

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

IP Casino & Resort

Biloxi, Mississippi

April 1, 2019

VOTING MEMBERS

- 10 Greg Stunz.....Texas
- 11 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
- 12 Susan Boggs.....Alabama
- 13 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 14 Susan Gerhart (designee for Roy Crabtree).....NMFS
- 15 Martha Guyas (designee for Jessica McCawley).....Florida
- 16 Paul Mickle (designee for Joe Spraggins).....Mississippi
- 17 John Sanchez.....Florida
- 18 Chris Schieble (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana
- 19 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

- 22 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- 23 Doug Boyd.....Texas
- 24 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- 25 Jonathan Dugas.....Louisiana
- 26 Phil Dyskow.....Florida
- 27 Lance Robinson (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
- 28 Bob Shipp.....Alabama
- 29 Lt. Mark Zanowicz.....USCG

STAFF

- 32 Assane Diagne.....Economist
- 33 Matt Freeman.....Economist
- 34 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
- 35 Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
- 36 Karen Hoak.....Administrative & Financial Assistant
- 37 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
- 38 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 39 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
- 40 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist & SEDAR Liaison
- 41 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 42 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

- 45 Ryan Bradley.....Mississippi Commercial Fishermen United, MS
- 46 Eric Brazer.....Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance
- 47 James Bruce.....MS
- 48 Nikki Burch.....MS

1 Traci Floyd.....DMR, MS
2 David Gloeckner.....NOAA
3 Tim Griner.....SAFMC
4 Neil Gryder.....Ocean Springs, MS
5 Ken Haddad.....ASA, FL
6 Jack McGovern.....NMFS

7
8
9

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Contents.....3
4
5 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes.....4
6
7 Action Guide and Next Steps.....4
8
9 SEFHIER Implementation Update.....6
10
11 Discussion of Commercial Fishing Unique Trip Identifiers.....34
12
13 Adjournment.....42
14
15 - - -
16

1 The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery
2 Management Council convened at the IP Casino & Resort, Biloxi,
3 Mississippi, Monday morning, April 1, 2019, and was called to
4 order by Chairman Greg Stunz.

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

10 **CHAIRMAN GREG STUNZ:** I would like to call together the Data
11 Collection Committee. That committee is made up of Mr. Anson,
12 the Vice Chair, Mr. Schieble, Ms. Boggs, Ms. Gerhart, Mr.
13 Donaldson, Ms. Guyas, Mr. Sanchez, Dr. Mickle, and Mr. Swindell.

14
15 Our first item of business is Adoption of the Agenda. Are there
16 any changes or modifications to the agenda? If not, I will
17 entertain a motion to accept the agenda as written. Motion by
18 Mr. Donaldson, and seconded by Ms. Guyas. Any opposition to the
19 motion? Seeing none, our agenda is approved.

20
21 Our next item of business is Approval of the Minutes. Are there
22 any modifications or changes that we need to make to the
23 minutes? Seeing none, could I have a motion to approve the
24 minutes, please? Motion by Ms. Guyas and a second by Mr.
25 Sanchez. Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the
26 minutes are approved.

27
28 Our next item of business is to go over our Action Guide and
29 Next Steps. We have a pretty light agenda today, with some
30 presentations, but I want to welcome Dr. Hollensead to her first
31 meeting, and so she's going to talk us through our action list.
32 Go ahead.

33
34 **DR. LISA HOLLENSEAD:** Thank you, Dr. Stunz. I just want to
35 orient the committee to the action guide here. If it looks like
36 it's familiar from what you saw in January, it's because it is.
37 Some of the agenda items, we weren't able to get to last time,
38 due to the partial shutdown.

39
40 Under Agenda Item IV, we'll receive a presentation from the
41 Science Center staff summarizing the challenges and potential
42 benefits of developing unique trip identifiers for commercial
43 fishing trips in the Gulf of Mexico. These unique trip
44 identifiers have been requested by stakeholders to improve the
45 timeliness and quality of commercial fishery data, and so, at
46 this time, the committee can provide guidance to staff,
47 determining if more information is needed or if this request has
48 been fulfilled at this time.

1
2 Then the next agenda item is, again, we'll be receiving a
3 presentation from the Regional Office staff dealing with the
4 SEFHIER, and so the for-hire electronic reporting requirements.

5
6 Additionally, there's some things that I just wanted to update
7 everyone. We met back in January, and you got a schedule of
8 some workshops that were being held across the Gulf states.
9 Those have now been completed, and so we have some summary
10 documents provided by council staff, one being sort of a
11 meeting-specific attendance and those sorts of things, if you
12 would like to go over those, as well as some broader summaries
13 from items that were sort of ubiquitous throughout the meetings,
14 and so what we call some sticking points and some things that
15 were sort of broadly brought up at all of those workshops.
16 Thank you, Dr. Stunz.

17
18 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Dr. Hollensead, and so we'll move
19 on, in a second here, to our next agenda item, but I just want
20 to highlight though what was brought up, and hopefully everyone
21 has had a chance to look through some of those comments and
22 things.

23
24 I mean, obviously, we're moving forward with this, and I think
25 everybody is excited to move that forward, but I think I would
26 encourage us to look heavily at a lot of those comments that
27 were made in there, because we want to make this a successful
28 program, and there is certainly going to be challenges all along
29 the way, but I want to make sure that we do this right and have
30 everybody onboard, so we can have a successful program.

31
32 That is really what I think is the next discussion we'll have
33 coming up, but anyway, and so did you say -- It was Dr.
34 Gloeckner? I have, on my older discussion, for the unique trip
35 identifiers.

36
37 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** I think that was supposed to be for a
38 representative of the Science Center, Dr. Gloeckner.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Is that you, Sue?

41
42 **MS. SUSAN GERHART:** No, it's not me. I was going to say that
43 Dr. Gloeckner I believe is on the phone, and also Dr. Travis
44 from our office will also be involved.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Just to make sure I'm clear, Dr.
47 Gloeckner, you are on the phone?
48

1 **DR. DAVID GLOECKNER:** I am here.
2
3 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Great.
4
5 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** While they are getting that presentation up,
6 could we ask that staff send us that, too? I didn't see it on
7 my email, and I didn't see it on the briefing book, and maybe
8 staff could email that out as well to the group.
9
10 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Yes, that would be great, if you all could
11 email that out while we're getting it going.
12
13 **DR. JOHN FROESCHKE:** Dave, we don't have the presentation. Can
14 you send it to us, and we'll post it up here?
15
16 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Mike, did you copy me on that?
17
18 **DR. MIKE TRAVIS:** I did not. It was sent to Bernie and Carrie
19 on the Friday before last.
20
21 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I'm out sick today, and I don't have it here
22 with me at home.
23
24 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Gloeckner, while you all are working
25 through that with staff, we might go ahead and move on to our
26 next agenda item, if that's okay with you, because our time is a
27 little short here, and then we'll come back to you in a little
28 while, and hopefully that will be sent around to everyone, if
29 that's okay with you.
30
31 **DR. GLOECKNER:** That would be fine with me.
32
33 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay, and so we'll move on to Agenda Item V,
34 the SEFHIER Implementation Update, and I guess, Sue, is that
35 going to be you then that's going to do that? Are you ready,
36 Sue? Okay. Go ahead whenever you're ready.

37 38 **SEFHIER IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE**

39
40 **MS. GERHART:** While they're getting the presentation up for that
41 one, just what I'm going to do is just update you on the
42 progress of getting the program implemented as well as the
43 rulemaking involved.
44
45 Just to remind you what was in the amendment, these various
46 requirements to declare the fishing trip before leaving port,
47 what we call a hail-out. Then to land at an approved landing
48 location, to submit logbooks prior to offloading the fish, and

1 then, also, to have a location-positioning device, either an
2 archival GPS or VMS unit, that is permanently affixed to the
3 vessel and on at all times.

4
5 We are planning for the final rule to publish in June or July.
6 As you might expect, we got quite a number of comments on the
7 proposed rule, over 150, I believe, that we got, and so we're
8 working on addressing those comments. We got a lot of very good
9 comments that made suggestions that we'll try to incorporate
10 into our implementation, and so that's taking a little bit of
11 time, and so we'll get that out as soon as we can.

12
13 One thing about the implementation is that we had planned to do
14 this in two phases, the first phase being the logbook
15 requirement and the hail-out and the second phase being the
16 location technology. Well, we found out that the hail-out
17 needed to wait until the Phase 2, and so we moved that to Phase
18 2, and the original plan was to do the logbooks starting in
19 August and then the other in October.

20
21 Based on several reasons, the shutdown that delayed us some, and
22 we talked about this at the January meeting, the red snapper
23 season being extended into August, we have determined that we
24 should move the logbook requirement to the same time as the
25 other requirements, and so we won't have this two-phase
26 implementation anymore. We're going to do it all in October, at
27 least now, and I'm not guaranteeing that we won't have any more
28 delays. Again, this implementation is very complex, and we
29 still have a lot of things to work on, but, right now, our plan
30 is, sometime in October, to make this rule effective.

31
32 We will still plan on getting the final rule out as soon as we
33 can. The sooner we get it out, the more time there will be for
34 people to be prepared, and we certainly want to give fishermen
35 plenty of time to get any equipment that they need to get
36 compliant with the regulations.

37
38 Some of the progress we've made, we have worked with a number of
39 vendors that will be able to do the software for the logbooks
40 and the hail-out. ACCSP is going to be our data warehouse, and
41 they have some software, eTRIPS and eTRIPS mobile, which is a
42 phone app that will be usable for doing this reporting, and so
43 people will be able to use a cellphone, or they can use regular
44 internet service.

45
46 We also have a program called VESL from Bluefin, and then many
47 of the VMS vendors that do the commercial program are also --
48 We're working on making sure that they will be able to apply

1 that to the recreational reporting.
2
3 We also are looking at the potential location devices. Again,
4 we have the VMS vendors that are currently in the commercial
5 system, and those go through an approval process that we have
6 through the NMFS Headquarters, and then there is also the
7 archival GPS units that were also one of the things that the
8 council wanted to allow, and we have several units undergoing
9 testing by the Science Center, and we are also working with our
10 VMS Program in Headquarters to get an approval process through
11 them, or we will do it ourselves. Either way, it's going to
12 take a little bit of time, and it takes some rulemaking to
13 actually put that approval process in the regulations.

14
15 Some of the things that you should be seeing soon, one is that
16 we have a development plan that we are in the process of
17 implementing, and we did a number of white papers, based on
18 input from a lot of our partners, both federal and state and
19 other partners, about different aspects of the development plan,
20 and so that should be ready to be put out to the public soon.
21 We are clearly continuing on that development plan now, before
22 it's been put out, but we're finalizing the actual report.

23
24 We conducted a series of outreach sessions, basically Emily
25 conducted a series of outreach sessions, and she will be talking
26 about those next, but we're going to do a second set of outreach
27 sessions, probably in September, when we get close to the time
28 when it's going to be effective and those people will need to
29 have that, and we'll focus also there more on the location
30 devices and the requirements for those and meeting some of the
31 challenges that are associated with that.

32
33 We're also putting together some very nice instruction packets
34 that we'll mail out to all the permit holders that explain what
35 they need to do and have FAQs and have directions on how to do
36 what they need to do, and, in association with that, we're going
37 to work on some instructional videos, or slide shows, that
38 people can go online and take a look at if they need some help
39 in figuring out how to do what they need to do.

40
41 Finally, we're working on putting together some specific
42 specialized outreach sessions geared towards our state partners,
43 which have concerns about how we're going to interact with their
44 data collection programs. Also, for the port samplers, who are
45 going to be actually on the docks and seeing this in action, and
46 then, of course, our law enforcement officers and how they will
47 enforce this.

48

1 There is a lot still to do, however, which is why we're looking
2 towards October. Certainly, we have to do our final rule
3 package, and we also have the Paperwork Reduction Act that we
4 have to go through that. Any time we ask anyone in the public
5 to fill out any kind of form, that all has to go through its own
6 -- It's associated with our regular rulemaking, but there are
7 extra steps to take comments on that required paperwork before
8 it can be approved through the PRA.

9
10 We have to figure out this type approval process for the
11 archival GPS units, because we haven't really done this before,
12 and this is a new thing that we're requiring, and so we have to
13 come up with that approval process sort of from scratch.

14
15 We need to still get together on the procedures to receive and
16 monitor the information coming from these archival GPS units,
17 because they aren't real-time monitoring, and they will
18 download, and we've got to get that process in place.

19
20 We also are really trying to look at how to account for
21 technical failures. You will hear from Emily that this is
22 something that came up time and again in the outreach sessions
23 that we've already had. People are really concerned about what
24 happens when they have technical failures, and so we're working
25 on that process right now.

26
27 Methods for notifying the Permits Office and OLE that people
28 have met the requirements, remember that they need to meet these
29 requirements to renew their permits, and so we have to have some
30 interaction and some connection with our data and whether we're
31 getting this logbook information when someone goes to renew
32 their permit and let the Permits Office know if they should be
33 holding that renewal or not.

34
35 We also want to look at data sharing. Again, a lot of our state
36 partners are interested in getting some of this data, and we do
37 have a requirement to preserve confidentiality of data, and so
38 we're trying to work on that and how we can do that and get
39 everyone what they need.

40
41 Finally, funding and staffing, and this takes a lot of people.
42 Right now, our staff is working on this, and they're supposed to
43 be writing amendments, and so they're taking their time trying
44 to do this implementation. We need some dedicated people to
45 work on it, and we have some contractors that are going to be
46 coming on, hopefully soon, but we are going to be short a little
47 bit on funding from our end and the Science Center end and the
48 staffing, and so we're going to do the best that we can with

1 what we've got and get this program running in a way that we can
2 get some usable data out of it, and I think that's it.

3
4 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Sue. Are there any questions for
5 Sue? There will probably be even more, Sue, too, I think, after
6 we go through the next meeting summaries and those sticking
7 points as well, but are there any questions? Martha.

8
9 **MS. MARTHA GUYAS:** This is, I guess, just about the outreach,
10 and I asked Emily this last week, and so I've gotten calls from
11 people that have -- They're looking for information about this,
12 particularly captains, and I was trying to find a place where
13 the presentation that Emily had made, if that was online
14 somewhere, and she said it's not on the Gulf Council website,
15 and can that be posted on the SERO site or something somewhere,
16 so that it's an easy -- It's an easily-digestible way for these
17 people to kind of understand what's happening, if they either
18 weren't able to attend one of those meetings, or now they've
19 thought about it a little bit more and are trying to get more
20 info.

21
22 **MS. GERHART:** Yes, and I can talk to Emily, and we can talk
23 about whether posting it on our site -- We have a webpage that
24 is dedicated to electronic technologies in general, and it's
25 really mostly about this program and the South Atlantic program
26 that is very similar, and so we have the amendment, and we have
27 the rules, and we have some information about when the outreach
28 sessions were, and we'll be posting the next set up there as
29 well, and so we're trying to keep that up-to-date. We don't
30 have a lot up there right now, because, honestly, we don't have
31 much completed, but I'm sure that I can work with Emily and get
32 that up there.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Are there other questions? Kevin.

35
36 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Sue, is a validation component still being
37 considered for this program, a dockside validation?

38
39 **MS. GERHART:** Well, we expect that there will be some
40 validation. The question is what level of validation, because
41 of the current funding for the -- We don't have additional
42 funding, let's say, for that, and so we'll have the level that
43 is possible with what we've got, but we won't, at this point, as
44 far as I know, have dedicated to that.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** A follow-up, Kevin?

47
48 **MR. ANSON:** A follow-up to that. In the past, when this was

1 initially discussed, before we really got into the meat of it
2 and the amendment and everything, the states were considered for
3 reaching out, I guess, from your perspective, to help with the
4 validation, and so it sounds like there still might be some
5 validation. Are the states no longer going to be part of that
6 process for validation and the initial stages?

7
8 **MS. GERHART:** I'm not quite sure how to answer that. I think
9 that we hope to work with our state partners with that. Right
10 now, we're not to that point yet where we're figuring that out,
11 and I know it seems very close, and we have that same concern,
12 that it's getting very close, but that's one of the things that
13 we're trying to work at, is how we're going to do that.

14
15 Keep in mind that part of the reason of having the location
16 devices onboard was to help with validation of that at least a
17 trip was taken, so we know when someone leaves the dock, and we
18 know there was a trip, and we should be getting some sort of
19 report from them.

20
21 We do have that level of validation of effort, at the very
22 least, and a way to say that we should have had a report about
23 that. As far as a compliance sort of thing and meeting at the
24 dock and going and saying did this person report what they
25 offloaded, that's a little bit down the line still.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Donaldson.

28
29 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To Kevin's point,
30 I would highly recommend utilizing the states, but it also goes
31 to my point about funding and people, and I am concerned that
32 there is not adequate resources, and this has been something
33 that the industry has been wanting, and we need to make sure
34 that, if we're going to implement it, that we do a good job at
35 it and don't put -- Don't do a less than 100 percent effort
36 towards it, and I understand that there are funding constraints,
37 and I'm sure you would prefer having a huge budget to do that,
38 but I'm concerned about doing it on a shoestring budget and the
39 implications of not doing it well and actually having --
40 Affecting the quality of the information that's being provided.

41
42 **MS. GERHART:** Well, just to remind you that, with the
43 implementation of this program, we won't be stopping the MRIP
44 data collection that's already in place. Just like the states
45 had to go through the full certification process, the side-by-
46 side for several years and get certified through MRIP, this
47 program will have to do the same thing, and so we're not -- I
48 think we discussed this at the last council meeting as well,

1 that it is a little bit down the road before we have the data
2 that we can say this is our source of data, as opposed to using
3 MRIP, or the state data, for that matter.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Sanchez and then Susan.

6
7 **MR. JOHN SANCHEZ:** Thank you.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** John, I'm sorry, but Dave had a comment to that
10 point, if you don't mind.

11
12 **MR. DONALDSON:** Just quickly. When we did the MRIP pilot, I'm
13 not sure people realized how much time and effort it takes to
14 have people on the dock to make sure that you have good
15 compliance, and the state folks can attest to the amount of
16 effort that you need to do it, and I know I'm preaching to the
17 choir, but I think it's worth mentioning that we need to make
18 sure that we're putting adequate resources towards this to make
19 sure that it's successful.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay, John.

22
23 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Thank you. Following up on the discussion, and,
24 given the Gulf support for electronic monitoring, and pretty
25 much we've heard this for years from the folks, the
26 constituency, and the South Atlantic's resistance to that, the
27 electronic component, and, of course, the cost associated with
28 boots-on-the-ground validation that is going to be far heavier
29 in the South Atlantic than in the Gulf, given the electronic
30 nature of this, is there any way to distinguish ourselves in
31 this, for budgetary purposes, from the South Atlantic, so that
32 we can proceed without that obvious -- Being mired with that
33 hardship?

34
35 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** To follow-up on that question, because that was
36 mine as well, Sue, because that three-and-a-half million number
37 that we see going around, that's an annual number, but you're
38 saying now that that's a low level of validation that would
39 occur with that?

40
41 **MS. GERHART:** I'm sorry, and I don't recall the budget details
42 offhand, and I'm not that involved in the budget part of it,
43 but, to answer John's question, that is outside of what I would
44 do, in terms of making ourselves distinguished to get the
45 funding, and I will look up the budget numbers right now.

46
47 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you. Susan.

48

1 **MS. SUSAN BOGGS:** Not to be redundant, but I think that it's
2 important, in following up with Martha and Dave's comments, but,
3 to Martha's comment about someplace on the internet where it's
4 accessible to where we're going with this, I think it's very
5 important.

6
7 I had a charter captain call me the other day panicked because
8 he wasn't reporting, and how does he do it, and I had to explain
9 that we're still in this process, but the other thing too, and I
10 participated in the SEFHIER conference last year, in July,
11 before I became a council member, and I know John was there, and
12 I think it's very important that we keep driving home this point
13 that this data collection, when it starts, is not going to
14 immediately change the decisions that are made at this table for
15 the fishery, and it's going to take time, and I keep driving
16 that point home, because I think some of these charter/headboat
17 captains are anticipating that, once this goes on the water,
18 it's going to immediately change the decisions that are made.
19 Thank you.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Susan. Are there other questions?
22 Mr. Swindell.

23
24 **MR. ED SWINDELL:** Is there any tradeoff being made between this
25 cost, and is there any cost that is ongoing now that's going to
26 be less of? I mean, do we have any tradeoff in cost to get this
27 reporting done?

28
29 **MS. GERHART:** Right now, in our office, with this
30 implementation, we're sort of doing with the current staffing,
31 and, for the contractors that we hope to take on, that's money
32 through granting programs.

33
34 To fully stand this up, particularly on the Science Center side,
35 and there is, obviously, not the Science Center person here to
36 respond to this, but it will have to be a decision, if we don't
37 have the additional funding to do this, of what would the
38 tradeoff have to be. Those decisions have not been made yet, as
39 far as I know, and I couldn't speak to them, and so hopefully
40 our Science Center representative will be here a little later,
41 and maybe you can ask them.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Ms. Bosarge.

44
45 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** Thank you, sir. I'm not on your committee,
46 and, Sue, I was wondering -- I just wanted to beat this drum one
47 more time. As far as in Mississippi, our federal guys are
48 already required to report under our system, and I just want to

1 make sure that, as we go forward, we are going to be cognizant
2 of that and try and work towards a system where those men and
3 women don't have to report twice, once to Mississippi and then
4 once to your Science Center office or wherever it goes, and so,
5 hopefully through ACCSP, or whoever you use, they can report
6 once, and the data can go to all the different partners that
7 need it, and so I just want to make sure that we're remembering
8 that.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Go ahead, Sue.

11
12 **MS. GERHART:** That's something that is really important to us.
13 We don't want to have this duplicative or triplicate reporting,
14 potentially, even with MRIP still going on amongst the
15 fishermen, and that's what we want to do.

16
17 Dr. Mickle and I do have a meeting tomorrow to talk about this
18 with his staff, about that, and there are different ways to do
19 it. There are ways to supply the data to them or for a state
20 program to be an approved system, and we just have to make sure
21 that everything matches up, and a problem with us right now is
22 our system isn't created yet, and so it's hard for us to match
23 up with what's really how many states, eight states, because
24 this is Gulf and South Atlantic, that we have to match. They
25 all have different programs, and so matching that all up is
26 really difficult.

27
28 We had a lot of input from the state people very early on about
29 how they do things, so we could get lessons learned from them,
30 which was really useful, but, right now, we have to get our
31 system set up before we can figure out how to integrate it with
32 other systems.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Leann, for pointing that out, and I
35 think, in a minute, when we hear some of the comments from these
36 meetings, that's going to be a recurring theme, and so we,
37 obviously, want to make sure we're on top of that. Dr. Mickle,
38 did you have your hand up?

39
40 **DR. MICKLE:** Yes, and thank you, Mr. Chair. Sue has reached
41 out, and we're going to meet, and Mississippi is unique. I have
42 put it on record in past meetings, and I hate to repeat myself,
43 but it's not triplicate. Actually, it's quintuplicate.

44
45 There would be five reporting systems, once SEFHIER is online,
46 and I just want to put it on the record and be very clear that
47 it's SEFHIER, Tails 'n Scales, which are both mandatory, or will
48 be both mandatory, and then there will be the Regional Headboat

1 Survey, the charter/for-hire survey, and MRIP, and so that's
2 actually five.

3
4 To burden a federal for-hire captain in the State of Mississippi
5 is definitely no one's intent, but I think we should all -- All
6 states should look forward to actually making a very efficient
7 way of doing it. I mean, I can just imagine five surveys to a
8 client going out on a boat for a for-hire captain and actually
9 seeing five data points going in for a single fish, and that
10 just -- I don't know how many times a fish gets touched before
11 it can go off with the client. This is crazy, but, anyway,
12 again, we appreciate NOAA reaching out, and I just wanted to say
13 that. Thank you.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Paul. Ms. Boggs.

16
17 **MS. BOGGS:** Sue, I don't mean to put you on the spot, and you
18 certainly don't have to answer right now, but one of my concerns
19 that keeps coming up is the budgeting for this program. Is
20 there going to be a budget for this program? Are the charter
21 boats and headboats going to be able to move forward with this?

22
23 I mean, that's a concern, because I've been hearing that since
24 July of last year, and I just -- We talked this up, and the
25 council did a great job, after ten years of the fleet coming in
26 and saying that they want this, and the council took action, and
27 we had stumbling block after stumbling block, and we're finally
28 there, and now the budget seems to be the concern, and so it's
29 very concerning to me.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Go ahead, Sue.

32
33 **MS. GERHART:** I think we were pretty upfront, during the
34 creation of this amendment, that funding might be a problem,
35 that we didn't have dedicated funding, and that's not something
36 that we particularly have control over. We are looking at
37 different places to get funding, and we have various granting
38 opportunities that we have looked for, and we're looking to do
39 more of in the future to get that money, and we're looking at
40 our current budgets and where that can fit in.

41
42 I am not the right person to ask that. I was hoping that Dr.
43 Crabtree would be here by now and be able to answer those kinds
44 of questions, because that's really more a question for him, and
45 I'm sorry that didn't happen, but we did get moved up a little
46 bit, and so hopefully maybe hold that question until he gets
47 back, and he might be able to answer that a little better than I
48 do.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Sue, and, Susan, I know a lot of us
3 around the table have that same concern, and so, when I see Dr.
4 Crabtree, I will bring that up, and maybe we can address that at
5 Full Council, obviously, since we can't do it here, because
6 that's going to be a major issue, obviously, and so is there
7 other questions?

8
9 Seeing none, I have just a couple, Sue, and, having done this
10 myself, personally, heavily involved in the whole data
11 collection realm, and I'm probably speaking for a lot of the
12 committee members as well, is that validation is certainly going
13 to be the key, and you heard that.

14
15 I mean, what I'm concerned with is we worked so hard to get this
16 in place, and everybody is onboard, and everyone wants it, and
17 we don't want to look up in five years and have a bunch of data,
18 but it's not validated, and then we can't use it for anything,
19 and I think that would certainly disenfranchise a lot of folks
20 from this whole process, and we don't want that, and so, whether
21 it's a budget issue or working with the states to validate, or
22 whatever that may be, and I think we need to work hard to do
23 that.

24
25 It's hard, at this point, for this group to do that, because,
26 you know, it's sort of out of our hands, in a way, but, at the
27 same time, we obviously want to stay on top of it, but, along
28 with that same thing, and I think we'll hear this more when
29 Emily gives her presentation, is, in addition to the budget and
30 validation, I would encourage you all to start small and get the
31 essential data elements.

32
33 What I keep hearing is that there is a lot of stuff being asked
34 and requested, and now I'm hearing times five, with Paul's
35 comment, and so that gets a lot, and we don't -- I mean, I want
36 this to start small and be successful and get a lot of buy-in
37 right out of the gate, rather than be asking for too much stuff
38 that we can slowly add in later and not getting those essential
39 data elements as well. Go ahead, Sue.

40
41 **MS. GERHART:** Just something that I wanted to add to Dr.
42 Mickle's five times is the headboats will still be reporting to
43 the Headboat Survey. They are not going to also be reporting to
44 this program. We're just adjusting the survey so they match up,
45 and so I just wanted to let you know that, and so you can go
46 back to four instead of five.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Ms. Boggs, and then we probably need to move

1 over, because I know that Emily has some essential information
2 that she wants to share with us.

3
4 **MS. BOGGS:** I apologize, and I meant to ask this earlier, but,
5 at any time, will the charter boats and headboats not be
6 required to report through the state reporting system, to
7 eliminate some of that redundancy?

8
9 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Go ahead, Sue, if you have anything.

10
11 **MS. GERHART:** Well, that's a question for the states. We don't
12 require anyone to report through the state systems. The states
13 created those programs and made their own requirements.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Paul.

16
17 **DR. MICKLE:** To answer Ms. Boggs's question, it's really -- That
18 is absolutely correct. It's up to the states now, and I will
19 speak for Mississippi and not another state, which is what I
20 should always do, but the State of Mississippi is mandatory, and
21 it would take a regulatory change to disjunct the legal
22 requirement for Tails 'n Scales reporting for the federal for-
23 hire sector, but we have reservations with that, and I've talked
24 to our staff here at DMR, and just the timeliness of the data.
25 We just don't know if we will be able to get the data from the
26 federal survey, SEFHIER, fast enough for whatever commissioners
27 are accustomed to.

28
29 Tails 'n Scales is literally by the afternoon, and it can be
30 that fast, and, for all of this, how we've really built red
31 snapper landings in our state, we would lose some resolution by
32 going to SEFHIER only, and, again, our captains really like
33 Tails 'n Scales, and they would probably be really upset if we
34 unplugged them from that system, but that is, again, just
35 Mississippi only. Thank you.

36
37 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** If we can move on, and I know we'll have some
38 more discussion in a minute, to Emily. There are some sub-
39 sections under this agenda item, and there is a presentation
40 about what happened at those meetings and then a nice sort of
41 summary of what those sticking points are, and so, Emily, are
42 you ready to go through that?

43
44 **MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN:** I certainly am. We are actually updating
45 this Tab F, Number 5(a) on the website right now, and so the
46 ones that you have are probably not the most recent versions. I
47 noticed a mistake earlier, and the ladies are working very hard
48 to fix that, but so we worked -- In conjunction with NOAA

1 Fisheries, we hosted eight workshops, and we had over 300
2 attendees at those workshops.

3
4 Now, that is significant, because it represents over a quarter
5 of the fleet that came to these meetings. It was a really neat
6 opportunity, and everybody that showed up at the meetings were
7 very eager to learn more about these requirements, and I am
8 really grateful that so many captains and so many advocacy
9 groups across the Gulf really worked to get people to these
10 meetings, so that we could have these conversations.

11
12 Just a little bit of background on how we handled these
13 meetings. We started with a presentation and gave the captains
14 the information that we knew at the time. Now, the truth is
15 that some of that was pretty sparse, and we went into it pretty
16 fully aware of the fact that some of the decisions had not been
17 made yet, and we told the anglers that, because we were at these
18 workshops, that we would be asking for their feedback and to
19 share their concerns with us, so that, as we began to implement
20 some of these regulations, we could tailor them to the anglers'
21 needs, as much as possible.

22
23 With that said, I did produce a meeting summary for each
24 individual meeting, and I will just quickly go over sort of some
25 of the general things that we heard from each location.

26
27 We started in St. Petersburg, Florida, and we had sixty-one
28 members of the public attend that meeting. We heard concerns
29 there about the security of the locations data and who would
30 have access to that information, and we also heard concerns that
31 location data would be used to close areas that were heavily
32 fished.

33
34 Fishermen wanted to know more about the equipment costs and
35 different cost recovery options, and captains wondered how to
36 handle idle permits, and so permits that were not being used,
37 and then captains objected to the collection of economic data at
38 these meetings, or at this meeting.

39
40 They also expressed concern for a growing number of illegal
41 charters. They reasoned that, as the council makes rules that
42 are harder and harder for the legal operators, that there are
43 numerous illegal operators out there that are sort of getting an
44 easier time as it gets harder for those permitted operators.

45
46 Moving to Orange Beach, Alabama, we had forty-three members of
47 the public attend, and, actually, a number of the council
48 members were there, because we held that meeting in conjunction

1 with the last council meeting, before a social. We heard
2 concern for the cost of equipment, and we heard concern over the
3 hail-out requirements, specifically when vessels needed to hail-
4 out and how the vessels would be able to modify their hail-out
5 landings notification.

6
7 Now, what we do know is that, when a vessel hails out, they will
8 be asked to give information about where and when they will be
9 landing, and captains there were worried about how specific that
10 landings time had to be, because sometimes, during charters,
11 operators will upsell a trip and end up fishing for two or four
12 more hours, or, if something happens and operators want to come
13 back early, if the seas are rough, if their clients are sick, or
14 if everybody has had enough and they're done for the day, and so
15 that was the point that was brought up at this meeting.

16
17 We also heard that captains did not want to double report if
18 they are already subject, in this case, to Snapper Check,
19 because we were in Alabama, and we heard concern for how to
20 handle equipment failures, and there was a fear of being tied to
21 the dock with clients onboard if something happened.

22
23 We also heard them express a desire for some type of power-down
24 exemption for operators that don't use their federal permits
25 year-round. It sounds like there is a number of operators in
26 Alabama that really participate in a hunting season, or don't
27 participate in the federal season unless it's red snapper
28 season, and so they were hoping for some exemption from these
29 reporting requirements when they weren't using that permit.
30 That sort of brought up the issue of an idle permit versus a
31 latent permit and whether or not, if it's still on the boat,
32 there was anything that could be done.

33
34 Moving to Destin, Florida, we had sixty-five members of the
35 public attend that meeting, and they expressed fear of what
36 would happen if they had an equipment failure and they had
37 clients on their boat. They also had the desire to be able to
38 modify their landing time, based on what they declared during
39 their hail-out.

40
41 They mentioned a resistance to providing their economic
42 information for every one of their trips. Also, the captains in
43 Destin questioned the implications the requirements would have
44 on those latent permits, and so what would happen to some of
45 those permits that are out there that are not being used.

46
47 Next, we went to Kenner, Louisiana, and we had forty members of
48 the public attend that meeting, and captains there were worried

1 about the location devices and that they wouldn't work in
2 covered slips or when their vessels were in high-and-dry.

3
4 Now, some of those devices work via satellite, and some of them
5 work via cellular network, and some of them are solar powered
6 and some of them are hard-wired, and so we tried to sort of talk
7 to them about the different options, but the captains remained
8 pretty skeptical that, in their specific docking locations and
9 areas, that having something onboard that would have a beacon
10 that would ping at all times might be a challenge for them.

11
12 We heard concern expressed for the illegal charters up in
13 Louisiana as well, and we had captains question what would
14 happen in cases of equipment failure as well, and they also
15 questioned when they needed to hail-out, and so, for example,
16 some of the captains there have their charter vessels at their
17 own camps, and they then go pick up their clients at a marina
18 somewhere, and they asked if they would have to hail out if they
19 were staying within the river, in the Mississippi River, but
20 going to somebody else's camp or not and how that would be
21 handled under our hail-out requirements.

22
23 They also expressed concern over reporting economic information
24 and if the IRS would have access to that information directly,
25 and then they questioned how long it would be before the data
26 collection was useful, and then, finally, they wondered if this
27 requirement was a precursor to some sort of IFQ management
28 program in the federal for-hire industry.

29
30 Next, we went to Biloxi, Mississippi, and I want to thank MDMR
31 for hosting that meeting in conjunction with their Charter
32 Taskforce meeting. We had a really nice showing of captains,
33 because MDMR did that due diligence for us.

34
35 We had forty-one members of the public attend that meeting, and
36 we heard concerns about the economic information being collected
37 and how it was going to be used. There was a big discussion on
38 how the program would cross over with the state's Tails 'n
39 Scales Program and whether or not they would dual report, and
40 there were a number of folks there from MDMR, and so we did have
41 a pretty robust conversation with the state agency personnel at
42 that meeting.

43
44 We also had captains question the data use and data sharing, and
45 they wondered which agencies would have access to the
46 information and how public the information would be. Captains
47 also inquired if they would be able to power down their vessel
48 if they aren't using their permits, and captains also questioned

1 which species would be included in the reporting requirements.
2 Specifically, they asked about why they would need to report
3 non-federal species and non-federal trips if this was a federal
4 requirement.

5
6 We also heard concern that this would be used to establish a
7 catch history. Captains there worried about fleet-specific
8 limits that they put on themselves and if that would reflect
9 poorly for stock assessments or for future IFQ programs and
10 establishing catch histories, and so one of the examples that we
11 were given at this meeting is the tuna fleet out of Venice,
12 Louisiana has a self-imposed limit on yellowfin tuna, and they
13 wondered if this information would feed into stock assessments
14 and established catch histories, where those guys are allowed to
15 catch more tuna than they do, but they sort of all decided,
16 since they target the same areas and the same clientele, that
17 they were going to have -- I believe it's one yellowfin per
18 boat, and they wanted to know how this was going to be
19 incorporated into both the assessments and their catch
20 histories, because they didn't want to be punished for sort of
21 trying to be conservation minded in the way that their fleet
22 handles their fishery.

23
24 Next, we moved to Galveston, Texas, and we had sixty-three
25 members of the public there. In Galveston, they questioned how
26 better for-hire data is going to help if we have no better data
27 from the private anglers.

28
29 They also addressed the potential for allowing for-hire
30 fishermen to fish in their Texas state-water seasons, because
31 there is going to be better data and tracking requirements, and
32 so they were hoping that would be sort of a fringe benefit of
33 these new requirements, and they expressed concern about how to
34 handle equipment failures, to ensure that they can still fish,
35 and they also expressed concern about, when they hail-out, how
36 to modify that landings declaration that they make during their
37 hail-out, and they heard concern about reporting their non-
38 federal trips. Captains also questioned what agencies would
39 have access to the landings data.

40
41 Next, we went to Key West, Florida, with six members of the
42 public in attendance there, and captains questioned how to
43 handle permits that are not in use on vessels that are not in
44 use, and there was also concern about how often their reports
45 would be validated, because that dockside validation process is
46 really burdensome for them.

47
48 Captains said that reporting discards would be very burdensome

1 for them as well, and they also question the need for collecting
2 economic data, and they asked which species they would have to
3 report, emphasizing that, in the south Gulf, there is such a
4 vast variety of species that it's going to make reporting
5 incredibly burdensome. They say that, sometimes, they catch
6 sixty or seventy different species of porgies and things like
7 that in one trip. Then they also expressed concern about what
8 happens when the equipment fails, and you will notice there is
9 some themes sort of coming out here.

10
11 In Fort Myers, we had thirty-eight members of the public attend,
12 and this was our final meeting, and they asked why the
13 information on discards was important, and they questioned which
14 species would have to be reported, and they wondered why and how
15 we would be able to ask for information on non-federally-managed
16 species. They expressed concern that the new reporting
17 requirements would be used to establish catch histories and that
18 it would actually encourage fishermen to inflate their catch
19 histories.

20
21 There was also concern that location information would be used
22 against them, and they wondered how it would be secured and who
23 would have access to that information, and they also worried
24 that this would degrade the value of permits and that adding all
25 of these extra requirements and potentially sussing out some of
26 those latent permits would degrade the value of permits overall.

27
28 Then, finally, they questioned how permit dealers would have to
29 handle the new reporting requirements, and so there are some
30 people that only deal in permits, and they don't actually put
31 them on their vessels, and they sort of have their warehoused in
32 a bunch of smaller vessels, and they wondered how the reporting
33 requirements would affect people that were in that situation.

34
35 That concludes the summary of what we heard at each of those
36 meetings, and we can stop now, or I can go to the sticking
37 points, whatever the committee desires.

38
39 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Emily, what I would recommend, since the
40 sticking points kind of summarize a lot of the stuff that we
41 heard here, so we can just get the full picture, before I open
42 it up for questions, and, I mean, obviously, there's a lot of
43 things here to deal with and talk about, and so why don't you go
44 ahead and get that done.

45
46 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Okay. Great. No problem. You might have
47 noticed that there were some themes that came out of the
48 different meetings that we heard, and so what we tried to do is

1 we had an internal meeting with the folks from SERO, from
2 National Marine Fisheries, and, in advance of that meeting, I
3 tried to distill some of the major points that we pulled out
4 sort of across the Gulf, and some of those reoccurring things
5 that we kept hearing, and so we're naming this the sticking
6 points, because it's kind of those issues that kept coming up
7 that, during our implementation process, as the rulemaking
8 happens, that we might want to sort of consider or address.

9
10 I will just run through those pretty quickly, and the first one
11 that we heard a lot was concern about the economic information,
12 and so it sounds to me like the captains are pretty resistant,
13 across the Gulf, to providing economic information. They have
14 said that they would rather report the information less
15 frequently, and they suggested that a mandatory survey,
16 potentially conducted on an annual basis, in conjunction with
17 permit renewal, might make some sense.

18
19 Some captains even said that they would willingly fudge this
20 information, and they suggested that, the more burdensome the
21 reporting is, and the sort of more data elements that they are
22 resistant to reporting, the less accurate the information they
23 report is going to be.

24
25 Then they were concerned about the information being available
26 to the IRS for auditing, and I mentioned that as well, and, now,
27 a little bit of history on this, and this is a South Atlantic
28 data element. The South Atlantic Council actually specifically
29 asked for this economic data to be incorporated into their
30 program, and so that's sort of the reason why that information
31 is in our program as well.

32
33 The next thing that we heard was a lot of concern across the
34 Gulf about how to handle equipment failures. You know, these
35 guys sort of wanted to differentiate themselves from the
36 commercial industry, in realizing that they have clients to
37 please, and so they were worried that, if something was going on
38 with their location tracker, or even with their reporting, if
39 there was going to be some sort of fail-safe that would still
40 allow them to go fishing. They emphasized, again and again and
41 again, that they did not want to be tied to the dock when they
42 had customers.

43
44 This is something that we wanted to bring back and just make
45 sure that there is a pretty clear process. We did have the
46 discussion, at most of these meetings, that there was potential
47 for us to find a way to deal with this, if it was sort of on a
48 case-by-case basis and it didn't happen all the time. However,

1 if it became a habitual thing, where we can tell that somebody
2 was sort of skirting the regulations and doing this over and
3 over again, that we would also be paying attention to that as
4 well.

5
6 The next thing that we heard a whole ton of was the concern
7 about changing your landings notification, and so, as I said,
8 upon hail-out, these fishermen are going to be asked to notify
9 us where they are going to land and give us a time that they are
10 going to land, and so the two concerns here are how specific
11 that landings notification is going to be, and is it going to be
12 within fifteen minutes, or is it going to be within an hour, or
13 how sort of granular that information is going to be provided,
14 and then they also wondered what they are going to do in the
15 case of modifying their landings notification, and so, if they
16 want to come in earlier, or they want to stay out late.

17
18 Unless they have a vessel monitoring system that talks to
19 satellites, they won't be able to modify their landings
20 notification in real time, in which case, if these people go
21 with a GPS archiving device and are going to be using a
22 cellphone, they're not going to be able to make any sort of
23 modification until they are within cellular service, and so they
24 wanted to make sure that the agency had considered that and
25 considered how to deal with that, so that it wasn't going to put
26 them in a punitive situation if there is a change of plans with
27 their customers.

28
29 The next thing that we heard quite a bit of was concern about
30 inactive permits and how to handle that, and so, in the
31 commercial industry, you guys might be familiar with a power-
32 down exemption, and so, if a boat is going to go into drydock
33 for a while to get some maintenance, basically a captain in the
34 commercial industry can request a power-down exemption, which
35 means our VMS unit doesn't have to be working, and you don't
36 really pay attention to that boat, because it is in power down,
37 which means it's not going to leave the dock.

38
39 Now, there might be a couple of different types of scenarios in
40 the for-hire industry that they brought up, and the first one
41 being these folks who said that they don't use their federal
42 permits very much, but they keep them on their vessel, and I
43 think, in speaking with the agency, that's kind of -- If your
44 vessel is operating and it has a permit, you're still subject to
45 these requirements, but then there was two other scenarios that
46 were brought up, one of them being these inactive permits that
47 are on vessels that are inactive, potentially even on a skiff in
48 somebody's backyard, just sort of on hold for a while.

1
2 These captains were concerned that they were going to have to
3 get these devices and have these devices up and running, and
4 they obviously won't be creating trip reports, because they
5 won't be taking trips, but they were talking more about the VMS
6 or the GPS archiving and whether there would be some way that
7 maybe they could indicate that it was an inactive permit, so
8 that they wouldn't be subject to those requirements until or
9 unless that permit became active at some point.

10
11 Then the second case here is the case of permit dealers, and so
12 I already sort of went into that, and those are when the dealers
13 have numerous permits and numerous vessels that maybe they have
14 in a warehouse that they are never going to intend to use, and
15 whether or not they're going to have to equip those vessels that
16 are not going to be fishing with these devices or not.

17
18 Next, we'll move on to worrying about the implementation
19 timeline, and we did hear quite a bit about this, and we did
20 directly ask for feedback on this, and it sounds like, from
21 Sue's update earlier, that we will be moving it back, and I
22 think that's going to address a lot of the implementation
23 timeline concerns that we already heard.

24
25 Then another thing that we heard was the concern over their loss
26 of GPS or satellite signaling, due to boat storage and how they
27 store their vessels, and we have talked to a couple of vendors
28 already, and it sounds like there is going to be a pretty wide
29 variety of equipment available to them, and, some of those guys
30 who directly brought up these concerns, we have put them in
31 touch with Ken Brenner, who is running a pilot study, and he is
32 trying to equip some of those guys with different options, so
33 that maybe we can work those problems out before implementation.

34
35 Next, we heard a lot about concern over the species that would
36 be subject to reporting requirements. Now, there is sort of two
37 different arguments here, or concerns here, that are brought up.
38 One of them is folks that are concerned about having to report
39 non-federally-managed species as well as having to report those
40 non-federally-managed species on non-federal fishing trips.

41
42 I guess there's a lot of captains out there that exclusively use
43 their permits for a very small red snapper season, and sort of
44 the rest of the year might be doing more inshore trips, focusing
45 on more inshore species, and so they were really concerned about
46 having to be subject to these reporting requirements all the
47 time, even if they weren't taking federal trips.

48

1 Now, the same goes for some of those folks that are running tuna
2 trips, and exclusively tuna trips, and they are in federal
3 waters, but they aren't catching federally-managed species.
4 Well, they are HMS, but sort of Gulf Council purview federally-
5 managed species.

6
7 Then the second type of concern we heard about these species
8 requirements was the guys mostly from south Florida who were
9 concerned about the variety of fish that they were catching and
10 asking us to sort of clump, as much as we can, and so, in other
11 words, if we can sort of clump the porgies together and sort of
12 some of those less game-type species, so that it would make the
13 reporting requirements a lot easier, and so you wouldn't have to
14 differentiate between a knobbed and a jolthead porgy if those
15 aren't federally-managed species subject to any sort of stock
16 assessment.

17
18 Then, finally, we did hear a concern about the trip types that
19 would be subject to reporting requirements, and so we did make
20 it clear that, upon leaving the dock, you would have to hail-
21 out, and, basically, under that hail-out, you would have to
22 declare if you were taking a for-hire trip or not.

23
24 If you weren't taking a for-hire trip, you were good to go, and
25 you were done with your requirements for the rest of the day.
26 However, if you were taking a for-hire trip, and that included
27 federal for-hire as well as non-federal-for-hire, and those guys
28 were, again, as I mentioned, worried about having to report
29 their non-federal for-hire trip activity, and that's it.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Emily, and, before I open up the
32 floor for some comments and questions, just a couple of things.
33 Mr. Chairman, to ask -- I mean, obviously, we maybe
34 underestimated the time needed for some of this, and that was a
35 lot of information, and thank you, Emily, and I know it was hard
36 to capture, and so are we okay on time? We still need to back
37 up to that Agenda Item IV at some point as well, and so I just
38 want to make sure that we're okay, since we're already over our
39 time here.

40
41 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** No, you're all right. I believe we've got you
42 scheduled until 12:15.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Obviously, we need to save time for that trip
45 identifier discussion in a minute, but, obviously, a couple of
46 things. That's a lot of information for a program that is
47 really not even in its infancy, and it probably hasn't even been
48 born yet, and we're almost there, and we're getting there, but I

1 don't know how to deal with all of that.

2
3 I mean, to step back for a minute, this was a concern. If you
4 recall, the committee had a pretty big concern that, once we
5 passed this and it was out of hands, that it could somewhat
6 snowball, and we don't want - I mean, we still want to retain
7 control, because I also think those that are doing the reporting
8 want to have some say in the process, which is typically through
9 us, and so I don't know how we handle that.

10
11 You know, we, obviously, want to address these concerns, and
12 some may come and go, depending upon once it's implementing,
13 and, I mean, I think -- Sue, we obviously want to encourage kind
14 of a slow walking of this, with minimal things to -- We're
15 obviously not going to get it right the first time out of the
16 gate, and so I don't know what the pleasure of the committee --
17 I mean, I am sure there is some questions and things.

18
19 I don't know -- I guess my concern, leading this Data
20 Collection, is making sure that we as a council have something
21 to say in this, and so I don't know if that involves us writing
22 letters or making a motion and sending information back to the
23 Science Center or the Regional Office about what we would like
24 to see in this program and what's working and what is not. I
25 mean, that's certainly an option, and I don't want to guide the
26 committee, exactly, but I'm trying to think of, wow, this is a
27 lot of stuff, and how do we deal with this in a thirty-minute
28 meeting kind of thing.

29
30 With that positive news, maybe I will open it up for some
31 questions and see if there is a way that we can move through
32 this. Mr. Dyskow, Martha, and Susan.

33
34 **MR. PHIL DYSKOW:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is actually a
35 question for Emily. You attended a lot of these public comment
36 meetings, maybe all of them, and the comments that have been
37 addressed to me were very impassioned. There is a lot of people
38 that are either very upset or very concerned about this data
39 reporting step, and would you say that this is a universal issue
40 that we ought to take notice and be concerned about before we go
41 forward?

42
43 **MS. MUEHLSTEIN:** Across the Gulf, I guess what I could say is
44 that, each meeting, it was about 50/50. There was about half
45 the people at each meeting that were really onboard with this
46 and glad to see it moving forward, and then the other half was
47 like really unhappy with these requirements.

48

1 I also know, in your sort of special case, the south Florida
2 region -- I will just say that I am glad that I left the Naples
3 meeting until last, because we were practiced and sort of felt
4 more confident going into that meeting.

5
6 I think, in your region, we heard more dissent, and I say your
7 region, because I know that you're local there, and we heard
8 more dissent for this idea than we did in a lot of the other
9 meetings, which isn't to say that the other meetings were
10 absolved from that completely. I guess, to answer your
11 question, I would say that this doesn't have universal support,
12 but it certainly does have support.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Thank you. Martha.

15
16 **MS. GUYAS:** I have a question. Kind of, all along, we've been
17 operating under this assumption that the Gulf program is more
18 restrictive and burdensome than the Atlantic, but I just heard
19 there are certain data elements that are probably more so on the
20 South Atlantic than the Gulf, like this economic information,
21 and my question is what's the plan for handling that, because
22 the economic information is one thing that I've gotten a lot of
23 comments on from particularly the people from the Fort Myers
24 area. I think maybe Key West people too, but that's a whole
25 other animal as well, but -- Do you guys have a plan yet?

26
27 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Sue, let me add to that, because that was a
28 sort of a concern of the committee early on, as we were going
29 through the approval process for this, of what Martha brings up,
30 and then, also, adding in a whole bunch of stuff right at the
31 beginning, and the same economics thing keeps coming up, that's
32 there's a lot of other things that -- Just to reiterate my point
33 that we don't want to disenfranchise those right out of the gate
34 and maybe start this slow and see what we're up against and
35 what's working and what is not and then begin to add in those
36 other data elements, which are useful, but many would probably
37 consider not absolutely necessary, and so I think that might
38 help some of the concerns that Emily is obviously feeling the
39 heat on from some of the folks.

40
41 **MS. GERHART:** Just to clarify, in relationship to these economic
42 questions, there are three. There are three questions about
43 economics, and I think they're on fuel price, passenger or fees
44 charged, and I can't remember what the third one was. Those
45 three questions did come from the South Atlantic. When they did
46 their amendment, they were specific about which data elements
47 they wanted included.

1 This council was not specific, and we have, in the amendment, in
2 an appendix, a table of recommended data elements, which
3 includes economic questions that were presented by a technical
4 committee that reviewed all of this, and, if we look at the
5 purpose and need for the amendment from the Gulf Council, it
6 does say the purpose is to improve accuracy and timeliness of
7 landings, discards, effort, and socioeconomic data, and so that
8 was in there that you wanted to collect socioeconomic data.

9
10 We used the three questions from the South Atlantic to get that
11 socioeconomic data, and so we aren't including it just because
12 the South Atlantic has it, but it does allow us to be consistent
13 with what they have, because recall that they also said that, if
14 you had both permits, they would only have to report to the Gulf
15 side, but they, of course, want that same information from their
16 fishermen, and so this allows us to be consistent and be less
17 confusing for the fishermen that have both of those permits, and
18 so that's kind of how that came about and where that was.

19
20 Of course, the purpose, why it got into the purpose and need, is
21 that we really need some better economic data to do analysis in
22 our own amendments that affect this industry, and we can also
23 use them in other ways, like for when disasters occur, like
24 hurricane disasters, for us to get the economic information to
25 support that kind of funding, that disaster relief funding, as
26 well, and so we have reasons for putting these three questions
27 in there.

28
29 We have heard that they feel that they are too much, and we were
30 very careful about, when we put these data elements together, to
31 not get so excessive that it would be too much for people to be
32 able to do and not get the buy-in that you're talking about, and
33 so we worked at that, but, if the council feels strongly about
34 that, then they can certainly make that recommendation to us in
35 some way.

36
37 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Yes, and that's really what I'm getting at,
38 Susan, whether it's economics or whatever. Certainly, as a
39 scientist, we always want more and more data, but what we've
40 discovered, in going through this, is that there's a fine line
41 between what people are really willing to report until finally
42 they say, okay, this just isn't working, and so I don't know
43 what is the best way to communicate with your group of what
44 we're hearing at the council and make sure this is an effective
45 program, and is that just through motions and letters, and I
46 don't know if the other committee members want to chime in. Go
47 ahead, Mara.

48

1 **MS. MARA LEVY:** I would just say that the agency is getting very
2 similar feedback in response to the comments on the proposed
3 rule and the notice of availability for the amendment, and so
4 it's not that the agency isn't getting the feedback. I mean, I
5 don't think you need to communicate that. I guess if, as a
6 council, you decide you want to say that you have a preference
7 for X, Y, and Z, you could write a letter.

8
9 I mean, if you want to -- I would discourage this, but, I mean,
10 if you wanted to be so specific as to state what the data
11 elements need to be, then you have to do some sort of amendment,
12 right, because we have an amendment that says this is the type
13 of information we want, and it talks about socioeconomic stuff,
14 and the council didn't specify data elements, which I think is
15 probably a good idea. I think, when you get too restrictive,
16 like the South Atlantic did, then you potentially run into
17 problems. Right now, the way it's set up, some of that
18 discretion is left to the agency, and Sue gave the reasons why
19 that's included.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Susan, I know your hand was up, but, I guess to
22 this point, and maybe something for us to think about is -- I
23 mean, obviously, we're not going to solve this here today, but
24 this is something we probably can't really sit on for too long,
25 as this thing is being developed, and so, if the committee
26 members have some ideas for what they would like to see or what
27 we need to do to alleviate some of these concerns, let's sort of
28 come up with a plan on what's the best way to do that. While
29 we're thinking about that, because we will need to move on here
30 in just a minute, Susan, go ahead, and I know you had your hand
31 up.

32
33 **MS. BOGGS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Since we're talking about the
34 data reporting elements, and I pulled up the amendment, and, of
35 course, we do this every day, because we own two headboats, but
36 there are only seventeen questions, and then, Sue, it's number
37 of paying passengers, fuel used, the gallons, and the price per
38 gallon. I mean, it's nothing difficult, and I sit there, and I
39 watch my husband, who has no computer skills, and he can fill
40 this out, with thirty-seven passengers on the boat, in five or
41 ten minutes.

42
43 It's not that burdensome, and I don't understand why everybody
44 is so disgruntled about these few socioeconomic questions. It's
45 not that invasive, in my mind. I mean, it's not asking how much
46 did they pay for the trip, but it's just asking who did you
47 have, and the only dollar amount on there is price per gallon.

1 Now, I don't know that this is the same data reporting elements
2 that are going to be used for the charter/for-hire -- What
3 you're developing, because it's kind of confusing, because
4 you've already got the headboats, and so I'm not going to keep
5 on that, but you all were discussing it, and so I just don't
6 understand the issue.

7
8 I could go through these one-by-one, Mr. Chair, and I know we
9 don't have the time, and so I don't know how we address it
10 either. Do we -- Because there are some concerns here, and I
11 have a lot of thoughts, but it's not going to happen in the next
12 fifteen or twenty minutes, and so I am looking for guidance on
13 how we can address these. Do we do it individually, or do we do
14 it as a council? I mean, how do we do it?

15
16 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Right, and I don't know, and we don't even have
17 fifteen minutes. We have like five minutes, and so, at some
18 point, we just have to roll out a program to see what's working,
19 and knowing full well that we're going into sort of the unknown
20 here, and we're going to have to fix things, and part of this is
21 there is a lot of concerns about a program that really isn't in
22 place, and so they don't really even know what to expect, in
23 terms of questions and things, and so I don't have a solution,
24 and, obviously, I am thinking now, Mr. Chairman, and, when you
25 meet with Tom, to give us a little more time at the next meeting
26 and maybe develop this more, and we can think about it between
27 now and then, of ways to solve this, but, while we're doing
28 that, Leann, I know you had your hand up, if you had a comment.

29
30 **MR. DIAZ:** Also, at Full Council, if people come up with some
31 things that they want to make for suggestions, when we go over
32 Data Collection at Full Council, it would be a good idea if
33 folks have some pre-prepared suggestions.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Yes, that would be great.

36
37 **MR. DIAZ:** Thank you.

38
39 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Dale.

40
41 **MS. BOSARGE:** I just wanted to highlight two other things that I
42 think we need to pay attention to, and there was one line in
43 Emily's sticking points document, and it says that the
44 granularity of anticipated return time will need to be somewhat
45 liberal, and captains will need a way to return outside of their
46 anticipated window without penalty, and I think that is
47 important, to have some sort of flexibility.

48

1 That is something that I don't think is unique just to the for-
2 hire industry, and I know we've had those same types of requests
3 from the commercial industry, with their VMS hail-in and hail-
4 out, and so, if we could really focus on that and find a way for
5 those times when you need to get in, when the weather is bad,
6 that you don't have to wait until your three-hour window and hit
7 the dock exactly at the time when you said you were going to.
8 That's important.

9
10 Then the other thing, real quick, Mr. Chairman, is I heard Emily
11 say that I think about a quarter to a third of the fleet showed
12 up at these meetings, and that was a really great opportunity to
13 get good feedback, and one thing that I heard her bring up that
14 was mentioned, I think in three of the five states, were these
15 illegal charters in federal waters.

16
17 I think maybe we need to hone-in on that and take that feedback,
18 since we did get so much input from such a good portion of the
19 fleet, and maybe Mr. Boyd could highlight that in his next LETC
20 meeting that he attends, and see if they have some feedback, or
21 raise that concern to NOAA OLE, that this is an issue that's
22 being voiced by our fishermen.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thanks, Leann. Yes, and that's obviously a
25 little beyond the Data Collection Committee as well, but not
26 that it's not important, but we need to take that up with them.
27 Mara.

28
29 **MS. LEVY:** Just a note on the hail-out, and so, right now, the
30 way the rule is written, if the vessel is operating as a charter
31 vessel or headboat during the trip, they have to report the
32 expected trip completion time, date, and landing location.

33
34 There is nothing that says you have to have a window, and so
35 there is nothing that is currently in the regs that says you
36 have to land within a certain amount of time of what your
37 expected return time is, and so that may be an issue with
38 respect to enforcement or meeting people at the dock, if they
39 have to change their time, but, in terms of a regulatory
40 requirement, there is no penalty right now, the way it's
41 written, if they come in early or late, and so I just wanted to
42 make sure that that was clear, that it has implications for
43 maybe the validation or the enforcement, and so maybe we would
44 want to write something in there to address that, but, right
45 now, there is no enforcement penalty type of implication from
46 that. It's not written like the commercial regs right now, is
47 what I'm saying.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Carrie, was it to that point, because Mr.
2 Schieble has had his hand up for a while. Chris, did you --

3
4 **MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE:** Mine is just a thirty-second housekeeping
5 comment. In the minutes from the Biloxi workshop, it discussed
6 the catch history reporting from our Venice fleet, and it
7 discussed how there was one yellowfin tuna per vessel, and
8 that's not accurate. The self-imposed limit is -- Basically,
9 they are imposing two yellowfin tuna per person, and not per
10 vessel, and so it would be a maximum of twelve for a six-pack
11 fleet, instead of the allowable eighteen, and so there is a
12 concession there, but it's not one per boat.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Thank you for clearing that up. Dr.
15 Simmons, did you have a comment?

16
17 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I
18 was just going to say that, regarding the illegal charters, that
19 was brought before the Law Enforcement Technical Committee, and
20 you will have a small report on that, I believe on Wednesday,
21 regarding the comments on that, and so that has been brought to
22 their attention.

23
24 My other suggestion would be -- I don't think the committee can
25 solve these issues, and I think maybe we need to get the SEFHIER
26 group back together, or you can direct us to figure out how to
27 work with the Regional Office on trying to come up with various
28 methods for solving these issues and bringing them back to you
29 at a later date.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Right, and that's exactly it. I think that's
32 what we need to do and why we're talking about populating these
33 advisory panels and things and getting the right people that can
34 solve some of these kinds of things. Anyway, we're probably
35 going to need to move on a little bit here, and so what I'm
36 trying to figure out -- Dr. Hollensead.

37
38 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Dr. Simmons, in a flurry of emails and other
39 things, if you're amenable, it's just possible to just move
40 forward with Dr. Gloeckner's presentation for today. Dr. Travis
41 has said that he can move his presentation to the Shrimp
42 Committee, that he would be fine doing that, just to save a
43 little time, if you're amenable to that.

44
45 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That works for me, if Mr. Chairman is fine with
46 that, and he is saying yes. Okay. Then we'll go ahead and plan
47 for that, but clarify that for me, real quick, exactly which --

48

1 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Yes, sir, and so that would be the presentation
2 that we could have just now, if you're amenable, would be Tab F,
3 Number 4(b), Dr. Gloeckner's presentation, and then Tab F,
4 Number 4(a), Dr. Travis's presentation, would be held during the
5 Shrimp Committee.

6
7 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Thanks. Just so we're clear, and so
8 we'll move on with 4(b) here in just a minute then, and so just,
9 as we're kind of wrapping up this discussion of -- We obviously
10 need to continue it quite a bit, and I think that the document
11 that was put together, and I'm trying to get the name of it, but
12 the sticking points document that Emily and Sue had kind of put
13 together, really captures some of those comments pretty well and
14 is a good starting point for some of the things that we might
15 need to solve or potentially want to look at, and then, as we go
16 through that, Carrie, maybe we can talk about what we need to
17 do, or at least you and I can talk offline here, since we're
18 getting close, and then I can report back at Full Council, as
19 far as maybe what could be a plan for getting the right people
20 back in the room to begin to solve some of these, because I feel
21 like it's a little bit out of our hands to try to do this in
22 just a short period of time in a council meeting, and it needs
23 some thorough discussing and vetting and that sort of thing, and
24 so I am kind of speaking on behalf of the committee here, but,
25 if that's okay with you all, or not, let me know.

26
27 Otherwise, we'll proceed. Does that sound okay to everyone? I
28 am seeing some nodding heads, and so then -- Anyway, is there
29 any other last-minute questions before we move back to that
30 former agenda item? Okay. Seeing none, obviously a lot more
31 work to do there, and we'll go back to Item Number IV, which we
32 will move the F-4(a) to the Shrimp Committee, but we'll hear
33 about F-4(b) from Dr. Gloeckner now regarding some of the unique
34 trip identifiers, and so it looks like we've got that
35 presentation loaded, and so, Dr. Gloeckner, are you there?

36
37 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Yes, I'm here.

38
39 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Good. We have you and the presentation
40 now, and we're good. Whenever you're ready, if you want to go
41 ahead and start.

42
43 **DISCUSSION OF COMMERCIAL FISHING UNIQUE TRIP IDENTIFIERS**

44
45 **DR. GLOECKNER:** This is Dave Gloeckner, and I'm the Acting
46 Director of the Fisheries Statistics Division at the Center, and
47 Andy had just sent me an email asking me for a presentation on
48 the unique trip ID, without much context, and so I guess we can

1 move on to the next slide.
2
3 Basically, the current state of our data collection systems are
4 multiple data collection systems run by different agencies,
5 collecting similar information, and the data must be united,
6 after being submitted to different programs, so that we can do a
7 little bit of quality control. It's difficult to unite the
8 systems, because of slight differences in the systems, and this
9 is why multiple systems collect the same information, and so
10 logbooks, trip tickets, observers, dockside samplers, and we're
11 all getting very similar information. It's just similar though,
12 and it's not quite exactly the same.
13
14 Why the difficulty uniting? Landing day versus purchase day,
15 different agencies have different requirements, as far as what
16 day they are reporting. You may have split trips, where a
17 single logbook trip may have fish that go to two or more
18 dealers, and you may also have combined trips, where multiple
19 logbook trips end up combined in a sale to a dealer on one trip
20 ticket, and you could also have errors in the vessel number or
21 differences in the owner information, and so Robert versus Bob,
22 and it can be as simple as that. A single system start point
23 for all trips, we don't have that, and this all makes matching
24 of trips difficult.
25
26 Possible solutions are we could report the trip ticket number on
27 the logbooks, and we could do mandatory reporting of trip ticket
28 on the IFQ landing form. We could report the logbook number on
29 the trip ticket and report the logbook number on the IFQ form.
30 We could give the trip ticket number to the port sampler or give
31 the logbook number to the observer.
32
33 We have tried many of these, and this relies on the fishermen or
34 dealer to pass on the information after the trip ends, without
35 error, and so there is a point of failure there, and so no
36 validation of logbook or trip ticket number entered by other
37 programs, and so there is another failure, an opportunity to
38 have a bad number.
39
40 Data integration, this is something we've been talking about a
41 lot on the east coast, and it's a unique trip ID shared across
42 all the programs, without error, and electronic data collection
43 allows automatic sharing with the trip ID between the programs,
44 and so, like I said, without transcription error.
45
46 The ID is created at the beginning of a trip and is shared with
47 other programs as entered. It is created by the first data
48 collection system that intercepts that trip, and so this is

1 transparent to the user. They don't see any of this back-end
2 sharing going on, and it eliminates reliance on the fishermen or
3 the dealer to pass on the correct identifier. The data streams
4 are integrated upon entry, instead of attempting to do that at
5 the end of the trip. Right now, sometimes that is months later,
6 or years later.

7
8 The components we're working with on the east coast is the
9 Universal Trip ID, and so this serves to integrate each fishery-
10 dependent data collection stream, and, like I said, it's
11 transparent to the user. They don't see any of this going on.
12 The Trip Management System is what we have designed as the hub
13 for that integrated reporting system, and it creates the trip ID
14 and facilitates the exchange of that trip ID among all the
15 programs. It's a logical program, and it triggers database
16 activity to each fishery-dependent data stream. This is
17 transparent to the user as well.

18
19 You have got this trip management system, which operates as the
20 hub, and it shares data with VMS, IFQ, logbooks, trip tickets,
21 observer reports, and the TIP interview program, and so multiple
22 programs will have the same identifier, and you can unite all
23 the information from one trip across all of those data
24 collection programs, or at least that's the goal.

25
26 The benefits, if we do something like this, we can reduce the
27 duplicative reporting if the information from multiple programs
28 can be reliably integrated. We will no longer have to collect
29 similar information across multiple programs, and so, for
30 example, we can get the effort data from the logbooks and the
31 dealers and discards from observers and then size composition
32 from dock-side samples.

33
34 We would get the complete trip information by integrating,
35 instead of each program, reducing the reporting burden, and so
36 we can cut down our reporting burden, they won't have to fill
37 out similar information four or five times, and it is reliably
38 integrated. Does anybody have any questions about what they are
39 doing on the Atlantic coast with their data integration?

40
41 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Dr. Gloeckner. Is there any
42 questions? Leann, you look like you want to raise your hand.
43 Leann, go ahead.

44
45 **MS. BOSARGE:** Thanks, and so this came -- This presentation
46 originally stemmed from two things. One, there was a motion
47 passed by I think it was the IFQ AP that asked us to please look
48 into a unique trip identifier, and then this has been brought up

1 at least one CCC meeting that I attended, and possibly more,
2 from other councils, where this is an issue from them, that they
3 have been requesting to get a unique trip identifier implemented
4 as well.

5
6 It sounds like it's a win-win, but I'm sure that there is an
7 issue somewhere that I am just not educated enough to understand
8 within the data warehousing and how all of that transpires, but
9 I think, at a minimum, I would definitely like for this
10 information to somehow feed back to that IFQ AP that originally
11 requested this, and I don't know if they're going to meet again,
12 but I would really like to get their feedback on this. If
13 they're not going to meet again, maybe we can get some feedback
14 at public testimony, but I think this is something that we need
15 to look into and try and pursue, if it's worthwhile.

16
17 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thanks, Leann, and they're obviously asking for
18 that, and we brought up that -- There were some challenges too,
19 last time, and I don't exactly recall what those were to doing
20 that, but, Carrie, do you know what the timeline would be to
21 take that back to them, offhand? If you don't know right
22 offhand, we can deal with that at Full Council, too.

23
24 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** I would have to get with Dr.
25 Lasseter on that, because we just had a meeting in November, I
26 believe, and so probably not for a couple more months. I think
27 we need to make a little bit more progress on the document, but
28 we can talk about it during Reef Fish.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thanks, and so I am not -- Kevin, go ahead.

31
32 **MR. ANSON:** I guess I am curious. I mean, Dave, Dr. Gloeckner,
33 kind of provided the fifteen-thousand-foot level and some of the
34 benefits and everything, and, I mean, this has been discussed
35 for some time at the FIN, in trying to do this, and there are --
36 You mentioned, in this first slide or two, that there have been
37 issues in trying to do this and implement it fully amongst all
38 the programs, and I am speaking specific to the state trip
39 ticket programs.

40
41 I didn't see anything on here as to the path forward or the way
42 that that's going to be carried out, and so I was just wondering
43 if either Dr. Gloeckner, or Dave has got his hand up, can kind
44 of answer that, as to what the process will be, and try to
45 actually roll this out and do it.

46
47 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Donaldson, go ahead.

48

1 **MR. DONALDSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are some issues
2 with doing it. The system has been in place. Through GulfFIN,
3 we have developed something. The problem is getting the
4 appropriate data on a timely enough basis to be able to
5 implement it.

6
7 I think Dr. Travis's presentation under the Shrimp Committee is
8 going to kind of address some of those roadblocks, and hopefully
9 from that we can carve a path forward from that, and so Kevin is
10 right that this is just kind of a high-level, but I think Mike
11 is going to get into the issues, and so maybe we just postpone
12 discussion until we hear those issues under the Shrimp
13 Committee.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That's good, and thanks, Dave, and so we can
16 hold off until then, so we can see what is happening there. Dr.
17 Gloeckner, I don't know if you heard that discussion, but the
18 question was essentially about how to build in some of the state
19 plans with these trip ticket plans as well, and so I don't know
20 if you have any more comments to that or we just wait until the
21 presentation during the Shrimp Committee, but, if you've got
22 something to add, please go ahead, while we've got you on the
23 phone.

24
25 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Sure, and so this started out within NMFS, and
26 we've been talking about integrated reporting probably for the
27 last ten years. The Trip Management System is something that
28 was started in the Northeast Region, and the Northeast actually
29 has control over their dealer reporting and their logbook
30 reporting, the observer program and the dockside sampling.

31
32 In the Southeast, we have passed on the dealer reporting
33 primarily to the states, and so not all of the states have
34 everybody reporting electronically, and so that leaves all the
35 shrimp dealers not having to report electronically, and so there
36 is kind of a flaw right there, and so I think the Southeast
37 version of this is going to take a lot more effort to try to
38 pass some coordination between the federal agency and the
39 states.

40
41 Just going through the implementation of the dealer electronic
42 reporting down here presented a lot of hurdles that we had to
43 get through, and I don't think we're through all of them, and so
44 I could see this taking quite a while, whereas, on the east
45 coast and the Northeast, the federal agency has much more
46 control, and so they can do pretty much what they want to with
47 their data collection.

1 If they want to make it electronic and specify the rules, they
2 can do that, but, if we've got a desire to have the total trip,
3 and so federal and state species reported, and that's usually
4 how the Northeast works, is all species, we may take a little
5 longer to get to that point, and so I think it's just going to
6 be -- Like Dave said, it's going to be a lot of work between the
7 feds and the states.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Well, thank you, and so I think the
10 Shrimp Committee is where we'll hear the other presentation, and
11 that will be Wednesday morning, and so that should give us a
12 little more clarity, and we can have some discussion about it
13 then, but Ms. Bosarge had her hand up. Go ahead.

14
15 **MS. BOSARGE:** Thank you, and it's just a quick question for Dr.
16 Gloeckner. I am wondering how difficult or how much easier it
17 may be if you discount the shrimp fleet at the moment, and I
18 want to say that because we don't report electronically, and we
19 have a yearly stock assessment, and we're not under quota
20 management, and so, if you look at this actually for the
21 commercial fisheries that are the finfish fisheries, does it
22 become somewhat more streamlined and actually doable?

23
24 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Possibly. At least we would have electronic
25 reporting dealers if we just concentrate on the federal guys
26 that have --, and so it could streamline it a little bit, but we
27 actually don't control, necessarily, the dealer trip ticket
28 program that's used in each state, and so there may be a little
29 bit of transfer of data that goes back and forth between the
30 states and the feds, like Bluefin Data, and we may have to work
31 that out, and that may take a lot of effort to try to get
32 feedback from every state and buy-in from every state.

33
34 Given past interactions with Gulf States and Bluefin Data, it
35 may take some time to get the federal requirements in place, and
36 so it may speed it up a little bit. It may buy us a little bit
37 of time, but I don't think it's going to be anything like the
38 Northeast, where we just mandate what we want and make it so.
39 It's going to be a lot of work with the Gulf Commission and
40 Bluefin Data and each state.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Dr. Gloeckner, and we'll continue
43 that discussion, it sounds like, on Wednesday. In a minute
44 here, that's going to bring us to Other Business, but, before we
45 go there, Carrie, I want to back up just really quickly, and
46 just so I have clarity and for our report that will come from
47 this committee regarding our discussion about getting the --
48 What you are recommending is getting our technical committee

1 together to talk about some of these sticking point documents
2 that we have and solutions to solve that. After we left that
3 discussion, I wasn't real clear, myself, what -- Go ahead.

4
5 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Well, I guess I'm not sure if it's
6 the technical committee, or we could just maybe get the SEFHIER
7 group, again, working together, and we could have Emily go back
8 over there and review some of the options, and I'm not sure
9 which group we need to convene again, and Sue is looking at me,
10 and maybe she knows the answer, but the appropriate people to
11 try to come up with some solutions for this, so that we can
12 bring them to you look at, a proposal of ways that we might
13 address some of these concerns, before we go back out to the
14 public with this.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. That seems fine, and, the committee,
17 looking around the room, is there any problems with that? Mara,
18 I see your hand up, but I'm just making sure the committee is
19 good with that. Okay. Go ahead.

20
21 **MS. LEVY:** Well, so the amendment -- You all submitted the
22 amendment for approval to the Secretary of Commerce, and it's
23 been approved, and the agency is implementing the amendment with
24 the rulemaking, and so, I mean, I think most of the
25 responsibility for addressing these issues that are coming up is
26 with NMFS, right?

27
28 I mean, they are getting the comments, and they are looking at
29 whether or not something can happen in the final rule to address
30 it, whether it's necessary for it to happen in the final rule,
31 and some of these comments just come from a misperception of
32 what is required, right, and some of them come from the idea
33 that they don't like reporting all species and such, and that's
34 a requirement of the amendment.

35
36 If the idea is that you want to go back and look at what you
37 have already submitted and has been approved and you want to
38 tweak it, okay, except we haven't even implemented what you
39 submitted yet, and so I don't know how -- I guess what I'm
40 saying is you can get together whatever group you want to look
41 at it, but, in terms of getting a group together and submitting
42 recommendations, NMFS is going through the rulemaking process,
43 and they are at least trying to potentially get a final rule out
44 this summer, and so it's not -- I guess what I am trying to say
45 is I'm not sure how a technical committee is going to sort of
46 help guide what NMFS needs to do in the final rulemaking, is
47 what I'm getting at.

1 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Well, yes, and I understand that, Mara, but
2 that was a big concern of the committee as well as the council,
3 because we didn't want to get down in the weeds under designing
4 every little bitty thing with this program, but, at the same
5 time, we wanted to maintain some type of connection with the
6 groups that are actually entering this data and that it didn't
7 turn into a program that none of us were envisioning, and I
8 think that's why you see some of the concern around the table,
9 and also some of the heat that we're getting from the people,
10 saying, wait a minute, we need to think about that.

11
12 I'm not saying that we micromanage this thing to death, but I
13 think having that committee together, or whatever we're calling
14 it, Carrie, the right group of people, will help guide this, so
15 that it doesn't blow up into a program that no one is expecting,
16 especially out of the gate, and then we have this whole problem
17 of we have a program in place that nobody wants, and it's not
18 validated, and it may or may not be useful, if we can't get
19 certain things in place that are needed and that sort of thing,
20 and so there is just a lot at stake here, and I think that's why
21 you're hearing that, and that was a big concern of the council,
22 is that we didn't want to -- We wanted to make sure that we
23 maintained some oversight over the program.

24
25 **MS. LEVY:** I don't want to belabor it, and I'm not saying that
26 the council shouldn't have oversight, but what I'm saying is the
27 program hasn't been implemented yet. It's like it's -- To me,
28 it's a little bit premature.

29
30 I mean, if you have ideas, or you want NMFS to sort of give you
31 their ideas about how they're planning to address some of these
32 things, or how they're thinking about addressing them, that's
33 one thing. If you have ideas that you want to share with the
34 agency about potential solutions, as long as it can be
35 implemented in a way that's consistent with the law and the plan
36 that's already been approved, that's another thing.

37
38 If you want to change things that are already in the plan, then
39 that's another thing, and so I guess I'm just asking you to kind
40 of think about at what stage and what you're really looking at
41 doing when you're thinking about getting these groups together
42 and giving advice and all of that.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay, and I think most of the concerns, or at
45 least my quick interpretation of what I'm hearing from Emily, is
46 that these were captured within the plan, and we're not saying
47 to do something new or something really different, but we just
48 want to make sure it's the program that all of us around this

1 table and others had agreed to as we started implementing that
2 thing, and so, obviously, we've got a lot more discussion to
3 deal with and things to work through on this, but we're out of
4 time here for this committee, Mr. Chairman, and that quickly
5 brings us to Other Business. Is there any other business that
6 needs to come before the committee? Seeing none, Mr. Chairman,
7 I will turn it back over to you.

8

9 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on April 1, 2019.)

10

11

- - -