GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

Perdido Beach Resort Orange Beach, Alabama

JANUARY 25, 2016

VOTING MEMBERS

Greg Stunz.....Texas
Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
Myron Fischer (designee for Randy Pausina).....Louisiana
John Greene.....Alabama
Kelly Lucas (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
Robin Riechers.....Texas
Ed Swindell.....Louisiana
David Walker.....Alabama
Roy Williams.....Florida

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Kevin Anson.....Alabama
Martha Bademan (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
Doug Boyd.....Texas
Jason Brand.....USCG
Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
Campo Matens.....Louisiana
John Sanchez.....Florida

STAFF

Steven Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
Assane Diagne.....Economist
John Froeschke.....Fishery Biologist/Statistician
Doug Gregory.....Executive Director
Beth Hager.....Financial Assistant/IT Coordinator
Karen Hoak.....Administrative and Financial Assistant
Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
Charlene Ponce.....Public Information Officer
Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Director

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

John Anderson.....FL
Pam Anderson.....Panama City Beach, FL
Billy Archer.....Panama City, FL
Steve Branstetter.....NMFS
Eric Brazer.....Reef Fish Shareholder's Alliance
J.P. Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy, Gulfport, FL

Mark Brown.....SAFMC
Gary Bryant.....Gulf Shores, AL
Jim Clements.....Carrabelle, FL
Michael Drexler.....Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL
Traci Floyd.....MDMR, Biloxi, MS
Troy Frady.....Lilian, AL
Brad Gorst.....
Chad Hanson.....Pew
Bill Huth.....Pensacola, FL
Joe Jewell.....MDMR, Biloxi, MS
Robert E. Jones.....EDF
Bill Kelly.....FKCFA, FL
Kristen McConnell.....EDF
Rusty Pittman.....MDMR, MS
Bonnie Ponwith.....SEFSC
Kellie Ralston.....American Sportfishing Association, FL
Lance Robinson.....TX
Katie Semon.....LA
Clarence Seymour.....Ocean Springs, MS
Bill Tucker.....Dunedin, FL
Bob Zales, II.....Panama City, FL
Jim Zurbrick.....Steinhatchee, FL

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- - -

TABLE OF MOTIONS

PAGE 38: Motion to convene the technical committee to work in concert with SEFSC and SERO to weigh various devices and platforms capable of fulfilling these requirements and review of the white paper from NOAA Fisheries and report back to the council. The motion carried on page 49.

- - -

The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the Perdido Beach Resort, Orange Beach, Alabama, Monday morning, January 25, 2016, and was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Chairman Greg Stunz.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CHAIRMAN GREG STUNZ: We will go ahead and convene the Data Collection Committee. Our first order of business is -- Looking around the room, I think just about all of our committee members are here for the quorum. The first order of business is Adoption of the Agenda. Is there any changes or modifications that anyone would like to make to the agenda? Seeing none, would anyone like to make a motion to approve the agenda?

MR. JOHNNY GREENE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Is there a second? Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. Our next order of business is Approval of the Minutes. Any edits or changes to the minutes? Seeing none, would someone like to make a motion for approval of the minutes?

MR. GREENE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Is there a second? Okay. We've got a little bit on our plate for today, and Dr. Froeschke, will go over our Action Guide here in just a minute, so we can continue with our discussions. Just to give everybody an idea of where we need to go today, Bonnie is going to give us a presentation and I assume -- I actually don't have that presentation and I don't know if we'll get that emailed around in just a minute, but to talk about some of these transition considerations.

As you guys know on the schedule, the final action was scheduled on our agenda, which we'll talk about some and a lot of the public comment related to that final action coming up. We will listen to what the webinar and other public comment was, but, John, did you want to go over the details of the Action Guide?

ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: Sure. The direction is that staff will review the final draft of the Electronic Charter Vessel and Headboat Reporting Amendment, including the public hearing and written comments, which we have several of each.

The committee will receive a presentation from Dr. Ponwith, which we are going to receive momentarily. I have a short presentation over the document itself, which we can discuss the preferred alternatives as well as the comment. The committee is expected to determine whether to recommend to the full council to take final action or not. I imagine we will have considerable discussion about that.

The important thing to note is that if the council decides to move forward with final action, the formal transmittal of this document will be delayed, because we don't have codified text available, because we don't have enough clarity in some of the descriptions of how this might work that's necessary to draft the text. If we did do final action, we would have to bring the codified text back to the council at some future time for review and to deem as necessary and appropriate.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thanks, John. If there's not any comments on that -- Mara, go ahead.

MS. MARA LEVY: I just wanted to say something about the implementation and codified text issue. I think one of the things is that there's still a decision point to be made about the location type of device, like the issue of whether you're going to require VMS or not require VMS. I think that's still at issue, and so it's difficult to draft the codified text without knowing all of those kinds of details.

Then once you do figure that out, we can potentially draft very broad codified text that doesn't necessarily include all of the details about how folks are going to report and what mechanism they're going to report it. The issue is that NMFS can't publish a proposed rule until we can explain that.

It is possible to have codified text at the next meeting if all the decision points have been made by the council that reflect the very broad reporting requirements, but there is also going to require how it's going to be implemented.

I think the other thing that NMFS may bring up is adding language in there that basically says that implementation of this is contingent on funding, because it's going to require funding to put it together, and I think Bonnie's presentation might go over some of that, but there have been other programs that the council has put in place that have basically said implementation of this is contingent on funding appropriations for NMFS to actually do it. We can talk about that more, but I just wanted to raise that at the beginning.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thanks, Mara. With that, I think we'll move on, if Dr. Ponwith is ready for her presentation. That was just emailed around. It just came through just a few minutes ago, and so if you're looking for that presentation, you can check your email. Go ahead, Bonnie.

TRANSITION CONSIDERATIONS FOR CHARTER VESSEL ELECTRONIC REPORTING

DR. BONNIE PONWITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today, we're going to talk about some of the technical aspects that are going to be required or considered for implementation of electronic reporting, and this should be reporting and monitoring really, for the for-hire fishery in the Gulf of Mexico.

I would like to recognize the team of colleagues that helped put this together. This is a conversation, of course, between the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, the Regional Office, and the MRIP Program up in Headquarters, and colleagues who were key players in the development of these slides and the presentation are Nick Farmer from SERO, Ken Brennan from the Center, and Ron Sauls from the MRIP Program.

Right now, we've got a headboat survey. In our status quo, we've got an unbiased census that covers about sixty-nine Gulf headboats. They report weekly and that reporting consists of catch and effort. We have dockside intercepts, and those intercepts are used to validate the electronic self-reported data, and also to collect biological samples.

The estimates of the landings are generated using those data, now with about a forty-five-day lag, which is about the same amount of time that MRIP uses for theirs. The forty-five-day lag comes from the time that it takes to gather the biological data, to understand what the size composition of those landed fish are, to be able to equate those landings in terms of pounds.

Ultimately, the direction we would like to be running is toward a better, faster, and more accurate system, as contemplated in this amendment. We would be shifting to electronic logbooks for a little over 1,700 vessels. The amendment looks at daily trip reporting. The reporting scale would be on a trip-by-trip basis.

There would be dockside and at-sea validation, and we're looking at a higher resolution in the reporting for fishing areas than

the current. The goal would be to get more timely delivery of those data for management purposes, and, of course, we would have to calibrate that system to the existing system, so we maintain the integrity of those long-term time series data, which is important for both stock assessments and for understanding allocation issues, among other purposes.

The notion is that a census can be better than a survey. A survey looks at a subset of a population and uses what we learn from that subset to infer what the whole population does. We see some of the benefits to going to a census is we get improved precision, we can get improved timeliness, we certainly get improved geographic data, by refining that reporting, and we also have the ability to gain from individual accountability.

There is some challenges that come with that as well. One of the challenges is 100 percent reporting. Often, when 100 percent reporting is required, less than 100 percent of the people report. You have to have then a system for what you do when you're missing information and how you interpret that missing information.

Basically, we have to have the mechanism to enforce the reporting and then a mechanism to deal with what do you do when the data are missing.

The technology requirements are some outstanding questions, and that was reflected in the letter that the Gulf Council sent to me last fall. That is will we have a single system, a hardware system, for the reporting or will there be many?

We know that we want something that's cost-effective and we know we need something that's reliable. What we're looking at is meeting a minimum set of standards for the timing of the data transmission, the quality of the data, the confidentiality of the data, and the security of the system, and these are not disputed criteria. These are closely-held criteria among the key data collection partners.

You see here kind of a graphic of what it takes to get the job done with the coordination among the NOAA Fisheries partners, GulfFIN, ACCSP, and the Gulf states. The major components of this are going to be data management, dockside validation, the biological sampling, and, again, that's so we get the age structures we need and we get the lengths and the weights of these fishes, and then at-sea validation. The at-sea validation is to validate the discard data.

When it comes to electronic data management, again, some of the benefits that we're looking for are faster delivery, integrated QA/QC. The example I use is when you're writing a paper report and you mistakenly put a wrong species or a wrong weight down, there is no way to catch that in real time. It isn't caught until an analyst looks at the data and says, wow, that's an odd report, whereas with electronic reporting, you can build in the ability to question data that if -- If someone submits a forty-pound guppy, you can send a note that says a forty-pound guppy is an unusual landing and maybe your species is wrong or maybe that poundage is wrong.

You can build those kinds of checks into the system. Again, we've already talked about improving the geographic data, the resolution of where those fishes are caught, and we can standardize these types of data across different fisheries, to avoid redundancies, to reduce the reporting burden on the industry, and to reduce issues reconciling multiple datasets, but, again, there are also some hurdles that we need to grapple with.

That is to make decisions about what are adequate reporting technology, to develop the collaborative approach across the data collection agencies, and hat's going to take some good collaboration, to develop a centralized data management strategy, and to avoid duplication between the state and the federal data collection programs.

Dockside validation, again, I'm going to touch lightly on this, because we've talked about it in almost every slide. It's important, because what it does is it groundtruths the self-reported data, particularly the catch and the effort, and it helps us account for non-reporting and also misreporting. If there are errors submitted in the self-reported data, it gives us kind of an error rate, so we can make corrections for that.

The biggest challenges with dockside validation are the need for additional field personnel. You have to have boots on the dock to do it. Access to private docks is challenging now, but having it would improve the validation.

Then the logistics. By that, I mean should it be a stand-alone program, where they focus exclusively on that, or should we fold that into the job that the current people who are doing biological sampling are? If we do, that means we're going to have to add the number of sort of joint samplers that do both of those, to make sure that we can get both of those jobs done without holding people up.

Field personnel for biological sampling is really important. These are crucial data for being able to get length and weight data, age composition data. These mean weights are used to convert landings and numbers to total pounds, and that's important both from ACL monitoring, but also it's important for the stock assessment. Then, again, to get the otoliths and the gonads, to know that age distribution and the reproductive parameters for these landed fish.

Again, some of the challenges are simply we need to add additional field personnel, and we've talked a little bit about private dock access to improve those data.

The at-sea sampling gives us biological sampling of discarded fish and it also enables us to validate those discard reports and verify the self-reported data. Some of the challenges are, again, we need more people. It typically is more expensive than dockside sampling. It takes strong cooperation from the industry to put people on those vessels. For example, some of the charter boats are smaller than headboats, and it creates some challenges to put another person on those vessels to do that validation work.

Compliance is a really critical component of this. What we need is a way to manage for late and for missing reports, and the reason is if we have 100 percent compliance, we're in good shape. If there is less than 100 percent compliance, we need to know what happened on those vessels that didn't report.

Typically, what we do then is make estimates of what happened. This reduces the overall accuracy and it increases the uncertainty of those estimates and it lengthens the amount of time it takes for us to be able to tell you how many fish were landed in any given period of time.

The compliance activities we picture would come in the form of port agent observations, the headboat activity reports, database monitoring, and delinquency measures, to be able to deal with the aftermath of missing data.

Just to give you a feel for how crucial this is, the headboat program right now is monitoring about 145 headboats. 25 to 30 percent of the survey staff's time is spent chasing down late reports. That's time that could be spent doing more validations, gathering more biological data, or improving the quality of some of the data products that we put out. This is something I think we really need to spend some time thinking

about.

This is a graphic that takes some of the data types that we talked about and it helps you kind of visualize how they're doing. If you take a look to the right, that image there, we use the biological sampling and the at-sea validation to collect weight information. Those weights enable us to understand the relationship of the number of fish to the total biomass that was removed.

If you look at the lower half, the logbook reports and the dockside validation helps us develop correction factors for errors in those self-reported data, and this is all really crucial for getting accurate catch estimates.

The timeframe of the reporting is going to be important for that. It influences the program size and complexity, and you can see the accuracy and completeness of the logbook reports, and then the coordination among those different data elements to get the products we need for ACL monitoring and for stock assessment inputs.

The next thing is once you stand up this program, the current program can't go away, because we do need to stand up the program and spend a good amount of time working with the industry to make sure they understand the importance of really high-quality data inputs to this, and we think that those communications, the outreach and education on this, would take about a year.

The historical catch and effort data are absolutely crucial, not only in and of themselves, but as a time series, and so to be able to take data collected in this way and link it to the data that were collected in the current MRIP approach, we need to calibrate them against one another, to see how those two programs perform against one another.

Of course, all of that is important to obtain MRIP certification. This methodology is going to have to be certified as meeting the criteria for scientific quality for use in management.

Again, the headboat survey is a census for about 145 headboats in the Gulf and the South Atlantic, total. It costs right around $1 million a year. The MRIP for-hire survey right now is covering about 1,600 federal charter boats and costs around $4.9 million. Again, these are really rough estimates, because we don't keep our books by individual project.

What we're looking for going into the future would be a for-hire electronic reporting program that has electronic logbooks for about 1,700 total vessels. We expect that we would have some startup costs that happen once, and then they go away, but then there would be operational costs that continue going into the future.

The types of those would be survey design, developing the software and the support for the software, the reporting and monitoring hardware, and additional personnel. We've talked about the dockside and the at-sea and then the data management.

What you see here are very rough order of magnitude. I want to really emphasize that these are rough order of magnitude estimates of what we think those costs could be going into the future and a first-cut notion of who would take on those costs.

You see we have software, outreach, data management, and personnel costs, dockside personnel, at-sea samplers, and some enforcement officers. Again, the enforcement, we can talk about how we want to manage enforcement. There are multiple ways, but, again this is just a first cut. Then the real question is VMS. Would we be using VMS, per se, or would we be using some other form of electronic monitoring or no form of electronic monitoring? That is why you see this in a different color.

There are questions regarding who is responsible for buying those units and the installation of those units and then certainly, once they were installed, cost-sharing with the industry to pay the data services for that. Again, these are all estimates, rough order of magnitude, so you know what we're looking at and the differences between costs with VMS and without.

Remember that while some of those dockside samplers already exist for the existing program, we're going to have to beef them up for this new program. You know we're going to have to run the electronic reporting alongside of the existing program. That's what some of the initial startup costs are. Again, this is just to remember that this is a work in progress. Be careful about carving these in concrete, because this is the first take on this.

What we view as some next steps on this is the fact that the regulations are farther along than some of the other components to actually be able to implement this. Having the codified text does not create the program. There are lots of steps that have

to happen for the program to be implemented, not the least of which is to make sure we have the resources we need to carry this out.

We need to make decisions on what kind of devices should be required and what those requirements should be for those, decisions about who pays for the costs of the hardware, the software and the monitoring, and what the council's desired timeline for implementation is, given some of these additional steps that have to happen.

What I view in this is really an iterative process. The council is very far along in thinking about the regulations. We're working on the technical aspects. I don't picture those as being independent of one another.

I think as decisions are made that we're on parallel tracks and those parallel tracks get closer and closer together and ultimately will converge on the approach that we need to actually implement this, should we find the resources we need to make that happen. At this point, I will turn it over to see if we have any questions.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG GREGORY: I don't have a question, but, for the audience, we update these presentations as we get them to our website. This presentation is on our website. You have to refresh the website every now and then to get the newly-updated publications.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Dr. Lucas.

DR. KELLY LUCAS: Bonnie, I don't know if you can speak to this or if this is strictly MRIP, but we talked about the forty-five-day delay in getting information and so let's say people are reporting daily. What would then be the delay in getting the data?

DR. PONWITH: The real question is now versus when the program has matured. Right now, what we want to be careful about using -- Be careful about using raw data for immediate decisions. That's concerning.

As we accumulate data that are self-reported against data that are observed by the dockside samplers, we will get a stronger and stronger feel for how close those two are to one another. If those two are very close and very stable in their relationship, it brings a higher level of comfort using the raw data as a leading indicator of where we are relative to the ACL.

If those data are parallel to one another, but very different, we can still use a correction factor. If those data are not parallel and they zig-zag back and forth, then it means we need to wait for the validation data to come in before we can make strong statements about what we're seeing in there.

If you see uncertainty, it is, until we see the data and see how they behave relative to one another and how much confidence we have in the self-reported data without correction, is difficult to forecast. The second thing is the poundage. We will be collecting data at the dockside to be able to understand what the average weight of these landed fish are.

Those average weights are needed for converting the numbers of fish that are being reported on the vessels into pounds. For species that are common, those data are plentiful and we're able to do those quite readily. For species that become more and more rare, we have empty cells, meaning you could sample three or four or ten boats without seeing one, and you don't want to make those relationships based on one observation, because if someone catches a really, really, really big fish, you could very much overestimate your total poundage.

You typically have to wait for enough data to accumulate to have average weights that are meaningful, and that's the situation we're in with the headboat data. We used to do headboat estimates once a year based on the paper. We're getting those data in on a weekly basis and the thing that is our bottleneck right now are getting adequate weight data to be able to convert those numbers to weights.

DR. LUCAS: So you don't necessarily envision -- Whoever is out there dockside validating and the biological sampling and all that, they will continue upon their normal process of reporting when they report, regardless of the fact that there is an electronic reporting system. You will basically have to wait for that information to come in and go back and look at the electronic reports.

DR. PONWITH: No, that's not necessarily the case. I mean those -- The dockside sampling, we can make modifications to how they report, too. Making modifications to that will have some costs, but it can be done. It's just that there is an analysis that needs to happen to be able to create those correction factors.

Otherwise, you basically have two raw data streams. There is still analysis that needs to happen. The other thing is that

you need to accumulate enough samples to be able to have a good correction factor. You don't want to take all the self-reported data and have just one or two dockside validation observations and expand using those, or you could end up having some problems with that as well.

Again, if, after time goes by, we find out that the dockside data are almost identical to the self-reported data, it creates some flexibilities for us to be a little more limber in how those data are used. We just can't anticipate that until we see those numbers.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Lance, Myron, and then Roy.

MR. LANCE ROBINSON: Bonnie, I don't know if you can answer or speak to this, but you mentioned in your slide presentation that in the current headboat sampling program that almost a third of the staff time is spent on tracing down compliance reports. Do you know if there is any consequences to the headboat operators for non-reporting or late reporting?

DR. PONWITH: Well, you know, regardless of what consequences there are here, this is certainly something to take into consideration in the construction of this program. If we want to be efficient, if we want to use analysts' time on things that make the system better, instead of analysts' time imploring people to submit their data, then working together to find ways to inspire timely reporting would be good.

Now, we understand that things happen. These are human beings and we have lives and things happen. There can be technical challenges and we can have personal issues, but, all that aside, when we create a program with an expectation of a timely report, getting it on time is going to be really crucial for this to be successful, and I think that as we look at how we're setting up this program that creating as many ways to incentivize timely reporting will hopefully reduce that number down to a tolerable level.

MR. ROBINSON: To that point, so you're unsure that there is any compliance requirement right now?

DR. PONWITH: Well, so in the Gulf of Mexico, the for-hire industry has permits and losing that permit has consequences. I don't want to speak to the -- I want to be careful about speaking to the management side, and I guess I would defer to my management partners on this, but if one of the consequences for chronically late reports was the risk of losing a permit and the

ability to recover that permit was limited, that's a pretty strong incentive.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: To that point, Dave?

MR. DAVE DONALDSON: Lance, something to consider -- Bonnie said about a third of the time is spent on compliance reporting. When we did the MRIP logbook pilot in Texas and Florida, we actually spent more time, because we were talking about more vessels. That's for 145 vessels. If you're looking at 1,700, it's probably even more time.

It's my understanding that the fisherman that doesn't report can lose his permit, but he has -- He potentially has a year before he has to report that information, and so the current regulations could certainly be strengthened to provide a stronger incentive for those guys to report.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I have Myron and then Roy. Mara, was that to that point? Then Mara real quick.

MS. LEVY: Just to clarify, there is a reporting requirement in the regulations that requires folks to report. When people go to renew their permits, the Permits Office will usually check with the Science Center to make sure their reporting compliance is up-to-date before they renew the permit, because we view that as necessary information for the administration of the permit.

If it's not up-to-date, they won't be allowed to renew it until it is, but that is separate from any potential enforcement action that the Office of Law Enforcement or NOAA General Counsel Enforcement could take for a violation. Those are two separate and distinct things, and the idea of having a violation and then actually getting it prosecuted and going through the administrative procedures and getting your permit taken away is a totally separate process than the process for renewal and our requirement that your reporting be up-to-date to renew. I just want to make the distinction there.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Myron.

MR. MYRON FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to make sure we're tightening up the boards, where we don't have data falling through the cracks. Out of 1,723 vessels, and I know there were other numbers up there, I guess I wanted to ask who are they, because we have boats that fish HMS species that don't have reef fish permits. We have boats that fish tarpon in the EEZ that don't have reef fish permits.

Then we have a whole array of state guide boats that run up and down the beach and they do go offshore and they do fish mangroves, but red snapper are pushing closer and closer to the beach and they're catching red snapper in state waters and then, with the new nine-mile temporary limit we are experiencing, we expect to see more snapper caught on these state guide boats.

The way it's going, we're going to have estuarine boats venturing out into state waters before long and so it's going to -- I think this number of 1,723 is a very low number of the potential boats that can harvest reef fish. I just want to see who is included in this and who is not included and how do we pick up the boats, the data from the boats, that may not be included in this total?

DR. PONWITH: The numbers that you see on the presentation are -- There are some vessels that are Gulf exclusively and some that are Atlantic exclusively and some that are dual. These are numbers of federally-permitted charter boats, and I think that one of the things that you raised, and it's really an important thing as we think about this, and that is the states have their own data collection procedures and these would be for federally-permitted vessels.

I raised the question of is there merit to creating one system for just the ease of having the data collected according to one methodology and having the data all in one place and not having to sew together two numbers that were generated from two systems on potentially two different timeframes.

Again, that makes things unwieldy and that makes things slower, but it is worth raising to the consciousness of the council of what those pros and what those cons are as we talk about that.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Roy.

MR. ROY WILLIAMS: Thank you, Bonnie. Your next-to-last slide was labeled "Next Steps", and you said we could approve the codified text, but you can't implement the program until the design is complete and funding is available. Have you not -- Didn't you receive funding for VMS and for -- In this last budget, didn't you get a lot of money there for doing this kind of thing?

DR. PONWITH: That was for a pilot study that's underway right now. It's a subset of vessels and they are getting -- They are putting VMS on vessels and they are reporting electronically,

but it would take an expansion -- It would take an evaluation of the results of that to determine what in that process was exactly what we want and what needs to be adjusted, either adapted or adopted, and then look at what it would take to do that for the whole fleet.

MR. WILLIAMS: Then so how far are we into that program? Do you know?

DR. PONWITH: That just got underway.

MR. WILLIAMS: Continuing on, I mean it seems like your next steps slides here are -- It goes in the direction that I was going. What types of devices should be required and what capabilities should NMFS-approved devices have? I mean obviously for the bigger charter vessels, a VMS-type system should work pretty well. If they don't have to pay for it, if that's being funded by Congress, I don't know why we wouldn't go ahead and require that.

I imagine everybody has been getting these emails from Louisiana that I've been getting about these runabout vessels, which I guess have federal reef fish permits. Is it possible that we could use some system other -- They don't want to use a VMS, or at least the ones that have been sending me emails don't want to use one. Are there other systems, for example the iSnapper system, that might work for these vessels?

DR. PONWITH: Rather than picking a piece of equipment, the most important thing is to always start with the requirements. You start with the management requirements, what do you want, what data do you want, and you start with the science requirements and you knit the science and the management requirements together and then start talking about tool is going to be the most effective way to deliver those requirements.

The answer to your question is if the council wants to be able to monitor a vessel and use VMS as a means to validate whether a vessel was off the dock or on the dock in a given day, to validate an effort report, then it's going to require some sort of a locational device.

The real question then is does that locational device have to be a VMS, per se, or can it be something different? Again, I think it's a matter of understanding exactly what those requirements -- What do we want out of the system? Then look at what hardware solutions meet those needs and what are the benefits and what are the costs of those hardware systems and make a decision in

that direction.

The same thing with the notion of an open vessel. You know we're talking about two separate things. We're talking about where are you, and that's one piece of information, and the other is how do I send my report? Those two things may be all collapsed into one device or they may not, but those are the two pieces of information we need.

We are doing studies right now that are looking at ruggedized notebook-type of means to be able to submit those data. I know that we've seen iSnapper as an example of a way to deliver those data. Again, it's a matter of looking at the requirements and matching the hardware to meet those requirements.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Bonnie, to Roy's point, I guess one of the questions that I would have too on this next step, and a major concern that we'll have today if we move, which is obviously going to be a big decision on if we want to go down the final action route, but the big concern of the fishermen, whether it's Roy's example of VMS from the Louisiana guys or whatever, is how input past this approval stage are the fishermen going to have in what systems end up approved or used or what input would they have on designing their data collection system? I think that's where a big issue is going to be.

DR. PONWITH: Again, that's a hard question to answer when we have sort of a basket of components in there. The issues are the hardware, the software, and the reconciliation of the dockside to the self-reported data. All of those are components.

I will tell you that our experience, when it comes to creating a method for moving data from the industry to the government, the more interaction we have with the industry, the better that system works. That's why we do pilots, because if you have a bunch of biologists who design a system and it's all based on what I want to get, it doesn't often take into consideration what's the easiest way to deliver it, to give it.

I think marrying the how do we tell what's on those boats to the biologists and how do the biologists need to receive those data, getting those two halves together is really, really important. We will learn a lot from this pilot program, and I think that there's a latitude in there for those kinds of interactions.

The first step in that process is to set the requirements. What is non-negotiable and I need this? There are questions with

respect to management and there are questions with respect to science, where those requirements are -- This is the starting point and I need this. How do you get it? There will be some latitude for interactions in.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Next is Kevin and then followed by Johnny, but, Kelly, go ahead, to that point.

DR. LUCAS: A lot of time we spent talking about VMS wasn't necessarily about the enforcement or the validation. It was about having a location to help improve stock assessments and discard mortality and stuff like that.

If that was the only requirement, if you were only looking at -- Not enforcing where they are, if they're at the dock or away, not looking at that type of validation, and if it's strictly about what depth were you fishing at, is there an easier way, besides a VMS, to get that? Could you zone it off and say what zone or what depth you were fishing at and have them report that as part of their electronic reporting and that would also get that information?

DR. PONWITH: You know there is a whole range of solutions to wanting to know where were you fishing. I think the coarsest way of getting that is, oh, you went fishing today and what depth did you fish at? That's not a really good way to do things, because we know everybody fishes -- It's a continuum. They can be at multiple depths and there is no one true answer.

There are ways of partitioning the reports over time, or different ways. That kind of approach would be less precise than having a locational device. There is also even a range of sophistication in the locational devices. Those can be like VMS, which is used for enforcement purposes, so very precise. Those are certified by the agency as adequate for use for enforcement purposes, but there are other types of electronic monitoring devices that are less rigorous that may end up being less expensive.

Again, there is a whole range. What we get by having locational information is valuable. If we know that fish pulled from deeper water die at a higher rate than fish pulled from shallower water, having a depth profile across that trip gives us a better way to credit shallow water fishers in terms of lower mortality rates. That can be done.

It takes an analysis, but that's a way to do that, but there is that other thing and that is what percentage of fleet reported

they went fishing versus what percentage of the fleet did go fishing. If you have 100 percent accuracy in the self-reported data, then you don't need monitoring for that, or you just need spot checks. If you don't have 100 percent accuracy in that, then it makes for a stronger case.

DR. LUCAS: In that case, have you, or has another division within NMFS, utilized VMS for scientific data collection that you were talking about, versus enforcement? Have you all used that locational information for --

DR. PONWITH: We have looked at fishing patterns of the VMS data for science purposes, yes.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Anson.

MR. KEVIN ANSON: Thank you. Dr. Ponwith, you had mentioned in your presentation a forty-five-day turnaround time for headboat reporting, and it's right now a weekly reporting. Is that the first time that the agency looks at the data for ACL monitoring and management, or is it, based on your discussion, where you say once you get more comfortable with the data and you're talking about a species that's more common in the catch, you can develop kind of some algorithms and such that kind of predict maybe or determine some sizes?

Is there a much quicker time that that data is available for use for ACL monitoring in the headboat survey or is that forty-five-day the minimum time that you need in order to process the data and to analyze it and to use it?

DR. PONWITH: Right now, forty-five days is the time we use to get preliminary estimates. We do look for patterns in the raw data to raise red flags or to calm the waters in terms of the pace at which we're approaching ACLs, but the forty-five days would be the first time you would have a preliminary estimate.

MR. ANSON: So looking potentially at a weekly reporting in the for-hire industry, and it would obviously be a much larger segment of the fishery, what is your sense of increasing that time or minimizing that time further, so that it could be useful for ACL monitoring, since we are talking about, at least in red snapper, a very short fishery? Triggerfish is the same thing. What is the likelihood then of developing the processes to shorten the time and what would be your sense of when that time would be available, that they would be available, for use?

DR. PONWITH: If we set up a program and we've already gone

through the MRIP certification -- So MRIP certification has been done and we are now sanctioned to use these data for management purposes. If we look at the dockside validation data and the self-reported data and they are very close to one another, or are less close, but very consistent in the differences, it creates sort of statistical grounds for using those self-reported data closer to in real time.

The thing that you would want to be careful of is a situation where behaviors change as you approach an ACL. If the self-reported data -- If the behavior in how self-reported data were submitted changed the closer you got to an ACL, that creates some challenges. You can see where I'm going with this.

If there is rock-solid consistency between the validation data and the self-reported data, our ability to use those self-reported data as an indicator of when we think we're going to close -- It becomes more valuable, but here is a question for the council, and I know Dr. Crabtree has raised this.

In the for-hire industry, if you gave them a choice that I can keep you open until you're within one day of your ACL, but you're only going to get twenty-four hours notice that you're closed, or I can use these data to create a more precise projection of when you're going to hit that ACL, but you still have to predict going into the future, using your current circumstances, which would you rather have?

The sense that I'm getting from the industry is knowing twenty-four hours from now that you are very precisely going to be at your ACL is not what they want. They need enough lead time so they don't end up having a situation of having to call customers that are coming from all over the country and say, by the way, that trip you planned last month isn't going to happen and we'll be closed tomorrow.

The real question is in a well-executed fishery, how much in advance does the industry want to know that, in all likelihood, X number of days or weeks going into the future this fishery will likely be closed?

That's kind of a management question, and these are the kinds of things that I was talking about, how we need to know what our requirements are. Then we design the system to those requirements. The answer to that question is very important in terms of how we design the system.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Greene.

MR. JOHNNY GREENE: Thank you, but just to follow up on your very last point, if the season has been going along at a certain rate and we know we've got an approximate season of however many days, and we realize that we're getting close to that date, I don't think it's going to be an issue for people to say, okay, look, we can book this trip, but it may or may not be within snapper season, and I don't think that's the end of the world. I don't know that that's a big hang-up to the point that I would stop the whole process.

Now, a couple of comments or questions. Part of it is, is there a list of National Marine Fisheries approved devices that other councils use, or are we the only ones that is experiencing this type of stuff? I was under the impression, from the last meeting, it was more along the lines of we will tell you guys what we need and then you guys can work with it from there, but now I'm kind of seeing it seems the other way around. Am I confused? Did I misunderstand something? Can you help me with this?

DR. PONWITH: Again, that's a chicken-and-an-egg question, and that's why it's hard to answer. I don't picture the agency saying you can have this and only this, unless the council decides they want VMS as the tool for monitoring location.

What I picture is we decide what our requirements are and then, as long as devices meet those requirements, they would be approved. It's the same way with the reporting hardware. Here is what we need from the industry, and as long as you have hardware that meets these requirements, then that need is satisfied.

MR. GREENE: Is that consistent with how this has been done in the past? Was this a conversation that was done when we set up the red snapper IFQ? Was it up to the council to come up with a VMS, or how did that work? I wasn't on the council at that time.

DR. PONWITH: I think that the decision was made that VMS was a requirement, but within the VMS program, there is more than one VMS unit that's approved, and so it's up to the industry to make a decision of I have to have one of these and which one works the best for my business. That's my understanding of how that was set up, but I would turn to my management colleagues to correct me if that's wrong.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: To that point, Mara?

MS. LEVY: I think that's correct, but I also think that there were very specific regulations setting out how you get your device approved and the process NMFS goes through. Then I think there were -- Those approved ones were published and then folks could select which one of those approved ones they want, but I think the decision point was VMS and sort of real-time tracking.

I think the way that we changed the alternative in the document now, it doesn't really talk about whether the council is expecting this sort of real-time location tracking, and I know we talked about that, versus gathering the locations and sending it when you're back at the dock. Those seem to be two very different things that folks had very strong opinions on.

Right now, it's very open-ended about what the council is expecting from this device to record vessel location at specified time intervals. That's very broad. It could be VMS, where people are actually tracked as they're going, or it could be something else. It might be helpful for the council to think about what they really want in terms of that requirement.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Right, and to that point, what I'm hearing from the committee and counsel is maybe we need to define some of the technicalities of this just a little bit more, but I know that at least that's a big concern expressed from the fishermen, of what they're going to get out of this amendment, should we pass it. There is some concerns about that, but go ahead, Myron.

MR. FISCHER: John has a comment, but I do want my turn.

DR. FROESCHKE: After you make your comment, I just wonder if this would be the time to -- I have a short PowerPoint presentation about the document, the current state and the alternatives, just so we could refresh everyone and make sure we're all on the same page about meshing the science and the management together.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Yes, John. I think that's a good idea. In fact, I was about to say that, so we could move it along, but I had you on the list, Myron, and go ahead. After that, we'll let John give this summary presentation and bring us up to speed. Go ahead, Myron.

MR. FISCHER: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mine is a comment and then a non-related question I do have. My comment is water depth fished seems to always come up and talking about barotrauma, but let's remember that you could be in 250-foot of water, and most

people are not fishing 250-foot down. They're fishing fifty and seventy-five-foot down, and it's not a real indication of barotrauma, just because someone is in 250-foot of water. That's going to be something for the analysts to keep in mind down the road.

My question is, through recent years, the states -- I don't know about the federal government, but the states experienced cuts in their age and growth labs and their age labs, trip ticket systems, MRIP, or dockside systems and SEAMAP. It's been steady cuts.

I guess my question is where are we getting the monies, because it's going to be -- I think Bonnie may have pointed it out, but there's going to be monies to construct the system, but once it's implemented, you're going to have either the states or contractors doing a ramped-up validation dockside. It's probably going to be more work getting the data to Gulf States and then having them do the final filters and get the data to the Science Center, where it will be filtered again.

It will just more work all along the way. I anticipate that the program is going to cost more than the existing MRIP monies the states are getting, and so I am just curious if Dave knows something about monies coming into the states or if Bonnie knows. How are we going to handle the financial burden of implementing the program?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Good point. Go ahead, Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: I think that's a really good question, and I think it's just, first of all, being aware that even if running this program costs the same amount, we would have to run both of them side-by-side long enough to be able to calibrate for the purposes of the time series, but I think it's reasonable, looking at this, that it is going to end up being more expensive than the existing system, because of the need for additional validation.

Again, the statistics would be the determinant of what is the right amount of dockside sampling you need, and, again, you would start with an estimate of how much you need and then refine that, based on the data that you collect, to determine, okay, this is the amount of precision we need, this is the correct amount of sampling to achieve that level of precision. It's an iterative process.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. We're having some very good discussion.

In the interest of time, Johnny, and I know you're on the list, but what would be the pleasure of the committee? John has prepared -- John, about how long is your presentation?

DR. FROESCHKE: Five or ten minutes. It's like eight slides.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Five minutes? It was largely an overview to bring everyone up to speed on the actual amendment. We can continue this discussion or have John present this, which might help in the discussion, or would you like to -- You had your hand up before.

MR. GREENE: I would like to just address a question toward Bonnie, just to the slide show that she presented. Then we can carry on, if that would be okay, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Yes, that's fine.

MR. GREENE: Bonnie, I think where I'm kind of looking at this is I think most people would agree that the Headboat Collaborative Program was a pretty good success in a lot of ways. I think one of the ways was finding out that there was in-season monitoring that was happening, the fish were not as big as they assumed they would be, and then there was an extension or more pounds that were allotted to them.

I think where I'm trying to kind of look at this is that, number one, if you're doing daily reporting, is it going to cut down on the amount of time lag to turn the information around, as opposed to weekly?

The other part is I think most everybody here wants to do something. I think it's very confusing to what to do in what level, but, building on the headboat program, the success that they appeared to have, in my opinion, the flexibility they had with in-season monitoring, I think that's where I would like to see us go.

Now, how we get there, I'm not totally sure, but can we reduce the amount of time at your shop to where we could potentially do in-season monitoring with a program similar to the Headboat Collaborative?

DR. PONWITH: Is the question to know in real time what percentage of the ACL has been caught, in real time? Is that what you mean?

MR. GREENE: Yes.

DR. PONWITH: For that, it really depends on how close the dockside monitoring data maps to the self-reporting data and the relationship between those two. If they are inconsistent with one another, we still get information about what's happening on a daily basis, but it creates a lot more uncertainty about how much we know.

If those data are very close to one another, we can use the self-reported, raw data to help us understand where we are relative to an ACL. That is really the deciding factor on how useful the raw data are for real-time decisions, whether you're talking about weekly checks or whether you're talking about moving to daily reporting and using daily checks.

MR. GREENE: Was there any non-compliance issues with the Headboat Collaborative?

MS. LEVY: Just remember though that the Headboat Collaborative wasn't just an open season and people report, right? They had a certain number of fish that they were allocated and they were -- There was monitoring of how much was actually coming in judged against that total, and it went through the fact that they had vessel accounts and collaborative accounts. It was more like what you're looking at in 41 and 42 and setting up a cooperative or an IFQ-type of system and not just an open season where people were coming and reporting what they were catching.

MR. GREENE: Thank you. I understand. That was where I was struggling, but that clears it up. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, John. Do you want to give us the overview with your presentation, please?

FINAL ACTION - GENERIC ELECTRONIC CHARTER VESSEL REPORTING AMENDMENT

DR. FROESCHKE: Sure, and I will be brief. What I did is I just put together a quick summary presentation. We haven't met and discussed this since October and a lot of things have happened related to this and other items.

What I did is I just wanted to sort of refresh everyone's memory about the three potential actions in the document and the preferred alternatives, and I will go through this. Action 1 refers to the frequency and the mechanism, and this applies only to vessels that we consider charter vessels, and I will explain the clarity to that in just a minute.

The council, at the October meeting, reaffirmed Preferred Alternative 4, which is the trip level electronic reporting. The same goes for Action 2. The only difference from Action 1 is this applies to headboats as opposed to the charter boats. Again, it's Preferred Alternative 4, trip level electronic reporting. Just for your clarification, the reason that these are in separate actions is when we originally constructed this document -- The current no action for charter and headboats is very different, and so, to appropriately compare the alternatives for impacts and things, we separated them into separate actions.

Action 3 applies to both headboats and charter vessels. This refers to the electronic reporting requirements in terms of what to report, the primary item being some sort of catch location reporting. The preferred alternative is to record vessel location using a NMFS-approved electronic device, which we've talked about already, as to what that might entail. I think there's a lot of work to do, and this would apply to both charter and headboats.

Just a quick refresher on how we got to this point. In 2014, the council appointed us to develop a technical subcommittee report with some recommendations on how this program could begin to materialize. The report of this was presented last January to the council. Based on that, we initiated a joint document, working with the South Atlantic Council, to address some of these.

In March of 2015, we went through the amendment development process, in both June and August. We met jointly with the South Atlantic in June. At their September meeting, they recommended splitting it and we concurred with that at the October meeting, into a Gulf-only document, the primary reason being that they, and I guess us, felt that our documents were developing on separate tracks and at different timelines, and so they opted to split. We concurred with that and so now we're really just focused on the Gulf.

The second development was that we talked some about some of the issues that Dr. Ponwith has presented to clarify here and decided to sort of move forward and staff was directed to prepare a document for final action, which we have done. That's for January 2016. You will notice there's an asterisk, and we've talked about this. This is the codified text, based on some of those issues that are not worked out yet, and we don't have those and that's the reason why.

This is just a brief overview of the three specific actions. Again, Action 1 refers to the charter vessels, and it's referring to the data reporting. I am just going to skip down to the asterisk down at the bottom.

It says "Applies to federally-permitted for-hire vessels that do not participate in the headboat program" and so there are lots of ways that you could differentiate between what's a charter vessel and what's a headboat, passenger capacity and Coast Guard requirements and things.

What we have done is consistent with other amendments and what we've done in the past. If you're currently reporting in the headboat program, you're a headboat. If you're not reporting to the headboat program, you're not a headboat, and that's the way that we've at least worked this out for the purposes of this document.

Again, it's Preferred Alternative 4. The same thing for Action 2 regarding the headboats and, again, the same language with the asterisk down there. It indicates who this would be applicable to.

Action 3, again, this is the location. As I indicated, it's Preferred Alternative 2 with the NMFS-approved electronic device to record vessel location. This would be opposed to something like a self-reported click, you know you go to a website and you indicate your primary area fished or something. This would be passively recorded by a device, as opposed to something where a user self-reported their own data. Based on the preferred subalternatives, it would apply to both headboats and charter vessels.

I put together my own little slide here about next steps or what would be -- In the top box is sort of the NMFS and Science Center steps, as I understood them. It seems similar to what Dr. Ponwith has put together, but this idea that there is hardware and software requirements that need to be developed based on the objectives, and that's sort of a marriage of both management and science needs.

There is some standards to ensure that the data meet the obligation of best science available and how those could be officially transferred among the data partners, the scientists and things, to make sure everything was there.

The transition plan, Bonnie described that briefly. We will

need to do some sort of transition plan. It will have to occur to ensure that we don't lose the time series of historical data and we can continue to integrate both historical and the new data in the stock assessment process. Then some sort of technical recommendations.

The green box in the bottom is what I've just called the council process. Essentially, once we get some clarification or decide how to proceed in the blue box, the council could then complete the analysis, the socioeconomic and biological things that we normally do as part of our document development. We would like to, as we always do, work with stakeholders about the preferred alternatives and what they can do and what they like and what they don't like, such that we can work back together, and then we can complete the regulatory requirements, however long that takes.

We would hope that the green box wouldn't take long once we have the blue box done. That's really what I have to bring you up to speed. I can answer any questions about this. I do have comments. We did a webinar and we received some public comments from that. We have written comments and we have some law enforcement. We can go through those now or we can do it after some discussion, whatever you prefer.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: John, I think it would be a good idea to go through that now, but I know Dr. Lucas has a question. Then I know we'll go through the full document here in a few minutes and so we'll have plenty of opportunity to weigh in on the comments, but, Dr. Lucas, go ahead. Roy, you're next.

DR. LUCAS: On your timeline that you had out there, at either August or October, and I can't remember which one, we had a discussion about a technical committee. Then the states all received letters about having somebody assigned and we all submitted them back to you or whatever, but I don't see where the technical committee ever met or -- I see where we jumped from somehow in October to where we are now, which is the final action, yet we have this technical committee that we were adding to or redefining, and I don't see where they met or discussed anything.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: To that point, John, that's a concern I share as well. I think that's a lot of the concern of the fishermen as well. It seems like we sort of missed a little bit of that technical committee and developing some of the technicalities that Bonnie was talking about that might help her office in this amendment.

DR. FROESCHKE: I can answer that question. That, I believe, was appointed in October of last year. We did send out letters to the states and we did receive appointments from everyone. We have had a conversation with the Science Center and things, but that committee has not met at this time.

As you can probably surmise here, there is considerable uncertainty about whose job it is to develop these guidelines and things like that, and so what we don't know is what they're supposed to do. The reason I say that is we had a technical committee and they met and they provided the recommendations that were in the report that were received in January of 2015.

In that, there are a number of decision points that need to be made about how the structure of the program and things -- Those decisions have not really been made, as we're discussing now, and it seemed fairly apparent to us that in order for them to provide more feedback that we need some more clarification about what it is exactly they're supposed to do at this point.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Go ahead.

DR. LUCAS: To that point, on the last slide about -- If you can flip back to the last slide, where you had the implementation kind of listed, I actually thought that that was what some of the technical committee -- Like I didn't have it divided into boxes as much as I had that committee kind of working on this, because I thought we captured people across NMFS and the Southeast Science Center and Gulf States and all the states that would kind of work together to do those things right there, instead of separating them into the boxes of who was doing what. I don't know and maybe some other committee member can speak to that.

DR. FROESCHKE: I can try again. When we initially developed the subcommittee report, it had a number of these things. The way it was structured is if a VMS route were to be selected, these are sort of the steps that it would be. If it were not, then it would be something else, and so I think our understanding is that once one of those nodes was selected that more or information or more work could be done. We still have not selected a node and so it wasn't apparent what we would do without some more information.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I was under that same impression as well, Kelly, but, Roy, go ahead. You had a comment?

MR. WILLIAMS: John, thank you. Going back to the proposed actions that we're considering, the first action was to modify the frequency and mechanism of data reporting for charter vessels. Then the same thing was for headboats. Then Action 3 is to also require a vessel location. We spent a lot of time earlier talking about that, and it seemed like we were kind of hung up on that.

How important is that location in this whole thing? It seems to me that it really isn't all that important. We need to know did the person fish, what species did they catch, how many of each species did you catch? Other than that, you can kind of -- I mean I know there's boats that leave Panama City, Florida or Destin and fish off of Louisiana, but that's not real critical, it seems to me, and we could get a lot of that just other ways.

I am not sure why we are getting -- It seemed like we were kind of hung up on this this morning, and I'm not sure why we are, and so I'm going to ask you how important this particular aspect of it is.

DR. FROESCHKE: My understanding is that the number one benefit of this is that this is the only surefire way to know in fact if that vessel left the dock and engaged in some sort of activity, and so whether it went fishing or it didn't, or at least whether it left the dock.

This gives you a piece of information that is of higher quality than sort of self-reported data. Moving beyond that, once you knew that, then you could look at things like where they went and approximately what depths. You could use that for bycatch mortality and things like that, but the number one thing, as I have understood it, has always been effort validation.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Brown had his hand up, but I think, before we get into some of the details, that's a good point, Roy, and I will add to that later. Some of the comments, John, from the public might shed some light, and so maybe we can go through that in just a minute and then we can move on to our discussions, but, Mr. Brown, go ahead.

MR. MARK BROWN: I just wanted to just make a brief statement that I'm also on the ACCSP and the South Atlantic Council made a proposal for some funding for a pilot program for location. It would have a tablet that was issued out to the fishermen to report their catches, and it would also have a way of collecting the location data on these tablets that will be issued out for this pilot program. That is something that's already been

approved and it's something we'll be doing in the near future.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Good. John, do you want to summarize the public comments, and if I could ask you to move so we can -- We still have a lot of discussion to go.

DR. FROESCHKE: I will go fast. What we have, we have three different types. I am going to do the webinar public hearing, which we held in December. Charlene is going to cover the written public comments, and then Steven Atran has some law enforcement comments.

I will go through the webinar very quickly and then turn it over to Charlene. The meeting was held on the 17th. We had thirty-one members of the public attend, which is pretty good for a webinar, and it probably is better than what we would have received had we moved around the Gulf.

Eight members of the public provided comment at the meeting, and I won't read them to you. It's Tab F, Number 5(a). You probably had a chance to review those in the briefing book, but, just briefly, many of the people that did comment were concerned about the use of VMS as the only sort of allowed tool.

There was some concern that this program might be approaching development and final action from the regulatory aspect too fast, and they were concerned that without many of the details being worked out that they may not have an opportunity to comment appropriately later on, and their primary objective was to slow this part down and to let the science part catch up, to make sure that they had an opportunity to comment as the program developed. That was really the consensus of what was stated at the webinar, and, again, it's Tab F, Number 5(a), if you want to read into the nitty-gritty.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay and just, John, to comment on the webinar, I had attended that and it was maybe interesting or maybe refreshing. There was a lot of diverse groups there, but it was pretty much a consensus of what John had said, that everyone agreed that we might be moving just a little bit too fast and not feeling real good. No one there was opposed to data collection. In fact, it was just the opposite. Everyone was -- We've been talking about this for a long time and we're really getting close, but they felt like just they needed a little bit more input before we move forward on this was the general tone, but, John, go ahead.

DR. FROESCHKE: Okay. I'm going to go to Charlene now. She has

the summary of the written comments that we received on the website.

MS. CHARLENE PONCE: Okay and John put together a map, just to give you an idea of where these comments, these online comments, came from. We also received a handful of telephone calls from the Fort Myers area.

Just briefly, there was opposition to electronic reporting for a number of reasons, mostly because the cost would be too much and it could put some people out of business. People feel like they already participate in the phone surveys and anything more than that is a burden.

People would support a paper logbook, but anything more than that, again, would be cost-prohibitive, and there was support for online weekly reporting or weekly reporting via smartphone. There was opposition to having to submit reports on the way back to the dock. People felt that this would interfere with safety issues and tending to customers and having a small crew onboard and not being able to have the time to do that while they were in route.

There was support of electronic logbooks and VMS, people saying that it's the best way to streamline data collection for the charter/for-hire industry and it's a huge opportunity to provide timely and accurate data while increasing accountability. People suggested VMS and electronic reporting or fish tags, saying that they're the only way to collect real-time data.

There was support for specific actions and alternatives. There was support for Action 1, Alternative 4; Action 2, Alternative 4; and Action 3, Alternative 2. There was a note in that support that the headboat pilot program worked very well. There was also support for Action 1, Alternative 2; Action 2, Alternative 2; and Action 3, Alternative 2; and support for Action 1, Alternative 2, as long as reporting requirements are only for the days in which fishing occurs.

There was also support for Alternative 4 in Actions 1 and 2, but no action in Alternative 3. There was a lot of opposition to VMS. Some of the reasons are VMS will not work, but electronic logbooks would. VMS is too much too fast and it would drain the batteries on the smaller boats.

Then there was support for no action at all, stating that these actions are too broad and they only establish a blanket rule that would be sent to some committee somewhere and designed with

no stakeholder or council input and people just really don't know what it is that they would be getting. They need more information. Is there a cost? How much is the cost? Is there a subscription fee? Things like that. Many people just reiterated that they couldn't afford this kind of cost.

There was a comment that any modifications to reporting should be paired with Amendments 41 and 42, and other comments were a request to implement trip limits on the commercial sector and consider adding an action that would require the weighing of fish via fish kiosk weigh system. That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you. John, just as some kudos to staff, and I don't know if you are responsible for the map, but I just think that that's a good idea. I mean it gives a nice visual representation of where they're coming from or if there's concerns. I can see this really taking off to give a nice Gulf perspective of what regions have what concerns and that kind of thing, and so that's nice.

DR. FROESCHKE: Just to follow up on the map, if you zoom out, you can see the full extent, and the comments that were actually provided are referenced, and so if you click on the dot, that represents a comment and so you can see the comment and its approximate location of someone. That's on there and then the actual information is down in the table, down below, in a little nicer form that it comes on the Google docs. We can circulate that out, or we can make them live on the website or something, if you are interested.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Right. I think that could prove to be very useful, and, John, did you say that Steven had a few comments concerning enforcement?

DR. FROESCHKE: I did, yes.

MR. STEVEN ATRAN: Thank you. I will be brief. The Law Enforcement Technical Committee, after they finished their agenda items, which Doug Gregory went over during the Administrative/Budget Committee -- Under Other Business, they got into a discussion of Reef Fish Amendment 39, which included some discussion of electronic logbooks. I will save the Amendment 39 comments for when we get into the Reef Fish Committee.

Their comments regarding electronic logbooks are on the top of page 4 of the Law Enforcement Technical Committee Report, Tab G, Number 6. Scott Bannon, who is the Alabama representative on

the Law Enforcement Technical Committee, should be in the audience somewhere, in case I misrepresent or leave anything out that they wanted to say.

Most of their comments had to do with hail-in and hail-out requirements, which I don't think that's part of any of the alternatives that are currently in place, but I know it's discussed in the amendment.

They're concerned about the volume of hail-in and hail-out requirements that would occur under electronic reporting, if it were to be a requirement. They said under the Headboat Collaborative that there's only about thirty-nine vessels that had those requirements, but if it was extended to all for-hire vessels, there's something like 1,200 or so vessels, and they thought the system would be overwhelmed.

Also, if those are supposed to be used to help verify that the fishermen are indeed submitting their electronic logbooks, if they intercept a vessel, they would have to have immediate access to those electronic submissions. Otherwise, without that immediate access, they felt that the hail-in and hail-out requirement would be a moot point. That's basically what they had to say on the subject.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thanks, Steven. Could you please remind the committee, or maybe me again, but where -- I missed those comments and where do we --

MR. ATRAN: That's in the Law Enforcement Technical Committee webinar summary, Tab G, Number 6, and it's the paragraph at the top of page 4 on that committee report.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thanks, Steven. We're just barely over fifteen minutes left in this committee and I know we need to move on to actually getting into the document and the committee recommendations. I think we need to really move into that discussion, so we can take our recommendations to the council. If there is other comments or suggestions, now is the time. John, do you want to talk us through the document?

DR. FROESCHKE: I guess what do you want to do? I mean we can go through this action-by-action, or do we want to do more of a holistic kind of do we want to proceed on this or do we want to hold off or maybe a little more information about some of the timeline from the pilot programs and when additional information would come online, such that we could complete the document, in order to satisfy the information necessary for the codified text

and those sort of things.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: What is the committee's pleasure, looking around? Dr. Lucas.

DR. LUCAS: I am going to say this in a broad sense. I don't think we have a final document, and I don't think voting on this as final action with no codified text is going to help us get to where we need to get, and I am wondering, and, John, this is a question for you, if we did settle on some of these alternatives and get some questions addressed, do you then think that moving forward with the technical subcommittee could help, if we had direct questions of that committee, so that they could help clarify some things that would make at least me feel a little more comfortable voting on a final document?

DR. FROESCHKE: I think perhaps I could speak with Dr. Ponwith or we could have it in -- I think some of this they're developing, and so I'm just not sure whether they want us to lead that role or how we could work with them so we're not stepping on their toes.

I am really not sure how we could help them do what they need to do, but I'm getting the feeling that that was a process that they felt like they should lead.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Kelly, I agree with where you're going with that. Could you explain maybe just a little better what you would envision? So we would ask that this technical subcommittee convene fairly soon and then we would take this up at the next meeting, or what timeline would you envision?

DR. LUCAS: Well, I mean I think it's -- Granted, NMFS has a huge role in this, in processing the data and all that, but even, like Bonnie said, it's working with the stakeholders and it's working with the states and it's working with everybody who is involved in the process to get this into some form that is workable.

I'm wondering if we can't just narrow down what some of the requirements are, in terms of what we want to see or how we want to see it. Then that committee could address those things and come back to us. I mean I don't expect it to be kind of real time and it may not be April.

I mean I would like for it to be, but I don't think it can be that quick, because of what they have to go through, but come back and like show us what the program looks like. I don't just

want to -- I don't think it's this council's responsibility to just say, hey, you all go handle it. I think it's our responsibility to work with everybody involved to determine how it should proceed.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Well, several times Bonnie has mentioned set the requirements. Personally, I don't feel the document right now is setting the requirements to a level that I feel comfortable voting on that, just personally, and that's kind of where I am on it right now and I would like to follow that path, but, Myron, I see your hand is up.

MR. FISCHER: Mr. Chair, if you're seeking a motion or something to move forward, I just emailed staff a motion that may work with what Kelly is saying, and I will read it as it gets posted. **This motion would be to convene the technical committee to work in concert with the Science Center and SERO to compile the minimum data fields necessary for assessments and management and to weigh various devices and platforms capable of fulfilling these requirements and report back to the council.**

Anyone can wordsmith it how they think it should be, but I think we're giving them direction of where to go and what to do and it will come up on the board and if someone seconds it -- I think it captures everything that we just discussed in this committee.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay and so we're getting that motion up now.

DR. CARRIE STUNZ: Dr. Stunz, I was looking back through the full council minutes, if I may, and just to remind everyone, one of the reasons that staff waited on holding this technical committee was, at the discussion at the October council meeting, and I know a lot of things have changed in light of this, is we were trying to get that regulatory aspect completed and then prepare the document for final action.

We came to find out that we couldn't get the codified text drafted without a better fleshed out program from the Science Center, and so that's why we don't have the proposed rule for you guys to look at and deem as necessary and appropriate.

Then the other thing we talked about is even you guys taking final action on the document and then, at a later time, in better coordination with the Science Center, to have this technical committee be convened to work out the details of the program. I know we've gotten a lot of public comments and there's been a lot of concern since then, but that was the nature of the discussion at the October council meeting.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Yes, and it seems like we're back to the chicken-and-egg thing, but maybe this technical subcommittee would help, and we do have a motion on the floor, and so if we hold that thought just for a minute. Myron, is this your motion?

MR. FISCHER: Yes, and like I said, anybody can make a friendly amendment to it, and I might nod my head one way or the other, but I think it captures some of what we talked about. I don't think we're ready for final action, because we don't know what we're taking final action on. I think this gets us down that trail and hopefully the report back to us starts to narrow what we're doing.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: So Lance is seconding the motion. Is there discussion? Dave.

MR. DONALDSON: Myron, do we need to put -- It says to report back to the council, but do we need to put a timeframe when you want them to report back by?

MR. FISCHER: I am not certain when these committees are going to meet. I hate to give them a timeframe. I don't know what the schedule on APs or technical committees are, and so I'm not capable of adding a timeframe. Someone else can.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Carrie, could you comment? I mean I think the timeframe -- I agree with putting a timeframe, but we don't want to push it too much and not get a quality product, but what's a reasonable rapid timeframe, if we were to suggest that?

DR. SIMMONS: I think we would do it as soon as possible, but I mean there's a lot of players involved and I really -- I know we want to move this forward, but I would feel more comfortable if we kind of put the ball in the Science Center's court and asked them to coordinate and us work closely, the staff and the state representatives, and moving forward with this committee in developing the plan, because we've had this technical subcommittee convened.

We've made recommendations, but we're kind of at a standstill until we know funding, the scope of the program, who is going to run it, is it going to be a census or a sample. These are all things that we can make recommendations on, but until we have at least a platform, I think it's kind of like the technical subcommittee doesn't really know where to go without some just basic information from the Science Center. That is my

understanding in why we haven't moved forward.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Go ahead, Myron.

MR. FISCHER: That's why I added to work in concert with the Science Center and SERO, to get those minimum elements.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Go ahead, Mara.

MS. LEVY: I am just wondering -- I mean compile the minimum data fields necessary for assessment and management. I guess that seems pretty broad, to me, and so what exactly are you asking? I mean in the document now, it talks about the data elements that the headboat survey reports on, and I mean I think a policy decision is, and it seems to be a big one that's somewhat controversial, is VMS-type location reporting or after-the-fact location reporting or no location reporting.

It's those types of decisions that I see the council making a policy decision, and then that can kind of narrow down sort of what devices maybe you may be looking at. If the council says we don't want real-time location reporting, then let's not give people a device that does real-time location reporting, but in terms of what to report, I mean we have a pretty well, I guess, used list of data elements that folks have been reporting, and that seems to be more of a science question, whereas I think the focus here really needs to be on those big sort of policy-type calls. Then you can mold what the system is to fit that.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay and so now I'm not totally clear of how we would work this into your motion, Myron, if you even want to. We need to do something, obviously. I'm sure we're going to hear a lot of public comment in a few days on this matter, if it's any indication of what all our email boxes look like lately concerning this matter. Go ahead, John.

DR. FROESCHKE: Just circling back to what Dr. Ponwith stated in her presentation, she alluded that it would be necessary to put in some text about upon receiving adequate funding to implement these programs. It seems like I think that's where we're seeking some leadership from them.

If, for example, you had a program with VMS and the Cadillac plan, but the funding is such that it would never be implemented, if there was a lesser program that maybe didn't have every single aspect, but it could be implemented with available funds, that seems like it would be something, information, that should go into the decision making process.

Just having more information about the types of reporting and things, I think without -- We've got to figure out some way to get the communication going between the Science Center and what they're able to do, so we know what we can figure out on our end.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Myron, there's two things to his point, real quick, and I think that's exactly what I was about to say, but I guess there's really two things going on. There is the technical aspects, but then there is the concern with the end users that aren't real comfortable with this amendment, because they don't really know what they're going to get, and so we need to come up with that.

I feel that, Myron, your motion is getting to that, but I don't want to have another meeting in April and we're still at the same spot again. Bonnie, do you have any insight in how to move this in the direction we're headed?

DR. PONWITH: Well, the materials you saw in the presentation, we're in the process of putting together into a white paper that just further elaborates on some of the considerations. Really, if you step back from all of this, it's challenging stuff, but if you step back, really what we're after is we have a program that delivers data right now.

What I'm hearing is, well, that's fine, but we want the data faster. It's a timeliness issue that is one of the drivers, and there is a desire for data that has more precision, and so the real issue here is to take a look at does this change deliver data in a way that's more timely and does it have the potential to deliver data that are more precise and in a way that is affordable?

The real thing is we don't want to create a system and say yes, this is going to do the job and then find out that it can't be implemented because it's too expensive, whether that's too expensive for the government or whether that's too expensive for the industry.

If, all in all, we look at a system and it's going to cost around the same, but it doesn't deliver data that have the promise of being substantially faster or substantially more precise, then you would ask yourself why would you make that change?

What we're trying to do is put together kind of a white paper

that looks at these technical aspects and looks at cost, to try and get that information out in a way that's organized, so we all remember what we're trying to accomplish and can use that as sort of guardrails for the decision making.

I think Mara is right that one of the key decision points here is the notion of location versus not location, because that changes not only the cost of the program, but it also changes the approach that you would use for -- It would influence the approach that you would use for effort validation and it would influence probably the sample size that we would need for dockside intercepts, and so that's a pretty fundamental decision that would be helpful in moving this along.

Again, I think it's a challenge of mapping the management decisions against the science decisions, making decisions of whose decision has to be made first before we can go the second step on the other side, and those are challenging choices.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Myron, we have your motion on the floor and I know your hand is up. We still didn't really didn't get back to Dave's issue of do we want to put some time of general date on the thing, and we're quickly running -- The clock is ticking here, and so I'm looking for some advice from the committee.

MR. FISCHER: I think the consensus is we may not need the motion and we may not need to vote on it. It might be something later. Bonnie is going to supply a white paper to give us more information. I think the only consensus is we don't have enough information to take final action on this document at this time. That's my feeling, and I have heard no -- I know we'll have public testimony, but I have heard no benefit of a VMS system, as an example.

We only have a few options, VMS and the daily reporting. So far, I haven't seen the reason for either, and so what I was going to do is give the opportunity for the committee to meet and possibly find these items. It could be just postponement until we have more information.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I still think there is -- Personally, I think there is value to this motion, and is there any other discussion on this motion, where we can act on it? John.

DR. FROESCHKE: One thing I just wanted to see if we have clarity on this is when we put together the document, the language states a "NMFS-approved electronic device", one of which could include VMS.

When we originally talked about this, we had a suite of electronic devices and VMS, and then we discussed that VMS was one type of electronic device and that we could just fold all of that together, with the understanding that we need to work with the National Marine Fisheries Service to develop what are the requirements, and then hopefully a suite of electronic devices. Perhaps VMS could be an approved device, especially for people who already have that because they're dually permitted, but not necessarily -- I don't think the intent was to restrict it to only those and that we would ideally certify tablets and a variety of other things, and so it wouldn't have to be a one-size-fits-all kind of thing.

If that's not the intent, perhaps we need to revisit the document and at least clarify that, but I think that was the intent, and so not to get just wrapped around VMS entirely.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. If there is no other -- Go ahead, Leann.

MS. LEANN BOSARGE: I just have a technical question. Whether we take final action on this document today or we don't, once this technical committee meets -- Like say we did take final action, because I'm a little concerned about how this plays out.

If we took final action and sent this up today, and then this technical committee and NMFS and the meeting of the minds occurs and they decide, okay, these are the applicable platforms that we could use, VMS and this or that, and then does that -- Once all those details are hashed out and there is more decisions to be made of which platform we choose, that's going to then come back to this council and we will say, you know obviously with stakeholder input, this is the way we want to go, or what's out input after that?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: That's a great point, Leann. That's something that I don't think a lot of us have answers to and what has got a lot of people concerned, is that at what point is there going to be this flow of information back and forth between let's say it's Bonnie or Roy's group and getting a program that's going to work for everyone.

If we pass this now, does that mean we just sort of don't have any say in it anymore? That's what has got a lot of the charter captains concerned, and I share that concern of why I don't feel like we're ready for final action, which I thought by having this motion, in my mind, that Myron made, it would make some progress and help us develop our ideas along those lines, but I

don't know. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: In terms of the minimum data fields, we have got a pretty good feel for -- We know what data fields we're collecting now and we know what additional data fields would be beneficial to have. I'm not sure if this is getting to the heart of the program, because I could sit down and create a list of data fields that I think would be useful and could talk to the managers and get consensus on it, probably within a half-an-hour.

I think the conversations are important. I'm not sure the data fields are the right metric, and really I think it's a step back from the data fields kind of question and say this is what we have now and what, of this, is inadequate and what would it take to fix those inadequacies, both from a management standpoint and from a science standpoint, and I think that is the bigger issue.

Do we need a report that's once a week where there are actual consequences if you're late? Do we need to be able to validate whether you left the dock or not when those reports come in? Those are the kinds of questions I think we're at, more so than what data fields we're getting at. Is that helpful?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I think so, and it's sounding like, as a committee, we need to get with staff and develop this document a little bit further to specifically define that, Bonnie, and not so much the specific data fields, and, Myron, I don't know and maybe that was your direct intention of the motion, but things like VMS reporting that I think maybe John can bring that back to us, to where we feel more comfortable with what we're moving forward. Is there any more comments on that? I know, Chairman Anson, that we're running over here and so you can direct me on what we need to -- I know Dr. Lucas has her hand up.

DR. LUCAS: I was just going to ask a question of Bonnie. I think some of why I keep getting stuck here is we keep saying -- I mean there's timely reporting and then there's the translation of that timely reporting into timely management.

I think when we start discussing all these scenarios of how things work that that translation -- If you can put that in your report, your white paper, that you're preparing, that says, you know, all these things equal a turnaround of X, it may help, because timely reporting does not necessarily mean more timely management, and so I think that's what some people's concerns are. If you're reporting daily, but you're still getting the information forty-five days from now, then why are you requiring

these people to report daily? What's the advantage of that?

If they report weekly and it's still forty-five days from now, what's the advantage of that, versus if you can at least show that in your white paper, I think that at least helps connect some of the dots for this committee, and that's just a thought.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mara.

MS. LEVY: Thank you. You have actions in here. Action 1 and 2 have a decision point about frequency of reporting, right? So it's keep it as it is, change it to weekly for charter and keep it weekly for headboats, go to trip reporting, daily reporting. You have made a decision, right? We've had these discussions and decided that trip-level reporting is what you want to do.

Then the next question is for NMFS and the Science Center to sort of figure out how that could be implemented, right? You can revisit that decision, but I'm hearing conversation like that's still a decision that hasn't been made, which it has.

Then the next piece was the catch location reporting. Yes, John is right that there is something in there that -- The way the alternative is written now, it's to use a NMFS-approved electronic device, and that could include VMS or something else. I think the important piece, from a policy perspective, is to record vessel location at specified time intervals.

There is nothing in here that tells us what that is. Again, are you talking about real-time intervals, while people are on the water, or are you talking about specified time intervals that then get transmitted when they're back? I really think that that's an important decision for the council to say how they want that location information provided and the reason for it. Is it important to have real time, or is it just important to know that they left and came back in one day and kind of where they went after they're back?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: Just following up on the forty-five days, I hear exactly what you're saying and that question makes sense. The real question back, again, is how does the for-hire industry desire to be managed in terms of the ACLs? Is it a forward projection of season duration to enable planning, and then using the more real-time information to ground truth whether that needs to be adjusted or not, or are you really truly looking for today we are at 47 percent of our quota and tomorrow our

projection is?

You're always going to have to project the future. You're always going to have to take what you have today and use it as a tool for understanding what's going to happen tomorrow and next week, but I think a really important question is how does the industry want to plan its season for these shorter seasons.

Is it better to know a beginning date and an end date, and, because that end date is uncertain, build a reasonable buffer to make sure that end date keeps you within your ACL, or is it to inch day by day toward that ACL and have a more refined notion of when you actually hit that? The tool you would use for those two scenarios could be very dramatically different and have very dramatically different costs.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. In the interest of time, Myron and Mark, real quick.

MR. FISCHER: I understand Mara's comments, but the last sentence under the electronic reporting requirements is the Center will develop the specific details and will provide the council the opportunity, but we're taking final action at this meeting. That's the part I don't understand and that's what this motion was about, so we could get the details first and then move forward.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Right, and if I may make a suggestion, I agree with that, Myron, and maybe John can capture some of this discussion through this technical committee, and we obviously have to have some more discussion on this. What it really means is until we feel comfortable as a council that we're providing the fishermen with some idea of what type of end product they're going to get to record their catch that they're comfortable with -- Then, I think, personally, I would feel better moving that forward, and so, maybe through this technical committee, we can do that. I don't know. Mark.

MR. BROWN: I just wanted to mention something about the program that we have in the South Atlantic for the headboats currently. We have seventy-six headboats that are doing electronic reporting, and they use a ten-by-ten-mile grid for reporting the area that they're in. They just give it by a code. Then the proposed pilot program, which is going to be done for the 1,984 charter vessels that are in the South Atlantic, will also be using a similar grid.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I think that's probably more than adequate for

what we're doing here, is this broad grid versus the more refined. We're at a point where we're really just out of time. John.

DR. FROESCHKE: Just quickly to that point and then one other. The grid, I guess the difference isn't necessarily the grid size, but it's whether it's self-reported data or if it's passively reported by a device.

As to this, one thing that seems like it might be appropriate is Dr. Ponwith noted that her staff is producing a white paper. It would seem that once that white paper is available, that might be the perfect product for this technical subcommittee to review and provide recommendations on the council and how to proceed, based on the results of the white paper. I don't know what the timing of that white paper is, but that seems like that would at least give us something tangible to work through.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Steve.

DR. STEVE BRANSTETTER: To reiterate something that Dr. Ponwith said, and it's something that I made comment on in the last round of iterations of the document that we were able to review, but a lot of the discussion in the document focused on the timeliness of the data, the timeliness of the data, and I made the comment back to the writers that timeliness of the data is one thing, but, again, as Dr. Ponwith pointed out, it's the accuracy and the precision that comes with the validation over a larger sample size, or even a complete census.

Let's face it. QA/QC is going to happen. QA/QC doesn't happen overnight and I don't care how well you write the program. QA/QC is going to take you ten days, fourteen days. Maybe we can speed up forty-five, but let's use the really bad example of the red snapper season as the real point here. You get fourteen days' worth of data reported and it will be fourteen more days before you have any information about that fourteen days.

You are going to be projecting, and I think wouldn't you rather have a season that you're going to get forty-five days and let's see if down the road that forty-five days still looks good or not, but if you have more accurate and more precise, through validation, data, then that forty-five days may not be forty-five days anymore.

I think that's a distinction that the council needs to make and that the industry needs to make. I don't think you're going to get timely data. You're not going to see IFQ reporting up on

the website tomorrow morning, especially for self-reported information. That may be a direction that the council -- That may be a dichotomy right there that solves some issues for the development of this program.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, committee. We've got a motion on the floor and we need to act and end our business, so we can turn this over to the council business. I would ask for us to take a vote on this motion. If there is no other very important comments --

DR. LUCAS: One question everybody seems to be stuck on is "the minimum data fields necessary". **I am wondering, Myron, if it just read "to weigh various devices and platforms capable of fulfilling the requirements" and struck the "minimum", if that works.**

MR. FISCHER: That's great. I accept it.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. To the motion, it's to compile the and get rid of the minimum data fields. Strike through the minimum data fields. I'm sorry, Kelly, but would you say that again?

DR. LUCAS: I think it can just start with -- Stop at the "to" right before "weigh". Get rid of "to compile". Does that work, Myron? Thanks.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Yes, Dave.

MR. DONALDSON: I think John had a good suggestion to react to the white paper that the Science Center was going to develop and can we incorporate that?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Would you like to incorporate that in, Dave?

MR. DONALDSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: So where would you like to -- To weigh the various devices and platforms and review the -- So after "capable of fulfilling the requirements" and "and platforms capable". Sorry. "Various devices and platforms capable of fulfilling the requirements and review of the white paper from SEFSC". Is that right? From NOAA Fisheries. So, instead of "SEFSC", it's "NOAA Fisheries".

MR. FISCHER: It's fine with me. I thought that would have been captured in the Center and the SERO comment.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Does that capture your motion, Myron? Okay. Anyone else? **Is there any opposition to this motion? If there is no opposition to the motion, the motion passes.** Other Business is the last agenda item. If there is no other business, Chairman Anson, I will pass it back to you, a little late.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 11:05 a.m., January 25, 2016.)

- - -