Background

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) has invited 15 representatives of the hard crab fishery, peeler fishery, and wholesale dealers to serve as members of an ad hoc Blue Crab Advisory Board (BCAB). The advisory board is designed to bring together a group of industry representatives from around the state who represent a diversity of commercial blue crab stakeholders and who can provide constructive comments and guidance to FWC on the development of the blue crab management program. From September 2003 through June 2004, the advisory board has met five times in one or two-day meetings to focus on reviewing and discussing blue crab fishery issues and the development of a state effort management program for the commercial blue crab fishery.

During the initial meeting of the Blue Crab Advisory Board on September 23-24, 2003, members worked through a process to develop goal statements and then identify possible key objectives or operational issues to be addressed in each goal area. During the second and third meetings on October 30 and December 3-4, members reviewed, discussed and refined an initial set of draft objectives. The facilitators redrafted the objectives based on member comments and created worksheets to guide discussion during the fourth meeting on January 6-7, 2004. Based on input from the advisory board in the first four meetings, the FWC staff prepared a workshop draft management plan for review by the Commission and conduct a series of regional input workshops during the spring.

The advisory board met again on June 4, 2004, to offer further guidance in response to input from the Commission and from the regional workshops. During the meeting members reviewed, discussed and refined the key elements of a potential effort management plan for staff to present to the Commission on June 9, 2004. Addition elements and additional Commission input will be reviewed and discussed at the next BCAB meeting scheduled for July 21 in Ocala.

Welcome and Introductions

Bill Teehan, Fisheries Management Analyst, welcomed members to the fifth meeting of the BCAB and stressed the value of the members’ ongoing participation and input into the development of a state management program responsive to the needs of the blue crab fishery. Facilitator Jeff Blair from the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium reviewed the meeting objectives and agenda, the meeting guidelines, and the consensus-building guidelines (meeting agenda packet available through [http://consensus.fsu.edu/](http://consensus.fsu.edu/) or upon request).

Agenda Review and Approval

The Board voted unanimously, 13 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented including the following objectives:
- To approve regular procedural topics
- To hear Agency presentation on input at regional workshops on management plan scenarios
- To review and discuss workshop input on access management issues
- To refine, and seek agreement on outstanding management plan issues
- To test for Board consensus on draft management plan recommendations
- To identify needed information, agenda items, and next steps for developing recommendations

**Approval of January 6 & 7, 2004 Facilitators’ Summary Report**

Since the members had not received the January 6-7 Facilitators’ Summary Report as part of the pre-meeting agenda packet, the Board moved to postpone approval until they had a opportunity to review the document for possible corrections.

**Review and Discussion of Draft Effort Management Plan Recommendations**

Bill Teehan presented a report on the series of regional public workshops used to gather input on the management recommendations proposed by the BCAB. The workshops were held in West Palm Beach (March 9), Titusville (March 10), Green Cove Springs (March 11), Ft. Myers (March 30), Pinellas Park ((arch 31), Crystal River (April 1), Pensacola (April 26), Panama City (April 27), Jacksonville (April 28), and Jacksonville (April 29). The workshops had 162 attendees, of which 63 individuals offered comments on the record.

The facilitators and staff used input offered during the regional workshops to reorganize the BCAB recommendations into worksheets to focus discussion on key elements of a potential effort management plan. The following is the summary of public comments from the regional workshops as prepared by the facilitators and reviewed with the advisory board:

- In general the public preferred Option I. (The total number of participants in the fishery would be capped at the initial number of qualifiers).
- There were a couple of comments relating to whether transferability should be allowed.
- Views on the number of traps indicate support for the Board’s recommendations; however, there were many comments indicating the number of traps should be less than those recommended.
- There is concern that landings of 500 pounds is too high a level.
- There were requests to extend the qualification period to include the years up to the lifting of the moratorium.
- The endorsement fee seems acceptable; however there is some support for a lower initial tag fee.
- There were many concerns expressed about the trap retrieval closure season, ranging from when it should be, to not having a place to store traps.
- Should commercial fisherman be allowed to keep V #’s as backup regardless of qualifying landings

Advisory Board members agreed that the focus of this meeting should be to review the input from the public workshops and provide the agency with further guidance in developing
recommendations for a management plan for the Blued Crab industry for presentation to the Commission on June 9, 2004.

The facilitators developed and utilized a worksheet to guide members through the meeting discussion. Members discussed each key issue under the draft management plan recommendations and, when necessary, offered refinements to address any concerns and build consensus support. Facilitators initially used the following four-point scale to test member consensus on refinements to the recommendations that received significant public comment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Acceptability Scale</th>
<th>4 = acceptable I agree</th>
<th>3 = acceptable, I agree with minor reservations</th>
<th>2 = not acceptable, I don’t agree unless major reservations addressed</th>
<th>1 = not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

During the meeting, the facilitators also used a yes or no straw poll to test for member support of suggested refinements to the draft objectives.

The following are the key issues or recommendations reviewed by the members. Those recommendations that received significant public comment are followed by an initial acceptability ranking, followed by a list of comments and suggestions offered by members and discussed during the initial review. The bold comments are the action taken and or the proposed revision that members indicated support for through the acceptability ranking or straw poll. At the conclusion of the day, all of the key issues related to management plan recommendations had been considered and consensus ranked for acceptability. (The letters and numbers assigned in the worksheets are not intended to indicate any prioritization and are used only to identify items for purposes of discussion.)

**Consideration of BCAB Options**

The members were asked to review each of the alternative options previously developed by the BCAB and to indicate their initial level of support for each respective option. The facilitators then asked members to discuss their concerns and suggest possible revisions to address those concerns.

**BCAB PREFERED OPTION —OPTION I**

This option would create a closed access fishery. The total number of participants in the fishery would be capped at the initial number of qualifiers. Traps would be issued to qualifying endorsement holders. The blue crab endorsement is identified as a "V" number. If an individual has multiple vessel licenses and qualifying landings for each vessel license, a new V#, and associated trap allotments, would be issued for each license. In order to get into the fishery once the program is established, an individual would have to purchase the V# and associated traps from someone wishing to get out of the fishery. Other elements of this option are defined for the hard crab and soft shell fisheries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking</th>
<th>reservations</th>
<th>reservations</th>
<th>acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS/AMENDMENTS:**
- Not locked in to one or the other, can hybridize or come up with something different
- We need to ask the marine institute for an estimate of the optimum number of traps for full yield
- Not likely to start passive reduction without first determining the starting point
- If the plan relies on selling by trap it will result in too many individuals participating. I worry more about the guy fishing 20 traps than the one fishing 200. We should set a minimum number of traps to fish or participate in the industry
- Need a goal of the optimum number of traps that are healthy for the industry before we can divvy it up
- Extending the moratorium for another year allows us to get more information. The numbers related traps and trap reduction can be modified once more and better info is available
- We just need to develop a structure to work from at this point. Either option can be structured so that we can work back from
- But working back once we have better info favors using option one as the initial basis for refinements
- If you sell traps you have to sell a minimum number such as 200 with a passive reduction built in
- Only allow a person to buy the number of traps they have previously reported. If they previously reported using 300 traps then can only buy in initially at 300
- We are just trying to refine the range of trap #'s

**BCAB ALTERNATIVE OPTION—OPTION II**

This option would create a **trap certificate program**. The overall number of traps would be set at the initial allotment. As in the preferred option, traps would be issued to qualifying V#s. If an individual has multiple vessel licenses and qualifying landings for each vessel license, a new V# would be issued for each license with associated trap allotments. To get into the fishery, an individual would have to purchase trap certificates from someone who is willing to sell them. There would be an associated 10% passive reduction on transactions outside the immediate family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3=minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1=not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Do the same limits on trap numbers apply to both Option 1 and 2?
- Confusing to say it is a “trap certificate program.” The distinction is not clear.
- Are option 1 and 2 the same but for passive reduction?
- The difference is the ability to buy in by the trap under option 2. Option 1 the number of license is capped and you have to buy out the whole operation to get in.
- Where does the 1,000 off-shore come in – need to reword and apply to both options
- No restriction on V #’s
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♦ Can we come up with one option that puts in a cap and allows you to buy in through traps or by selling whole operation
♦ Option 2 devalues the license; the first option makes the license more valuable as an investment – better for those who want to retire.

Based on the initial ranking and the subsequent discussion, members indicated a desire to develop one option by further refining the elements under Option 1.

### Additional Considerations under Option 1

#### A. Should there be a passive reduction element to any option?
The facilitator asked for members’ initial response to the staff’s recommendation that Option 1 be clarified to include a passive reduction element.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3=minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1=not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reservation expressed related to whether or not option 1 was a better starting point than option two. All of the members agreed that a passive reduction element should be included in the final recommendation to the Commission.

#### B. Should the blue crab endorsement moratorium be extended until July 1, 2006?
The facilitator asked members to indicate their initial support for the recommendation to the Commission to extend the current moratorium until a management plan could be refined and implemented July 1, 2006.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3=minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1=not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. Should commercial fisherman keep their V#’s regardless of landings?
The facilitators asked members to indicate their initial reaction to allowing commercial fisherman to keep their V#’s regardless of their landings during the qualifying period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3=minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1=not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS/AMENDMENTS:
- Will create too many people trying to qualify now to get in
If someone wants to blue crab then they should buy out the certificates of someone in the industry. I sympathize with commercial fishermen and their desire to diversify, but I don’t want Johnny-come-lately’s jumping into the industry as part timers. Old gill netters for example lost their industry and had to adjust.

The Hard Crab Fishery


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Ranking</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3=minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1=not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMENTS/AMENDMENTS:
- Those who do not qualify can still go through an appeals process and also still have an opportunity to buy license from someone who is getting out.
- We will set up an appeals board to hear legitimate reasons.

2. Endorsement could either be individual or vessel.

- What is the basis for keeping individual vessel (spl)?
- Ability to go from one boat in one coast to one at another site in consecutive days, or if one boat breaks down.
- Problem of one v# running multiple boats with people who do not know what they are doing.
- I do not see hordes of people jumping in under this provision.

The facilitator asked members to indicate in a yes/no straw poll if it should be left like it is to include either an individual or vessel: Leave it like it is? Y-11; N-1

- Wrong not to let an individual in the boat with me who does not have their own license.
- Boat breaks down, then I can take the license to any other boat, the buoy number color is transferable – can borrow another boat.

3. Endorsement fee of $125 (includes $25 trap retrieval fee).

The facilitator asked members if they wanted to discuss or revise this provision. Members indicated they were still comfortable with this provision and did not see any need to discuss or revise it further.

4. 600 traps (with 50 extra for rotation).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>4=acceptable</th>
<th>3=minor reservations</th>
<th>2=major reservations</th>
<th>1=not acceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMENTS/AMENDMENTS:

- First we need to clarify the numbers. Didn’t we agree that the total traps were 1,000? 400 traps outside Col Regs and 600 (with another 50 extra for rotation) inshore with colors to differentiate between the two
- Possible objection: In the big bend area using the same traps allows someone to beat the stone crab regulations by adding additional blue crab traps
- We are setting the starting point until we get better numbers from the marine institute
- Areas for winter crabbing in the gulf are Cedar key to Apalachicola and Naples to Florida Bay
- You can fish more traps in the winter because of limited growth on the traps. You do not have to pull the traps up to clean as often
- My reservation is with the starting point of 600. Those currently fishing less will now start at 600. Doesn’t that artificially inflate the initial number of traps even before we begin passive reductions? Same thing that happened to gill netters will happen to the blue crab? Homeowner anger will haunt the industry if we are not careful
- I do not see how others get by with less than 600 traps
- I want you to start at the level you need but also start those currently fishing fewer to start at that lower point, rather than give them an opportunity to artificially inflate the total number of traps available
- Would we base it on past landings? Set a limit for initial traps based on your past landings?
- People will tire of paying the tag fee for additional traps and will not renew traps they are not using
- Stone crab people do hang on to tags they are not fishing as an investment
- Is the concern really about homeowners in S.W. Florida looking out their windows? We are trying to regulate over 1300 miles of coastline but we have different problems in different regions of Florida. Big Bend makes money in the winter because of higher prices; we exist in the summer to fish in the winter. Lots of individual people only use 200 traps. To sustain the business we need different things. How are we going to get what we each need and get it through the commission? If I don’t buy my tags in the first two years then I lose them. We can say it will cost you this much, not that you can each have this many
- We have an influx of crabs now. I have six hundred traps and rotate them. They are not all in the water. My season on the east is the summer. We are trying to address the issue on statewide basis. What are preliminary numbers? We require 600 to make a living.
- People are holding on to certificates in stone crab even if they are not currently using them as an investment to sell later. If too many hold without selling for a few years, then this provision will not work since people will hold as an investment.
- Consider a tiered system? Tier with qualifying criteria for 200, another tier of criteria for 500, another tier for 1,000? People said at the workshops that they fish 200 but would buy 650 if allowed to.
- Even if they buy the full number of trap tags they will not necessarily put that many in the water. There will not be a big influx of traps into the water

ADDITIONAL OPTIONS:
The facilitator presented a summary of three possible options that members might want to consider and discuss:

1. Leave it as the option is presented now (1,000 total per qualifying spl)
2. Initial number of traps you can buy is based on landings
3. Initially eligible to buy 1,000 (per spl) but would not be allowed to buy/sell for a moratorium period (for example 2 years)

- I can’t go with it as is (#1) or waterways will be too crowded
- Do you have to sell the whole rig or can you split it up? Can I sell part and still fish 200 traps or do I have to sell the whole 650?
- In SW Florida, there are 26 people with 300-600 traps but half are working on another license. We cannot let them get endorsements based only this one year of higher landings. The recreational boaters are complaining- last year individual had 150 traps this year he increased by adding three more individuals
- Traps based on the number of licenses you own? How does that relate to the number of traps you fish?
- I just put down what I think I should when reporting. I do not think the numbers reported are accurate.
- Current range 600,000-800,000 traps based on spl’s, and the 2,000 that qualify for v#’s
- Those boats that started this year will not qualify under current qualifying period
- We have a problem with people fishing on other’s V#. Some are putting five or six boats out there with more and more pots. The current proposal does not limit the number of pots in the water
- It is hard as a buyer to accurately indicate on the trip tickets how many traps are actually pulled
- Individual name is put on spl card but not on the boat endorsement. The check should be made out to individual on spl card
- That is why I favor eliminating the individual qualification.
- But individual card needs to be you but not on the boat. Most operations are one man on a boat.
- If fisherman themselves filled out tickets you might get more accurate info but the reality is they will not do it.

*(The board took a break before resuming the discussion)*

- If we go with Option 1 then do not allow selling only a portion of the traps. You should either have to sell all your traps or none at all. I say stick with option one and cut off vessel endorsements with last years landings
- I suggest that you cannot sell out in the three-year start up period. People who want to fish less will not pay fee for full allotment for three-year period.
- I qualify for 650, but that year I want and pay for only 300; send a notice asking how many you want now, but can get additional traps later up to 650 but have to pay a higher fee for additional traps over the 300.
- If allotted 650, but this year buy 300. Do not have to buy 650 if you can buy additional next year
- The state could put a higher fee on the remaining balance of traps.
- Qualify for 650, but fish 350 this year and pay only for those 350, same next year; but the third year I want to increase, to the next 300 cost more. Then after that pay regular fee for full allotment in subsequent years
- Set one time each year for purchasing tags. Have to wait to the beginning of the next year to add traps
The facilitator asked members to indicated in a yes/no straw poll their initial level of support for the concept as discussed: **Straw poll Yes-12; No-0**

- Need better system for counting numbers. I support passive reduction, but need accurate number on what industry can support as the target, need to establish the right levels with data
- Not reducing licenses, but the number of traps that run with the license is reduced each time it is sold – previously used 10% reduction in option 2
- If under option 1, licenses do not turn over will there be any reductions? We should consider a higher % for reduction if license turnover is slow or infrequent
- Those fishing fewer pots will not feel compelled to buy whole allotment at the beginning if they knew they could buy full allotment in future years

The facilitator asked members to indicate in a yes/no straw poll whether or not the supported including a passive reduction element in Option 1: **Straw poll on passive reduction Y-12 to N-0**

5. **Traps would be required to have individual tags.**

The facilitator asked if members wanted to discuss this provision further. Members did not feel the provision needed to be refined or revised based on public comment from the workshops.

6. **The number of participants in the fishery would be capped at the number of initial qualifying entities.**

Members indicated that this issue had been considered and revised as part of the discussion above.

7. **After termination of the moratorium, these endorsements would be transferable. In order to get into the fishery, the entrant must buy the endorsement and trap tags as a package from someone who is leaving the fishery.**

Members indicated that this issue had been considered and revised as part of the discussion above.

**The Soft Crab Fishery**


- I am concerned that the minimum is too low, particularly for additional licenses. Additional licenses should require 2500 soft crabs for each additional second boat
- Each license is $250
- Incidental catch of 150 per day with hard crab trap
- We should consider 2500 crabs for every boat, even the initial boat
- When it comes to the trip tickets, what are you looking for?
- Put in a new species code for future reporting – but for now?
- Have to demonstrate landings
2. Endorsement could either be individual or vessel.

Members indicated that this issue had been considered as part of the discussion above.

3. Endorsement fee of $250 (includes $25 trap retrieval fee).

Members indicated that this issue had been considered as part of the discussion above.

4. 400 traps (with 50 extra for rotation).

- Some of the public comment indicated that the number is too high
- But those comments come from one area of the state. The Big Bend area is different from the St. John’s River as to place, timing, runs and need for number of traps. We can’t have different numbers for different areas
- Have a set number for the state or set up regional basis?
- 450 total traps outside Col Reg, with 250 for inside?
- Limit the number to the entity?
- Collapse all licenses to one social security number and limit to 450 total for that one number?
- Hurts if running two hundred pots on two boats
- Limit each V# to 450 traps?
- 450 for first V# boat, only two boats with second limited to 250 traps;
- An entity (social security number or federal employment identification) qualifies for 450 for first spl, qualify for additional 250 if he has a second spl with qualifying landings – maximum of 750 total

The facilitator asked members to indicate whether or not they support this concept in a yes/no straw poll: Straw Poll - Yes-12 to No-0

The facilitator asked members to indicate in a yes/no straw poll whether or not they supported including a passive reduction element in this recommendation for soft crabs: Passive reduction element for soft crab: Yes-12 to No-0

- Concern applies here too that we don’t have optimal number yet for the industry to set the specific level for passive reduction

5. Endorsement allows holder to operate shedding tanks for soft shell crab production.

Members did not feel the provision needed to be revised or discussed further based on public comment from the workshops.

6. Traps would be required to have individual tags.

Members did not feel the provision needed to be revised or discussed further based on public comment from the workshops.
7. After termination of the moratorium, these endorsements would be transferable. In order to get into the fishery, the entrant must buy the endorsement and trap tags as a package from someone who is leaving the fishery.

Members indicated that this issue had been considered as part of the discussion above.

Additional issue: the following issue was raised by a member for discussion and possible inclusion for immediate action by the Commission.

➢ Jimmie crab: Would like for commission to consider it now, rather than waiting for implementation in July ‘06 as a rule change. Problem currently with uneven enforcement of the issue.
➢ The Board indicated they supported taking the issue to the Commission.

COMMON MANAGEMENT PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS

The members considered the following BCAB recommendations that were common to both the preferred and alternative options:


The facilitator asked members to consider the public comment from the workshops and indicate in a yes/no straw poll their initial level of support for leaving this provision the same: Straw poll Yes-12, No-0

COMMENTS/AMENDMENTS:

- Stay the same- unanimous
- Those who have gotten in will pressure the Commission and Legislature to extend the dates to include this year. We may want to consider offering a non-transferable license for those who qualify after 2003
- Why can’t they can buy in to get in the business
- Low numbers at workshops show limited concern
- They did not get in when the going is tough, but want in now that business is good without the drought. They can get in if they buy someone out
- Moratorium since 1998 – how did they get in now?
- Those with endorsements from prior to ’98 who did not fish till this year when it was profitable again
- That’s business if they did not qualify in the required years
- If you want in, buy a license
- This is not like stone crab industry. With blue crabs it is easy to get in as an initial investment as compared to stone crab. Tough, if you do not have the landings
- As appeals board you may want the option of giving non-transferable license based on a set of criteria
- Had to buy in to stone crab
- But anyone could get in if they paid $125
Crabbing is good now but not the past few years

Create criteria to allow nontransferable V# that appeals board could grant at their discretion

Why should it be different than stone crab or lobster?

Need to demonstrate why you could not crab during the qualifying year, but not just because you just went out this year because the crabbing is good.

The facilitator asked members to indicate in a yes/no straw poll their support for including the following provision: **BCAB, as an appeals board, would create the circumstances or criteria for consideration and have discretion to award non-transferable license**: Straw Y-12, N-0

Hardship? What if they were farming instead during the qualifying years? Example of Mr. Daniels in the shrimping business? Must demonstrate involvement in the industry prior to the hardship? We can develop criteria for consideration later but this could be the biggest problem faced by an appeals board.

2. The qualifying criteria are the same for both hard crab options (500 pounds), as well as the same qualifying criteria for the soft crab options (750 crabs) regardless of whether preferred or alternative plans are considered. This will allow a person to possibly receive more than one trap allocation, e.g. an individual with multiple SPLs that have V#s and qualifying landings (for each license) can receive trap allocations for each license. An individual who qualifies for a second or third endorsement will have to demonstrate a higher landings qualifier than the first, e.g. 1,500 pounds.

**COMMENTS/AMENDMENTS:**

- You should have to show a higher number for a second or third vessel endorsement – too easy to qualify and put others on the boat. Should we put it at 20,000 or 25,000?
- Use a tiered system of 10,000 for second, 20,000 for third, etc.?
- Too easy to get someone to write up a tip ticket for 1,500. We must close the gap
- The tiered system will get to be too burdensome on more boats
- Each additional boat after the first one must have same amount of landings to qualify; 5,000 or 10,000 each?
- Must be tied to the boat not the person

The facilitator asked members to indicate in a yes/no straw poll their support for the following: **5,000 for each boat after the first one - Straw poll Yes-9; 3 supported a higher number**

- 5,000 for second; 10,000 for each subsequent boat?
- 7,500 for each boat after first?

The facilitator asked members to indicate their support for setting a minimum of 7,500 for each additional boat after the first one (for any of the three year qualifying period) Straw Poll Yes-11; No-1

- (From the member dissenting) 5,000 is enough in my opinion
- Consider the value of landings versus pounds?

3. **Establish an initial tag fee of $1.00 per tag with $.50/tag every year thereafter.**

**COMMENTS/AMENDMENTS:**

- Discussed different fees – initial $1 fee with a lower fee in future years
Did that tie in to option 2 purchasing traps?
♦ Yes, but also preceded development of option 2 as a way to establish funding for start up of the effort management program
♦ Start with .50 in first year and all subsequent years
♦ Agency would prefer a constant fee from an administrative point of view

The facilitator asked members to indicate in a yes/no straw poll their support for the following:
One .50 fee for the first and subsequent years; Straw Poll Yes-12, No-0
♦ (One time deal to keep up to 650 in subsequent years)

4. Establish an apprenticeship program for persons wanting to enter the blue crab fishery. This would require the person to work on an existing blue crab vessel for a period of two weeks, in order to obtain a certified document to that effect that would allow them to buy into the fishery.

Members did not feel the provision needed to be revised or discussed further based on public comment from the workshops.

5. Prohibit the sale of undersized peeler crabs going out-of-state.

Members did not feel the provision needed to be revised or discussed further based on public comment from the workshops.

6. Allow degradable hog-rings (staples to attach panels to the trap).

Comments/considerations:
♦ Consider allowing 16 gauge rather than 24. Approved for past five years but now a new enforcement officer is threatening to ticket them if they are not changed out
♦ Board would like staff to move forward with this with the Commission

7. Allow 3 X 6 inch degradable panels to be horizontal or vertical.

Members did not feel the provision needed to be revised or discussed further based on public comment from the workshops.

8. Reevaluate escape ring regulations to consider a minimum of two rings per trap with a minimum inside diameter of 2 3/16 inches per ring.

Members did not feel the provision needed to be revised or discussed further based on public comment from the workshops.

9. Allow bait to be used in peeler traps to keep "jimmie" crab alive (a "jimmie" crab is a male crab used to attract female crabs into the trap).

Comments/considerations:
10. Require maximum 1” X 1” mesh in peeler traps.

Comments/considerations:
- Some do not like this. If we have separate tag for peeler trap then don’t have to have the vent. We should not require this
- We were defining what a peeler pot is when we came up with this
- Tagging system for peeler pots, designated as a peeler pot, baited with jimmy crab
- Peeler tags are different color

The facilitator asked members to indicate in a yes/no straw poll their support for withdrawing this provision as unnecessary: Straw Poll Yes-12 to No-0

11. Designate the federal exclusive economic zone (EEZ) as a blue crab sanctuary.

Members did not feel the provision needed to be revised or discussed further based on public comment from the workshops.

12. Regional rotating short-term closures to facilitate trap clean-up projects.

COMMENTS/AMENDMENTS:
*Members did not discuss or revise this provision in response to the public comment from the workshops.


Members did not feel the provision needed to be revised or discussed further based on public comment from the workshops.

14. Establish a permanent Blue Crab Advisory Board by rule.

Members did not feel the provision needed to be revised or discussed further based on public comment from the workshops.

15. Allow alternate buoy types - minimum dimension of 5” diameter and 5” length.

Members did not feel the provision needed to be revised or discussed further based on public comment from the workshops.

BCAB Summary Report for June 4, 2004
Review of Actions of Recommendations

At the request of the members, the facilitators offered the following summary of the recommendations developed by the board to verify the board members’ support and understanding:

♦ Offer Commission only one option
The facilitator asked members to indicate their support in a yes/no straw poll for this recommendation: **Straw: Yes-11; No-1** (member expressed concern about not giving the Commission an alternative to consider)

♦ Number of participants capped by initial three year qualifying period 2000-2003 license years
♦ Each individual and vessel must qualify: 500 lbs for the first, 7500 lbs for each subsequent boat
♦ Each qualifying license can purchase up to 600 in shore traps (with 50 more for rotation) and 400 off shore (COL REGS) – color differentiation between trap types
♦ Each trap has to have an individual tag with initial $.50 and annual renewal
♦ Each qualifier is and remains entitled to full allotment of traps; if full allotment is not selected for the first year, then can increase allotment up to total allowed in each subsequent year, each subsequent year is $.50 for renewals, allotments can only be increased at the beginning of each license year
♦ Board supports a passive reduction element to be determined from future data on the optimal trap levels for the industry
♦ Board supports extending the moratorium until July 2006
♦ Board supports a criteria based non-transferable license for hardship cases. The criteria for “hardship” to be determined in future meetings.
♦ Endorsement fee: $250 for soft crab; $125 for hard crab

♦ Transfer fee to the state? Stone crab certificates example? To be determined in future board consideration; also separate from private sale of license

Other Issues for Future Board Consideration

– We are faced with different issues in different areas
– The current “hot” spots include the Peace River, Little Manatee, parts of St. Johns, park line for Everglades, and others. These areas are the points of conflict
– Can we address and limit the conflicts by defining these areas as a board and try to limit the number of traps within those areas designated?
– How would you regulate the limits in each area? Would the marine patrol be required to pull traps?
– In high multi use areas, we should consider using drawl systems with a buoy on each end of the line. Such systems limit the conflicts with recreational users
– The “hot” spots are getting worse
APPROVAL OF DRAFT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The BCAB voted unanimously, 12 - 0 in favor, to approve the recommendations as refined during the June 4 meeting as a package for presentation to the Commission for further guidance on June 9, 2004.

NEXT STEPS

After discussing several possible dates in July and August, the members agreed to hold the next advisory board meeting on July 21, 2004, in the same location. Staff will send members relevant information about making reservations as soon as it is available.

Members were reminder that they are eligible for reimbursement of any expenses related to the BCAB, including hotel rooms for the board meetings and travel to the regional workshops. Advisory board members were encouraged to submit any outstanding requests for reimbursement as soon as possible since the current fiscal year ends on June 30.

The facilitators reminded members that they were representing other stakeholders and urged members to continue talking about the meetings and the materials with their respective constituencies prior to the next meeting. Members were asked to complete the meeting evaluation forms attached to the agenda packet (see Appendix A for the meeting evaluation summary). The meeting was then adjourned.
## APPENDIX A

### MEETING EVALUATION SUMMARY

**Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission**

**Blue Crab Advisory Board**

**June 4, 2004 - Ocala, Florida**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were the Meeting Objectives Met?</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency presentation on input at regional workshops on management plan scenarios</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and discuss workshop input on access management issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on outstanding management plan issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board consensus on draft management plan recommendations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on next steps for developing recommendations for a management plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEETING ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Organization</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background and agenda packet were helpful</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations were effective and informative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion format was effective</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators guided participant efforts effectively</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BCAB Summary Report for June 4, 2004
Participation was balanced

What Did You Like Best About the Meeting?
- Location
- Arrived at a fairly good plan to submit to the Commission

What Could be Improved?
- More study on the catch (surveys)
- Did not receive my agenda packet until the meeting