

**Consensus Ranking and Member Comments**  
**November 8, 2006**  
**Snook Workgroup Meeting #3**  
**St. Pete Hilton**

**Note: Consensus rules require that, if a vote is taken, 60% of voting members present is necessary to pass an item. For this meeting, that meant 11.**

**Goal 1: Retain 40% SPR Goal for Snook**

1.1 Continue to keep the SPR goal for snook at 40%.

1<sup>st</sup> ranking on 1.1

Mean: 3.61

5	4	3	2	1
8	2	2	5 Gary Borland Tom Twyford Mike Kennedy Danny Guarino Butch Constable	1 Roger Birt

Consensus not achieved, discussion followed

Member comments

1. Habitat needs to be considered.
2. Continue to try for 40% by 2017.
3. Goal setting may be unrealistic; what message are you sending to public, you need more regulation and then there will be too much regulation. Can we really attain this goal?
4. As long as population of snook is increasing should we have this goal; we never achieve this anyway.
5. 40% is sociological and it is likely not an obtainable goal.
6. All percentages more than 35% are good
  - a. Maybe the 40% is a goal and we should specify a threshold less than 40%
7. We need a range rather than a specific number
8. Average angler should have a reasonable expectation of catching a fish; we need a balance (example: 35-40%)
9. This is a philosophical goal, not a biological goal that would be needed to sustain the fishery
10. 40% is a guideline to improve the fishery. But we can still go below the 40% goal if we are moving toward the goal.
11. Ask the Commission to recognize that the 40% is a guideline.
12. We need to worry about the folks that are not in this room; different demographic of user; the average fisher is not represented at this table

- 1 13. RE: habitat: we must make sure that habitat can support the fish;
- 2 how many snook can a specific area of habit support? We need to
- 3 determine this. 40% might not be attainable with the current habitat
- 4 loss
- 5 14. Habitat is the real importance.
- 6 15. The different coasts are different re: snook species
- 7 16. You must consider that human population is increasing and affecting
- 8 fish populations.
- 9 17. Data is already more than 2 years old. In 3 years the FWC is going
- 10 to reassess this issue.
- 11 18. If we keep this SPR, it helps for preserving habitat.
- 12 19. This is all about tradeoffs.
- 13 20. We need a goal to shoot for; without a goal of some sort we are just
- 14 floundering around.
- 15 21. Some fish populations are down and not because of habitat loss.
- 16 22. The science shows we can reach 40%; it is a matter of whether we
- 17 like the slot or bag limits.
- 18 23. East coast has too much pressure, we need a goal to try to achieve.
- 19 24. We need a measurable biological goal. For snook, we are giving a
- 20 more protective standard
- 21 25. What about the seasons? You may want to close a month and then
- 22 get a larger slot size. Biggest issue is slot size; we are not too far
- 23 away with some adjustments.
- 24 26. Look at the West coast; the reduction of fish is due to fishing
- 25 pressure not habitat. We need a goal.
- 26 27. Mechanisms of getting to the goal are political; how do we get there
- 27 that is acceptable to the folks in Florida.
- 28 28. We may need to regulate the Atlantic and Gulf sides differently.
- 29 29. I don't like the idea of threshold concept; just stick with a number for
- 30 the SPR
- 31 30. The current numbers are based on a sociological basis; "we want
- 32 more fish or larger fish"
- 33 31. We need to know the threshold number- the number below which the
- 34 fish population would collapse
- 35 32. Bottom line is that we want a *different* kind of fishery.
- 36 33. You don't want to experiment with the biological limits- too
- 37 dangerous to the fish population.
- 38 34. Nothing wrong with the goal of 40% as long as everyone
- 39 understands that it is a sociological goal not a biological goal. Right
- 40 now we are actually at 25% and the fish population is increasing.
- 41 35. If we always have a goal we cannot obtain, the message to the public
- 42 is bad; it deflates support for the goal. Will be difficult to get the
- 43 general public behind us. We will lose support.
- 44 36. Go with a threshold and target.
- 45 37. FWC should follow their mandate to protect habitat. We need habitat
- 46 and restoration and protection. We need research on habitat.
- 47 38. A "goal" is just something you work toward, and the Commission
- 48 voted to keep the SPR at 40% up until now.

- 1 39. Education will help with this concept.
- 2 40. We should not be afraid to be strict enough. You need to clamp
- 3 down on fishing mortality.
- 4 41. Concern in lower East coast that no matter what you do you aren't
- 5 going to better fishing there.
- 6 42. Habitat is a separate issue; it should be discussed in a later section
- 7 and we should take a very strong stance on habitat.
- 8 43. Separate stock enhancement, habitat restoration and SPR, have them
- 9 all.
- 10 44. Worried about the public relations implications; how would putting a
- 11 threshold in change the perception that we are doing ok. I don't want
- 12 the public to think we are doing an ok.
- 13 45. I am opposed to a threshold and a lower number. That is all that
- 14 anyone will look at. It will drive management down if you set a lower
- 15 number.

16  
17 2<sup>nd</sup> ranking on 1.1 with original language

5	4	3	2	1
7	3	7	1 Danny	0

18 Consensus not achieved after second ranking, went to vote.

19  
20 **Vote: Yes: 15 PASSED**

21  
22 Following this vote, FWC Staff asked the group if they could be more specific  
23 in the language in 1.1 to help guide the Commission. Members made the  
24 following suggestions:

- 25 1. Leave the wording as it was originally written above.
- 26 2. Opportunity for us to set a goal; we should support this
- 27 3. The state made a change in regulations in June, the 27inch minimum;
- 28 why should they care if we change the SPR
- 29 4. Add "By 2017": makes it a 10 year plan
- 30 5. A goal that is attainable but must be achieved over time and not allow
- 31 fish populations to decrease

32  
33 Suggested alternate wording for 1.1: Continue to work toward a conservation  
34 mind ed SPR goal for snook at 40%.

35  
36 Ranking on 1.1 with new language Mean: 3.5

5	4	3	2	1
6	0	6	4	0

37 No alternate wording was adopted.

38  
39 Member comments:

- 40 1 Was there ever a time frame for meeting the 40% SPR?
- 41 2 The history is to "maintain" a 40% SPR

42  
43 Language addition prior to 1.3: "It is the considered opinion of the workgroup  
44 that the recommendations made in section 1.3 meet with the intent of 1.1."

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

Ranking on additional language:

5	4	3	2	1
8	5	4	0	0

*Consensus achieved*

1.2 Establish the bag limit for snook at one per person statewide.

First ranking 1.2

Mean: 4.0

5	4	3	2	1
11	1	2	3 Richard Butch Gary	1 Roger

*Consensus not achieved, discussion followed.*

Member Comments:

1. Current science does not show a reason to limit bag limit, limit size or months instead
2. There is a lot of pressure on the East Coast to keep 2 fish limit; many people come from far away to fish
3. Another option is to make the season smaller; maybe just May, Sept, Oct and Nov.
4. There is no problem with the different coasts having different season closures
5. Why is the shorter season better than the longer season
6. The Atlantic side has many other fish we can fish for; Gulf has less fish variety
7. May and Sept is Atlantic side biggest snook time; so we could close more
8. The way I read the charts, the fish population is in trouble in some of the options
9. Southeast Florida fishers are different than those further up the coast
10. Southeast Florida has different enough weather (warmer) so folks do continue to fish in months that may get too cold further north on the east coast
11. We can't tailor the regulations based on one particular region of the east coast
12. General angling public should not be more restricted
13. Most of East coast people want more months and 1-fish
14. Sebastian is the last area that still has good habitat and still has good fish
15. Many areas for people to fish are closed to the public from shore
16. One fish makes sense

1 Second ranking 1.2

5	4	3	2	1
13	2	2	0	1

2 Consensus not achieved after second ranking, went to vote.

3

4 Discussion before vote:

- 5 1. More palatable to take an inch off the top instead of taking 2 inches
- 6 off the top and only achieving another 2% SPR difference. Prefer
- 7 40c (Exhibit Need to fill this in of November 8, 2006 meeting
- 8 Report)
- 9 2. Option 40c better for stakeholders.
- 10 3. How long will fish be in the slot is an important consideration
- 11 4. There are more model outcomes greater than 40% for Option 35c
- 12 5. Tampa Bay/Charlotte Harbor snook should be closed in February
- 13 based on weather patterns
- 14 6. I like Option 40c but should use less months, knock off February
- 15 and ½ of December, which is option 40f
- 16 7. From the area being discussed, rather a 5 inch slot and get rid of a
- 17 winter month (weather affects) (Option 40f)
- 18 8. Option 40f would overlap other closed seasons (red fish, sea trout)
- 19 9. Could we close the second half of December and the first half of
- 20 February
- 21 10. Easier to get buy-in from stakeholders if we only change one thing
- 22 11. Trying to sell to the public will be the hardest thing.
- 23 12. Everyone is willing to adopt more restrictive management
- 24 measures
- 25 13. Being too restrictive might not be adopted by the public
- 26 14. The limits we are currently looking at are the current human
- 27 population sizes; as populations grow we need to continue to
- 28 evaluate
- 29 15. 40% is above what it takes to protect the fishery

30

31

32 **Vote: 1 fish bag limit statewide: Yes: 17 PASSED**

33

34

\*\*\*\*\*

35 The original version of 1.3, (*Change the size limit to \_\_\_\_\_ and have \_\_\_\_\_*

36 *months closed.*) was changed to reflect separate indications for the Gulf

37 Coast and the Atlantic Coast.

38

39 For the Gulf: The three recommendations below were suggested. Members

40 were first asked to rank them individually. None achieved consensus.

41 Members were then given the opportunity to multi-vote to choose 2

42 alternatives. Items #2 and #3 were adopted by the Workgroup as

43 acceptable alternatives to be submitted to the Commission.

44

- 45 1. Change the slot limit to 28-32 inches and no change to months closed.
- 46 (35c)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

Ranking if this is the only recommendation Mean: 3.0

5	4	3	2	1
2	1	11	3	1

Consensus not achieved; went to vote.

1<sup>st</sup> Vote for utilizing only this recommendation:

Yes 11 No 7 Did not pass

2<sup>nd</sup> Vote in multi-voting: Yes 5 Did not make the top 2

2. Change the slot limit to 28-33 inches and no change to months closed. (40c)

Ranking if this is the only recommendation Mean: 3.83

5	4	3	2	1
7	5	3	2	1

Consensus not achieved; went to vote

1<sup>st</sup> Vote for this recommendation:

**Yes 14 Passed**

3. Change the slot limit to 28-33 inches and change open season to March, April, Sept., Oct and November. (40f)

Ranking if this is the only recommendation

5	4	3	2	1
6	2	7	3	0

Consensus not achieved; went to vote

Vote: Yes 11 Did not pass

**2<sup>nd</sup> vote in multi-voting: Yes 13 PASSED**

**#2 and #3 above (40f and 40c) are the recommendations to be presented to the Commission.**

For the Atlantic: The four recommendations below were suggested. Members were given the opportunity to multi-vote to choose 2 alternatives.

1. Option 40b: 28-33 inch slot, Feb, March, April, May, Sept, Oct, Nov and first 1/2 of Dec. (matches months with 40c except May)

**Vote: Yes 15 PASSED**

2. 40h same as #1 above (without Feb and December is 38%SPR)

**Vote: Yes 15 PASSED**

3. 40g: 28-33 slot, March, April, Sept Oct and Nov (matches 40f in Gulf, 41% SPR)

Vote: Yes 4

4. 36b: 29-33 slot: same months as #3 above

Vote: Yes 1

#1 and #2 above (40b and 40h) are the recommendations

Member Comments:

- 1. We should go with Option 40b because it gives something back to the East Coast that lost a fish in one per limit vote
- 2. 40b matches up with 40c because it keeps almost same months except May and 36% SPR
- 3. We should eliminate all alternatives that do not achieve 40%
- 4. Guides keep fishing, recreational fishers stopped fishing

\*\*\*\*\*

1.4 Research and Monitoring done to support the 40% SPR.

1.4.1 External peer review of snook stock assessment (specifically facts and assumptions in the two models)

First ranking 1.4

Mean: 3.88

5	4	3	2	1
3	10	5	0	0

Consensus achieved.

Comments:

**Goal 2: Direct enforcement to raise the actual SPR to the 40% Goal**

2.1 Decrease poaching:

- a. Enlist snook experts to help identify specific areas of high incidence of snook violations
- b. Direct "sting" operations to target areas on land and sea, and visit these locations at regular intervals

1 First ranking 2.1 Mean: 4.1

5	4	3	2	1
7	6	5	0	0

2 Consensus achieved

3

4

5 2.2 Hire more officers and increase officer retention for fisheries  
6 enforcement.

7

8 First ranking 2.2 Mean: 4.16

5	4	3	2	1
8	7	2	0	1 Howard Wells

9 Consensus not achieved, discussion followed.

10

11 Member comment:

12

- 13 1. This is outside the purview of this group and FWC
- 14 a. Staff response: You can still recommend this

15

16 Second ranking 2.2 Mean: 4.72

5	4	3	2	1
14	3	1	0	0

17 Consensus achieved

18

19

20 **Goal 3: Increase funding and scope of Licensing**

21

- 22 3.1 FWC support for fee increase from Legislature - Snook Stamp fee to  
23 be raised from \$2 to minimum of \$5.

24

25

26 First ranking 3.1 Mean: 4.33

5	4	3	2	1
14	0	0	4 Ted Forsgren Ken Leber Tom Fraser Rick Roberts	0

27 Consensus not achieved, discussion followed

28

29 Member Comments:

30

- 31 1. Why are we talking about specific fee increases; we should work on  
the shoreline exemption, takes attention away from other things
- 32 2. We can raise the license fee and take care of this; we do both
- 33 3. It is so hard to work with Legislature to raise license fees
- 34 4. First deal with shoreline exemption
- 35 5. Increasing overall license fees would be better

- 1 6. We make the case that permit to transport a snook after you catch it
- 2 needs to be higher; I would like it to be higher than \$2
- 3 7. We should be addressing snook issues and snook stamp is a snook
- 4 issue; the shoreline exemption is for all fishing
- 5 8. Staff: you don't want to leave things out that you really want to
- 6 change ultimately even if you think it is difficult to accomplish
- 7 9. Staff: you can recommend more than one concept/issues
- 8 10. Snook stamp has always been a low figure; the real money could be in
- 9 other areas from the Legislature
- 10 11. Message should be seen that snook workgroup members are willing to
- 11 pay more for a snook stamp
- 12 12. Money from snook fee would go to research for snook only
- 13 13. We in the small group wanted this money to go to snook and snook
- 14 only
- 15 14. All of this (shoreline exemption and snook stamp) will be difficult to
- 16 pass; politically this may not be a good time to try to pass this item
- 17 this year
- 18 15. Raising the stamp amount is more of a deterrent to keeping a snook
- 19 rather than raising funds
- 20 16. Shoreline fishers without snook stamp are taking the resource free

21  
22 2<sup>nd</sup> ranking of 3.1 Mean: 4.22

5	4	3	2	1
11	2	3	2	0

23 Consensus not achieved; went to vote.

24  
25 **Vote: Yes (raise snook stamp fee) 14 PASSED**

26  
27 ~~3.2 — Have FWC aim to generate \$675,000 annually by raising the snook~~  
28 ~~stamp fee.~~

5	4	3	2	1

30 Eliminated 3.2 by unanimous agreement.

31  
32  
33 3.3 Added revenue from snook stamp increase should go to  
34 enforcement and research only.

35  
36 First ranking 3.3 Mean: 3.11

5	4	3	2	1
4	3	3	7 Ted Forsgren Ken Leber Tom Twyford Curtis Bostick Rick Roberts Sawyer Smith	1 Tom Fraser

			Butch Constable	
--	--	--	-----------------	--

1 **Consensus not achieved, discussion followed.**

3 Member Comments:

- 4 1. If you eliminate the word "enforcement" and leave research only.
- 5 2. Snook stamp monies go to internal snook program but not necessarily
- 6 for snook enforcement
- 7 3. Do not allow revenue to go to general revenue
- 8 4. What about management?
- 9 5. What about habitat?
- 10 6. You need to do research with juveniles, especially juvenile habitat
- 11 7. May not be possible anyway

13 Note: There was confusion over where the funds from the snook stamp  
14 are designated to be spent currently. For the next meeting, staff will look  
15 into where money is designated.

17 ~~3.4 Increase the number of permit buyers by requiring that anyone  
18 harvesting snook, from land or boat, must purchase a snook stamp.~~

20 1<sup>st</sup> ranking 3.4

Mean: 4.33

5	4	3	2	1
11	4	1	2 Ted Forsgren Sawyer Smith	0

21 **Eliminated by unanimous agreement**

23 3.5 Have FWC go to Legislature and request that the shore-based  
24 exemption be eliminated. ~~so that all anglers will be licensed.~~

26 1<sup>st</sup> ranking 3.5

Mean: 3.82

5	4	3	2	1
7	4	3	2 Butch Constable Danny Guarino	1 Wade Thompson Sawyer Smith

27 **Consensus not achieved, discussion followed.**

29 Member comments after first ranking:

- 30 1. This is a snook group, not a shore based angling group
- 31 2. This group does not represent everyone who fishes; subsistence
- 32 fishing and poverty level cannot afford a license
- 33 3. Valid that everyone should be able to fish; how much would this be?
- 34 4. We need to reword "the all anglers"
- 35 5. Numerous exemptions in salt water fishing license; none of this would
- 36 change since it is right in the license

- 1 6. It will put an extra strain on law enforcement
- 2 7. People without licenses often don't understand the regulations;
- 3 licensing educates
- 4 8. Requiring everyone to have the licenses would give the money for
- 5 more enforcement
- 6 9. Staff: eliminating the shore based exemption provides more data
- 7 10. Snook is not a food fish; it is a game fish
- 8 11. Why are we targeting the low socio economic group and not the
- 9 "above 65 years old" group.

12 2<sup>nd</sup> ranking of 3.5 Mean: 4.33

5	4	3	2	1
14	1	0	1	2

13 Consensus not achieved, went to vote

15 Vote: Yes 15 Note: This vote is to be held again after research by staff

17 Staff needs to look up the poverty exemption and come back with more  
 18 information before voting again on this issue. Staff needs to define what  
 19 is poverty.

22 ~~3.6 — Increase general fishing license fees/user fees for all anglers.~~

24 First ranking 3.6 Mean: 2.94

5	4	3	2	1
1	6	4	6 Sawyer Smith Ted Forsgren Tom Twyford Tom Fraser Howard Wells Butch Constable	0

25 Consensus not achieved.

27 Eliminated by unanimous agreement

29 Goal 4 was not discussed at this November 8, 2006 meeting. It will be  
 30 discussed at the next meeting.

32 **Goal 4: Determine stock enhancement viability**

34 4.1 Re-evaluate the viability of stock enhancement programs.

36 First ranking on 4.1 Mean: 2.67

5	4	3	2	1

0	2	8	8 Howard Wells Ted Forsgren Curtis Bostick Sawyer Smith Ken Leber Rick Roberts Tom Fraser Roger Birt	
---	---	---	--	--

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

4.1a Evaluate the viability of mosquito impoundments as release habitats for stocking hatchery reared snook. (added at meeting)

First ranking of 4.1a

Mean: 2.72

5	4	3	2	1
0	2	9	7 Ken Leber Tom Fraser Sawyer Smith Ted Forsgren Howard Wells Rick Roberts Curtis Bostick	0

7  
8  
9  
10  
11

4.2 Consider additional ways of financing stock enhancement.

First ranking of 4.2

Mean: 2.44

5	4	3	2	1
0	2	4	12 Gary Borland Danny Guarino Howard Wells Ted Forsgren Wade Thompson Sawyer Smith Ken Leber Rick Roberts Tom Fraser Curtis Bostick Susan Cocking Mike Kennedy	0

12  
13  
14

1 **Goal 5: Outreach and education**

2  
3 5.1 Have FWC conduct additional research to obtain more accurate  
4 data on snook release mortality using both live and artificial baits.

5  
6 First ranking 5.1(before eliminated language)

Mean: 3.56

5	4	3	2	1
3	6	7	2 Susan Pat	0

7 Consensus not achieved, discussion followed

8  
9 Member Comments:

- 10 1. Artificial bait guys want to take away live bait
- 11 2. This statement has to do with the mortality rate that was listed in the
- 12 assessment.
- 13 3. Want better data to estimate mortality rates
- 14 4. If we get better information we will have our SPR go up, the mortality
- 15 rate is not as bad as the former research shows
- 16 5. We need new testing to show better rates of release mortality
- 17 6. Focus is on release mortality not on live or artificial bait
- 18 7. We need to know about the effects of a vertical hold using a Boca grip

19  
20 Second ranking 5.1 with elimination of "using live and artificial baits"

21 Mean: 4.94

5	4	3	2	1
16	1	0	0	0

22 Consensus achieved

23  
24  
25 5.2 At license purchase agents' locations, in addition to rules and  
26 regulations include tips on handling release for all species tools,  
27 terminal tackle (examples: barbless hook and circle hook) and  
28 predation.

29  
30 First ranking 5.2

Mean: 3.72

5	4	3	2	1
6	2	9	1 Rick Roberts	0

31 Consensus not achieved

32  
33 To be discussed at next meeting.

34  
35  
36 5.3 Include tips on handling release for all species in all publications,  
37 and specifically in *Fishing Lines*.

1 First ranking 5.3 Mean: 4.22

5	4	3	2	1
9	4	5	0	0

2 Consensus achieved

3  
4

5 5.4 Include tips for decreasing release mortality of all species in all  
6 publications of rules and regulations (i.e., *Fishing Lines* magazine  
7 and/or on a separate sheet) and make sure this is available at the  
8 tax collectors' offices.

10 First ranking 5.4 Mean: 3.38

5	4	3	2	1
5	7	6	0	0

11 Consensus achieved

12

13 5.5 Notify all media using public service announcements (PSA) about  
14 techniques and tools for release, tackle, predation avoidance, and  
15 catch and release.

17 First ranking 5.5 Mean: 3.72

5	4	3	2	1
4	5	9	0	0

18 Consensus achieved

19

20 5.6 All license holders should be issued a regulation book that includes:  
21 regulations, angler ethics and fish handling, and fish identification  
22 all in the same book. (This brochure should include tips on release  
23 mortality such as tools and techniques, predation avoidance, and  
24 emphasize catch and release in general.)

26 First ranking 5.6 Mean: 3.5

5	4	3	2	1
4	4	7	3 Sawyer Smith Mike Kennedy Ken Leber	0

27 Consensus not achieved

28

29 To be discussed at next meeting

30

31

32 5.7 A snook ethics brochure/flyer should be issued to the public,  
33 including but not limited to: waterfront homeowners, conservation  
34 groups, and fishing clubs.

36 First ranking 5.7 Mean: 3.17

5	4	3	2	1
3	2	8	5 Ted Forsgren Tom Fraser Susan Cocking Roger Birt Sawyer Smith	0

1 Consensus not achieved.

2  
3 To be discussed at next meeting

4  
5  
6  
7 **Goal 6: Estuary micro management-geographic (dictated by science)**

8  
9 6.1 FWC should continue to manage East coast and West coast snook  
10 stocks separately, but let science dictate management

11  
12 First ranking 6.1

5	4	3	2	1

13  
14  
15 6.2 Re-evaluate beach renourishment projects and their impact on  
16 shoreline habitat.

17  
18 First ranking 6.2 Mean: 3.33

5	4	3	2	1
3	6	3	6 Tom Fraser Ted Forsgren Ken Leber Curtis Bostick Wade Thompson Sawyer Smith	0

19 Consensus not achieved.

20  
21 To be discussed at next meeting.

22  
23  
24 6.3 On the West coast, identify causes of red tide and contributing  
25 factors, i.e., storm runoff, Okeechobee runoff and freshwater  
26 discharges, etc.

27  
28 First ranking 6.3 Mean: 2.89

5	4	3	2	1

3	2	3	10 Howard Wells Ted Forsgren Curtis Bostick Wade Thompson Sawyer Smith Tom Fraser Roger Birt Rick Roberts Pat Kelly Ken Leber	0
---	---	---	---	---

1 Consensus not achieved.

2

3 To be discussed at next meeting.

4

5

6

6.4 Design a study to determine the effects of the impact of mosquito control on juvenile snook population.

7

8

9

First ranking 6.4 Mean: 2.72

5	4	3	2	1
1	2	6	9 Howard Wells Ted Forsgren Curtis Bostick Wade Thompson Sawyer Smith Ken Leber Rick Roberts Roger Birt Tom Fraser	0

10 Consensus not achieved.

11

12 To be discussed at next meeting.

13

14

6.5 FWC should take advantage of tournaments to collect more snook data.

15

16

17

First ranking 6.5 Mean: 2.89

5	4	3	2	1
1	3	8	5 Howard Wells Ted Forsgren Rick Roberts Tom Fraser Rick Grasset	1 Danny

1 Consensus not achieved.

2  
3 To be discussed at next meeting

4  
5  
6  
7 **Recommendations made by Workgroup but outside the purview of**  
8 **the FWC:**

9  
10 OP1. In order to decrease poaching, have FWC apply uniform penalties  
11 statewide.

12  
13 First ranking OP1

Mean: 2.33

5	4	3	2	1
0	2	7	5 Susan Cocking Tom Fraser Roger Birt Rick Roberts Ted Forsgren	3 Curtis Bostick Howard Wells Sawyer Smith

14 Consensus not achieved.

15  
16 To be discussed at next meeting.

17  
18  
19 OP2. Establish mitigation for habitat lost due to development.

20  
21 First ranking OP2

Mean: 3.56

5	4	3	2	1
6	4	3	4 Tom Fraser Ken Leber Sawyer Smith Ted Forsgren	1 Curtis Bostick

22 Consensus not achieved.

23  
24 To be discussed at next meeting.

25  
26  
27 OP3. Set aside habitat and protect it from development.

28  
29 First ranking OP3

Mean: 4.06

5	4	3	2	1
9	3	2	3 Sawyer Smith Ken Leber Wade Thompson	0

1 Consensus not achieved.

2  
3 To be discussed at next meeting.

4  
5  
6 OP4. Evaluate beach renourishment programs (especially on the East  
7 coast) and its impact on shoreline habitat, changing the renourishment  
8 program if it has a negative impact.

9  
10 First ranking OP4

Mean: 3.65

5	4	3	2	1
6	4	3	3 Tom Fraser Sawyer Smith Wade Thompson	1 Curtis Bostick

11 Consensus not achieved.

12  
13 To be discussed at next meeting.

14  
15  
16 OP5. Establish a bond issue to preserve critical mangrove habitat.

17  
18 First ranking OP5

Mean: 3.11

5	4	3	2	1
1	5	7	5 Tom Fraser Ken Leber Sawyer Smith Ted Forsgren Curtis Bostick	0

19 Consensus not achieved

20  
21 To be discussed at next meeting.

22  
23  
24 OP6. Look at obtaining federal funds to assist with implementing  
25 recommendations.

26  
27 First ranking OP6

Mean: 2.89

5	4	3	2	1
0	0	10	7 Wade Thompson Sawyer Smith Curtis Bostick Pat Kelly Ken Leber	1 Rick Roberts

			Tom Fraser Susan Cocking	
--	--	--	-----------------------------	--

- 1 Consensus not achieved.
- 2
- 3 To be discussed at next meeting
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7