

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2
3 DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

4
5
6 Golden Nugget Casino Hotel Biloxi, Mississippi

7
8 March 30, 2015

9
10
11 **VOTING MEMBERS**

12 Harlon Pearce.....Louisiana
13 Doug Boyd.....Texas
14 Roy Crabtree.....NMFS, SERO, St. Petersburg, Florida
15 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
16 Myron Fischer (designee for Randy Pausina).....Louisiana
17 John Greene.....Alabama
18 Greg Stunz.....Texas
19 David Walker.....Alabama

20
21 **NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

22 Kevin Anson.....Alabama
23 Martha Bademan (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
24 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
25 Jason Brand.....USCG
26 Pamela Dana.....Florida
27 Dale Diaz (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
28 Campo Matens.....Louisiana
29 Corky Perret.....Mississippi
30 Lance Robinson (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
31 John Sanchez.....Florida
32 Roy Williams.....Florida

33
34 **STAFF**

35 Stephen Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
36 Assane Diagne.....Economist
37 John Froeschke.....Fishery Biologist/Statistician
38 Doug Gregory.....Executive Director
39 Karen Hoak.....Administrative and Financial Assistant
40 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
41 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
42 Cathy Readinger.....Administrative Officer
43 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
44 Charlotte Schiaffo.....Research & Human Resource Librarian
45 Bryan Schoonard.....GIS Analyst

46
47 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

48 Pam Anderson.....Panama City, FL

1 Randy Boggs.....Orange Beach, AL
 2 Steve Branstetter.....NMFS
 3 J.P. Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL
 4 Michael Drexler.....Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL
 5 Mike Eller.....Destin, FL
 6 Cynthia Fenyk.....NOAA
 7 Martin Fisher.....FL
 8 Chuck Guilford.....FL
 9 Ken Haddad.....American Sportfishing Association, Lloyd, FL
 10 Chad Hanson.....Pew Environmental Trusts
 11 Betty Harder.....FL
 12 Ben Hartig.....SAFMC
 13 Bill Kelly.....FKCFA, FL
 14 Kristin McConnell.....EDF, Austin, TX
 15 Jack McGovern.....NMFS
 16 George Niles.....Summerland Key, FL
 17 Daniel Padron.....Key West, FL
 18 Bonnie Ponwith.....SEFSC
 19 Jenny Thompson.....Oceana, Lafayette, LA
 20 Bob Zales.....Panama City, FL

21
 22 - - -
 23

24 The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery
 25 Management Council convened at the Golden Nugget Casino Hotel,
 26 Biloxi, Mississippi, Monday morning, March 30, 2015, and was
 27 called to order at 10:52 a.m. by Chairman Harlon Pearce.

28
 29 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
 30 **APPROVAL MINUTES**
 31 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**
 32

33 **CHAIRMAN HARLON PEARCE:** The agenda is Tab F, Number 1. Are
 34 there any changes or additions to the agenda? If not, can I
 35 hear a motion to adopt the agenda as written?
 36

37 **MR. JOHNNY GREENE:** So moved.
 38

39 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** We've got a motion and a second. Any
 40 opposition to the adoption of the agenda? Hearing none, the
 41 agenda is adopted. The minutes are Tab F, Number 2. Any
 42 changes or additions to the minutes? If not, I would like to
 43 hear a motion to adopt the minutes as written.
 44

45 **MR. GREENE:** So moved.
 46

47 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I've got a motion and a second by Greg. Any
 48 opposition to the approval of the minutes? Hearing none, the

1 approval of the minutes passes. Next is the Action Guide, Tab
2 F, Number 3. The action guide basically is going to be to
3 electronic charter boat reporting recommendation discussion
4 paper and they are looking for our input to advise staff on the
5 preferred course of action. Any questions about the action
6 guide? Hearing none, we will move into the next part of the
7 agenda, the Discussion Paper on Joint South Atlantic and Gulf of
8 Mexico Generic Charter Boat Reporting Amendment, Tab F, Number
9 4. Dr. Froeschke, are you ready?

10
11 **DISCUSSION PAPER - JOINT SOUTH ATLANTIC AND GULF OF MEXICO**
12 **GENERIC CHARTER BOAT REPORTING AMENDMENT**
13

14 **DR. JOHN FROESCHKE:** Yes, I am. Good morning, everyone. Tab F-
15 4, this is a joint document. As you recall from the last
16 meeting, this was recommended that we proceed jointly with the
17 South Atlantic Council.

18
19 What we have done since the last time is we've appointed the IPT
20 process, which does take some time. The South Atlantic Council
21 met earlier this month, in March, and reviewed this document,
22 which was put together by the South Atlantic Council. It, as
23 you will see, is very early in the process and is really more of
24 a proposed workflow or something to solicit your ideas in how to
25 move forward.

26
27 What will happen after this meeting is we will take your input
28 and we will meet the IPT and get the full range of perspectives
29 and we can fill out the appropriate range of actions and make
30 sure that the no-action alternatives and those things are sort
31 of characterized correctly and integrate whatever guidance you
32 give us at this meeting.

33
34 If you look through the document, it is a South Atlantic sort of
35 document. By the next meeting -- We are the administrative lead
36 and it will be more something that you're probably familiar
37 working through.

38
39 What I am going to do is just ask you to move to page 4, the
40 purpose and need. As you all know, we've discussed the needs
41 for better data and faster data for a long, long time and so I
42 don't think we need a lot of background information on that. It
43 seems I think we're all well aware.

44
45 Some things to think about in this is the way that the South
46 Atlantic Council has considered it, is to roll some aspect of
47 headboat reporting modifications into this document and so I am
48 curious as we move through this if that's something that you're

1 interested in at this time or you would prefer we address that
2 separately in another item.

3
4 Any questions on the purpose and need and whether that needs to
5 be changed at this point? If not, we will proceed to talk about
6 the actions.

7
8 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I don't see any questions and so keep going,
9 John.

10
11 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Let's move to Action 1 and it's on page 5. What
12 this action is, it's really to modify the data reporting timing
13 and for some of you who have also been through this process both
14 with the dealer reporting and the headboat reporting -- We do
15 have some experience with this.

16
17 The action alternatives build on what we've learned in the
18 process and so what we've done, just for a bit of background,
19 the first thing we did was the dealer reporting and we have
20 weekly reporting and the reports are due the Tuesday following
21 the week end, which is on a Sunday. The week end is on Sunday
22 and you would file your reports on Tuesday. That seems to work
23 well.

24
25 In headboats, we have weekly reporting, but the reports are not
26 due for a week after. In terms of the timing that we're always
27 pushing for, it might seem more appropriate that we have the
28 reporting due Tuesday rather than a week following the Sunday
29 and so it would be -- If we didn't address the headboats, which
30 we could do later, it would be out of sync, but I think, based
31 on the technical subcommittee and discussions and things,
32 timeliness is always better and so that's one option.

33
34 The status quo option really in here would be considered
35 Alternative 2 and then Alternative 4. Alternative 5 is sort of
36 what we have recommended, or at least discussed. It would be
37 weekly or intervals shorter than a week for specific issues or
38 fisheries that we have addressed in headboats, with the reports
39 due the following Tuesday.

40
41 Again, things for daily reporting and that are always possible
42 as alternatives and at this point, I guess I'm just soliciting
43 feedback as to whether this range of ideas is within the
44 ballpark of what you all are thinking.

45
46 **DR. GREG STUNZ:** John, I know we're early in the process and I
47 have questions about the timing and the weekly nature of this
48 and it concerns me a little bit not to have a little bit faster

1 of a reporting, one for just recall of the anglers and fishermen
2 entering the data, but also from a validation standpoint.

3
4 You know if you're reporting a week after the fact, that could
5 be problematic in ensuring the quality of the data we're getting
6 in and so what I would like to see is maybe another alternative
7 for a more rapid response time and I believe that you're going
8 to see that the charter captains are going to want that as well.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Do you have a motion or do you just want to
11 talk about it or what?

12
13 **DR. STUNZ:** I can offer a motion if we need one, or do we just
14 need to talk about it? I am not sure. John had mentioned this
15 was early in the phase and I guess I would leave to him what he
16 needs to proceed.

17
18 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Greg, two points. Alternative 3 in here has a
19 daily reporting with two different reporting options and so
20 that's one, but I do think we could get some clarification on
21 this, but if it is weekly reporting, it doesn't mean that you
22 can't turn in daily reports. It just means that it would be
23 tabulated through the data flow process on a weekly basis.

24
25 We could probably get some clarification, but yes, please
26 provide any guidance like this that you want. We would love to
27 have it, so it helps us flesh out the document.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I kind of agree. You've got daily almost in
30 three sections.

31
32 **DR. BONNIE PONWITH:** In the pilot that was run in the Gulf, we
33 ran into some challenges with reporting and certainly you do
34 have a good range of alternatives here for the timing, including
35 daily. I think it would be advantageous to add one more
36 alternative, from a science perspective, and it is daily in real
37 time.

38
39 Another consideration is that if you are designing this to be a
40 real time data collection and a census, then having an
41 alternative that requires the vessels to report before they hit
42 the dock, so that when they hit the dock their data have already
43 been submitted and you can compare those submitted data against
44 a dockside intercept, it enables you to do a one-to-one match.

45
46 In the pilot study that we did, the validation was done based on
47 averages and by that, I mean since it was impossible to match
48 what people put into the system against the landings on a one-

1 to-one basis, we took what was the average catch of vessels that
2 were intercepted versus the average catch of vessels that were
3 not intercepted and reported electronically in this study and
4 were there differences.

5
6 When you do averages like that, you get a lot of variance and it
7 confounds the signal, whereas if you have a requirement that you
8 submit that before you know whether you are going to be sampled
9 or not, it enables us to be able to match what was reported at
10 sea to what was observed on that dock, to be able to look for
11 reporting errors and do correction factors for those reporting
12 errors.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I think what Bonnie is saying is that she
15 wants us to move at the speed of business this time and get
16 things done a little quicker. I think, John, it's duly noted
17 that both Greg and Bonnie want something in this document that's
18 real time and so I think that's something you would -- If you
19 could come back and figure that out for us, please.

20
21 **DR. FROESCHKE:** If you have a chance, look at Alternative 3.
22 There are two subalternatives. One is the reporting is noon of
23 the following day and 3b is prior to arriving at the dock. Does
24 that encapsulate what you are discussing or is something
25 additional to that needed?

26
27 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Greg, just follow that up and then I've got
28 other people.

29
30 **DR. STUNZ:** Yes, John, that would capture that. I guess Bonnie
31 made my point better about that, but if you looked at via
32 computer or the internet, I think that's what I was -- I know
33 that's addressed later on in the document, but maybe some
34 verbiage there about other means to enter that much more
35 quickly, because the biggest complaint we had, and I hear from
36 the captains, is the last thing they want to do is go log on a
37 computer after they are cleaning up and preparing for the next
38 day and so offer some of those options in 3.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I think Mr. Greene has got something to solve
41 that problem.

42
43 **MR. GREENE:** I've got a motion I want to put up. I had emailed
44 it earlier and it's specifically to what Dr. Stunz is talking
45 about in Action 3, Subalternative b. **I move to change the**
46 **language in Subalternative 3b that currently reads "via computer**
47 **or internet" to read "via National Marine Fisheries Service**
48 **approved electronic logbook devices".**

1
2 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** There is a motion on the board. Do we have a
3 second to this motion? We have a second from David Walker. Is
4 there discussion of the motion? It's pretty straightforward.
5
6 **DR. FROESCHKE:** That would apply to just Alternative -- It would
7 also apply to Alternative 3a and so would you just want to make
8 that Alternative 3, rather than a subalternative?
9
10 **MR. GREENE:** Yes, you're correct. I missed that. Thank you.
11
12 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Does the seconder agree with that? All right.
13 It's not much of a change. Any more discussion on the motion?
14
15 **MR. DOUG BOYD:** Would that exclude some method of reporting that
16 may be in the near future?
17
18 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** John, any comments on that?
19
20 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I don't think it would and since I've got the
21 mic, perhaps what you should do is just to broaden it all the
22 way and just make it appropriate for this action in general,
23 because even if you chose a different alternative in this, you
24 would still likely want that or very similar language and so
25 perhaps we could just make it a NMFS approved electronic logbook
26 for each alternative in this action.
27
28 **MR. BOYD:** My concern is that there may be some limitation with
29 technology moving so fast and I wouldn't want to limit us to
30 something that the government is currently doing that may take a
31 while to change when we have other alternatives available.
32
33 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I agree completely, Doug.
34
35 **DR. FROESCHKE:** For example, in the commercial for VMS and
36 things, there is a certification process and so long as your
37 unit meets the qualifications and becomes certified, it is
38 eligible to be used and it isn't restrictive of someone -- If I
39 came out with a new one today and I got it certified, I could
40 use it and so I don't think this would prohibit new things from
41 coming to the market that are better than what we currently
42 have.
43
44 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I agree, John. There could be different
45 options for each boat to utilize. One might like VMS and one
46 might like iSnapper or different programs that could be
47 certified by NMFS to use and so I think that would be an ongoing
48 process, I would assume, and so that should cover the problems,

1 Doug. Any opposition to this motion?
2

3 **MR. GREENE:** I just wanted to -- I think that Dr. Froeschke had
4 said is prudent and I think that I would like to modify it just
5 to change the language in Action 1 or in the document or however
6 it needs to be. I just want to make sure they're straight with
7 what we're doing. I think the intent is there, but I am just
8 trying to get it to reflect on the board.
9

10 **In Action 1 and then strike the "Alternative 3". I move to**
11 **change the language in -- Just do it in the document. Just take**
12 **out "Action 1" and just put it in the document, that should it**
13 **read anywhere "via a computer or internet" that it's changed to**
14 **"National Marine Fisheries Service approved electronic logbook**
15 **devices".**
16

17 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Does everyone understand the change?
18

19 **DR. ROY CRABTREE:** That's saying that this is not going to be a
20 program where you go home and get on your home computer, but I
21 guess I don't understand changing it broadly like that, because
22 we have alternatives here to report once a week and so why
23 couldn't they just get on their home computer and access the
24 internet? Why would we have to have a NMFS approved logbook if
25 they are not going to report on the vessel?
26

27 I can understand a logbook if we're going to have them report
28 before they hit the dock, but if they're going to report after
29 they hit the dock, it doesn't seem they need a NMFS approved
30 logbook to do that, right?
31

32 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** According to this, yes, you're right. John,
33 have you got an answer for that?
34

35 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Most of the applications I would see would kind
36 of have a complementary PC-based login that you could do and so
37 they would have a piece of software that you could use from your
38 home computer that I would view that could be NMFS logbook
39 approved and I don't see a PC at home being an unapproved device
40 in this way and so it doesn't seem at odds to me.
41

42 **MR. MYRON FISCHER:** Mr. Chairman, mine is more from the dumb
43 side and so my question is who or what is the Science Research
44 Director?
45

46 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Dr. Ponwith.
47

48 **MR. FISCHER:** In one action we discuss sending the information

1 directly there and in another action, we are discussing sending
2 it through GulfFIN and so I want to make certain that we are not
3 boxing ourselves in in the first action.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I agree with you, Myron. I think there is
6 some motions you will hear later on that will help us with that.

7
8 **DR. STUNZ:** Mr. Chair, maybe just a point of clarification. I
9 think this is probably implied, but in that Alternative 1, it
10 talks about individuals, John, that aren't required and what
11 they do have to report, but, just to be clear, we're talking
12 about -- In all of these alternatives, we're talking about --
13 Like in Alternative 3, we would require that all charter vessels
14 submit these.

15
16 In other words, just to alleviate what might be some confusion
17 from this full census that we're talking about, or maybe I am
18 confused, but, just to be clear, all of these other
19 alternatives, other than 1, is talking about everyone is going
20 to do this.

21
22 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I guess depending on how you define everyone,
23 but how I think we are discussing it is federally-permitted
24 charter boats and so if you have that permit, then this would be
25 applicable.

26
27 **DR. STUNZ:** Right and so I am wondering if we just shouldn't, in
28 a future modification, say something like require that all
29 federally-permitted charter vessels, for clarification purposes,
30 in those alternatives, where it's appropriate.

31
32 **DR. FROESCHKE:** We could certainly add that to the wording.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** All right. Let's get back. We've got a
35 motion on the table. It's changed a little bit from the
36 beginning motion. **Any opposition to the motion on the table?**
37 **Hearing none, the motion carries.** John.

38
39 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Next, let's go to the Action 2 on page 11. This
40 action deals with the data reporting in terms of location, which
41 we have heard from multiple sources that this is very important
42 for release mortality and where effort is occurring and all
43 sorts of things.

44
45 As you are aware, there are lots of different ways that this
46 potentially could be done. Some other preliminary discussions
47 at the South Atlantic side, from what's been communicated to me,
48 is they have a different idea of what they don't want, which is

1 they are not interested in VMS technology on charter vessels at
2 this time.

3

4 It doesn't mean that it couldn't happen in the Gulf by any means
5 and that's for you all to decide, but just have a look at these
6 kinds of things and if it's something where we want reports of
7 primary area fished by a grid, sort of what we do with the
8 headboats, and it would be a self-reported kind of thing or if
9 we would rather that information be captured passively by a
10 device, whether it be VMS or the app or something like that, or
11 if we wanted to rely really on true VMS and so is there any
12 discussion on that?

13

14 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Anybody?

15

16 **MS. MARA LEVY:** Just a question about Alternative 4. I
17 understand what you just said about the South Atlantic not
18 necessarily being interested at this time for doing VMS, but is
19 there any reason not to structure it like Alternative 3, where
20 you say require the use of VMS and then have an option for South
21 Atlantic and Gulf, so there can be an explicit decision and
22 reason for not doing it in the South Atlantic versus doing it in
23 the Gulf?

24

25 **DR. FROESCHKE:** In my view, the way that Alternative 2 and 3 are
26 worded -- It would be appropriate for Alternative 4 and, again,
27 this hasn't gone through the full IPT gamut and all that stuff
28 and so some of this we can work out, but the reason that it is
29 the way it is is that the South Atlantic -- I don't think they
30 felt that VMS was in the range of appropriate alternatives for
31 their region, based on what they feel their needs are, and so
32 they didn't want that in there and so that's why it's that way
33 and perhaps Ben or someone could provide a little more insight
34 from them, but if you feel that it should be changed, please let
35 us know.

36

37 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Ben, did you want to chime in on this?

38

39 **MR. BEN HARTIG:** Yes, Harlon. I mean he's right. I mean
40 basically we've been told loud and clear by the fishermen in our
41 area that VMS is not something that they want to use and so
42 that's why it's been structured as just a Gulf option.

43

44 Like I say, I mean looking at the way the other subalternatives
45 are in the other two alternatives, I mean certainly you could do
46 that, but it's just that we would not do it in the South
47 Atlantic. I think we wanted to send a strong message from our
48 fishermen that VMS -- We are not going to entertain VMS in the

1 South Atlantic.

2
3 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** All right. Thank you. John, do you need a
4 motion or you can handle this on your own?

5
6 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I guess I'm not totally clear. Do you want me
7 to leave it the same or make it different?

8
9 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Let's hear from the committee.

10
11 **DR. STUNZ:** I want to add something and I don't have specific
12 changes to alternatives, but as a scientist, I am certainly not
13 opposed to collecting more catch location information, but from
14 a practical standpoint, when you go beyond just generalities,
15 general locations, the charter captains probably aren't going to
16 like doing that, but when you start specifying where you are
17 fishing, that also implies you are going to have to keep
18 separate catch logs of what you're catching at each location and
19 before long, that becomes very, very problematic from a data
20 entry standpoint and it gets very cumbersome.

21
22 In some of our experiences, you don't want to disenfranchise
23 them from having ease of entry kind of thing and so while I am
24 very much for getting location information, I think we need to
25 make it as simple as possible and as streamlined as possible.
26 If they're fishing five spots in a day, how you're going to keep
27 track of all that becomes very difficult.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Thanks for that, but let's go back to
30 Alternative 3 and 4. Do we want to put a subalternative of in
31 the Gulf of Mexico and in the South Atlantic as an option on 4?
32 Any discussion? How does everybody feel? John, I guess no
33 discussion means we keep it as is.

34
35 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Okay. To summarize sort of the idea about the
36 location, and I agree it's complicated, I think the biggest
37 philosophical difference is do you want the location information
38 to be specified by a person who reports a general area or do you
39 want that location collected passively by a device and I guess
40 the resolution and all that you could work out, but that seems
41 to be the fundamental difference between Alternative 2 and then
42 3 and 4.

43
44 **MR. FISCHER:** I guess my question is what location data -- What
45 are the needs of the data? Before we vote on -- I know this is
46 the inception of this paper, but before we get into what
47 elements we want taken, I think it should come from the top,
48 meaning it should come from Bonnie's section telling us what we

1 need and not for us to build something with a whole series of
2 data and find out they use 10 percent of it.

3
4 I would like to know what's the necessary data points for a
5 stock assessment and if they're going to use the standard grids
6 in the Gulf and not the headboat grids, but the statistical
7 zones, which are roughly sixty-miles across, then we don't have
8 to micromanage to someone's private individual spot that no one
9 else has and down to four decimals. I really think things like
10 that, before we get into the details, we have to know what the
11 needs are.

12
13 **DR. PONWITH:** That's really smart, Mr. Fischer, to make sure
14 that your data collection actually aligns with the questions
15 that you're asking of the data and so I think that that's a
16 right-minded way to approach this.

17
18 The first thing is looking at this and what are we trying to
19 accomplish? Are we trying to bypass the use of paper, where we
20 collect data exactly the way we do right now except we don't use
21 paper, or are we trying to create a completely new and different
22 approach to the way we account for effort and landings in this
23 segment of the fishery?

24
25 If the latter, one of the things that having an electronic
26 device that gives you location of that vessel does is validates
27 the effort in addition to the location. Basically, we need
28 effort to be able to understand what the landings are and if you
29 see that a boat is afloat, that has a higher probability of
30 being actual fishing effort than if you see the boat at the
31 dock.

32
33 The second thing that those data are for, and it gets back to
34 Dr. Stunz's comment, and that is knowing the location of those
35 landings is very, very valuable from a science standpoint and I
36 don't necessarily think we need to go so far as to assign this
37 fish right here, Fish Fred, was caught at this depth, but
38 understanding the distribution of sampling effort in a trip
39 gives us the ability to understand and assign release mortality
40 ratios.

41
42 As you know, our understanding is that there is a gradient in
43 release mortality that maps to the depth that people were
44 fishing and if a vessel fishes three different locations, we
45 don't necessarily need to assign each individual fish to which
46 location, but knowing that that happened at three different
47 depths gives us an ability to further refine those discard
48 mortality ratios.

1
2 **MR. FISCHER:** Bonnie, one thing we've heard from discussion and
3 one thing we have to remember, has to be considered, is it's not
4 the depth the boat was in, but it's the depth the hook was in.
5 They may be sitting in 200-foot of water and fishing sixty-foot
6 down and from the videos I've seen and what I've seen personally
7 in snapper, you could catch them on a fly rod on the surface
8 these days and so release mortality is not this depth issue it
9 once was. When the population drops back down, it will be.
10
11 **MR. GREENE:** I think I'm just going to pass at this point. I am
12 curious to see what the South Atlantic comes back with. I mean
13 they're sending a pretty bold statement that they don't want
14 VMS, but I am curious to see what they are interested in and as
15 Ben mentioned earlier, they can certainly choose not to pursue
16 an option that we have laid out in front of us and so that's
17 really all I've got right at this particular moment.
18
19 **MR. DONALDSON:** I was just going to ask Ben what options are you
20 looking at other than VMS?
21
22 **MR. HARTIG:** We are looking at a tablet. I mean we've had some
23 presentations on a tablet that has GPS within the tablet, so it
24 can give you the location. We are not so much looking at the
25 VMS, but we are looking at locations through GPS and so we are
26 certainly looking to get location information from this.
27
28 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Anything else on Action 2?
29
30 **MR. GREENE:** I just want to go back to Mr. Hartig for a minute
31 and I want to make sure I understood. You said you were looking
32 at a tablet that does do location as opposed to a VMS and that's
33 correct?
34
35 **MR. HARTIG:** That is correct, Mr. Greene.
36
37 **MR. DAVID WALKER:** Is this a tablet because of the cost versus
38 the VMS?
39
40 **MR. HARTIG:** Yes, that's a good point. There is a cost
41 associated with the tablet and I am not sure what that is. I
42 will have to ask Gregg and I will get back with you about that,
43 but it's been used. In New England, they had a pretty
44 interesting pilot program and we had an extensive presentation
45 on it and actually the fishermen designed the tablet.
46
47 They designed the buttons and they had these bells and whistles
48 that they wanted in that tablet and that actually helped them

1 participate more in the project, because they were collaborators
2 in developing that tablet itself and so that helped as well in
3 the project as far as getting participation and so that's kind
4 of the direction that we're going in, as we've seen this
5 presentation. I will get back with you on the cost.
6

7 **MR. WALKER:** Of course, they're not opposed to like a hail-in
8 and hail-out and so forth?
9

10 **MR. HARTIG:** I don't know that we've talked about the hail-in
11 and hail-out so much, but I may be wrong. Maybe John can answer
12 that.
13

14 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Do we need to discuss hail-in and out? Is
15 this the place for it? If so, just let me know.
16

17 **DR. FROESCHKE:** One thing I would like your input on regarding
18 this is there's a little paragraph at the end of page 11 and it
19 deals with what or how these data from a VMS or any sort of
20 geolocation device would be used.
21

22 I think what would be helpful is to have some background, which
23 I am not privy to necessarily, about how the commercial VMS data
24 are used, because it's a similar device, and whether it's a law
25 enforcement tool or do we intend this to be a science tool or
26 something like that, because I think that could affect your
27 perspective on what data are collected in terms of what's being
28 used.
29

30 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Before we leave this, Mike Eller, are you in
31 the audience?
32

33 **MR. MIKE ELLER:** Yes, I'm here.
34

35 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** You have got a device you wanted to show us
36 quickly, so there is other alternatives out there.
37

38 **MR. ELLER:** This is a VMS that came off my boat. It was
39 installed about a week or so ago. It's also what the partyboats
40 use for their collaborative effort. It's an Android device and
41 it Bluetooth's to a little box on my boat. It's about this big
42 and then that has an antenna.
43

44 On my boat, there is a little box about this big and then
45 there's an antenna and that's it. The boat is out fishing right
46 now and that thing is pinging and it's doing its thing and then
47 I have the interaction device right here. I could submit his
48 trip ticket right now from here. This is what they gave me and

1 it's waterproof and it's pretty simple.
2
3 The greatest thing about is that it's -- The things that you
4 have to fill out, once you fill it out one time, that's it.
5 It's done and it saves that and so I don't have to go in there
6 and put my boat name in there, like I do with a paper logbook,
7 put my boat name and my boat number and all that stuff.
8
9 I hit the button and it pulls it up and it's already pre filled
10 out and then if there's any data that changes for today, I can
11 enter that in pretty quickly and hit "submit". The future is
12 here and we've got it and it works really well and it's pretty
13 basic and it's very, very user friendly.
14
15 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** You are doing that at sea?
16
17 **MR. ELLER:** Yes, sir. That is correct.
18
19 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Thank you for coming up. Any other questions
20 or anything on Action 2?
21
22 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I am just curious. How specific are these GPS
23 coordinates that you're interested in, because it seems like a
24 fisherman works all his life to find his spots in areas that are
25 kind of likened to a business trade secret and then for you to
26 just be putting them out there and God knows where they're going
27 to go, there is some reluctance.
28
29 We seem to manage other things in very large square-mile grids
30 and I am just curious to see how this is going to evolve into
31 something extremely specific or not.
32
33 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I know in discussions with what Bonnie has
34 said, it's important they know the pretty much exact areas to
35 help them with their management tools and also in the last
36 paragraph, the vessel location would be treated as highly-
37 confidential information and so it's something that's not public
38 information and it's not public knowledge. I think those two
39 together kind of make it work. Any other discussions on Action
40 2? All right, John Froeschke, what else?
41
42 **DR. FROESCHKE:** The next thing I have for you is Action 3 and it
43 says to amend the Gulf Reef Fish, South Atlantic Snapper
44 Grouper, Coastal Migratory Pelagics, and Atlantic Dolphin and
45 Wahoo to specify certain aspects of reporting for for-hire
46 vessels.
47
48 What this is really outlining, that we haven't talked much

1 about, is specifying a flow of data. I talked a little bit with
2 Harlon this morning about this and so there are a couple of
3 alternatives in here and we won't go into the details unless you
4 want to, but I think there are two ways.

5
6 One is we could do something like this and you could specify the
7 data go from here to here to here and then it ultimately ends up
8 at Bonnie's office for use or we could do something where we
9 provide what we want at the end. We want it to be available at
10 this quality at this time and let the process evolve how it does
11 to accomplish what you all request.

12
13 The other thing regarding this is would we want to address this
14 sort of flow thing to charter boats and headboats or just
15 charter boats and address headboats at a later time in a
16 different amendment?

17
18 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** A quick question. Myron, does this satisfy
19 your GulfFIN thought or is there someplace else we need to put
20 it?

21
22 **MR. FISCHER:** No, it's fine.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** You're fine? Okay.

25
26 **MR. GREENE:** I had a motion I wanted to put up under Action 3
27 and it will be the third motion that I had sent to staff earlier
28 and it's going to work on Subalternative 3a. Basically, it's
29 just going to incorporate the GulfFIN into the process. If I
30 could get staff to pull the third motion I had sent to you.

31
32 I will go ahead and read it for you. **It says I move to change**
33 **the following language of Subalternative 3a. Number 1, in line**
34 **i, include GulfFIN so that the line reads "National Marine**
35 **Fisheries Service and/or ACCSP or GulfFIN". Number 2, in line**
36 **v, include language that states "devices that can transmit data**
37 **from sea". Number 3, add a line 6 that states "National Marine**
38 **Fisheries Service is to specify data elements necessary for**
39 **vessels to report that are equal to or greater than reporting**
40 **requirements of the federally-permitted headboats".**

41
42 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Okay. Do we have a second to the motion?
43 David.

44
45 **MS. LEVY:** Just a minor point. So I assume you want to change
46 the language in 3, right? Because then 3a and b give you the
47 choice of charter boat and headboat, but it's really 3 that you
48 want to change.

1
2 **MR. GREENE:** Yes and that's the same mistake I made earlier and
3 that's correct.
4
5 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Are you okay with that, David? Okay. Thank
6 you, Mara. Is there discussion?
7
8 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I guess just to broaden this discussion a little
9 bit, do you have any guidance on whether you would like to
10 restrict the document entirely to just charter boats at this
11 time and address headboats later, to simplify and keep us from
12 getting off the path, or is this something you would want to
13 consider incorporating headboat in various actions where it's
14 appropriate? If not, we could just make perhaps some sort of
15 broad motion that we want to just address charterboats now.
16
17 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Do you want to handle this one and maybe come
18 back to that, Johnny?
19
20 **MR. GREENE:** We will get to that I guess as we go through this.
21 I was just trying to use the headboats as the data that -- The
22 reporting requirements that they're using kind of is similar to
23 what we're trying to do as well.
24
25 **MR. BOYD:** Just a question. I am not sure I really understand
26 what we're doing here. Are we saying that we might propose or
27 we would propose to have different types of reporting for
28 charter boats and headboats, when we're talking about a common
29 recreational fish?
30
31 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Right now, they are not together. They are
32 independent and that is what John Froeschke is talking about, is
33 to pull them together, so they are under the same program.
34
35 **MR. DONALDSON:** Wouldn't it make it simpler if we included both
36 headboats and charter boats, so they are both reporting?
37 Because they are both for-hire vessels and obviously there is
38 some characteristics between the two types of vessels, but I
39 would think it would make it simpler if we just included both
40 headboats and charter boats.
41
42 **MR. BOYD:** That's my question also, because by having two
43 subalternatives, one for charter and one for headboat, you are
44 implying that you can have separate types of reporting and
45 implicit in any reporting is going to be the intercepts and
46 dockside validation and enforcement and I don't think you want
47 to have separate reporting methods for enforcement at some point
48 in time.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I agree with both of you guys. Johnny, do you
3 have something later on that you're going to present that's
4 going to do this?
5
6 **MR. GREENE:** Yes and I am just trying to get my notes.
7
8 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Do you want to get through this one and then
9 come to the next one or what do you want to do?
10
11 **MR. GREENE:** Let's see what Dr. Froeschke has got.
12
13 **DR. FROESCHKE:** One challenge is that we currently have
14 different reporting requirements for charter boats and headboats
15 and if you recall when we started revising the current headboat
16 requirements to what they are now two or three years ago,
17 originally we discussed if we would want to just address this
18 for charter boats and headboats at the same time.
19
20 After some preliminary discussions, you all decided that no,
21 they are different both in the number of vessels that are
22 affected -- It's an order of magnitude different, but the
23 biggest difference is the headboats were reporting through the
24 Headboat Survey Program, whereas the charter boats were not.
25
26 I think that's the reason why we discussed whether or not -- One
27 thing that concerns me is I wouldn't want to run into something
28 that we hadn't thought about and then get tangled up and delayed
29 and so that would be, I guess, one rationale for just doing
30 charterboats, but you're right that it certainly could be done
31 both ways. I don't know if that would lead to some
32 complications that I am not anticipating.
33
34 **DR. CRABTREE:** That was going to be my point, that you already
35 have separate reporting methods for charter boats and headboats.
36 You already have electronic reporting on the headboats and
37 whether you want to make changes to that or not, I don't know,
38 but I would think you would want to look at how well the
39 headboat program is performing right now before you start
40 changing it again, but you have had, for many years, separate
41 reporting methods for the two fleets.
42
43 **MR. GREENE:** To Dr. Crabtree's point, I think he's right and
44 that's why when I was putting this together that I wanted to
45 make sure it was either greater than or equal to what the
46 headboats have done. That seems like it's worked pretty well
47 and that was my attempt here to do that and I may need to just
48 circle back and pick this up a little bit later, but I mean I

1 certainly think that we're trying to combine them, I would
2 assume, although having separate requirements is something we're
3 going to have to work through.

4

5 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Any other discussion?

6

7 **MR. FISCHER:** What are the requirements for headboats, being
8 it's part of the motion? I don't know what the requirements
9 are.

10

11 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I don't know the flow off the top of my head.
12 We could certainly find that out and get back to you, but in
13 terms of the -- To me, the crux of the matter is the reporting
14 timing and the headboats are weekly, with reports due one week
15 after. That part is relevant.

16

17 **MR. FISCHER:** The motion says to specify the data elements and I
18 would like to know what the data elements are before I vote on
19 it and that's all I was getting to.

20

21 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I don't have those at the tips of my fingers.
22 We could get them and one of the things that I mentioned earlier
23 is perhaps another course of action, instead of getting into
24 this part, is to allow that to be worked out in conjunction with
25 the Science Center and you specify the output, the management
26 metrics, that you all are interested in in terms of timing.

27

28 If the elements are exhaustive, but they don't get you what you
29 need in the time to make the decisions that you require, that
30 doesn't do you any good and so I think you could do it a
31 different way if you chose and I am not even suggesting that you
32 need to decide that now.

33

34 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Remember we are in the early stages of this
35 whole document and so we're trying to shape it right now.

36

37 **DR. PONWITH:** The way this action is worded, it doesn't seem to
38 match what the alternatives are. The action says to specify
39 certain aspects of reporting for for-hire vessels. Certain
40 aspects. Then Alternative 1 says there is no time for the data
41 to be made available to the public and the councils and then
42 Alternative 2 says specify the following data flow and there is
43 no mention of the councils and there is no mention of the
44 public.

45

46 You have two things that seem completely disconnected from one
47 another and then Alternative 3 says to specify the following
48 aspects of data reporting and so I don't know whether you are

1 getting at flow or whether you are getting at timing the way
2 this is structured.

3
4 My view is this needs a lot of work to be able to bring clarity
5 and so there is point number one and point number two is it
6 seems odd, to me, to dictate the data flow in a regulatory
7 amendment. It seems odd to me.

8
9 It seems less odd to say we are regulating the fishing fleet to
10 have this desired outcome and I am concerned about regulating
11 the flow of what direction the data go in what steps as opposed
12 to saying the council's desire is to have a weekly estimate of
13 what landings are in-season, so we know whether the fishery
14 needs to be open or needs to be closed.

15
16 That is the kind of question that I think should be answered and
17 then if you put your requirements in, what is the council's aim,
18 and you put that in as a requirement, then it becomes a
19 technical task to figure out what are the many ways of achieving
20 that requirement and, of those, which one is the most
21 affordable, the most expedient, the most advisable?

22
23 It is concerning to see those interim steps put in a regulation
24 and so I think it would strengthen the document to have a
25 clarity in the title of what that action is intended to do and
26 then some continuity in the actions so each of those actions can
27 be connected to the action or the alternatives can be properly
28 connected to the action that's stated.

29
30 That's the flow issue and then in the timing, timing is
31 mentioned, but I don't see a lot on timing in here and it could
32 be that the other action, where we talked about the timing of
33 the reporting, was mentioned, but I am not seeing a lot of
34 timing in this one and so I think it's a matter of thinking
35 about what you want to achieve in terms of timing and stating it
36 explicitly.

37
38 **MR. GREENE:** I guess I am guilty of just trying to give too much
39 information and trying to do too many things at once here. With
40 that, I want to modify the motion and just delete Number 3 on
41 the board and that should clarify it a little bit. I was just
42 trying to add in the option for GulfFIN, after going to the Gulf
43 States meeting the other day. I just wanted to make sure that
44 option was there if they chose to use it. Then Number 2 is
45 pretty simple, but that's my motion, Mr. Chair.

46
47 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Does the seconder agree? Okay.

48

1 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Just building off of Bonnie's comment, one thing
2 that could be done is Gregg Waugh just emailed me and he
3 reminded me that the reason the flow information I think is
4 probably in there is that that was sort of a sketch of what was
5 recommended from the technical subcommittee report.

6
7 It doesn't necessarily mean, at least from my view, that it
8 needs to be a regulation, apart from whatever consequence that
9 it may happen. It seems like if you have it as a regulatory
10 thing and you come up with some new and better flow, then it
11 might slow down your ability to incorporate that in.

12
13 One way to maybe address this is to strike the Action 3 as we
14 have it and craft a new action entirely that focuses more on
15 what you want out of it and the timing and leave that part to
16 whomever else is best. Just focus on the deliverables instead
17 of the mechanism.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** All right. Are we all thoroughly confused
20 now?

21
22 **DR. CRABTREE:** Is there a motion on the board anymore?

23
24 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** There still is.

25
26 **MS. LEVY:** I am just going to agree with that, that the issue
27 with being so specific about something like a process, number
28 one. Whether the process can actually happen the way you're
29 saying it should, I don't know.

30
31 Once you have it in your FMP that this is the process, that if
32 anything happens that you want to change that process, you have
33 to go back and go through the FMP amendment or something to
34 change it and it seems more advisable to address what you want
35 the regulated community to do, what do you want the permitted
36 vessels to do and how you want them to do it, rather than how
37 that information will be funneled through to someplace like the
38 Science Center.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** We have a motion on the board and let's get
41 some closure on this motion. Any more discussion before I shut
42 the door? **Hearing none, all in favor of the motion raise your**
43 **hands, two; all opposed raise your hand, three. The motion**
44 **fails.**

45
46 **DR. CRABTREE:** I only voted against it because I am not sure
47 what it does, but I am coming back to what Mara said and others.
48 I am just not sure we need this level of specificity in here.

1 We ought to be focused on how we want them to report and how
2 quickly they want to report and those kinds of things, what
3 units we want them to use. I don't see why we need to get into
4 this level of detail.

5

6 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Got you. Dr. Froeschke, what's next?

7

8 **DR. FROESCHKE:** That's pretty much what I have at this time. I
9 think you guys have had a really good discussion and so that
10 gives us a lot of information that we can bring to the IPT and
11 refine these. I guess do you want to give us some formal
12 guidance about what to do with Action 3 in its entirety and if
13 you would prefer us to come back with a revised action that
14 deals more with deliverables and timing rather than nuts and
15 bolts?

16

17 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** What is the pleasure of the committee? I
18 think everybody must just be hungry or something.

19

20 **MR. GREENE:** I think we need to do what Dr. Froeschke is saying.
21 I think that it makes a lot of sense and I want to look at it
22 the way he's laid it out. I can offer some other stuff if he
23 wants. I mean I want it to kind of get into some idea of how to
24 handle people not reporting and that kind of stuff, but it may
25 be too early. I was just trying to help it along as much as
26 possible.

27

28 What are you looking for? Do you want more information from us?
29 I can give you information until tomorrow, probably, and really
30 slow things down, but I don't want to be too specific like I
31 just attempted to be there earlier as well.

32

33 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** The only question I still have is Dr.
34 Froeschke is asking us if we want to tie the charter boats, the
35 private charters, with the headboats together and I would like
36 to hear discussion on that before we get away, so he's got some
37 ideas of what to do. No discussion?

38

39 **MR. GREENE:** Well, I mean I am curious to see the report from
40 the headboat program. From everything that I've heard on the
41 dock and offshore fishing, it seems like it's worked pretty well
42 and most of the headboat users seem to like it. Now, I mean
43 Captain Randy Boggs is out there and he might could speak to
44 that.

45

46 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I am going to ask Randy to come up, Johnny, if
47 that's okay. Randy Boggs, can you come up and tell us about
48 your program and any problems? I've got ten minutes left, Mr.

1 Chair.

2
3 **MR. RANDY BOGGS:** With the headboat program that we're doing
4 right now, we report daily instead of weekly. It's all
5 computerized now and there's a smartphone app you can do it
6 with. We have the same VMS that they're using on the commercial
7 boats. We had very little to no reporting issues.

8
9 There is a couple of things in there that we would like to see
10 changed to maybe make it a little bit simpler, but it's no big
11 deal to do, because you can do it on your cellphone or you can
12 do it from the computer in your office or wherever you're at.
13 It makes it really, really easy to work with.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** As a headboat, do you think we should put the
16 headboats and the private charter boats under the same reporting
17 program?

18
19 **MR. BOGGS:** The headboats have always been held separate because
20 we report to the Beaufort Center and so I think it would be --
21 If you mirrored the headboat thing, I would be simpler, or
22 expand the Beaufort Program to include them, but that's up to
23 the Science Center and Beaufort, but I mean it is considered the
24 best information available.

25
26 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Just, Randy, you're talking about the Headboat
27 Collaborative as far as your daily reporting and is there much
28 difference between --

29
30 **MR. BOGGS:** If you're not in the program, then it's weekly and I
31 think it has to be completed within seven days of the final and
32 so there is a small lag time.

33
34 **MR. ANSON:** Is that also electronic? Is that through like an
35 app or is that just by fax or how is that?

36
37 **MR. BOGGS:** It is all electronic. You can do it on your
38 computer or you can do it on your telephone app and we still
39 have some of the old paper forms around and we keep up with them
40 and we still keep them on the old paper forms just in case
41 something goes wrong and we have to reproduce it, but that's
42 just in my company for safeguards.

43
44 **MR. DONALDSON:** As I stated earlier, and I realize that we've
45 had different reporting systems in the past, but it just seems
46 like a good opportunity to combine those and simplify things.

47
48 However, if it's not going to simplify things and complicate it,

1 I certainly don't want to put more burden on the industry, but I
2 think we ought to look at the possibility of if we combine the
3 two, headboat and charter boat. If we can do it the same way,
4 then it seems like a simpler way to do it.
5

6 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Randy, thank you. John, I am hearing at least
7 Dave say that we would like to look at the possibility of
8 combining them together and so you can think about that as you
9 move forward in the document.

10
11 **MR. FISCHER:** I guess I have two questions. One is where are we
12 in this document? We are just creating a paper that maybe after
13 next meeting we may all agree to and it goes out for scoping?
14 Would that seem close?

15
16 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Perfect timing. What I was going to refer you
17 to is page 16.

18
19 **MR. FISCHER:** But I had a second one. The timing may not be --

20
21 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Okay. It was just regarding the timing of the
22 document.

23
24 **MR. FISCHER:** Right and my timing may not be perfect on my
25 second question and it was to Dave, because I was not at the
26 Gulf States meeting and don't know what the TC agreed to, but
27 you did have the five state directors and their data, with input
28 from the data people in their home states, and I just wanted to
29 know what decisions they may have made and how it works into
30 what we're using, some of this information here.

31
32 **MR. DONALDSON:** Are you referring to the NFWF RFP that's -- I
33 mean we talked about -- The five state directors talked about
34 looking at developing a reporting tool for federally-permitted
35 vessels through NFWF. I know there is other groups that are
36 submitting proposals as well, but we are examining the
37 possibility of doing that. We haven't made a decision yet.

38
39 **MR. FISCHER:** Okay and I am not sure what part of the meeting it
40 was, because I was not at the meeting, but I heard some talk
41 about the table briefly about attending and John said he was in
42 attendance and I would like to make sure that whatever elements
43 and whatever comes out of that is not excluded and that it's at
44 least included in some type of way.

45
46 **DR. FROESCHKE:** If we could just quickly look at page 16, it has
47 the timing and the reason I ask this is Carrie Simmons just
48 reminded me -- She is Deputy Direct-ing from afar, but the

1 timeline that we have on here essentially says that we would
2 bring back a document that you could approve for public hearings
3 in June.

4
5 If we were to do that, I think we would need to have the actions
6 reasonably well ironed out and I am still not certain about what
7 your intent is about Action 3 or how we might bring that back to
8 you at the next meeting and so I guess it's a two-part question.

9
10 One is are you comfortable with the proposed timeline? If so,
11 could we, either now or at full council, get some more guidance
12 on Action 3?

13
14 **MR. DONALDSON:** Action 3 -- As it was pointed out, I am
15 concerned about putting it in this particular document because
16 it could potentially tie our hands on how we want to do things.
17 However, I think it's very important that data flow and those
18 issues that are raised are addressed and I guess my question is
19 where can we address those issues? If not in this document,
20 where would that be appropriate?

21
22 **MS. LEVY:** I think it can be addressed in the document. If you
23 recall when we had the dealer reporting amendment where we went
24 to electronic reporting, it wasn't a decision point. It wasn't
25 a how do you want the data to flow? It was weekly requirements
26 and this is what's going to be used and there was a description
27 about how the data flows at that time, because that's what was
28 going to happen. You would include it, but it just wouldn't be
29 a decision point as to we want it to specifically flow in this
30 way for all time.

31
32 **MR. DONALDSON:** Then I think that that's how Action 3 needs to
33 be presented, as a discussion and this is how we would like to
34 see it, but not necessarily as action points.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Good point. Dr. Froeschke, any comment to
37 that?

38
39 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Sure. I think that the idea is when -- The flow
40 and things perhaps the reason that you created the technical
41 subcommittee in the beginning, is to hash out that stuff and
42 provide guidance, which was done without obligating yourself
43 forever in a regulatory thing, which seems now to have been a
44 good way to go.

45
46 If we provided the discussion and rationale in Action 3, I am
47 not certain what the actions would be or alternatives at this
48 point. If it was just rationale, if that was just something

1 that we would cover and the flow and the reporting is part of
2 the rationale that we always do or if there is some actual
3 management alternatives that we would be thinking about in terms
4 of timing or something.

5
6 **DR. PONWITH:** I have a suggestion and that is rather than
7 getting down into the weeds about the design of this
8 interworking of where the data go and in what chain, I think it
9 would be a really valuable piece of input to that technical
10 subcommittee -- These were the people named by the councils and
11 by the states and by the FIN folks and by the fed to look at how
12 do we tackle this long-term.

13
14 They are really smart and capable people and my view if the best
15 gift you could give them as the council is to say what are you
16 trying to do? What do you want to be the outcome at the end of
17 the day? Is that outcome the ability to make in-season course
18 corrections if the burn rate of landings within that sector of
19 the recreational fishery changes fast enough to be able to make
20 a change to the way the fishery operates?

21
22 I mean those are the kinds of things that I think would be
23 valuable in this. What is the council trying to do and what
24 kind of reporting rate would lend itself to enabling the council
25 to do that?

26
27 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Thank you, Bonnie. John, does that finish
28 your report?

29
30 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Yes, for now. Perhaps between now and full
31 council we can hash it out in our brains a little bit and make
32 sure that we're all on the same page moving forward.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Thank you, John. Unless there is any other
35 questions to come before the committee, we have done the
36 business of the committee and the committee stands adjourned.

37
38 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m., March 30,
39 2015.)

40
41 - - -
42