proactive decision, we are starting from
24 the perspective that none of this is going to be in the letter,
25 meaning that, if, as a committee member, you want something to
26 make it to the letter, you have to say so, and so the default is
27 it's not in unless somebody tells us otherwise.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Does that need to be done in a motion, or just -
30 -

31
32 **DR. DIAGNE:** No, and I guess the motion is going to be perhaps at
33 the end, if you decide to approve the list, or doing Full Council
34 and so forth, but, right now, if someone around the table feels
35 that a particular item has to be included, they have to tell us,
36 so that it will make the list. Thank you.

37
38 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Well, let's start with that. I see a
39 couple of hands. I'm going to start with J.D.

40
41 **MR. DUGAS:** Thank you, Dr. Banks. Just for clarification, this is
42 our last opportunity to make any changes before September 30.

43
44 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** At Full Council, yes.

45
46 **MR. DUGAS:** Well, Full Council this week.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Thank you. Ed.

1
2 **MR. ED WALKER:** So it was mentioned that I think most of these
3 first ones are things we can't do. We could mention it, to let
4 them know that we kind of support this idea, and we heard this,
5 but do we want to mix all those together, or do we want to separate
6 things that we can actually do from things that we just kind of
7 recommend, but we can't do?
8

9 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** They should get separated in the letter, based on
10 what Emily said we can and can't do around the table-type thing,
11 and so it will fall in that third category Assane and Emily talked
12 about, where it's not under council purview, but these are things
13 we would like NMFS, or whoever, to maybe reach out to the
14 appropriate person. Anthony.
15

16 **DR. ANTHONY OVERTON:** Is it possible we could highlight which ones
17 were under the purview? I mean, I was listening to the list, but
18 I can't remember all of them.
19

20 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Hold, please.
21

22 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** While she is getting that done, there is nothing
23 under domestic seafood competitiveness up here that fell under
24 council purview, and so these would all fall under that third
25 category, if there is any on just that first portion that anybody
26 would like in the letter, and so, while they're getting the rest
27 highlighted, that are under council purview, none of these at the
28 moment are. Ed.
29

30 **MR. WALKER:** Well, I mean, I personally would support all of these.
31 You know, it just seems a little odd, to me, to pick things that
32 we can't do, but I'm in favor of all this, the helping the
33 shrimpers, bans on imports, quotas. Everything listed in this
34 first category, I support.
35

36 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Thank you. Anybody else got any comments?
37 All right. Okay, and so anybody got anything against including
38 all four of those in the letter in that third category? Okay.
39 Dakus.
40

41 **MR. GEESLIN:** I guess, you know, the one that's bothering me, and
42 I understand the impetus of limiting shrimp imports to support
43 domestic recovery, but, in a free capitalist society, it's the
44 demand of those imports that are driving that. Consumers are
45 selecting for a lower-priced product. I just want to throw that
46 out there for consideration. That's a slippery slope, and I
47 understand it could help the shrimp fishery. I think there's other
48 ways to get at it, including the first three there. I'm just a

1 little hesitant to embrace that limit shrimp imports to support
2 domestic recovery.

3

4 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Thank you. Kevin.

5

6 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** I'm wondering if there's interest in adding, to
7 the implementation of tariffs, that any collected tariffs could go
8 back into NOAA Fisheries to support fisheries management.

9

10 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Mr. Schieble.

11

12 **MR. SCHIEBLE:** So, to Mr. Geeslin's point regarding the shrimp
13 imports, what if we change the word "limit" to "regulate" or
14 "further regulation of shrimp imports to support domestic
15 recovery"? I understand that part of the problem is the
16 International Trade Commission, and their failure to regulate
17 anti-dumping practices, led to where we are, and so maybe just
18 better regulation of shrimp imports, or further regulation, and
19 just some different language change.

20

21 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Mr. Geeslin.

22

23 **MR. GEESLIN:** Chris, I could certainly be behind that. Certainly
24 some increased, you know, testing of those products coming in from
25 overseas, due to the growth enhancing -- You hear, from some of
26 the inspectors, that just a fraction of that product could be
27 tested, and so I could certainly be behind that.

28

29 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so do you want to say it one more time,
30 Chris, so Bernie can get the language?

31

32 **MR. SCHIEBLE:** I would say further or increased regulation of
33 shrimp imports to support domestic recovery. Let's put "further
34 increase" and get rid of "limit". Further increase shrimp import
35 -- Regulation of shrimp imports to support domestic recovery.
36 There you go.

37

38 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Any other --

39

40 **DR. DIAGNE:** Yes, Madam Chair. I think, to the point that Mr.
41 Anson made, if he could repeat it, so we can have it here on that
42 list here.

43

44 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. We're going to add to the first bullet
45 point, Bernie. Okay. Kevin, do you want to give her your language
46 one more time?

47

48 **MR. ANSON:** Yes, and I'm just offering, for consideration, adding,

1 to that first bullet, that tariffs collected basically would go to
2 NOAA Fisheries to support fisheries management.

3
4 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. While she's getting that up on the board,
5 General Spraggins.

6
7 **GENERAL JOE SPRAGGINS:** When we're talking about this, I'm sitting
8 here thinking about it. You know, one of the problems too is the
9 conditions that they're grown in, you know, from other countries,
10 whenever we're talking about tariffs and we're talking about
11 countries using forced labor or banned chemicals, and, also, what
12 about the ones that are grown in a sewage plant, or something to
13 that effect, which, you know, seems to be things that have come
14 out in the news here lately. I don't know how to put it, and I
15 don't know if it's something we want to address, but do we want to
16 address something to do with the conditions that the seafood is
17 grown in?

18
19 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** So could that one potentially fall under the
20 further increased regulations of imported shrimp that we have? Do
21 you see that it could fall under that, or do you want it separated
22 out? Further increased regulation of shrimp imports to support
23 domestic recovery, and do you want it separate or --

24
25 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** I don't know, and I just -- I'm not sure that
26 that covers it, but it may, and, you know, the point I'm getting
27 at is we're asking people to do something, and look at it, and I'm
28 not sure if it covers it.

29
30 Increased regulations, if you're going to say, in the increased
31 regulations, that you're going to look at conditions, that's one
32 thing, but, if you don't, that means what's the regulations? We
33 don't know what the regulations are, you know, until we come up
34 with something.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Mr. Geeslin.

37
38 **MR. GEESLIN:** Just to point out the obvious, and I know we're
39 working within the first executive order of restoring American
40 seafood competitiveness, but further increased regulation kind of
41 conflicts with the next one of deregulations. I just wanted to
42 point that out. I don't know if, you know, maybe something a
43 little different, and I don't know, but enhanced inspection, or
44 something, would be a little more palatable.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Assane.

47
48 **DR. DIAGNE:** With, I guess, the last comment Mr. Geeslin made,

1 that would cover it, and so, instead of "further increased
2 regulations", use, you know, another phrase that will capture that
3 sense. Like he offered, you know, enhance or improve regulations,
4 or something like that, to that effect.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Chris, are you good with that change?

7
8 **MR. SCHIEBLE:** Yes, I suppose. I mean, I don't think the executive
9 order is directly reflecting regulations on imported products. I
10 think it's domestic products we're talking about, but I'll agree
11 to this language change. It makes it flow better.

12
13 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Any more discussion under domestic seafood
14 competitiveness? Okay. If not, we're going to move on to council
15 representation. As Emily pointed out, only one really falls under
16 our purview, which would be the makeup of the advisory panels.
17 I'm looking around the table for any comments. If you don't say
18 you want all of them on there, or any single one, none of these
19 will be on the letter. Mr. Strelcheck.

20
21 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Caveating this, this is a letter coming to my
22 agency, and so I don't have a dog in this hunt right now, but the
23 middle bullet really gives me pause, right, and so I'm curious,
24 from Emily's standpoint, and was there more context? Was it more
25 like wanting people that are more from the industry, or was it
26 just, you know, objection to, you know, who is being nominated for
27 the council process, because I would not recommend including that
28 bullet.

29
30 **DR. DIAGNE:** Yes, and that doesn't make for a pretty picture. Yes,
31 Mr. Strelcheck, and, actually, you know, that could have been
32 rolled into the first bullet, if you would, because, when folks
33 were discussing the balance, in terms of representation, some folks
34 argued, on top of that, well, you know, if we had qualified
35 representatives, from both sides really, and that is what folks
36 are looking for, for, quote, unquote, at the end, better council
37 decisions, but, by itself here, it may be -- It may serve us better
38 to not have that in the letter as we go forward and concentrate on
39 the balance, really, between the sector when it comes to
40 appointments.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. C.J.

43
44 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm kind of with Andy on
45 this. While I understand concern about representation, and things
46 along those lines, I don't think the council should be writing a
47 letter to the U.S. Secretary of Commerce who they should or should
48 not be appointing, and the same for governors of each respective

1 state, and so that's just my two-cents. I would not be in favor
2 of Number 1 and 2 being in our letter here. Advisory panel, that's
3 a different story.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you. General Spraggins.

6
7 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** I don't know about the rest of the states, but
8 I have enough trouble getting my governor to appoint anybody, and,
9 when you say you've got to appoint qualified representatives from
10 all sectors, how many different people are you looking at? You
11 know, how many different people are you looking at the governor to
12 appoint, because, if it's like me, he's going to have a hard time.
13 I mean, he doesn't just do it for the fun of it.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so what I'm hearing is we do not want
16 to include 1 and 2, as written, and do we want to leave in that we
17 will look at balanced representation for advisory panels? Bernie,
18 I think we're going to try to modify -- Balanced representation
19 across all sectors on -- I guess you could just get rid of the
20 words "and Gulf Council advisory panels", and get rid of that.
21 Anybody got any issues with how it's phrased now in the first one?
22 Okay. John Sanchez.

23
24 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I was fine with it as it stands before the changes,
25 because there is an imbalance on this council between the sectors,
26 in terms of the voting membership that's appointed. Now, I think
27 it's a little too much, in Number 2, to say governors must appoint
28 qualified representatives, but I've heard that for years now, that
29 there's an imbalance, and I think the first one, that's highlighted
30 in yellow, should kind of remain as it is. It does reflect a
31 concern from a vast number of the constituents that follow this
32 council.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so we have some support and some not
35 supporting the word change. Okay. For giggles, let's vote it up
36 or down, and so raise your hand. I guess Carrie is going to count
37 hands. Well, do I have opposition? Any opposition to the word
38 choice here? If you have opposition, please raise your hand. As
39 it is on the board now.

40
41 **MR. SANCHEZ:** This is with the changes?

42
43 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** With the changes.

44
45 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Opposed.

46
47 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Just one, and so we're going to move
48 forward with it as changed. Going to Bullet Point Number 2,

1 governors must appoint qualified representatives from all sectors,
2 any opposition to removing it from the council's letter, from not
3 including it? Okay. Bernie, we're going to strike Bullet Point
4 2.

5
6 I've not heard any discussion around preserving those core
7 functions, such as stock assessment and permitting. Is there any
8 support to including that in the letter? This would be under the
9 third category. Ed.

10
11 **MR. WALKER:** I'm not necessarily in support, just for the sake of
12 getting things done here, and it kind of goes without saying that
13 that is their function. I don't think we need to reiterate that.
14 In my view, we could strike it and move on.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so there's a proposal to strike that
17 also from the letter. Any opposition to striking it from the
18 letter? I see no opposition, and so, Bernie, we're going to strike
19 Number 3 as well.

20
21 All right. Moving over to IFQ programs, is there any support in
22 including any of these six bullet points? We'll start from there,
23 four of which are under our purview. I'm going to give everybody
24 a second to read the six. Ed.

25
26 **MR. WALKER:** I support the third one there. We've talked about
27 that around the room, to require active participation and permits
28 for IFQ holders.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. We have support for including requiring
31 active participation. Is there anybody not in support of including
32 that in the letter? I don't see any. Okay. I'm just going to go
33 bullet point by bullet point, because it seems to be easier.
34 Starting with improving the IFQ loan program, does anybody have
35 anything to say, support or not support, of including it in the
36 letter? There's nothing, and so strike it from -- C.J.

37
38 **DR. SWEETMAN:** So this is a federal loan program, correct, Andy?
39 I mean, sure. I mean, any way to improve the situation that's
40 currently on the water right now, I would be in favor of.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Any opposition to including it in the
43 letter? Bernie, we're going to move to Number 2, seeing no
44 opposition. Increase transparency in ownership and cap shares.
45 Is there any interest in including this in the letter? Seeing --
46 General.

47
48 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** I think, any transparency we can have with

1 that, I think it's good to do it, and so I would recommend we put
2 it in the letter.

3
4 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Moving on to the fourth one, create a quota
5 bank, is there any interest in including it? Andy.

6
7 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Well, I'll comment to the second part, and so,
8 tomorrow, we'll be sharing with you that we've created a
9 marketplace for share and allocation exchange, as part of the IFQ
10 system, and so that's something that's already being completed.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you, and so I guess the question is should
13 we leave it as written, or should we modify that language for the
14 letter? Andy.

15
16 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Well, I would recommend striking marketplace,
17 because we're doing that. Keep in mind, with the IFQ program, one
18 of your either goals or objectives was to look at quota banks for
19 allocation exchange, and so I think that's in line with the current
20 IFQ program goals.

21
22 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. No opposition to including it with the
23 change to remove marketplace? Looking around the table, I'm not
24 seeing any. Okay. Ed.

25
26 **MR. WALKER:** Create a quota bank, asking that question to create
27 a quota bank, I mean, we've been around the room a bunch of times
28 on ways to create a quota bank, and I don't know that we ever came
29 up with one, and so it might be more appropriate to change the
30 terminology to, you know, look at options for a quota bank, or
31 explore a quota bank alternative or something like that, but we're
32 asking them to create a quota bank with this question, and I don't
33 know that anybody knows a way to do that yet, and so just a
34 suggestion.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Bernie, the suggestion is to change the
37 word "create" to "explore", or I guess you could put "explore
38 creating a quota bank" in front of -- Does that work for you, Ed?
39 Okay. Any opposition to that bullet point as now modified? Not
40 seeing any, we'll move on to the next one. Kevin.

41
42 **MR. ANSON:** Just to follow-up on that point that Ed brought up,
43 the words that are used I think would be very critical, related to
44 the letter, because some of these, as Ed mentioned, we've been
45 kicking around here at the council for many years, so I just -- I
46 mean, we as a council are going to respond to the executive order,
47 that basically says some things that, again, we've just not been
48 able to do, or it's been taking a long time, and so I don't know

1 what the -- How the language of the letter will be, if this is
2 going to be specific to the response, or the question, that came
3 from NOAA to say, NOAA, go ahead and do these things, but yet it's
4 been under the council's purview to kind of take those ideas, and
5 allow them to germinate, and they either do or they don't.

6
7 So I just -- I guess I'm a little torn, you know, having been on
8 the council for some time, and having to deal with these issues,
9 that we're going to offer these issues back to NOAA, for them to
10 come back to us and say, hey, talk about these things, and so I
11 don't know. I just -- Again, I think the choice of words, and,
12 you know, the action that we are going to recommend, is important.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Assane, do you want to --

15
16 **DR. DIAGNE:** Yes, Madam Chair. To the points made by Captain
17 Walker and Mr. Anson, absolutely, yes. The choice of words here,
18 and the choice of, I guess, prudent, if not to say conservative,
19 in quotes, words would be really key here, because the missing
20 piece, which we didn't discuss yet, is that the letter to be
21 written would also include a workplan that would give, you know,
22 essentially how it is that we as a council are going to get there
23 from here, from the recommendations made.

24
25 The development of that workplan will be done with Mr. Strelcheck's
26 staff. We are going to work with them to develop that workplan,
27 I mean, to take into account this council's priorities, as well as
28 also capabilities, personnel, and so on and so forth, and so
29 absolutely. You know, not committing, you know, hard and fast to
30 something like this may be, you know, the best way to go. Thank
31 you.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Ed.

34
35 **MR. WALKER:** So we're going to -- Assane, we're going to have to
36 have a way to accomplish these things, each one of these things we
37 suggest, and that sounds like a -- Well, you said we're going to
38 have to -- We're going to list a way of potentially developing
39 each one of these things, and so that sounds like a year's worth
40 of council meetings, to me. I mean, we might want to tighten up
41 on what we're asking for here a little bit, instead of these kind
42 of vague ideas, if we're going to list out a path forward on each
43 one of them.

44
45 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Assane, and then C.J.

46
47 **DR. DIAGNE:** Just to that point, Captain Walker, we are going to
48 have to write a workplan only for the items that are under this

1 council's purview. The general stuff, those are going to be, you
2 know, additional suggestions, if you would, to the Department of
3 Commerce for them to explore, should they desire to do so, but the
4 workplan would only include those items that were selected by this
5 council and are under our purview, and that's number one.

6
7 Number two, when you -- At the end of this, hopefully we'll have
8 time to prioritize your recommendations of items under this
9 council's purview, so that, when we work with NMFS to lay out this
10 workplan, we know that, Items 2, 3, and 7, those definitely have
11 to be on the top of that workplan, when it comes to time and
12 resource allocation. Thank you.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Yes, and so, right now, we have two workplans
15 that we've agreed to start, which is balancing representation on
16 Gulf Council advisory panels and requiring active participation
17 and permits for the IFQ holders. We've not agreed to anything
18 else yet. C.J.

19
20 **DR. SWEETMAN:** To that point, that latter point, about require
21 active -- I mean, that's -- We're working through an amendment
22 that's evaluating that. Are we committing to explicitly requiring
23 that with this language right here, because I don't think the
24 council has decided on that yet.

25
26 **DR. DIAGNE:** Well, it could be also, to take a page out of the
27 example after that, is to explore, you know, the requirements of
28 permits and active participation, or to consider active
29 participation and permit ownership for IFQ members, meaning that
30 if, at the end of the development of amendments, if I recall, 59A
31 and B, this council decides to, for example, not require a permit,
32 well, we would have done due diligence, because it was explored,
33 and evaluated, but the council voted to not have it, but, as
34 written, it means that, at the end of 59A and B, these are going
35 to become requirements.

36
37 People would have that, and so, to the extent that this can be
38 modified, and the comment would be applicable to all of the items
39 under our purview, to give the council an out, if you would,
40 consider the requirements for active participation and permit,
41 something like that, and just do that throughout this discussion,
42 if you would.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** C.J.

45
46 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Yes, and that's what I was getting at, Dr. Diagne.
47 Thank you, and so, in light of that, I mean, I think we need to be
48 considerate throughout this entire -- Both of these documents here

1 about the language there, but, you know, explore requiring active
2 participation, or consider requiring active participation, just to
3 give us that flexibility there, would be my suggestion.
4

5 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Bernie, the suggestion on the floor is to
6 add, right there, "consider" or "explore", either one, or all of
7 them, all of the options. Mara.
8

9 **MS. LEVY:** Just to a slightly different point, and so, the two
10 above it, improve and increase, I mean, you can put whatever you
11 want in the letter, but, to the extent that you want to provide
12 any additional information about what that means, right, it's very
13 vague. You know, in what way, what barriers? Increase
14 transparency, again, what's lacking in terms of transparency? I
15 mean, we have a FOIA page that has every IFQ shareholder, and the
16 percentage of shares that they have, and so, to the extent you can
17 be more specific for things like that, that are not within your
18 particular purview, but you want to see improvements, or increases
19 in transparency, the better it would be in terms to articulate
20 those points.
21

22 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Assane.
23

24 **DR. DIAGNE:** Not for all cases, but, in some instances, such as,
25 you know, the first one here, the IFQ loan program, in the body of
26 the letter, perhaps we could rely on some of the things we've
27 heard, you know, over the years.
28

29 Everybody says that this is almost impossible to get, in terms of
30 the loan, because the folks that, you know, it is supposed to help
31 typically don't have enough collateral to qualify, et cetera, and
32 so, to the extent that we could say, in the letter, something like,
33 you know, revise the criteria of eligibility for the federal loan
34 program, to reduce barriers of access for young fishermen and
35 entry-level fishermen, something like that. Rather than just
36 putting the bullet here, put some context, and that would be
37 helpful.
38

39 For the second one, I struggle to see what is missing, because, in
40 terms of the IFQ program, all of this information is available. I
41 mean, we all like the term "transparency", but, as far as I know,
42 it is fully transparent. Anybody could go online now and see who
43 owns what, and how much, and how it changes over time, and so this
44 is, I guess, a general statement, but I'm not sure that it does
45 anything for anybody.
46

47 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. I would suggest, and I'm going to take my
48 chair hat off for this, but I would suggest we focus on the ones

1 that are actually under council purview at the moment, and then we
2 can come back to the ones that are not, and, if there's something
3 major that you, as an individual or council -- If we as a council
4 feel needs to be in that third category, then we come back and add
5 those, but, right now, we're stuck on things that aren't even under
6 our purview.

7
8 This third category is nine pages, and we've got two workplans,
9 and so I'm going to mess your plan up, Emily, and I'm going to
10 skip the third categories. We're going to go with the highlighted
11 ones for now, Bernie, and so we're going to jump down to management
12 reform. Let's discuss eliminate one-size-fits-all management
13 approaches. Ed.

14
15 **MR. WALKER:** That doesn't really -- That's all encompassing. It's
16 not -- It has no specifics whatsoever, and it's too generalized to
17 be worth anything, in my view.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so you're suggesting to strike that
20 one. I kind of feel the same. We already do that on a species-
21 by-species basis, in my opinion.

22
23 **MR. WALKER:** Correct.

24
25 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** But is there support around the table to strike
26 that and not include it from the list? Yes? Bernie, strike it.
27 I'm seeing head nods. All right. Moving on to streamline
28 reporting and compliance through digital systems, as Assane
29 mentioned, we kind of did this already. We are in the process of
30 discussing SEFHIER. Any comments, any hopes of including it? Just
31 reminding you that you have to put in a workplan, that I would
32 imagine has to have deadlines. Assane, did you have a comment?
33 Ed.

34
35 **MR. WALKER:** So it just -- Streamline reporting and compliance
36 through digital systems, it doesn't say where, what species, what
37 kind of reporting, or compliance, or anything. It's super, super
38 vague. I mean, some fisheries already have reporting and digital
39 systems. Others don't, and don't need it. You know, I don't think
40 we need digital monitoring systems in Spanish mackerel at the
41 moment. This doesn't have any -- It's too broad and vague, in my
42 view.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Is there any hopes of adding language to -- No?
45 Okay. Is there support to strike it from the list? I'm looking
46 around the table for heads to nod or shake. You guys are giving
47 me nothing.

1 **MR. DUGAS:** I'll try. Ed, how do you feel about striking "digital"
2 and adding the word "modern"?
3

4 **MR. WALKER:** I'm okay with "modern" or "digital", but we're not
5 saying where or how. Maybe we could put "improve or explore
6 streamlining reporting and compliance through digital systems",
7 but this is kind of a direct -- Streamline via digital, which is
8 good for some things, and good for others, but does this mean it
9 encompasses everything that council manages? It just doesn't
10 really say.
11

12 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Andy.
13

14 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I agree with the conversation, in terms of detail
15 is important, but I also want to encourage you that you don't have
16 to have everything figured out today, right, and that there is a
17 workplan where you could put more meat on the bone and address
18 this. I think there's some key themes and things in here that you
19 may want to convey to the agency, right, that are still important,
20 even if they're generic, and so, for example, I'm thinking of
21 streamlining reporting and compliance through digital systems.
22

23 We're working on a coast-wide logbook program right now for the
24 east coast that integrates Northeast and Southeast and HMS all
25 into one umbrella, right, and so those are the types of things
26 that are, obviously, in our view, going to create efficiencies,
27 reduce the cost of these reporting systems, and so just, I think,
28 keep a broader view, in terms of recommendations you could provide
29 at the agency.
30

31 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. With that clarification, is there any
32 interest in adding terminology to this bullet point? Okay. I'm
33 seeing some nods for yes, and so, Bernie, please, let's modify to
34 explore --
35

36 **MR. WALKER:** To explore streamlining reporting and compliance
37 through digital systems.
38

39 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Is there any opposition to including this
40 bullet point as written? Not seeing any, we're going to move on
41 to turtle gear, which we have heard a lot about the last little
42 bit. I'm looking at you, Ed.
43

44 **MR. WALKER:** I certainly speak in favor of reevaluating sea turtle
45 protection, and certainly not removing them. It's just my personal
46 view on it is it's a little bit over the top, and so maybe take
47 another look at it and see what we need and what we don't, to
48 reduce the burden on commercial and charter boat operators.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Billy.

3
4 **MR. BILLY BROUSSARD:** Ed, would you want to put in there to make
5 them less restrictive, because you can read that and take what you
6 want out of the text.

7
8 **MR. WALKER:** Yes, and thank you for that. I didn't look at it
9 that way. I didn't mean to open the door to throw in four more
10 things inside the console that somebody somewhere said I need.
11 Yes, and I would maybe call it re-evaluate the need for individual
12 turtle protection gear and requirements, or individual items in
13 sea turtle protections and gear requirements, something like that.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** C.J., while we're working on language on the
16 screen.

17
18 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Yes, and it's to this point, and so, if we're going
19 to have to create a workplan to look at this one particular item,
20 we've got a lot we're working on, Ed. Is the juice worth the
21 squeeze here? I'm just throwing that out there.

22
23 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Emily.

24
25 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** So I just want to clarify, and maybe this didn't
26 come across in the points, and so the reevaluating sea turtle
27 protections was separate from the sea turtle gear requirements.
28 When they're talking about protections, as it was mentioned by the
29 advisory panels, they were talking about the listing, like it being
30 an ESA, it being, you know, endangered or whatever, and so that
31 was sort of, I think, separate, more of a NOAA purview type thing,
32 where they were saying that turtles should not be so highly
33 protected, or considered endangered or threatened, and I'm sorry
34 that I don't know which they are.

35
36 Then the separate part here, which I think you guys are talking
37 about, is reevaluating the gear requirements, which might be a
38 little bit over the top, and so I think maybe there's a way that
39 we need to separate those out, either into two separate bullets,
40 so that it's clear that one goes to the agency to say delist
41 turtles, unless you don't want that, and then one talks about
42 what's under directly our purview, which is removing some of those
43 individual requirements.

44
45 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Then I would suggest that we focus on the
46 gear requirements at the time, and ignore the listing, and we'll
47 come back to that, if that's something we want to add in that third
48 category. So, Ed, are you good with reevaluating individual turtle

1 gear requirements?
2
3 **MR. WALKER:** Yes, and that's really all I was -- I'm glad you
4 pointed that out, Emily, because I certainly would not go and ask
5 to delist sea turtles, but just reevaluate the gear requirements.
6 Thank you.
7
8 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Then can we add "turtle", the word "turtle" in
9 front of gear requirements? Brenda.
10
11 **MS. BRENDA BALLARD:** So I guess I just want some clarification.
12 We're sending this letter with an attachment of bullets, or is
13 this going to be written in paragraph form? I'm sorry, and it's
14 very technical.
15
16 **DR. DIAGNE:** Maybe both, and even some more, and, by that, I mean
17 there is a recommended format in the directive to the EDs, one of
18 the letters, by which there is a spreadsheet and different columns
19 referring, you know, to several items, but, probably for the
20 generic stuff, if you would, those may be in bullet format, but,
21 for our items, text format, to put some context, as mentioned by
22 some of you.
23
24 **MS. BALLARD:** Okay. Thank you.
25
26 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** C.J.
27
28 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I have an addition, if you would be okay with that,
29 Madam Chair.
30
31 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Go for it.
32
33 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Can we throw on here, and this is consistent with
34 what the Gulf Council has put forward in the past, implement the
35 DESCEND Act with Gulf Council regulations?
36
37 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Any discussion or opposition to that? Ed.
38
39 **MR. WALKER:** I would speak in favor of that.
40
41 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Dakus.
42
43 **MR. GEESLIN:** I would speak in favor of that as well.
44
45 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Any opposition? Andy.
46
47 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I'm not opposed, but I think the intent is not to
48 implement the DESCEND Act, but it's to implement -- Or replace the

1 DESCEND Act, right, because that's going to go away.
2
3 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Bernie, please change the word "implement" to
4 "replace". We all had to put our lawyer hats on, and only one of
5 us went to school for it at this table, and she's not here to check
6 us. Okay. As of right now, everything highlighted in yellow,
7 that is not struck out, will be in the letter. Is everybody good
8 with that under management reform? J.D.
9
10 **MR. DUGAS:** Thank you, Ms. Chair. Before we move on, I wanted to
11 revisit the first bullet point, eliminate one-size-fits-all
12 management approaches. I feel like this maybe should be in there.
13 We've had a lot of discussion around the table about regional
14 management. State management is already in place for red snapper.
15 To me, that's what this is.
16
17 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** C.J.
18
19 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I understand what you're saying, J.D., but I feel
20 like we're already doing that. Like we already have state
21 management, and we're considering other approaches to do things
22 relative to other species, like you're talking about there, and so
23 that's why I was okay eliminating it, because I feel like we are
24 doing that already.
25
26 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Mike.
27
28 **DR. ALLEN:** Again, it depends on what you mean by one-size-fits-
29 all, but this could fly in the face of deregulation too, right?
30 Like it may not be consistent with that, right? Like one-size-
31 fits-all could be a way to deregulate, or make regulations more
32 simple.
33
34 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so good with leaving the first bullet?
35 Okay. The first bullet is going to stay removed. Is everybody
36 good with the highlighted portions now? Last chance. Moving to
37 the next one, Bernie. Mr. Sanchez.
38
39 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Before we move on to the next one, are we going to
40 go back to IFQ? I'm not sure what we did with that.
41
42 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** We're just keeping the yellow ones at the moment
43 in the IFQ.
44
45 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Okay. Can we go back there, please?
46
47 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Back to the IFQ.
48

1 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Thank you. We kind of quickly jumped over that. I
2 would say the last one, consider replacing IFQ with trip-based
3 systems to improve impediments, we can remove that, because,
4 really, what happened, that created, that was the genesis of IFQ,
5 was a trip-based system. We had derbies, and we had safety-at-
6 sea issues.

7
8 We came up with an IFQ program, and here we are, many years later,
9 and, whether you like it or not, it's been successful, and I don't
10 see why we have to go back to that, which didn't work, and it got
11 us to where we're at, and so I would like to remove that one.

12
13 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Ed.

14
15 **MR. WALKER:** I would agree with that. I don't even remember us
16 talking about that. I wouldn't have supported that to begin with,
17 because Mr. Sanchez is right, and the red snapper in particular.
18 You know, the fisheries were a derby, and, like it or not, and
19 there's IFQ problems here and there, but it has worked out better
20 than a derby system would have, in my view, and so I don't think
21 we want that on our list, in my view.

22
23 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Looking around the table for support to
24 remove the last bullet under IFQ. I'm seeing a bunch of head nods,
25 and some thumbs-up. Bernie, please strike the last bullet, and
26 then C.J.

27
28 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Yes, and I guess we didn't go over these last couple
29 ones here, and so the oppose reallocations to the recreational
30 sector without accountability, I struggle with the sector versus
31 sector kind of call out here, but, I mean, the recreational sector
32 is accountable to the regulations that we put forward. It's just
33 not supported by some folks in the commercial sector, and so I
34 guess I would say that, and I'm not a huge favor of that one, and
35 I would like to remove it.

36
37 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I think you're right. I think we skipped a couple
38 of these. Good catch, Sanchez. I see Mr. Geeslin.

39
40 **MR. GEESLIN:** I would speak in support of that too, and I think we
41 did. I think we just skipped both of those, because that stuck
42 out with me as well.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so please strike through the highlighted
45 bullet point, Bernie, and then we're going to look for support or
46 not support. General.

47
48 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** Well, I can wait until after that, if you want

1 to do the support or not on that one, but I'm looking at one above
2 that.

3
4 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Let's finish this one, and I'll come right back
5 to you. I'm looking around the table for support to remove the
6 opposing reallocation to the recreational sector without
7 accountability. I'm seeing some head shakes. Any opposition?
8 Not seeing any, and so we're going to keep it stricken. General.

9
10 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** Third bullet down, where it says "explore", I
11 mean, we've been exploring this for five years, and we've been
12 looking at it and everything else. Is the council here
13 recommending this, that we think that this is what they should do?
14 If that's the case, I understand that require we can't do, you
15 know, because we can't require somebody, without understanding the
16 letter, but wouldn't we want to make that more of a strong thing,
17 of saying we recommend it, if that's what we want to do, rather
18 than explore it? I just don't like the word "explore", to me,
19 because that means they can just go, okay, we explored it, and we
20 looked at it.

21
22 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I believe it's for us to explore it. I'm looking
23 at Emily and Assane to confirm. Yes, and so this would be basically
24 making our list a to-do, and then we would work with Andy's team
25 to actually set up a workplan, with deadlines, is my understanding.

26
27 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** So we're going to send a letter to somebody
28 telling them we're going to explore something? I don't understand.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Well, would you like to strike it from the list?
31 Would you like to make that suggestion? Just a reminder that we're
32 only on the first EO, and we have another one to go.

33
34 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** I see what you're trying to do there, but I
35 just don't like the idea that I'm going to send a letter to
36 Secretary of Commerce, or whatever, saying that I'm going to
37 explore something. You're going to tell me to explore something
38 I'm already doing?

39
40 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. I mean, we can -- If you want to make that
41 suggestion, I'm happy to take it. I'm looking around the table
42 for support to strike that third bullet, or fourth bullet, and
43 that does not mean we don't do it. It just means it's not in the
44 letter, just for clarification. Mr. Geeslin.

45
46 **MR. GEESLIN:** No, and the General is right. We've been exploring
47 and talking about this. This is one of the lowest-hanging fruits
48 that we've been kicking around for a year or two now. I think

1 it's meaningless to include in the letter. I agree with the
2 General.

3

4 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Assane.

5

6 **DR. DIAGNE:** Yes. I mean, when the discussion started, I guess
7 there was -- You know, it was the statement was worded differently.
8 The exploration, or the addition of the word "explore", is simply
9 to maintain -- I guess to allow you, during the discussions on 59A
10 and B, to make the choices that you want to make. It is very
11 possible that, while we are discussing this, someone here thinks
12 that, rather than going with a permit requirement, a very strong
13 active participation is better. This is hypothetical.

14

15 In that case, well, you can do that, or vice versa, or if you
16 wanted to do both and so forth. The addition of the word "explore"
17 is just to maintain the full suite of choices that you have as a
18 council, and, if you recall, in 59A, you have already picked a
19 preferred that would require the ownership of a valid commercial
20 reef fish permit to obtain and maintain a shareholder's account
21 and to have shares and so forth.

22

23 This would allow us to let you keep the possibility of changing
24 your mind, because I think that this council has clearly indicated
25 that they are going to implement permit ownership as well as, how
26 do you say, active participation, and, which one is going to stay
27 at the end, that we don't know.

28

29 If, tomorrow, let's say you thought that active participation alone
30 was better, and you said I'm going to require both, then you won't
31 be able to go and have that choice going forward. That's all, but
32 the workplan here would indicate that we started two amendments,
33 59A and 59B, and then, upon completion, these amendments would
34 implement one or the other or both of these criteria. Thank you.

35

36 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Kevin, then the General.

37

38 **MR. ANSON:** So Assane addressed my point is that, again, depending
39 upon the words that you do use, and, you know, how you summarize
40 where these specific things fit into what the council has already
41 been doing -- I mean, it is helpful to at least -- Since these are
42 items at least that the APs have recommended, and the council seems
43 to be adopting for the most part, and, I mean, these are still
44 items that would be addressing specifically the EO, and so I think,
45 to the extent that even though we may have already started
46 something, and gone down that road, and it may be in a different
47 section of these are things that the council has already been
48 working on, but they would still address the EO.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you. General.
3

4 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** Okay. I'm trying to get my head around this.
5 I don't understand why we're asking the Secretary of Commerce to
6 tell us what we want to do, and, if that's what we do, and I know
7 they had sent us something, and asked for it, you know, some
8 information and all, but we're already doing this, right? We're
9 already doing something, and so why are we asking them to tell us
10 to do something we're already doing?
11

12 I guess I'm not understanding what they're asking for. I mean, if
13 a governor called me and said, hey, I want you to do something,
14 and tell me how you're going to do it, I would do it. I would
15 tell him how. I wouldn't go back and tell him that I would like
16 to think about doing this, but that's not what he's going to want.
17 I don't think Secretary of Commerce is going to want this. I think
18 he's going to want you to tell them what you want to do, and not
19 ask him what you want to do.
20

21 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so I'm going to let Andy jump to that,
22 but then I also saw Emily's hand come up, and so you're good?
23 Okay. Andy, we're going to let you address it.
24

25 **MR. STRELCHECK:** So I think there's three aspects to this, and I
26 saw him cover this earlier, General, and that's we've been going
27 through the yellow highlighted activities, which are things that
28 are within the council's purview, right, and so this is really the
29 focus of what you would want your workplan to be, in terms of
30 seafood competitiveness actions, right?
31

32 We also are interested in hearing from the councils about things
33 that NMFS can do, that maybe fall outside the scope of the council,
34 and things that fall outside the scope of NMFS there are more
35 initiatives, goals, objectives for government-wide seafood
36 competitiveness improvements, right, and so it's really that
37 three-pronged approach and how we, obviously, consider all of that,
38 but you're going to play a huge part, obviously, in that initial
39 workplan and how you want to prioritize the seafood competitiveness
40 actions that are under your purview.
41

42 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. I have Ed, and then Brenda. Okay. Ed is
43 good.
44

45 **MS. BALLARD:** So I guess, the way I see this, and I don't know if
46 this will help you, General, but I feel like we're reiterating our
47 efforts that are helping towards the competitiveness, and then
48 we'll let them know what they can do to help us, and help everybody

1 else, and so I just feel like we're reiterating what we're already
2 doing to help, so that they know we're contributing as well.

3
4 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so we're going to go back to the IFQ
5 highlighted two bullet points that have not been struck out. Are
6 we good leaving them in the letter as written? I'm looking around
7 the table. Okay. We're going to move on to a whole other topic
8 now, because we still got one more EO to go through, and we've got
9 to prioritize this stuff.

10
11 Keep going down, Bernie. I think we're through management reform.
12 Keep going, and so we're going to jump to species-specific
13 management. The first bullet point is shark harvest, which does
14 not fall under the council's purview, and so we're going to move
15 to support for opening red drum to commercial fishing. Dr.
16 Geeslin. I'm going to give you the honorary doctorate now.

17
18 **MR. GEESLIN:** Thank you, Dr. Banks. I'm going to speak up against
19 this one, and maybe a question for -- Mara, you are here. Back in
20 2007, President George W. Bush issued Executive Order 13449,
21 Protection of Striped Bass and Red Drum Population. Section 2
22 indicates revise current regulations as appropriate to include
23 prohibiting the sale of striped bass and red drum caught within
24 the EEZ of the United States off the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf
25 of Mexico. Not only does my interpretation indicate that this
26 would fly in the face of that executive order, but I don't think
27 that's something I would support, regardless.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Mara, comments?

30
31 **MS. LEVY:** I don't know if there was a question in there. I mean,
32 we've talked about this before, and so it's an executive order.
33 An executive order, they all say that you do them consistent with
34 applicable law. If there's a reason to manage it under the
35 Magnuson Act, there's a reason to open commercial fishing to
36 achieve OY, whatever the rationale is, the executive order on its
37 face would not prohibit you from doing that.

38
39 Whether the agency would implement what you're suggesting, because
40 there is a standing executive order, is another question. If
41 there's some desire to do it, and some reason, you could always
42 make the recommendation through your process.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Dakus.

45
46 **MR. GEESLIN:** Thanks for that, Mara. I mean, I just wanted to
47 bring it up in the context, as we're addressing two executive
48 orders, to bring back a previous executive order, which then begs

1 the question of why are we messing with these two executive orders?

2

3 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Ed, then C.J.

4

5 **MR. WALKER:** I would suggest striking this in the list.

6

7 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. C.J.

8

9 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I would suggest striking all three from this list
10 here. The king mackerel trip, we're, obviously, dealing with some
11 concerns on king mackerel right now. We've got an assessment, and
12 we delayed action on it.

13

14 The red snapper commercial allocation and remove minimum size
15 limits, that is a substantial change, and certainly we're going
16 through -- Working through a stock assessment where,
17 theoretically, these things can be worked out in a much better
18 process.

19

20 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. I'm going to look around the table, in
21 hopes that this goes really smoothly, and is everybody in agreement
22 to strike all three. Is there any opposition? Last call. We're
23 moving on.

24

25 Enforcement and monitoring. I'm telling you that we've got a whole
26 other one of these, and so looking at camera use, instead of
27 onboard observers, to reduce cost, and streamline economic surveys
28 and reduce burdens.

29

30 While I have the mic, I would suggest striking the economic
31 surveys. We're already discussing that in multiple other
32 amendments. I don't think that's something we need to include.
33 I'm going to look around the table, to see if anybody has got any
34 opposition, and I see C.J.'s hand. I think you have something to
35 say though. Okay. It's not about that one. Any opposition to
36 striking the survey portion? Seeing none, C.J.

37

38 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Yes, and then, to the other one, I do think that
39 there's some active lines of research that's ongoing right now. I
40 think the Gulf States just actually funded a couple of programs,
41 or projects, that were looking at explicitly this, and so can we
42 just add some of that language about consider use of cameras, or
43 explore use of cameras, to reduce costs of having observers
44 onboard? A question for the group, if this is of interest.

45

46 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I'm not opposed to that. Just remember anything
47 that we add to this list has to have a workplan, and is that
48 something we want to come up with a workplan? It doesn't -- It

1 not being on the list doesn't negate it happening.
2
3 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Fair point, Kesley.
4
5 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** So I would actually recommend striking it, but I
6 also see Ed's hand up, and so I'm going to let Ed jump in here.
7
8 **MR. WALKER:** I agree. The only way I would support that is if it
9 was a explore use of cameras, because I'm personally not a fan of
10 cameras on my commercial boat, and so I wouldn't support a line
11 that says use cameras.
12
13 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so I'm going to look around the table.
14 Any opposition to striking both of those from this list? No? All
15 right. We're hitting a stride. Moving into research and
16 technology. Sorry. General.
17
18 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** Can I go back up, and just not to that last
19 one, but the before that?
20
21 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Species specific management?
22
23 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** Some support of opening red drum to commercial
24 fishing, and, I mean, I guess the question is we have it in
25 Mississippi, and so I don't want to not be able to do it in
26 Mississippi.
27
28 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** It not on this letter does not mean we cannot do
29 it. It's just we are not putting a workplan to it. Okay. Research
30 and technology, Bernie. Embrace existing tech for data,
31 monitoring, and compliance, and I know we're kind of already doing
32 this, but, again, you would have to add a workplan to it. Is that
33 something we want to tie our hands to, or do we want to keep
34 talking about it in amendments?
35
36 I'm looking around the table. All right. No takers. Bernie, I
37 think we can strike it. I'm going to look around the table one
38 more time for any opposition to striking it from the list. Seeing
39 none, all right. Emily, do we need to prioritize any of those?
40
41 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** So I think that we can do that in Full Council,
42 once we clean up the list and present that to you in the committee
43 report. Do you want to take a look at the list that you generated
44 in June, the first time we talked about this, and see if there's
45 anything that needs to be retained and added to that list?
46
47 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Yes, I do. We also need to go back through the
48 non-highlighted portion, and I'm going to do it really quickly.

1 So, Bernie, go back up to the top of the list. Now that you know
2 that we do not have to have a workplan for these, I think we just
3 need to go through yes or no.

4
5 We can work on language, and maybe Full Council, if there needs to
6 be a lot of wordsmithing. Okay. Anything under domestic seafood
7 competitiveness that needs to be included or can be removed? Troy
8 Frady.

9
10 **MR. TROY FRADY:** Thank you, Madam Chair. After thinking about
11 these pretty broadly, I think we need to at least discuss the
12 utilization of bycatch and turn undervalued fish, or underutilized
13 fish, into pet food, fish oil, fertilizer, and at least have it -
14 - The idea to look at those things, the underutilized bycatch, get
15 rid of it, and use it for something good, because that is a constant
16 thing that we're always dealing with, is bycatch, and everybody is
17 always giving us a black eye, but, if we took that bycatch and
18 turned it into something productive, like the pet food, the fish
19 oils, and stuff like that, dog food or cat food, it would be wise
20 to at least give them an idea of what we're thinking about.

21
22 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Thank you. Bernie, can we add a bullet,
23 under domestic seafood competitiveness, for the use of bycatch?
24 Do you have any wordsmithing there, Troy, that you would like?

25
26 **MR. FRADY:** No, ma'am. It's just utilize the bycatch, which means
27 simply turn underutilized fish into pet food, fish oil, fertilizer,
28 et cetera. Turn underutilized fish species into pet foods, fish
29 oil, and/or fertilizer.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** So I have a question with this, and I'm maybe
32 jumping C.J.'s hand here, but are you talking about just unmanaged
33 species, because red snapper, and things like that, also pop up in
34 bycatch.

35
36 **MR. FRADY:** I would let the people higher up than me decide which
37 species. If it's going to die, and like shrimp trawls, for
38 instance. Those things that are shrimp trawls, all they do, use
39 them for, is to throw the stuff off the back of the boat, and
40 sharks eat it, or red drum come eat it, if they're in state waters.

41
42 You know, I'm not talking about using like a released red snapper
43 that floats off. That would be -- I mean, our job is to make sure
44 any fish doesn't float off, by using the DESCEND Act, but I'm just
45 trying to figure out a way to -- A broad term that we never
46 addressed bycatch.

47
48 Every issue we do, we always have to address bycatch, and I'm just

1 trying to say, well, why not take the underutilized fish? Red
2 snapper would be a utilized fish, but, you know, anything that is
3 not going to survive, utilize it, and create a market for it.
4

5 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. C.J., then Ed. Okay. Ed, then C.J.
6

7 **MR. WALKER:** So, while I don't disagree with Troy, I would like to
8 point out that we're going over comments that have been given to
9 us by the public comment and the advisory panel meetings. This is
10 a summary of their recommendations. I don't think we're adding
11 completely new ones at this time, are we?
12

13 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** We're using this as the list for Assane and Emily
14 to make our letter from, and so, yes, while the list started with
15 AP summaries, we are now accepting, removing, or adding to the
16 list for the letter.
17

18 **MR. WALKER:** I thought we had our own list the last time though,
19 didn't we?
20

21 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** We're going to add anything that wasn't on that
22 list to this. We are about to combine all of them. Mr. Sanchez.
23

24 **MR. SANCHEZ:** No.
25

26 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** No? Okay. Johnny Marquez.
27

28 **MR. JOHN MARQUEZ:** Is "underutilized" the right term to use here,
29 because it seems to me that that term gets used in fisheries when
30 we're talking about trying to prosecute a fishery that has not
31 been used in the past, like say ladyfish or something, and
32 developing a market for that as an underutilized fishery, whereas,
33 when you've got bycatch, you've got all kinds of stuff in there
34 that are utilized fisheries, and that's just -- I mean, it's a
35 function of the fishery that you have these dead discards.
36

37 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Have you got a suggestion to wordsmith? C.J.,
38 you had your hand up, while he's thinking about it. Do you want
39 to jump in?
40

41 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Sure. I mean, yes, these are great ideas
42 conceptually across-the-board, and I don't think really anyone
43 necessarily disagrees with, you know, not having -- Not importing
44 products from countries with forced labor. Bycatch, sure, that
45 would be great to be utilized, but there are so -- Bycatch in
46 particular, I just get afraid, when we're sitting here talking
47 about utilizing bycatch in some capacity.
48

1 While good in principle, I mean, now we're talking about
2 potentially creating fisheries that are targeting those instead,
3 and like we have to be considerate of how that works in the quota,
4 and it just gets incredibly complicated.

5
6 Troy, I mean, in theory, I like the use of bycatch, if we can, if
7 that fish is going to be dead anyways, and that's a waste of a
8 resource, but, I mean, I would like to be a little bit more -- Can
9 we explore using bycatch, and, obviously, there are implications
10 for MSA, but I was really just kind of shaking my head about some
11 of the other stuff here.

12
13 Like I realize that these are recommendations coming from the AP,
14 and these are beyond our purview here, but this is really getting
15 into the weeds here, and I feel like we're going to be here until
16 like midnight if we're like exploring one-by-one every single one
17 of these, when, in reality -- You know, like the tariffs one, and
18 like that doesn't even involve NOAA. I mean, that's not even a
19 NOAA recommendation, and so what are we doing here?

20
21 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** So what is the council's appetite then to --
22 Because we do have that third section, where we can put stuff in,
23 and I would say maybe limit it to like the top five that you really
24 care about. Otherwise, we are going to send like a forty-page
25 letter, and we all know how we like forty-page letters. Troy.

26
27 **MR. FRADY:** What if we just use the words "dead bycatch in the
28 reef fish and shrimp fisheries"?

29
30 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I don't think that negates any of the things C.J.
31 was talking about, because you still have some other issues there.

32
33 **MR. FRADY:** I'm just trying to figure out a way to make our nation
34 a little bit better. That's all. I'm just trying to -- I'm
35 thinking about these things.

36
37 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I think we're all on the same page of that. Okay,
38 and so the suggestion has been consider the use of bycatch.

39
40 **MR. FRADY:** "Consider" is an acceptable word.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Consider the use of bycatch.

43
44 **MR. FRADY:** I just thought of that.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Then I had you had -- John Walter, you raised
47 your hand up?

48

1 **DR. JOHN WALTER:** Yes, and thank you. I'm not on the committee,
2 but I just wanted to bring back that increased production is one
3 of the -- Sorry, Frank, and I know that probably had you fall out
4 of your chair, when I said increased seafood production. You could
5 see that, and so how are we going to do that, but we are asked to
6 do that, and how we can get more out of the system.

7
8 I think that's certainly within scope for the EO, and I think
9 Troy's suggestion is getting there, in terms of what's
10 underutilized, or not utilized at all, and so I think those are
11 good things for say, you know, as a workplan, what are the scope
12 for increased production out of the system that would be
13 sustainable, and I think that meets the EO, very much to the
14 letter, and so I think maybe that broad thinking might be a good
15 endeavor to set a workplan up. Are there species that are
16 underutilized, because, you know, we used to be the Bureau of
17 Commercial Fisheries, and that's what we focused on, but then our
18 mission has changed, but I think part of this is saying what kind
19 of production can be increased, and so thanks.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. So we've now -- Oh lord. All right, Troy.
22 Let's go.

23
24 **MR. FRADY:** All right. Under the marketing, I would ask that the
25 agency, or our government, consider, under the marketing aspect of
26 this, storytelling, using local fishermen, families, and
27 communities to be part of the marketing of domestic seafood
28 production, much like the beef industry did, or the dairy industry
29 did, like Got Milk. These are just ideas to be considered, but
30 the marketing using the storytelling, using fishermen and local
31 families on coastal communities to be part of the marketing, and
32 is that too much?

33
34 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** So, Bernie, under promoting domestic seafood
35 through national branding and marketing campaigns, specifically
36 using tactics including storytelling, and what else have you got,
37 Troy?

38
39 **MR. FRADY:** By using local fishermen and families.

40
41 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Highlighting local fishing families.

42
43 **MR. FRADY:** Yes, and communities as part of the marketing. We're
44 just following the example that the milk industry and the dairy
45 industry and the beef industry has used before, and I've yet to
46 see any kind of seafood marketing, other than Cisco Foods, the
47 buyers.

1 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so we're going to keep moving forward.
2 Good news that we're only going to do one EO today. The other one
3 does not have a timeline on it, and, since we're in the weeds of
4 the first EO, we're going to push the second EO to November. I'm
5 looking around the table that the committee is okay with that.
6 Otherwise, to quote C.J., you can hang out till midnight. Okay.
7 We're going to stick with the first EO. Okay, and so, on the
8 screen, are we good with domestic seafood competitiveness? C.J.

9
10 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I'm going to bring up the concept of what we talked
11 about at the last council meeting, before we got the AP
12 recommendations, and there might be some things on there we might
13 want to consider.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so you want that letter up prior to
16 finishing the non-highlighted ones? Okay. We're going to go
17 through the non-highlighted ones, and then we'll pull that up.
18 Okay. While Bernie is doing some stuff, we're going to stick with
19 the non-highlighted ones, and finish out the AP stuff first,
20 Bernie.

21
22 Okay, and so we're going to move on down to the IFQ program. We
23 have two non-highlighted bullet points. Are these things we want
24 to include in that third category or not? Any appetite for
25 improving the loan program or increasing transparency? I'm getting
26 nothing, and so, at this point, it's not. Okay. Ed.

27
28 **MR. WALKER:** I don't understand why we're doing this again. I
29 think didn't we just do this? We picked the ones we wanted, and
30 why are we going over the ones we didn't want? This is the non-
31 council purview ones to include in that third section, and so we
32 stopped looking at them to get our highlighted ones, our purview
33 ones, done first, and so, Kevin, you're thinking about it.

34
35 **MR. ANSON:** That's a scary proposition, and so then, based on what
36 your comment was, if we decide not to include Number 2 in here,
37 then it won't be referenced at all in the letter, correct?

38
39 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Correct.

40
41 **MR. ANSON:** Okay. All right. Thank you.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** C.J.

44
45 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I think this is where we stopped kind of splitting
46 things up here, or we started to split things up, and I think we
47 had already discussed these two, and I thought most people around
48 the table were good with what we had there, unless I'm mistaken.

1
2 I think Andy asked for maybe a little bit of how can we improve,
3 a little bit more prescriptiveness on the IFQ loan program, and
4 then we talked a little bit more in detail about the transparency
5 part, and Assane hit that.

6
7 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Does anybody want to add any specifics?
8 If not, we're going to move into labor issues. Seeing nothing,
9 Bernie, we're going to labor issues. Okay. Anybody want to
10 include any of the four of these? As of right now, there are zero.
11 C.J.

12
13 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I mean, I'm in favor of the last one. If there's
14 anything that we can do along those lines to make recommendations,
15 and, I mean, I think graying of the fleet is a constant concern
16 that we have. We're trying to work through that through some of
17 the IFQ amendments, to address some of those issues, and so I don't
18 know what the council thinks, but I would be supportive of putting
19 that one forward.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I'm looking around the table for any opposition
22 to including supporting training programs for young fishermen.
23 Seeing no opposition, any of the other three? Seeing no hunger,
24 Bernie, we can strike the other three. Sanchez.

25
26 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I don't know if the verbiage is exactly what it
27 should be, but we are having a lot of issues in the industry right
28 now with citizenship requirements and crews. For instance, in the
29 Keys right now, there's a lot of lobstermen that still have their
30 gear on the hill, because they were using some non-citizen crews
31 historically, and now they're all afraid to show up at the boat.

32
33 A lot of gear is remaining on the hill, and I suspect it's not
34 just the lobster fishery. It probably goes to others, and so,
35 while I'm all for, you know, requiring citizenship and this and
36 that, and removing the worst of the worst in what we're trying to
37 do now, I think that, when we have law-abiding people, that are
38 trying to come to this country and arguably do jobs that most
39 people don't want to do, it's going to have an impact on the
40 industry, and so I would say leave that one in there.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Are you talking about the third bullet, remove
43 citizen requirements for crews?

44
45 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Yes, and like you were going to strike that one, and
46 I would say leave it. That would be my opinion.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Yes, and these are recommendations that we are

1 pushing forward. I don't know if they would specifically go to
2 NOAA, or someone above that. Ed.

3
4 **MR. WALKER:** I mean, so what we're saying is allow illegal workers,
5 illegal immigrants, on work crews, and is that correct?

6
7 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Lt. Morton.

8
9 **LT. MORTON:** Hi. Thank you, Madam Chair. I think, when we talk
10 about citizen requirements for crews, we're talking about like the
11 75/25 rule, and not illegal immigrant workers working, but, on
12 commercial fishing vessels, non-licensed seamen can't make up more
13 than 25 percent of the crew onboard, and so, if you have four
14 people onboard, three have to be either U.S. citizens or legal
15 permanent residents, like green card holders, and only one of those
16 four people could be on an H2B visa, I believe, is the appropriate
17 code for fishing, and so not illegal immigration, but, for the
18 sake of discussion, it would be that 75/25 rule.

19
20 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you. Emily.

21
22 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Just to provide a little bit of context for where
23 this specific one came from, is we heard from a gentleman in the
24 shrimp industry, and often shrimp vessels run three-person crews,
25 in which case the 75/25 rule means that you can't have anybody
26 that's here working on a visa. It has to be all American citizens
27 onboard, and so that's just the context for it.

28
29 **MR. WALKER:** Thank you for that. I was I missed the visa part. I
30 didn't know if that's what we were talking about, and I've heard
31 Mr. Sanchez -- I've been down in the Keys for a while, and it's a
32 very big deal down there for them, but I didn't understand it
33 completely, but I do now, and so thank you.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Dakus.

36
37 **MR. GEESLIN:** I mean, this is this is not specific to the fishing
38 industry. This is -- We're experiencing this right here, right
39 here in Texas, across many industries, many sectors, many different
40 businesses. I guess my suggestion would be to keep stricken the
41 remove citizenship requirements for crews, but to bring back the
42 top two, because, if you're going to retain citizenship
43 requirements, that's great, but you've got to have an avenue for
44 workers to get aboard these vessels to do the work they're intended
45 to do in a legal way.

46
47 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Kevin, I think your hand was up next.

48

1 **MR. ANSON:** Yes, and so I'm trying to reconcile what Lt. Morton
2 said relative to removing the citizenship requirements for crews,
3 and so remove or modify citizenship requirements for crews, and
4 then specifying the -- What was that terminology used to describe
5 that?
6

7 **LT. MORTON:** 75/25.
8

9 **MR. ANSON:** The 75/25 rule, is my suggestion.
10

11 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** So, Bernie, I think, rather than striking remove
12 citizen requirements, it would be modify citizen requirements for
13 crews by reconsidering the viability of the 75/25 rule on all
14 fishing vessels, and so that would sort of, you know, create maybe
15 a consideration for these three-crew ship type deals.
16

17 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I'm confused doing math. Okay. I'm looking
18 around the table for any opposition for the language change in
19 bullet three. Seeing none, are we back to including all four
20 bullets in category three? All right. Moving on to management
21 reform. We'll give Bernie a second. Lt. Morton.
22

23 **LT. MORTON:** While we're waiting, I did want to point out that
24 there are currently 75/25 rule waivers that you can apply for
25 through -- I believe NOAA takes those waivers, and so there are
26 avenues possible to have folks who aren't U.S. citizens working on
27 these vessels.
28

29 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you. Okay. Looking at management reform,
30 Bernie, starting with apply sector-specific discard rates
31 independently. Is there an appetite to include this in the letter?
32 I'm seeing a couple of head shakes. Is there any opposition to
33 striking it from this list? Seeing no opposition, Bernie, please
34 strike apply sector-specific discard rates.
35

36 Moving to suspend ESA consultations for certain species, is there
37 any support to include this? Seeing no movement, is there any
38 opposition to striking it? Bernie, please strike it. Re-evaluate
39 sea turtle protection. Is there any appetite to include this?
40 Seeing none, Bernie, please strike. All right. On to economic
41 support. Support working waterfronts with investments in docks,
42 dry dock facilities and fish markets, is there any appetite to
43 include this? Ed.
44

45 **MR. WALKER:** On the first line, I support working -- Supporting
46 working waterfronts, yes.
47

48 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Is there any opposition to including it?

1 Good. Moving on. This is awful. To the second bullet point, is
2 there any opposition to include this, the disaster relief funds
3 for commercial fishermen? C.J.
4
5 **DR. SWEETMAN:** No opposition, but can we just put the words
6 "quickly", "more quickly", or "more rapidly" somewhere in there?
7
8 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Sure. General.
9
10 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** I mean, aren't we already authorized to do
11 that?
12
13 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Emily.
14
15 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** We are not, but, yes, that is the thing, and then
16 I think there's a bill in Congress that would expedite it so that
17 it has to be within forty days of the disaster already, and so it
18 could be redundant, or maybe not. I don't know.
19
20 **DR. SWEETMAN:** It's in FISHERIES Act. Yes, I'm very familiar, but
21 there is still some things that could be improved upon there, I
22 would say, and so that's why I'm putting that one forward, and,
23 also, I'll say, because of FISHERIES Act, it also includes charter-
24 for-hire, and so maybe we want to throw that in here, too.
25
26 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Dave.
27
28 **MR. DONALDSON:** So can we change it to improve the timeliness of
29 distributing disaster relief funds to commercial fishermen, just
30 because I think that's what we're trying to do.
31
32 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I will look to Emily. I do not think the AP
33 included for-hire in that discussion, but we can definitely add it
34 to this line. Sanchez.
35
36 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Yes, and I like where Dave was going, to just add
37 charter-for-hire.
38
39 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Bernie, so we're going to wordsmith this to say
40 improve timeliness of disaster relief funds to charter-for-hire
41 and commercial fishers. General.
42
43 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** Okay, and I'm still trying to get this. We
44 already do that in Mississippi. We had federal funds for disaster
45 that we were able to give it to charter-for-hire, and we were able
46 to give it to commercial fishermen, and now I do like the
47 timeliness. I do like that part of it, but, I mean, I thought
48 charter-for-hire was already there. It's up to the state to decide

1 how they want to distribute their money that they receive.

2
3 **DR. SWEETMAN:** It's not the state process I'm talking about,
4 General.

5
6 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** Okay. Then, I mean, I guess what you're
7 talking about -- When we work with NOAA on our process, you know,
8 we asked them to allow us to do that, and, this last two times we
9 had, 2019 and 2020, they allowed us to do both. You know, if it
10 was enough disaster, and especially 2019, and we were allowed to
11 do the commercial, and were allowed -- Am I missing something here?

12
13 **DR. SWEETMAN:** All I'm talking about is the timeliness of when
14 these decisions are made. That is literally all I'm talking about,
15 General.

16
17 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Moving forward, any opposition to including it as
18 written? Seeing none, moving on. Create federal insurance
19 programs for fishers, do we want to include this, yes or no?
20 General.

21
22 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** Yes, and I think there is some programs out
23 there now, but I would love to improve them as much as we possibly
24 could, because we have like oystermen and others that are doing
25 it, and, you know, I know that we could look at different programs,
26 but aquaculture, you know, could be included.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Any opposition to including? Seeing none.
29 Secure funding for shrimp vessel tracking and data programs, any
30 appetite to include? I'm looking around the table. Seeing none,
31 Bernie, please strike. Sanchez.

32
33 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Leave that one in there.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Any opposition to including it? This is
36 going to be a fifty-page letter. Kevin.

37
38 **MR. ANSON:** So this -- We talked earlier, when we first started
39 this this agenda item, about how some of these might be conflicting
40 with the second executive order, and so I just can't remember where
41 we fell on that decision, as to whether or not we would restrict,
42 or have them both be talking to one another, essentially, because
43 this I see is additional regulation potentially, and so that's
44 all.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I don't think we fell anywhere on it. I think we
47 just decided to punt that whole other EO to another meeting. I
48 also think it would be -- It would fall probably more under that

1 deregulatory, but last chance for any opposition to including.
2 All right. We're going to leave it in there, Bernie.
3
4 Redirect S-K funding directly to fishermen. I'm just going to go,
5 as an academic, and I kind of disagree with this. If you want
6 some science done, you need to -- We're already getting our grants
7 cut, and so I personally would like to strike that, especially
8 since the government -- Okay. I see a couple of other academics
9 saying yes. Anybody have any opposition to striking it? Seeing
10 none, Bernie, please strike that one.
11
12 All right. Moving to species-specific management on sharks, there
13 was a very -- Before I jumped to you, Troy, because I know you're
14 going to say a lot of the same things that were said at the AP,
15 there was a very strong push to transfer management to the council
16 process in all four of the AP sessions that I sat, and so just
17 bear that in mind as we talk about this. Troy.
18
19 **MR. FRADY:** Madam Chair, you speak really fast, and I apologize,
20 but I would like to go back and add a bullet point, right up
21 underneath redirects Saltonstall-Kennedy, before we leave it. You
22 were real quick change it, and I'm like I know you knew I was
23 coming, but I just want to get one more little bullet in there.
24
25 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** All right. Let's hear it.
26
27 **MR. FRADY:** I would like to require that more U.S. seafood was
28 used in school lunches, for our military, and for food assistance
29 programs. That is to require more U.S. seafood into the school
30 lunches, military, and food assistance programs.
31
32 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I think that was in the last letter. Any
33 opposition to including this bullet point? Seeing none, we're
34 going to move back to species-specific management.
35
36 **MR. FRADY:** Thank you, Madam Chair.
37
38 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Sharks, and so any opposition, or appetite, to
39 including this in the letter? Ed.
40
41 **MR. WALKER:** I support this. I think this should be number one on
42 the list, to be honest with you, particularly the shark fin ban on
43 sharks that are already coming to the dock anyway, and requiring
44 domestic fishermen to cut the fins off and throw them away, when
45 a shark is already in the boat dead. If you really want to help
46 American seafood competitiveness, let the American man that
47 brought the shark in sell all of it, instead of just the cheap
48 part, and dump the rest overboard, and this goes across a lot of

1 different things, and I know that it came up in a lot of the APs
2 as well, and so it seems to be a popular topic.

3
4 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you. C.J.

5
6 **DR. SWEETMAN:** So the fin ban was a congressional action, and so
7 this is where I'm struggling with some of these things here, okay,
8 because like we're making recommendations to the U.S. Secretary,
9 and separate powers there, and then I guess my question maybe is
10 for Mara. Is it MSA that dictates that sharks and those are
11 managed by HMS, and so that would require an MSA reauthorization
12 by Congress once again to do that?

13
14 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** So what I'm hearing is you want to strike it,
15 because it's not relevant in the third category?

16
17 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I mean, I'm not saying strike it, and like there's
18 parts that I understand, and I agree with, and I just -- Is the
19 Gulf Council going to ask Congress to change their laws, basically,
20 is what we're asking them to do here, and I just don't think that's
21 operating in reality, but maybe I'm --

22
23 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Shoot for the stars, C.J. This is your wish list.
24 J.D.

25
26 **MR. DUGAS:** C.J., I hear you loud and clear, and it's a
27 recommendation. They can say no, and they can say yes. Put it in
28 there. We get complaints all the time. Let's do something, or
29 try.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Ed.

32
33 **MR. WALKER:** So I have a suggestion. Maybe we separate the fin
34 band, and perhaps expanding shark harvest, and put transfer
35 management of sharks as a separate bullet point, because one seems
36 entirely impossible, and the other one seems like it might have a
37 chance, and, by linking them together, you may sacrifice -- I don't
38 know that a lot of them have a lot of chance, but I would suggest
39 making that two bullet points, the second one being transfer
40 management of sharks to the Gulf Council.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I'm going to offer a friendly amendment to just
43 say council process. I don't think the Gulf Council wants to
44 manage all sharks, because we do manage them with the Atlantic.

45
46 **MR. WALKER:** You know that that's a good point. Transfer
47 management of Gulf of America sharks to the Gulf Council, and I
48 don't know. I mean, we don't want to manage, you know, Antarctic

1 salmon sharks or anything like that, but maybe our coastal, common
2 coastal, sharks in the Gulf of Mexico. I don't know. The point
3 being that I would like to separate those two, and we could talk
4 about them separately.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Yes, and I agree with separating them. I just -
7 - You do have some species in the Gulf that migrate to the Atlantic,
8 and so now you're only talking about coastal sharks, is what I
9 heard in your discussion.

10
11 **MR. WALKER:** I think --

12
13 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** That was why my point was if you just said council
14 process, and you leave it up to the reauthorization of Magnuson to
15 figure out who is doing what.

16
17 **MR. WALKER:** Well, if you think that has got a better chance, I'll
18 go with that, sure. It would get complicated trying to identify
19 which we're talking about, and so, yes, we can go with that.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, Bernie, and so we're going to say transfer
22 management of sharks to council process, or councils. To the
23 councils, the fishery management councils. Ed.

24
25 **MR. WALKER:** Sorry, but this is an important one to me. I think
26 it would be more reasonable to, in the first line, not to open
27 shark harvest, but to expand. I mean, we're not looking for
28 unlimited, unbridled shark harvest here, but just a reasonable
29 increase in quotas, where applicable.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Any opposition to including these two in
32 the third category as written? Seeing none, moving on to
33 enforcement and monitoring. Reduce enforcement targeting of
34 commercial vessels for minor issues, and is there any appetite to
35 include? I'm looking around the table. Seeing nothing, please
36 strike, Bernie. Okay. Research and technology. Ground test
37 shrimp stock assessment models before use. What does that mean?
38 Mike, did you have your hand up?

39
40 **DR. ALLEN:** I have the same question. I don't know what that
41 means.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Dr. Froeschke.

44
45 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I believe that was in reference to the new stock
46 assessment model, which is a totally different paradigm, in that
47 it uses historical information and time lags to make predictions
48 sort of in a new space, and the request was made that this actually

1 be tested, such that you should be able -- If it worked accurately,
2 you should be able to take the environmental data and predict one
3 year ahead, and they wanted to actually make that test before you
4 operationalized it, and so it's essentially a predictive model,
5 and they just wanted to see some validation of that before it was
6 used to base management off of it.

7
8 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** C.J.

9
10 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Dr. Walter, I assume the Science Center would do a
11 lot of exploring to any new model that's being considered for use
12 in a stock assessment.

13
14 **DR. WALTER:** Yes, and, actually, one of the key elements of that
15 process, the EDM process, is validation as to whether it does do
16 predictive -- Whether the prediction works, and you take that
17 through the time series.

18
19 I suppose here this request is to do further evaluation of that
20 before something goes into place, but it seems like that was what
21 was done in order to obtain that process, and so it seems to be a
22 fairly substantially additional request that we don't usually put
23 our other assessments through, and probably, for an annual species
24 like this, that isn't getting the same type of management, because
25 it doesn't have an ACL, because of its annual life history, perhaps
26 it's not as critical of a concern, because it has already been put
27 through that kind of testing to show whether it works.

28
29 I would need more information to know what in particular the
30 concern is here, but, to my mind, and given from what I've seen in
31 the modeling, it's not going to restrict the productivity of the
32 shrimp fishery by any means, because the shrimp stocks appear to
33 be in perfectly fine shape, and overfishing is not going on, and
34 there are other factors that are right now currently at play
35 restricting the fishery from achieving its optimum yield, and so
36 I can't speak further for it, because I wasn't there when that
37 recommendation was put in place. Thanks.

38
39 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Dr. Froeschke.

40
41 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I think, just briefly, the idea was -- So, for
42 example, the EDM model would predict year class strength, you know,
43 one year ahead of time, and so, for example, before it was in
44 place, you would actually say provide a prediction for the 2026
45 year class strength based on the preceding year data out of the
46 model.

47
48 They just wanted to see an actual working example, I mean, with

1 validation, and, you know, you still have all the data beforehand,
2 and so this would be a true out-of-sample test, and they just
3 wanted to see that.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so, based on that conversation, I would
6 recommend this not necessarily be included in the letter to the
7 Secretary. We've just notified NMFS that the APs would like a
8 little more information, is what I got from that, and so is there
9 any opposition to striking it? No? Bernie, please strike the
10 ground test shrimp stock assessment.

11
12 Cooperative research to reduce lag between science and management,
13 there are a few research grants like this already, but I will open
14 the floor to discussions. I personally think, the more we put in
15 the letter, the less things stand out, and so, for me personally,
16 I would strike this, but I am open to the committee. Any appetite
17 to include it? Seeing nothing, C.J.

18
19 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I don't view it as bad necessarily, Dr. Banks, and
20 mainly the reason why I'm viewing it under this lens of potential
21 inclusion is because we're going to be operating now under less
22 data, based on current fiscal constraints, and what we've really
23 been trying to do is address some of the timing issues that we've
24 had for science and management, and I feel like this kind of falls
25 along those lines.

26
27 This might be different than just SEDAR, which is really what we've
28 been talking about, to kind of streamline that, and so I don't
29 know exactly what this looks like, but I think this kind of lines
30 up with what the council has been trying to do.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Any opposition to including it in the
33 letter? All right. Environmental concerns. Address windfarm
34 impacts on shrimping grounds and ecosystems, and any appetite to
35 include in the letter? Seeing none, Bernie, please strike.

36
37 Ensure long-term competitiveness and ocean health in regulatory
38 decisions, any appetite to include? Seeing none, Bernie, please
39 strike. J.D. Okay. Before we jump into our list, because we
40 haven't even got there, I'm hearing we're going to take a break.

41
42 **MR. DUGAS:** Let's take a ten-minute break.

43
44 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

45
46 **MR. DUGAS:** We're going to get started. Okay, folks. We're going
47 to move some things around on the agenda, due to the Coast Guard
48 being on the line to answer some questions due to the safety

1 requirements, and so Dr. Banks is still going to lead us through
2 that, and then we'll go back to the other EO and finish that today.

3
4 A lot of it is duplicated, and so we just knock it out today, and
5 so our four o'clock closed session may be a little bit later today,
6 and so just a heads-up to stay put, and we might be here until
7 5:00. Dr. Banks.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you very much. Lt. Morton, are you ready
10 to talk about Starlink?

11
12 **U.S. COAST GUARD SAFETY REQUIREMENTS TO CARRY OBSERVERS**

13
14 **LT. MORTON:** I am. Thank you, Madam Chair. Okay. Bernie, if you
15 could please pull up the presentation. All right. While that's
16 getting pulled up, I'll just go ahead and start. For the new
17 council members, welcome. My name is Lt. Jackson Morton. I'm the
18 Living Marine Resources Officer at Coast Guard Heartland District.
19 We used to be known, up until a couple of months ago, as the Coast
20 Guard's 8th District, but we've since changed names.

21
22 No changes to the mission or daily operations or anything like
23 that, but just a name change, and a logo change as well. I'm going
24 to be talking about -- I'm also joined, on the line, by Mr. Patrick
25 Gallagher from Coast Guard Headquarters. His office works as the
26 main POC for Starlink, as well as Mr. John Sherlock. He's the
27 district's Commercial Mission Safety Coordinator, and then Mr.
28 George Rau. He is a local Coast Guard fishing vessel safety
29 examiner, and they'll be online to answer any questions and assist
30 as needed at the end of the presentation.

31
32 Today, I'm talking about radio telecommunications safety
33 requirements for the commercial fishing vessel fleet here in the
34 Gulf. I'm making today's presentation because, during the last
35 council meeting, we heard some comments about some fishermen's
36 inability to have observers onboard due to noncompliance with their
37 Coast Guard dockside safety exam, specifically the radio
38 telecommunications portion of the exam, and then, more
39 specifically, because they had Starlink installed onboard, and
40 then they were told that they were not able to carry observers,
41 because they didn't pass the exam.

42
43 There's two things at work here, the first one being the
44 requirement to actually be able to carry the observers, as well as
45 the Coast Guard portion of the safety exam, and so, first, I would
46 like to point out that, per the CFR listed, and 50 CFR 600.746 is
47 the actual requirement for these vessels to pass the exam, and so
48 it requires a vessel to pass the Coast Guard dockside safety exam.

1
2 We'll look at it in a second, but it's Coast Guard Form CG5587,
3 and, with that, display a valid dockside safety examination decal,
4 and then, once those are complete, you can carry observers for the
5 safety portion of it.

6
7 That dockside safety examination decal is good for two years, and
8 so that means a commercial fishing vessel, in order to carry
9 observers, would have to go through this exam once every two years.
10 Bernie, if you could please pull up the Coast Guard CG5587
11 checklist, and then so, in general, in order to get your decal,
12 you have to go through this examination.

13
14 We can see it here. It's ten pages long. This is what the Coast
15 Guard fishing vessel safety examiner is going to bring onboard,
16 and go ahead and check it off, and so the first page is mostly the
17 administrative portion, you know, and you can see things like
18 vessel name, ID number, so on and so forth.

19
20 If you just want to go down to the next page, Bernie, you can see,
21 and then here you can see there's like six pages of this, and so
22 it's different regulations and requirements. It has a reference
23 number for the exact CFRs, as well as like a plain language
24 document, and it's broken up into different sections. Like I said,
25 this is a ten-page document, and there's a lot of small print on
26 it, and so there's a lot of different regulations that these folks
27 have to be in compliance with.

28
29 If you're -- If you have the document pulled up on a computer,
30 page 3 has -- Under the bridge section, it has the specific
31 regulations that I'll be talking about, about your communication,
32 and so, Bernie, if you could go back to the slides, please.

33
34 Okay, and so there's a lot of different regulations, and, in fact,
35 each vessel is going to have different requirements, based on
36 numerous things, and it could be the vessel characteristics, where
37 they're operating out of, et cetera, et cetera, and acknowledging
38 this, that there's a lot of different -- There's a lot of different
39 things that need compliance with.

40
41 The Coast Guard, specifically the Northwest District, Coast Guard
42 District 13, it used to be known as, Fish Safe West, created a
43 website that has a user friendly web-based tool that is designed
44 to assist your vessel owners with preparing for your exam. You
45 can see the URL is down there, as well as the Coast Guard CGCBC3.
46 That's the headquarters office that deals with commercial fishing
47 vessel safety.

48

1 You go there, and you enter in some information about your vessel,
2 and it will generate a checklist for you of what you need to have
3 for this for this exam, and then, also, a side note, and we did
4 talk about 75/25 a little bit earlier, and I said I wasn't exactly
5 sure who granted the waivers for 75/25, and it's going to be that
6 program office right there, and so CGCBC3, and so I just wanted to
7 correct myself from a little bit earlier.

8
9 That is the examination, in a general sense, and then, for the
10 rest of the presentation, I'm going to be focusing on the specific
11 radio telecommunications requirements, and then we'll be able to
12 answer questions on that specific part as well.

13
14 The first part is your short-range communications, and this is all
15 working off of 46 CFR 28.245 Coast Guard recall, Rescue 21, but,
16 essentially, it states that every vessel operating outside the
17 boundary line must be equipped with a radiotelephone transceiver
18 capable of transmitting and receiving within the listed 156 to 162
19 megahertz frequency band.

20
21 In plain language, all that means is that these vessels have to
22 have VHF radio capable of operating on those frequencies. For
23 example, Channel 16, international hailing and distress, is 156.8
24 megahertz, and so this is close-range, short-range communications.
25 If you have VHF radio capable of using Channel 16, you meet the
26 requirements in this part.

27
28 Okay, and so this is your more long-range communications,
29 specifically sat phones, right, and this applies to vessels
30 operating more than twenty nautical miles from shore. In the Gulf
31 regio -- There's a lot of different parts of this, per the
32 regulations, but, for the Gulf region, for the most part, the kind
33 of vessels that we have, we're really talking about satellite phone
34 communications.

35
36 In order to meet the requirements for this, you need to have a
37 satellite phone that can operate on the Iridium MR sat network in
38 the area in which you're operating, right, you have to have service
39 where you're going to be, and then you meet the requirements listed
40 under the CFR there. It's in 146 CFR 28.245.

41
42 There's also another provision for cellular service and with a
43 cell phone in the CFR, but this gets a little bit tricky, because
44 remember these are -- This requirement is only for vessels
45 operating more than twenty nautical miles offshore, and then the
46 onus is always on the operator of the vessel to be in compliance
47 to have these emergency communications, and so they need to know
48 where you're operating, how far offshore, will you have cell

1 signal, and, if you generally have cell signal, what -- You know,
2 it could be multitude of reasons why, on a certain day, you don't
3 have that, right, and so reliability there for the cellphone,
4 especially because we're talking about so far offshore.

5
6 Starlink, and the Starlink program used to be kept at the CG-CVC-
7 3, and that's the commercial fishing vessel safety for
8 headquarters. It has since moved to CG-C5I-E3, more your
9 technological specialists. They're going to be the lead office
10 for all things Starlink at the headquarters level.

11
12 The bottom line is, currently, Starlink is not an approved
13 emergency radiotelecommunications method, in accordance with the
14 regulations at 46 CFR 28.245.

15
16 I'm going to read a statement here that we got from headquarters
17 about kind of the why, and so Starlink is like an internet hotspot.
18 It doesn't have any direct services, but it may be able to perform
19 certain communication-related functions.

20
21 For Starlink to function, it needs to be connected to another
22 device to work properly, known as device-device, and not a
23 communication service. Unlike Iridium or Inmarsat, that have gone
24 through the recognition process identified by IMO, and that's the
25 International Maritime Organization, and administered by IMSO, and
26 that's International Mobile Satellite Organization, for
27 participation in the GMDSS, and that is Global Marine Distress and
28 Safety System, and these services can only have less than eight
29 hours of downtime per year before corrective action or to go
30 through the recognition process again.

31
32 Starlink does not maintain its level of availability, making it
33 questionable as a service to provide emergency communications. We
34 also recommend the users read the terms of services, when they
35 sign the contract, to see what Starlink offers. We've been told
36 that this changes frequently by the IMSO and some of our SOLAS,
37 safety of life at sea, operators.

38
39 Starlink in general has received a lot of interest from not only
40 here in the Gulf in the commercial fishing vessel industry, but
41 around the country in the commercial fishing vessel industry, and,
42 even then, outside of the fishing industry, because the regulations
43 apply to some of the other vessels in the maritime transportation
44 system as well.

45
46 I understand the frustration coming from the industry regarding
47 these regulations, and headquarters is receiving a lot of scrutiny
48 on what's going on, and so, for contact information for this, for

1 safety specifically, the Commercial Fishing Vessel Safety
2 Coordinator, Mr. John Sherlock, will be your kind of your one-stop
3 shop for all questions regarding safety.
4

5 Even though the program office at headquarters is responsible for
6 it overall, communication should be flowing through Mr. Sherlock.
7 He's good for answering any questions you have, as well as
8 scheduling examinations and for putting in touch with your local
9 examiner. There's examiners throughout the Gulf. Commercial
10 fishing vessels can go to whichever one is closest.
11

12 For Starlink specifically, and so this is not the commercial safety
13 side, but Starlink specifically, CG-C5I-E3 is the lead office for
14 questions related to Starlink in general. The two POCs are listed
15 right there. The primary is going to be Mr. Patrick Geddes, and
16 then secondary is Mr. Jerry Ulcek, and their emails are listed on
17 the on the slides there as well, and so I just want to thank
18 everyone. I know this is a very contentious issue, and we
19 appreciate all the communications flowing out from it. At this
20 time, I would like to open the floor to questions for any of you
21 that may have them.
22

23 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Be careful what you ask for. Ed.
24

25 **MR. WALKER:** Well, I didn't have that last page that says
26 "Starlink". It didn't come up on my link on the council page here.
27 Can you go to the slide that says just "Starlink" on it, Bernie?
28 Right. That one I didn't see on mine. Maybe it's me over here,
29 but that seems to be the answer to the question we all want, and
30 so I haven't had a chance to look at it, but it says Starlink does
31 not maintain eight hours downtime per year before corrective action
32 or go through the recognition process again, and could I get an
33 explanation of that from one of the guys on the line that's an
34 expert in Starlink?
35

36 A lot of people, as you guys are aware, don't understand why
37 Starlink isn't acceptable, because for most of us, it's been a lot
38 more reliable than the old satellite phones, and so could you
39 explain that to us, please?
40

41 **LT. MORTON:** Thank you, Captain Walker. I'm going to kick that
42 one over to Mr. Gallagher.
43

44 **MR. PATRICK GALLAGHER:** Thank you, Lt. Morton. This is Patrick
45 Gallagher. The reason right now why it's not authorized is it
46 does not provide a communication service. You cannot pick up
47 anything directly and call, because Starlink, in an emergency
48 situation right now, your choice is to text a message to somebody.

1
2 The Coast Guard does not receive any text, and we can't, because
3 of cybersecurity, receive any texts anyhow, and so, in an
4 emergency, all you can do is send a text. It will be a text
5 device, and so, until it becomes a communication service, where it
6 can provide radio communications, we don't have a lot of latitude
7 right now to allow this to happen. Does that make sense?
8

9 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Ed.

10
11 **MR. WALKER:** No, it doesn't, actually, because phones work on the
12 boat when you have Starlink, and so it's not just a text unit.
13 You can call anybody you want. You can livestream on Facebook, if
14 you want to, but it's not just a text device if you have a mobile
15 phone, and so am I misinterpreting something there?
16

17 **MR. GALLAGHER:** Which carrier are you using to do your phone calls?
18

19 **MR. WALKER:** It's any carrier. Your phone, all the phones on the
20 boat, work if you have a Starlink antenna on the roof. Text
21 message, phone, livestream, internet, everything you've got, and
22 everyone on your boat, regardless of their carrier, has wide-open
23 phone access, as far as you want to drive, if you have the right
24 service, and I think that's why a lot of people are confused as to
25 why they can't use their cell phone through Starlink and qualify
26 as a communication device.
27

28 **MR. GALLAGHER:** I will have to reach out to them to confirm that,
29 because there is no information that we've received to-date, that
30 says they can do voice communications.
31

32 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** They can definitely do voice communications right
33 now, but we have another hand up, Ed, and I'm going to cut you off
34 for a second.
35

36 **MR. DUGAS:** I was going to make the same comment, that, while we're
37 out fishing hundreds of miles off the coast of Louisiana, Orange
38 Beach, no matter where we are, all cellphone service works
39 connected to Starlink, at 120 miles, or 150 miles, and we do it
40 every weekend, and also bring a computer and do work.
41

42 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** So my question with that is actually -- Because
43 it says it's a device to device. If your boat were to sink, the
44 Starlink system would go under the water, versus like technically
45 you could take the satellite phone with you, and so I didn't know
46 if that was maybe more where the rub was, but it sounds like they
47 just aren't aware, or Starlink hasn't filed with the Coast Guard
48 that they're voice as well. I'm looking at someone from the Coast

1 Guard, to see if that if it's a device to device issue again.
2
3 **MR. GEORGE RAU:** This is George Rau.
4
5 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Can you say that again?
6
7 **MR. RAU:** Sorry to cut you off. This is George Rau, the fishing
8 vessel examiner from Louisiana. Based on what I knew about this
9 thing, it is a cellphone Wi-Fi calling. You're calling over a Wi-
10 Fi signal through the satellite system. It's no different than if
11 you turn the Wi-Fi on your phone when you didn't have service at
12 a house. You're making a phone call through the Wi-Fi on your
13 phone, and then through the Starlink system, and so it's a voice
14 to data call.
15
16 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Any further questions for the gentlemen on
17 the phone or Lt. Morton regarding Starlink?
18
19 **MR. GALLAGHER:** There was an earlier question, if I could answer
20 that too, because it was a little confusing when Lt. Morton
21 presented it, but, the terms of service for Starlink right now,
22 they don't guarantee that you're going to have connectivity, and
23 so, for you to make a call right now, and whatever the previous
24 gentleman was, and I'm sorry that I forgot your name, 120 miles
25 out, if your phone goes dead, or the Starlink goes dead, you would
26 have no ability to tell anybody that you have a distress situation,
27 aside of maybe an EPIRB, if you're required to carry an EPIRB, but
28 I don't see that in the requirements.
29
30 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. We've got a couple more questions for you,
31 gentlemen. I got Sanchez, then Ed.
32
33 **MR. SANCHEZ:** You know, perhaps satellite phones have improved
34 over time, but, when I had one before, it was with Globalstar, and
35 I ended up dropping it, because, towards the end of the terms of
36 my agreement, the phone would work maybe about fifteen minutes out
37 of every hour, and the whole reason why I got a satellite phone
38 was in case of an emergency, but emergencies don't wait on your
39 fifteen minutes and hope like hell they line up with them.
40
41 If Starlink is viable, and there's a lot of people saying that it
42 is, then this seems to me that the nuance, regulatory nuance,
43 that's precluding it from being accepted -- It falls under these
44 executive orders as a regulatory burden, and so I would like to
45 see how, once we get through with this discussion, we go about
46 seeing how we remedy this.
47
48 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Ed.

1
2 **MR. WALKER:** Thank you, and so, yes, to suggest that there's no
3 guarantee that you can link up with your Starlink might be valid.
4 However, as a former owner of two sat phones, I can assure you
5 they were way worse at getting a connection than the Starlink is.
6
7 Even the best, the Iridium sat phone, the two times I really needed
8 it, I couldn't get a connection. One time it didn't work, and the
9 other time there wasn't a satellite in view. Over the course of
10 three or four years, I really needed my sat phone twice, and I
11 couldn't get a connection.
12
13 I can pick up the phone anywhere in the Gulf and call anybody I
14 need to on Starlink, and so, with all due respect, it sounds to me
15 like perhaps the regulations, or the understanding of Starlink,
16 has not kept up with the technology, and perhaps we could come up
17 with a way that either the Gulf Council, or some commercial fishing
18 groups, could coordinate with the Coast Guard and see if we can
19 remedy the situation.
20
21 It appears to me like Starlink probably does meet the requirements.
22 There's just a misunderstanding of what Starlink is, and what you
23 can do with it, and I would like to take some steps forward to
24 seeking some solutions there, because Starlink is taking over as
25 the primary communication on commercial, charter, and some
26 recreational boats nowadays, and so I think we need to get some
27 clarifications on what it is and see if there's a way we can get
28 it as an approved device, if possible.
29
30 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. With that sentiment, maybe we can get some
31 guidance from -- Does the Coast Guard need a letter from the
32 council asking that this be explored? What would be the next step
33 to help you guys come to either -- Not necessarily the decision Ed
34 would like you to have, but either a hard no to us, or, I mean, I
35 understand the Federal Register has a language already. Lt.
36 Morton.
37
38 **LT. MORTON:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, and, if the council --
39 That's certainly an option, if the council would like to write a
40 letter, and I can bring it back to the Coast Guard. If that's
41 what the council does decide to do, I can work with you all to see
42 who it needs to be addressed out to. The process is not 100
43 percent smooth, but I can work to get that.
44
45 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so -- Sorry. Go ahead.
46
47 **MR. RAU:** If I could just add real quickly, it's a work topic right
48 now. My office and the Commercial Vessel Compliance Office have

1 been working on this topic for about a month now, and, like I said,
2 one of the biggest problems we have is, when that section of Part
3 46 was written, there was no such system as Starlink in place, and
4 it doesn't follow the same rules as the other people had to follow
5 to do and provide emergency services.

6
7 Right now, both offices have lawyers looking at it, to make sure
8 it's being interpreted correctly, and so that's part of what is
9 going on, but, obviously, like I said, it's come a couple different
10 ways, and so you can write a letter, and it will just go in the
11 pile with the other letters that we have received, and so we are
12 working on it.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** You mean to tell me you're not going to frame our
15 letter? Come on, man. All right. So, Ed, if that is the route
16 you want to go, we will need a motion, but I have Kevin's hand up
17 before. Kevin.

18
19 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm just curious about the
20 certification process for determining reliability. Is that just
21 something that the company provides, or is that what the Coast
22 Guard -- Do they spot check or do any testing on reliability?

23
24 **MR. RAU:** Both, and, like I said, this is a little difficult for
25 me, because I'm not used to dealing with the small vessels as much.
26 I usually deal with the big vessels, and, like I said, it's a
27 requirement for GMDSS, but there's a whole list of things you have
28 to do to meet that, and you have to meet 99.997, which equals about
29 eight hours of downtime max per year, where Starlink can turn their
30 service off right now, and you have no recourse, and I'll give you
31 a great example.

32
33 When they were fighting with Brazil, when Elon Musk was fighting
34 with them, Brazil said turn it off, and they had to, and so that
35 service went off immediately overnight, and it was no longer
36 available.

37
38 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so I'm looking around the table. Is
39 there appetite to write a letter to add to their stack? I'm seeing
40 yes, and so, Bernie, I think a motion is coming. We're going to
41 add to your paperweight stack there. We expect ours to be framed
42 and on the wall. Ed, do you want to take a swing at it?

43
44 **MR. WALKER:** Yes. Thank you. I would -- Is this something we do
45 now or in Full Council? We can do it now?

46
47 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Now.

1 **MR. WALKER:** Okay. Great. I would float a motion to have the
2 council write a letter to the Coast Guard requesting that they
3 certify Starlink as an acceptable satellite communication device
4 as soon as possible.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Sanchez. Are you -- Before we talk about it,
7 we're going to need a second. Are you seconding for that?

8
9 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I will second it.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you. Okay. We have a second. Bernie, do
12 you have anything you want to add to it, the discussion?

13
14 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I think you already heard me out, but I would say,
15 and, obviously, we can get assistance from staff, to kind of -- To
16 make this the letter that we need to make it, in terms of who it's
17 going to and what have you, but, yes, I will add that this is
18 clearly an example of just regulatory stuff that's burdensome and
19 that we need to address.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** You're jumping the gun. Our next deregulatory,
22 Starlink might fall on the list as replacing a few things. Andy.

23
24 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and I'm glad John said that, and so, first,
25 I wanted to thank Lt. Morton. I've talked to him quite a bit about
26 this. I know he's been fielding a lot of calls, and so I appreciate
27 the presentation and having the Coast Guard here today.

28
29 To me, I think a lot of the focus of this letter, beyond just the
30 requesting certification, really needs to be focused on your
31 experience with the reliability of existing communication systems,
32 the concerns you have about those systems for safety and
33 communication relative to Starlink, and your experience, I think,
34 real-world, on-the-water experience, obviously goes a long way.

35
36 As was noted, you know, regulatory impediments, and this wasn't -
37 - Starlink wasn't envisioned when the regulations were developed,
38 and is there changes to the regulations that can be done that help
39 to improve or maintain safety standards, you know, and so I think
40 those are all critical components of this letter.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. We got to do some housekeeping real fast.
43 Neither of you gentlemen are on the committee, and I'm going to
44 turn the mic over to Troy Frady for a second.

45
46 **MR. FRADY:** Now I've got you hostage.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Yes.

1
2 **MR. FRADY:** I second this motion.

3
4 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** You make the motion, because neither can make the
5 motion.

6
7 **MR. FRADY:** I would like to make this motion under my name.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Under Troy Frady's name, he is claiming this
10 motion. We need a second. Dr. Sweetman will second, and we have
11 confirmation you are both on our committee. Now we can move
12 forward with discussions. Any more discussion on this, before we
13 vote it, and you two gentlemen please refrain from voting. You
14 are not eligible at this time. **Seeing none, is there any**
15 **opposition to this motion? The motion passes.** Lt. Morton.

16
17 **LT. MORTON:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to say --
18 Before we moved on, I just want to say thank you to Mr. Gallagher,
19 Mr. Sherlock, and Mr. Rau for having the time here today. I really
20 appreciate it. It means a lot. I'm definitely not the subject
21 matter expert in this, and so their expertise is invaluable, and
22 so thank you to those gentlemen.

23
24 **ORGANIZATION AND PRIORITIZATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS ON EXECUTIVE**
25 **ORDERS 14276 AND 14192 (CONTINUED)**
26

27 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Yes, and thank you very much for joining us, and
28 we will send a frame with our letter for you. Okay. We're going
29 to move back into the executive orders. We need to go through the
30 council list for the last executive order, and then we are going
31 to go through the next Executive Order 14192, and just remember we
32 also have closed session, and so let's keep this on task.

33
34 Okay. Looking at our Gulf Council list from the June meeting, is
35 there -- I'm going to actually punt this over to Emily? Is there
36 anything on this list that we have not already included? Do you
37 want to go through that, since you've looked at it?

38
39 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Sure, and so I guess we can just go one-by-one
40 and talk about it. Most of these things are under the council
41 purview, but not all of them. I took four out, and so the ones
42 that are highlighted in yellow are related to council things, and
43 most of them -- Except for the turtle gear, most of them we have
44 not yet addressed, and so I think you can just go item-by-item,
45 honestly, with the understanding that the yellow ones are things
46 we can do, and the white ones are things we have to punt.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so we're going to do it like last time,

1 and so the first -- She punted it back. The first bullet point,
2 remove low-priority species from FMPs or fishery management units,
3 is this something we still want to include in our letter? Yes?
4 Looking around the table, is there any opposition? No. Then
5 moving forward.

6
7 Multiyear ACLs and accountability measures, and remember these are
8 all under our purview, and so there will be a workplan that is
9 required with these. Any opposition? No. Keep going. Carryover
10 options for unharvested quota, any opposition? No? Okay. Moving
11 on. C.J. So close.

12
13 **DR. SWEETMAN:** No, no, and it's fine. I mean, similar to language
14 that we used before, and, I mean, I just don't want to be too
15 prescriptive. Can we just like consider for explore for some of
16 these things here?

17
18 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Yes, and I think the plan is to add that to most
19 of them, unless otherwise notated that this is a mandatory.
20 Everything else will have considered or explored, yes.

21
22 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** We can add that language by the time you see it
23 in Full Council.

24
25 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Allowing shark harvest, we have already
26 talked about, and so I'm going to skip over that one, unless
27 anybody has got heartburn jumping ahead. Streamlining stock
28 assessments, we've already talked about. Revisiting the shark fin
29 ban, we've already talked about. Commercial and for-hire
30 requirements for turtle gear, that was under the first EO, and I
31 think we're going to see it again. Any issues there?

32
33 Crew size limits on dual-permitted vessels, is there still appetite
34 to include? Okay. Moving forward, reporting requirements when
35 not fishing.

36
37 **MR. WALKER:** (Mr. Walker's comment is not audible on the
38 recording.)

39
40 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** That's a good question, Ed. No fishing reports
41 is do not fish, or did not fish, reports. Ed.

42
43 **MR. WALKER:** I get that, but I don't think it's stated very well
44 in that sentence. I think there's a word missing or something,
45 and so we're calling -- We're talking about did not fish reports,
46 and there we go. That's a little better. Reporting requirements
47 while not fishing/DNF.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Any opposition to including this as modified?
2 Okay. Seeing none, we're moving on. Allowing red snapper quota
3 to move between states with a Gulf-wide quota. C.J.
4
5 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I mean, obviously, we've talked about that, right,
6 at the table here. It's just more nuanced than that, and there's
7 a lot of details that are associated with that that we have
8 previously talked about, and so, just as long as that is in, you
9 know, encompassed within this here.
10
11 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Just remember that everything on this list has to
12 come with a workplan, and so not being on the list does not preclude
13 us from continuing to work, but we will give ourselves deadlines
14 once it's on the letter. Ed.
15
16 **MR. WALKER:** So it seems to me there's a word missing here, too.
17 Are we talking about commercial or recreational?
18
19 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I believe this one would be recreational.
20
21 **MR. WALKER:** I think we should include that there.
22
23 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** General.
24
25 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** We've talked about this several times. I think
26 it's a good thing to look at, because, you know, obviously, we
27 have times when somebody might accidentally go over just a little
28 bit, and there's no sense in having that to where it couldn't. In
29 the past when we've had a million pounds under, and we had people
30 with 15,000 pounds over, over 900,000 pounds or whatever, and, you
31 know, I think it's just something good to look at, that we could
32 be able -- As long as we don't exceed that Gulf quota, I think
33 it's something we need to look at, and I think it's something we
34 need to put effort into.
35
36 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Sanchez.
37
38 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I guess the devil is in the details in that, in that,
39 you know, you could look at it that way, as it's a good tool to
40 bail somebody out, but it also might encourage some states to go
41 a little heavy on the overfishing, and relying on something that
42 may or may not be there, and so I don't know if it's a wonderful
43 thing entirely.
44
45 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** General.
46
47 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** Yes, and we've already talked about that, too.
48 It would be a situation where it would be voted on by the states,

1 you know, at that time. In other words, if Mississippi went over
2 by 10,000 pounds deliberately, then you ought to not -- Then it's
3 up to them to say, hey, that's stupid, and you shouldn't have done
4 that, okay, but if they -- Like what happened to Louisiana last
5 year, and, at the last minute, something came up, and it happened
6 that way, and there was no reason for Louisiana to pay back, when
7 we had a million pounds under sitting there from Florida, and so
8 there was no reason to do it.

9
10 I mean, it isn't like the fish have a tag on them and, when they
11 hit the Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, and Texas
12 border, they stop, turn around, and go back. Come on. It's all
13 a quota, and I think, if we have common sense and use it, that's
14 what we should do. We ought to use common sense with this, and
15 let the states -- Let the council here vote on it, if they see
16 that there's an issue with that, but, I mean, why let someone be
17 penalized if they didn't try to do wrong?

18
19 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Dr. Simmons.

20
21 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Madam Chair. This is on
22 our action schedule as a request. I think it was made back in
23 April of 2024 for us to look at this, and so I think maybe the
24 word "quota", or "recreational ACL", or maybe that's throwing folks
25 off, and we can maybe massage that a bit, but this is already on
26 our -- Sort of our workplan, and not our new workplan.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and I'm going to task Emily with massaging
29 that language when this comes back to us at Full Council for final
30 approval. All right. We're going to move forward, because we've
31 still got a whole other EO and a closed session. Commercial weight
32 estimate requirements prior to landing fish, is there still an
33 appetite to leave this on? Ed.

34
35 **MR. WALKER:** I hate to sound like a broken record, but I don't
36 think all the words are in this one either. Is this IFQ fish, or
37 non-IFQ fish? We already do a weight estimate for IFQ fish. It's
38 mandatory. Are we talking about mangrove snapper here?

39
40 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** If I remember right, Ed, I think this was to
41 remove. I think this was supposed to be one of our deregulatory
42 ones, but I'm looking down the table, at staff, to see if they
43 remember the context as well.

44
45 **DR. DIAGNE:** As I remember it, this was about IFQ fish, you know,
46 the weight estimate prior to coming back to the docks, and that
47 is, you know, something that is already done, and so this
48 discussion was maybe in terms of the tolerance, you know, how much

1 under or how much over, but that's something that was addressed in
2 the past, but remember that this is your list that, I mean, various
3 people just threw on the board, right at the end of the meeting,
4 maybe without thinking that this is something that was already
5 addressed.

6

7 **MR. WALKER:** I would suggest striking that.

8

9 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Is there any opposition to striking this
10 from the list? A reminder that it does not prevent us from working
11 on it, but it just doesn't go on a workplan and the letter. Okay.
12 Bernie, please strike from the list. Marine mammal deterrent.
13 Dakus.

14

15 **MR. GEESLIN:** I would be in support of seeing that evaluated,
16 investigated, for, you know, multiple uses within the commercial
17 fisheries, within the state science and resource monitoring
18 programs.

19

20 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Any opposition to leaving it on the list?
21 Seeing none, moving forward to regional management. Any opposition
22 to removing? No? C.J.

23

24 **DR. SWEETMAN:** So these are one of -- this is where I struggle,
25 with this one. Like, obviously, there's instances where we could
26 support regional management along those lines, but, broad strokes
27 application, I just get a little confused as to where we're going,
28 and now we're mandating basically a workplan to address regional
29 management, and does that apply for all of our fisheries, or are
30 we just talking about one or two here and there?

31

32 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I think that's for a lot of these things on this
33 list. We weren't very descriptive in June.

34

35 **DR. SWEETMAN:** So I guess I'm asking the question to the council
36 then.

37

38 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Is this something we want? General.

39

40 **GENERAL SPRAGGINS:** I think it's something we should look at. I
41 think we've talked about it on numerous things, and regional
42 management could work in a lot of situations. Once again, it goes
43 back to us as a group deciding what's best for the Gulf of America,
44 and not what's -- You know, for each state or anything else, but
45 what's best for the overall, and regional management could work,
46 and I think it's something that's worth the effort to put into it.

47

48 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** So maybe we need to wordsmith and say explore

1 regional management. I think, once you get that back at Full
2 Council, it will --

3
4 **DR. SWEETMAN:** But it's -- Again, to the point, it's like we can
5 still be working on this, General, and we're still going to, but
6 it's are we just mandating ourselves to do exactly that, and I
7 want to just -- I mean, maybe that language helps out there. I'm
8 not opposed to regional management. I just -- It was a very broad
9 statement right there.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Sanchez.

12
13 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I agree, in terms of this is very broad, and, I mean,
14 we've been talking about regional management, and I got on the
15 council, and got off it, and we were talking about it. We have
16 problems coming up with common currencies. I mean, it just goes
17 on and on, and so it could be good, or it could be terrible, and
18 so I don't know what to do with it in this document.

19
20 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay, and so I'm seeing mixed opinions around the
21 table, and so, if you have opposition to including in the document,
22 please raise your hand. One. Okay. We're going to keep it in at
23 that point.

24
25 Sector separation, and I personally would make the argument that
26 that might fall under the regional management discussion, and may
27 not need its own line in this document, but I will look to the
28 committee. C.J.

29
30 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I would move to strike that. I think you're right,
31 Kesley, that it could be considered in that, but I also think that
32 sector separation is probably going to be one of the most
33 controversial and challenging things that this council would have
34 to deal with, depending on what we're talking about here, and then
35 mandating, again, that we have a workplan to address that is my
36 whole point in why I object, and, like I said, I don't oppose
37 regional management. It's just mandating that we actually do this
38 is where my concern is, and so I would move to strike that.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Sanchez, then Mike Allen.

41
42 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I would say, along the same thought process, you
43 know, regarding regional management and leaving it in there with
44 the insertion of the word "explore" before it, and let's leave
45 sector separation in there and add "explore sector separation".

46
47 **DR. ALLEN:** Thank you. I mean, I'm not opposed to saying explore
48 sector separation. It just seems, to me, that these two examples

1 are just so generic that they're not really useful, and, if they're
2 not on our list, it doesn't mean we can't consider them in the
3 future, right? It's not -- We're not taking anything off the table
4 here. It's just there's no context here.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** What I'm interpreting is --

7
8 **DR. ALLEN:** I would say they're not useful.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** So strike both, is what I'm interpreting.

11
12 **DR. ALLEN:** That would be my sense, but I'm okay with explore
13 sector separation, because it just says we would explore it. You
14 could say "explore" in front of both of them, and that's fine. I
15 just don't think it's that useful.

16
17 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Mr. Schieble.

18
19 **MR. SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and so I would say explore
20 regional management is almost redundant with allowing quota to
21 move between states, and so, essentially, allowing quota to move
22 between states is a form of regional management between those
23 states anyway, and so we're kind of covering it. Maybe it isn't
24 prescriptive that we need to have it in there, because we're
25 probably going to deal with it anyway, and so I see what Dr. Allen
26 is saying, and I can agree with that.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. So we're back to -- I'm going to go back
29 up. Any opposition to leaving explore regional management in the
30 document? Seeing -- To leaving it in the document. Still one,
31 and so we're moving forward. Any opposition to leaving sector
32 separation in the document? One. Two.

33
34 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Mike is not on my committee.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Mike is not on my committee.

37
38 **DR. ALLEN:** Sorry about that.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** You guys just jumping the line. Okay. So one
41 against, and so we're going to leave it in, at least until Full
42 Council. The last one on our list --

43
44 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Did we add "explore"?

45
46 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Yes, and it will come back to Full Council with
47 the word "explore". Emily has been tasked, and she will make sure
48 it's there. Feel free to put it in, Bernie, to make everybody

1 happy. Okay. Last one. Ability to land species that experience
2 depredation, any opposition to leaving it in the document? No?
3 Okay. Moving forward, do you need anything else from us on that
4 EO, Emily?

5
6 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** No.

7
8 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Then we will move to the last executive
9 order. This is unleashing prosperity through deregulation. Are
10 you ready for me to just go through the list?

11
12 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Yes, Madam Chair, but you might want me to just
13 briefly remind you what this EO is about. Okay, and so the aim of
14 this executive order, Unleashing Prosperity through Deregulation,
15 is to reduce regulatory burdens. It requires that federal agencies
16 eliminate ten existing regulations for every new one that is made.
17 However, this only applies to regulatory actions that are deemed
18 to be significant by the White House Office of Management and
19 Budget.

20
21 What I will say is we did hear that a lot of the council actions
22 are sort of routine in nature, and don't hit that significant
23 threshold, but this could still be a way for us to suggest some
24 things that could be removed without sort of creating problems,
25 you know, in the council system, and there will be things that the
26 council wants to do that will require this ten-for-one tradeoff,
27 and so it might be nice to create a list of things that says, if
28 you're going to get rid of stuff, start here.

29
30 This executive order also mandates that total incremental costs of
31 new regulations be significantly less than zero, and this is very
32 similar to the process during the last Trump administration.
33 However, the last time around, I think it was a two-for-one, rather
34 than a ten-for-one, and so the stakes are a little bit higher, and
35 so with --

36
37 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Mr. Strelcheck.

38
39 **MR. STRELCHECK:** So there's been a lot of confusion around this
40 executive order, and a couple of things I will mention, and the
41 ten-for-one applies for regulations that are deemed significant,
42 and there are certain criteria that define significance, but one
43 of the main ones is that the rule has an impact of \$100 million or
44 greater, and so nearly all of the work that the Fisheries Service
45 does falls below that threshold.

46
47 There's other factors, like controversy, duplication of
48 regulations with other offices or agencies, where you could have

1 a rule deemed significant, and so the ten-for-one won't necessarily
2 apply to our rule makings.

3
4 What will apply, and what Emily noted, is that offset for
5 regulations, if there's an expense to those regulations, and we're
6 going to have to, obviously, track that and ensure that there's a
7 net benefit, or reduction, from the regulations that are being
8 implemented.

9
10 There's also I'll say an exemption for what are considered routine
11 actions for fisheries management, and so annual catch limit
12 specifications are an example of a routine action, and so it's a
13 little more nuanced than that, in terms of the deregulatory work,
14 and we just wanted to emphasize that there isn't a ten-for-one
15 requirement for most of the fisheries regulations that we're
16 working on.

17
18 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you. Okay. We're going to start just like
19 last time, and we're going to go through the bold topics, and so
20 regulatory burden reduction. The first bullet point is eliminating
21 redundant reporting requirements, including VMS, hail-out or hail-
22 in, trip declarations, paper logbooks, and economic reports. Is
23 this something we want to -- This would be under council purview,
24 and so is this something you want to put into our deregulatory?
25 C.J.

26
27 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I'm confused about the word "redundant". What am
28 I missing here relative to that? Where is there a redundancy for
29 this?

30
31 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** The commenter essentially was explaining that
32 having a trip ticket on top of a declaration and the paper -- Like
33 the trip ticket system was redundant to the fishermen calling in
34 with their supposed amount of harvest that they were going to
35 harvest, you know, when they estimate the pounds that they have
36 onboard, and so that's the word "redundant", was about the
37 commercial fishermen having to report what they thought they had
38 onboard and then the paper logbook and the trip tickets being
39 generated.

40
41 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Well, that I get, but then it's like referencing
42 VMS, hail-in and hail-out, trip declarations, paper logbooks, and
43 economic reports, and that doesn't really -- That's where I'm a
44 little confused.

45
46 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** I think the tone of the comment was that the
47 commercial fishermen have to do a lot.

48

1 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Can it just be eliminate redundant reporting
2 requirements, I mean, very explicit to VMS, and like, I mean, hail-
3 in and hail-out -- Like we utilize a lot of this information
4 actually for real management purposes. Economic reports, I
5 understand the concerns there. We utilize that, from a fisheries
6 disaster perspective, I mean, and so there's utility there, and so
7 I don't want to put something forward, create a workplan, and then,
8 all of a sudden, it's like -- I get it, and removing redundancies
9 is important, but --

10
11 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** This one doesn't have a workplan. This is just
12 the deregulatory, and so, essentially, we are suggesting removing
13 all of these, but I -- Before you jump back in, I had -- Mr.
14 Strelcheck, your hand was up.

15
16 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Well, I was thinking along the lines of what C.J.
17 was suggesting. You know, there's intent behind all of those
18 requirements. I agree with the premise here, and I think it would
19 be okay to say review and eliminate, where appropriate, redundant
20 reporting requirements.

21
22 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** We can wordsmith. Bernie, we're going to
23 wordsmith the first bullet. Review and eliminate redundant
24 reporting requirements, where appropriate, and delete everything
25 after that. You're good with that, C.J. and Andy? You're good?
26 Okay. Is there any opposition to including this in our
27 deregulatory letter? Again, no workplan. No? Okay.

28
29 Moving on, remove landing notification requirements and allow
30 flexible unloading times, and I assume that is for the commercial
31 sector. Emily.

32
33 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** So one of the things, just for some context here,
34 this flexible unloading time, and so a number of fishermen came to
35 us and said that, you know, right now, the loading requirements
36 make them unload during banker's hours, and a lot of those
37 commercial trips don't come in between banker's hours, and so
38 there's like declarations and hail-ins that have to happen when
39 you come in, or then maybe you have to move your boat, so that you
40 can unload it at your spot, and so this was -- One of the things
41 was allowing -- This focusing on the flexible unloading times was
42 not limiting those fishermen to only offloading during banker's
43 hours.

44
45 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** C.J.

46
47 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I'm sorry about just like talking about every little
48 item here, but the point for having those banker's hours, as you

1 call it, is because law enforcement has to be there, right, and
2 so, if we are saying flexible, then what is it? What is flexible?
3 I mean like could they come in at 2:00 a.m., and now that they're
4 going to have law enforcement required to be there at 2:00 a.m.?
5

6 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** I think that was the intent of the comment, but,
7 again, I'm going to remind you that this is just a list of things
8 that we heard from the public. It doesn't mean that it, you know,
9 is something that needs to be followed by the council, right, and
10 so you guys essentially should be selecting and cherry-picking the
11 things that you see here that you think are worth removing, and
12 so, if that doesn't make sense to you, that's -- It doesn't make
13 sense to you, and you don't have to forward it.
14

15 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** A reminder that, just because it's not on the
16 list, it doesn't mean we can't look at it later. Ed.
17

18 **MR. WALKER:** I just realized I'm not even on your committee, and
19 I've been talking all day, but I do have some experience.
20

21 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Imagine that.
22

23 **MR. WALKER:** I have some experience.
24

25 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** And you're even voting.
26

27 **MR. WALKER:** I don't think you can remove landing notification
28 requirements in the IFQ system. You just can't. There's not any
29 purpose in talking about that. That would open widespread
30 problems, I believe.
31

32 Flexible unloading times, if you work it out with your fish house,
33 which don't always want to offload fish at 2:00 a.m., I don't
34 think, but, you know, that could stay for discussion, if some
35 wanted it to, but I don't see any way you could get rid of landing
36 notifications in the IFQ system.
37

38 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I personally would scratch this from our list,
39 and not to say that we can't discuss it as we're moving through
40 the IFQ process, reforming that program, but I don't think that
41 this is something we need to put on our list for the EO, me
42 personally. I'm open to discussion, but I don't think it needs to
43 make this list. Is there any opposition to striking it from this
44 list? Seeing none, Bernie, can you strike remove landing
45 notification?
46

47 Remove 3 percent cost recovery fee from IFQ operators, and is --
48 I'm looking at Mara, and is that even something we can do? The

1 answer is no, and so go ahead and just strike through. We cannot
2 legally do that. Next is allow grace periods for IFQ overage.
3 Emily.

4
5 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** I can give you context on that one. This was --
6 Let me just talk about the 3 percent, if I can, for a minute, and
7 so I don't think that they were asking that the 3 percent recovery
8 fee disappears.

9
10 It's just that, right now, as the industry operates, that recovery
11 fee is paid by the captains, and not necessarily by the fish houses
12 or the shareholders, or however that works, and so the context of
13 that was that the 3 percent -- They were hoping that the captains
14 themselves, who are claiming that they are shouldering the burden
15 of lease costs and things like that, are the ones that are charged
16 the 3 percent, or paying the 3 percent, right now, and they thought
17 that that should change. It wasn't that they wanted to remove the
18 3 percent, necessarily, but that maybe the person responsible for
19 that 3 percent changed, and so there's one.

20
21 This one, allowing grace periods for IFQ overage, so this is in a
22 case when, you know, you're coming back to the dock, and you think
23 you've got enough IFQ. You start to figure out your pounds, and
24 you do your declaration, and you, let's say, have more red snapper
25 onboard than you have in your account, and you need a couple hours
26 to source some of that quota, so that you can then land those fish
27 legally, and so this was just asking for a grace period, so that
28 people could move IFQ into their accounts, and properly land the
29 fish, in cases when they like had more onboard.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Ed.

32
33 **MR. WALKER:** You can't do that, unless it's before they hit the
34 dock, and I'm not sure what the rule is. If you're on your way in,
35 on a six-hour steam and you get your -- Maybe have your fish house
36 transfer some quota, or you forgot to shift it from your
37 shareholder account to your vessel account, or something like that,
38 but you can't let a guy land with IFQ fish that he doesn't have
39 the quota for, and hit the dock and, you know, just leave that
40 open ended like that, because that would open up some real
41 loopholes for enforcement.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** So I'm hearing appetite to strike. For those
44 that are actually on the committee -- Okay. C.J.

45
46 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I forgot that Captain Walker is not on this
47 committee. I mean, I agree with what he's saying, and so I would
48 move to strike.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Any opposition to striking? Okay. Remove quota
3 overage payback rules and discard buffers from recreational
4 sector. C.J.
5
6 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Move to strike.
7
8 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Any opposition to strike? Bernie, please strike.
9 Gear and vessel requirements, and so eliminate hook limits on
10 bottom longline vessels. Is any appetite to include? None of
11 these are actually included at the moment, and so I see no appetite
12 to include, and so, Bernie, please strike. Remove venting and
13 descending tool requirements and sea turtle gear mandates, sea
14 turtle release gear mandates.
15
16 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** This is redundant.
17
18 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** This is redundant. It's on the other EO, and so
19 I think we just leave this one, or that's true. This is the other
20 direction. Okay. Is there any appetite to go against what we
21 just put on the other EO? I'm seeing, from C.J., to strike. Is
22 there any opposition to striking this from this EO?
23
24 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** I think you would just strike the venting and
25 descending tool requirement part, and then the sea turtle release
26 gear mandates, which is what we already talked about would probably
27 remain on here, because that would be deregulatory, and it would
28 also satisfy the seafood competitiveness EO.
29
30 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Perfect. Bernie, will you please strike
31 "venting/descending tool requirements and"? You're good with
32 that, C.J.? Okay. Any opposition to what's on the board? Seeing
33 none, moving on to re-evaluate gear bans and allow innovative
34 studies such as naked net trials. I'm seeing just strike from
35 C.J. Any opposition from the committee to strike this? Seeing
36 none, Bernie, please strike. Apparently, C.J., it's just you.
37
38 Remove cruise size limits and large vessel marking requirements.
39 All right. We're going to leave that one. Any opposition to
40 adding that to our list? Seeing none, moving forward. Rescind
41 U.S. Coast Guard boat building and load line regulations. Emily.
42
43 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** A little context here. There are Coast Guard
44 boat building regulations that have been inhibitory in the shrimp
45 fishery, so most of the shrimp operators, as far as I understand,
46 are basically patching together their old boats, because the cost
47 of building a boat that would meet these requirements is like
48 exorbitant, and so they were asking that those boat building

1 requirements either be sort of lessened, or removed, because it's
2 keeping shrimpers in their old vessels.

3
4 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** That is not under our purview, correct, and so
5 let's -- I think we strike it from our list, since we can't do
6 anything about that. Okay. Thank you, Bernie. Species-specific
7 management, remove shark fishery restrictions and fin ban.
8 Redundant. Address increasing shark interactions and gear damage,
9 and that would allow harvest, and that's also redundant.

10
11 Re-evaluate turtle gear, that's redundant. Lower penalties for
12 violations, I guess, of the turtle gear stuff. Okay. Eliminate
13 shallow-water grouper closures. I'm assuming this is the twenty-
14 fathom. Okay. Is there any appetite to leave this on the
15 deregulatory list, or add it to the deregulatory list?

16
17 **MR. WALKER:** Which one?

18
19 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** The shallow-water grouper closure. Dr. Froeschke.

20
21 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Well, just for your information, that is currently
22 an action in the Draft Reef Fish Amendment 62.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** We're already working on it, and so scratch.
25 Strike it. Remove closed areas and increase live bait lobster
26 limits. Mara.

27
28 **MS. LEVY:** Not related to that, but why would you take off eliminate
29 the shallow-water grouper closure? It's your list that you're
30 saying you're going to do to deregulate, and you're actually doing
31 it, and so just check it off as a win, right?

32
33 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Bernie, put it back on. We're going to
34 check a box. Thank you, Mara.

35
36 **UNIDENTIFIED:** (The comment is not audible on the recording.)

37
38 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** They're redundant, and so they will not. They'll
39 go the other way. What about the lobster limits?

40
41 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I move to strike those. I mean, those closed areas
42 were put in by both the councils, and the commercial fishery worked
43 together to do that, and I would not be in favor of increasing the
44 live bait lobster limits.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Any opposition to removing this? Seeing none,
47 Bernie, please strike. Observers and monitoring, remove shrimp
48 vessel observer programs, due to stagnant discard data.

1
2 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Do you want context?
3
4 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Sure.
5
6 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Stagnant discard data, meaning that discard and
7 the composition of discards has not changed over the years, and
8 you already have a baseline of what that looks like, and so there
9 is no reason to have observers onboard to continue collecting
10 information on the same thing, that doesn't change. and that was
11 the rationale provided. I'm not saying that that's legit. It
12 just was what we heard.
13
14 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I would argue, as species are shifting, due to
15 water temperatures and habitat movements, that that's something we
16 would want to keep, but, C.J.
17
18 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Yes, and I would agree, and I think we're going to
19 hear about the biological opinion about lack of observers in the
20 shrimp fishery, and how that intersects with sawfish and everything
21 along those lines, and so I would move to keep it.
22
23 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Vote to keep it?
24
25 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Sorry. Get rid of it. Sorry.
26
27 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. I'm looking around the table for those on
28 the committee, and any opposition to removing this from our list?
29 Seeing none, Bernie, please strike. Fishermen should not bear
30 observer costs.
31
32 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** I think the context here is that the commercial
33 fishermen feed the observers. There are some costs associated
34 with having observers onboard, and so they did not think that they
35 should be paying to have to have that extra body onboard, and that
36 that person should come with their own stipend.
37
38 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Is that under our purview? Do we have that?
39 Okay. Strike that, because that's not even us. Starlink. You
40 might as well strike it, because we can't do anything about it.
41 We've already written the letter, or we will write the letter. I
42 think you can strike Starlink, Bernie. Replace life raft
43 requirements with survival float options.
44
45 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Those life rafts are very expensive, and they
46 have to be recertified every five years, for like a thousand
47 dollars, and there are other technologies, and so this was just
48 the idea that you should be able to open up regulations, but that

1 is also Coast Guard, and it's not us.

2

3 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** So that can also be stricken. Extend inspection
4 interval scope.

5

6 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Same. This is about the life rafts.

7

8 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Okay. Moving on to environmental, and this is
9 going way faster than the last EO. Environmental and industry
10 protection, mitigate adverse impacts of offshore wind and
11 aquaculture industries on existing fisheries. I think that's a
12 little broad for us to have on our list. I think there are things
13 we can do, but I think that's a broad statement. Any appetite to
14 include? Seeing none, Bernie, thank you.

15

16 Evaluate ecosystem risk, such as gear damage and habitat
17 disruption, and that also seems entirely broad to me. I think we
18 can strike. Any appetite to keep on the list? Seeing none, moving
19 forward. Prioritize sale of wild-caught seafood and create
20 domestic aquaculture quotas, and I feel like that's better on the
21 other EO, and so I would strike from this EO. Anybody on the
22 committee have any adverse reactions to striking that? Okay.

23

24 Moving on to market issues, address rent pricing issues and
25 investigate potential price gouging. I also think that's the other
26 EO. Any opinions or any heartburn into removing that from this
27 list? Seeing none, moving forward to policy suggestions. Support
28 commonsense regulations, as advocated by APs.

29

30 **MR. DUGAS:** Keep it.

31

32 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** I'm hearing keep it. It is not deregulatory, and
33 so I think we have to strike that one. Encourage new entrants by
34 reconsidering shrimp permit moratorium. That also doesn't seem
35 deregulatory. You could reword it, maybe. Andy.

36

37 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Well, it is deregulatory if you're allowing more
38 people to participate in the fishery.

39

40 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Good point, and so is there appetite to include
41 this on the list? I believe we started a permit moratorium
42 amendment.

43

44 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** You will take your first look at it on Wednesday,
45 and so you do have an active document already addressing this.
46 Now, if you decide to get rid of the moratorium, then this could
47 be added to the list of deregulatory things, a la Mara's suggestion
48 earlier, but, if that's not where you're headed, then it doesn't

1 belong on the list.

2

3 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** If we remove it from the list now, it could be
4 added at Full Council later, and so, at this point, I would say
5 it's contradictory to what we're doing, and so I would remove it.
6 I'm seeing head shakes from the committee. Thank you. An AP
7 member suggested abolishing recreational fishing to boost GDP.
8 C.J.

9

10 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I'm going to move to strike that one.

11

12 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Looking around the committee, is there any
13 opposition to striking that? I'm seeing none. I believe that is
14 it for the EOs. We had no Other Business, Mr. Chair. Kevin.

15

16 **MR. ANSON:** I just want to go back to a couple of those that were
17 within other agencies, like the Coast Guard bullets, and, I mean,
18 we had some discourse here today for something that we don't
19 regulate, earlier with the Starlink, and so, you know, these are
20 issues that our fishermen, you know, are concerned about, and so
21 I think, at the very least, at some future council meeting, that
22 we bring these back up and see about -- Even just as much as
23 writing a letter to the Coast Guard, just to let them know that,
24 hey, these are concerns. I mean, they may be hearing it from their
25 folks that are on the docks and such, but at least, as a body that
26 are here representing the fishermen, I think we ought to do that.

27

28 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** To that point, I believe there were some notes
29 taken about adding that Starlink would also check a deregulatory
30 box to get rid of some other stuff that it would fill. By swapping
31 over to Starlink, you could get rid of some other things that would
32 be deregulatory, but, yes, we can bring this list back. Sanchez.

33

34 **MR. SANCHEZ:** In the future, I guess, if we could, I don't know,
35 maybe create a committee-of-the-whole to look at this stuff, only
36 with the interest of not having to go back and do it again in a
37 few days, and it would have the added bonus of probably Ed and I
38 wouldn't be making motions.

39

40 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** We're just going to put you on every committee,
41 you two, and then we don't have to worry about whether you're on
42 the committee or not. Okay. Last chance for hands. Otherwise
43 I'm turning over the mic to J.D. All right, Mr. J.D., and I took
44 all of the General's hour-and-a-half he gave back.

45

46 **CHAIRMAN BANKS:** Thank you, Dr. Banks, and so our next agenda item
47 is a closed session, and so I'll give council members five minutes
48 for the public to exit the room, and we'll convene our closed

1 session.

2

3 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on August 25, 2025.)

4

5

- - -