

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2  
3 DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

4  
5 Hyatt Regency Birmingham Birmingham, Alabama

6  
7 APRIL 3, 2017

8  
9 **VOTING MEMBERS**

- 10 Greg Stunz.....Texas
- 11 Kevin Anson (designee for Chris Blankenship).....Alabama
- 12 Roy Crabtree.....NMFS, SERO, St. Petersburg, Florida
- 13 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 14 John Greene.....Alabama
- 15 Kelly Lucas (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
- 16 Lance Robinson (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
- 17 John Sanchez.....Florida
- 18 David Walker.....Alabama

19  
20 **NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

- 21 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- 22 Doug Boyd.....Texas
- 23 LCDR Leo Danaher.....USCG
- 24 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- 25 Tom Frazer.....Florida
- 26 Martha Guyas (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
- 27 Campo Matens.....Louisiana
- 28 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana

29  
30 **STAFF**

- 31 Steven Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
- 32 John Froeschke.....Fishery Biologist-Statistician
- 33 Douglas Gregory.....Executive Director
- 34 Karen Hoak.....Administrative & Financial Assistant
- 35 Morgan Kilgour.....Fishery Biologist
- 36 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
- 37 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 38 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
- 39 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 40 Camilla Shireman.....Administrative Assistant
- 41 Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Director

42  
43 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

- 44 J.P. Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy
- 45 Shane Cantrell.....CFA, Galveston, TX
- 46 Chris Conklin.....SAFMC
- 47 Levi Denham.....USCG
- 48 Tracy Floyd.....MDMR

1 Susan Gerhart.....NMFS  
2 Ken Haddad.....ASA, FL  
3 Chad Hanson.....Pew  
4 Alison Johnson.....Oceana  
5 Bill Kelly.....FKCFA  
6 Vivian Matter.....SEFSC  
7 Amanda Nimbish.....CLS America  
8 Bart Niquet.....Panama City, FL  
9 Kirk Patterson.....CCA  
10 Rusty Pittman.....MDMR  
11 Clay Porch.....SEFSC  
12 Bob Zales, II.....Panama City, FL

13  
14  
15

- - -

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 SEFSC Presentation on Recreational Data Procedures.....5  
10  
11 Discussion of MRIP PSE Methods and Protocols.....12  
12  
13 Other Business.....18  
14     SAFMC Letter.....18  
15  
16 Adjournment.....29  
17

- - -

1 The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery  
2 Management Council convened at the Hyatt Regency Birmingham,  
3 Birmingham, Alabama, Monday morning, April 3, 2017, and was  
4 called to 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 will call together the Data Collection  
11 Committee for the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council. I  
12 want to recognize the members of the committee, and that is,  
13 obviously, me as Chair, and John Greene as Vice Chair. Absent,  
14 it looks like is Patrick Banks or Myron Fischer. Kevin Anson is  
15 here, Roy Crabtree is here, Pam Dana is absent, Dave Donaldson,  
16 Kelly Lucas, Lance Robinson, John Sanchez, and David Walker, who  
17 are all present.

18  
19 Our first item of business is Adoption of the Agenda, and so if  
20 the committee would please look at the agenda, and I will  
21 entertain a motion to approve that. I would direct your  
22 attention to Other Business. There is one item there, dealing  
23 with the South Atlantic Council, and we will discuss that when  
24 we get there. I would recommend that we also add one other item  
25 to Other Business, and that is an update from Dr. Froeschke on  
26 where we are with the amendment that was moved forward just  
27 recently, so he can kind of update the committee just briefly  
28 there. Is there any other additions or modifications to the  
29 agenda?

30  
31 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** If we have time, I attended the last South  
32 Atlantic meeting, and this is not in relation to what is already  
33 under Other Business for the South Atlantic, but they had a  
34 pretty interesting idea that relates to data collection that I  
35 would just like to just throw out there and see if we have any  
36 interest in it on our side, if we have time. If not, the next  
37 meeting is just fine.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Ms. Bosarge, I think that's fine. I think  
40 we're going to have plenty of time today. Would anyone make a  
41 motion to approve the agenda? We have a motion and a second.  
42 Any opposition? Seeing none, the motion carries.

43  
44 Our next item of business is Approval of the Minutes. If  
45 everyone has had a chance to look through the minutes, is there  
46 a motion to approve the minutes? So moved, and Mr. Greene  
47 seconds. I don't see any opposition for that motion around the  
48 table, and so the motion carries. Our next item of business is,

1 Dr. Froeschke, do you want to talk us through the action guide  
2 for our business today?

3  
4 **DR. JOHN FROESCHKE:** Sure. There are three items on there, none  
5 of which require council action or committee action. The first  
6 is going to be a presentation on recreational data procedures,  
7 and this is going to be via webinar, and I'm thinking that we're  
8 going to get that fired up here.

9  
10 Then Dr. Porch is going to lead a brief discussion on the MRIP  
11 calibration methods and protocols, converting the MRIP data to  
12 the numbers used by the Science Center. Then, again, under  
13 Other Business, this letter we received from the South Atlantic  
14 regarding a request for an exemption from the council reporting  
15 requirements for vessels fishing in the South Atlantic waters.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Dr. Froeschke. Are there any  
18 questions before we proceed into the agenda? Seeing none, we  
19 will move to Item IV, which is the Science Center Presentation  
20 on Recreational Data Procedures, and I believe this a remote  
21 presentation.

22  
23 **SEFSC PRESENTATION ON RECREATIONAL DATA PROCEDURES**

24  
25 **DR. VIVIAN MATTER:** We were asked to present this presentation,  
26 just to kind of give you an overview of the different procedures  
27 that we do here at the Science Center to prepare recreational  
28 landings for both management and for assessment purposes. The  
29 main question we received was why are the ACL monitoring  
30 different from the landings on the NOAA recreational statistics  
31 website, and so that's the MRIP website.

32  
33 There's a lot of adjustments that we go through, and these are  
34 just some of the bullet points of some of the differences. When  
35 we prepare recreational landings, we are including all the  
36 surveys available, and the MRIP website, obviously, will just  
37 have the MRIP. We include the Southeast Region Headboat Survey,  
38 data from Texas Parks and Wildlife, and currently also from the  
39 LA Creel Survey.

40  
41 We also assign landings to management jurisdictions and so  
42 sometimes the Florida Keys gets assigned to the Atlantic. On  
43 the MRIP website, the Florida Keys are always included in the  
44 Gulf. We also include some species ID corrections, for example  
45 gag and black grouper corrections. We also use different weight  
46 estimation methodologies, and I will get into the specifics of  
47 those further on in the presentation.

48

1 We also assign some species to migratory groups, for example  
2 king mackerel and Spanish mackerel, that could be not designated  
3 on that website. We use gutted weight estimates to monitor some  
4 of our species. We also assign landings to fishing year, when  
5 necessary, and so that sometimes requires a wave to be split in  
6 half.

7  
8 Finally, we use the MRIP estimates that have been converted to  
9 MRFSS estimates for monitoring, because some of the species have  
10 gone through -- The ACLs have been set on assessments that have  
11 used the original MRFSS estimates. Until those species go  
12 through an assessment again, we need to monitor using the  
13 original MRFSS estimates, and so we have to sometimes do this  
14 calculation back from MRIP to MRFSS, in order to properly  
15 monitor those.

16  
17 This is just a process flow for some of the stuff that we do  
18 here, and I'm just going to start with the MRIP up here. You  
19 can see that our charter boat estimates go through a for-hire  
20 survey calibration, and that is to take into account the change  
21 from the coastal household telephone survey to the for-hire  
22 survey, and so those are done on the historical data.

23  
24 Then the private and shore estimates, along with those adjusted  
25 charter estimates, then go through an MRIP adjustment for the  
26 ACL file. We adjust for the change in the way MRIP calculates  
27 their estimates. That is also, again, into historical data.  
28 That's not the current stuff that is coming out, and we also go  
29 through this post-stratification and domain, and so that's when  
30 I was telling you that some of the times that we need to move  
31 the Keys to the South Atlantic, or, for example, in black sea  
32 bass, we need to split North Carolina at Cape Hatteras, and so  
33 we need to go through some of these modifications of the data in  
34 order to do that. Species ID corrections that I mentioned,  
35 these are typically done following the SEDAR recommendations for  
36 those species.

37  
38 To kind of go back over here, you can see that we are getting  
39 size data from both the Texas Parks and Wildlife and the MRIP  
40 survey, and we are coming up with a size database. We apply a  
41 maximum size by species, in order to rule out any outliers or  
42 sizes that are over the maximum size.

43  
44 We take that sample data, and we put our estimates through a  
45 weight estimation procedure, and so, at that point, we are  
46 grouping those size data by a hierarchy, and I will go through a  
47 little bit more detail in the next slide, but, basically, this  
48 is where we assign our weight estimates.

1  
2 Our Texas estimates do not have any -- The estimates that come  
3 from Texas are only in number of fish. They do not provide  
4 estimates in weight, and so we do the same thing for the Texas  
5 estimates. We go through that weight estimation procedure.  
6 Finally, we are joining the -- The SRHS here is headboat survey.  
7 Those estimates get joined with those other two surveys, we  
8 assign migratory group definitions, when needed, and we apply  
9 the whole to gutted weight conversions, when needed, and that's  
10 pretty much how we get to our ACL dataset.

11  
12 Our ACL dataset is then sent to SERO, where they process the LA  
13 Creel estimates and size information. They reformat it, and  
14 they also apply fishing year designations, and that is pretty  
15 much what they then put on the SERO ACL website. I am not sure  
16 how you guys do this, if you want to stop me for questions in  
17 between, or if you wait until the end. However you guys want to  
18 do it.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** You can go ahead, and then we will wait until  
21 the end for questions.

22  
23 **DR. MATTER:** Great. Thanks. These are just some more details  
24 of some of the things I mentioned, the adjustments for  
25 historical estimates. Like I said, we have the for-hire  
26 calibration, from that change from the telephone survey to the  
27 for-hire survey of the charter captains. Again, that applies  
28 just to the charter boat mode.

29  
30 This is a methodology change that is not species-specific, based  
31 on effort, and, the MRIP adjustment from 1981 to 2004, we have  
32 the re-weighted estimation methodology change. It is species-  
33 specific. It uses the ratio estimators based on the means of  
34 the MRFSS to MRIP landings from when we had both. This followed  
35 -- We had some MRIP calibration workshops, I believe it was in  
36 2012, and we followed those procedures to adjust for the MRIP  
37 weighted estimation change.

38  
39 Our post-stratification and domain estimation, again, we use  
40 these methods to generate estimates that are a finer level than  
41 the official state estimates, and so north and south of Cape  
42 Hatteras, and we break up Florida, in order to move the Keys,  
43 when needed.

44  
45 It's only used for specific species, to properly assign the  
46 landings to the management jurisdiction, and the programs that  
47 we use for these procedures are provided by S&T, and they give  
48 us guidance as to how to use them. We have different programs

1 for the older data, 1981 to 2003, and they're called post-  
2 stratification programs. Then, from 2004, they came up with  
3 domain estimation. They are slightly different weights, just  
4 because of when they re-estimated the MRIP, but, essentially,  
5 it's a way to break up the official state estimates.

6  
7 Our weight estimation procedures, I mentioned to you that we  
8 have some times where we need to use MRFSS estimates for the  
9 current monitoring, and so this is what I call the MRFSS ACL  
10 file. This is what we use in order to get at those species that  
11 haven't gone through an assessment using the MRIP estimates.

12  
13 In this case, we use the weight estimates provided by the  
14 survey, and then, in cases where there is an estimate of fish  
15 landed in number, but not weight, we fill in the holes using the  
16 sample data that I described in the flow chart. Sample data is  
17 prepared using both MRFSS and Texas data, and we, again, clean  
18 up the sample data by applying the maximum weight and length by  
19 species. We also give it by percent buffer, and we exclude any  
20 size less than twenty-five millimeters, and so that is the MRFSS  
21 ACL file.

22  
23 Our hierarchy for the strata is, when at all possible, use the  
24 finest strata available, and it's species, region, year, state,  
25 mode, and wave. When we have to fill in that hole, we want to  
26 get it to the finest strata that we can. We have a thirty-fish  
27 minimum at each level, in order to use the average weight. If  
28 we only have twenty fish, we will knock off -- For example, the  
29 first thing to be knocked off is wave, and then we will come up  
30 with an average weight at the species, region, year, state, and  
31 mode and so forth and so on, and so we are able to get that  
32 thirty-fish average weight. That is applied to this estimate in  
33 number, and that's how we get the estimate in weight.

34  
35 Our second ACL file is the MRIP ACL file, and so these are used  
36 to monitor those species that the ACL has been set using MRIP-  
37 adjusted values. The problem we run into in this situation is  
38 we have different weight estimation methodologies from the  
39 survey for the historical data and then for the MRIP data  
40 stream, from 2004 on, and so, especially for an assessment, it's  
41 very important that we have a consistent time series of weight  
42 estimates.

43  
44 Rather than using a whole bunch of different methods and then  
45 filling in, like I just described in the previous slide, we used  
46 the Southeast Center weight estimates procedure for all the  
47 estimates from 1981 on, and so that's using that thirty-fish  
48 weight, and we try to do it at the finest strata, and then we



1 kind of tick off the strata as we go on, and this was detailed  
2 in SEDAR 32. Again, that strata hierarchy is species, region,  
3 year, state, mode, wave, and area.

4  
5 As I mentioned, the Texas Parks and Wildlife data comes in, and  
6 we have to do some modifications to it, in order to integrate it  
7 with the MRIP. Texas Parks and Wildlife data is provided by  
8 season, and so it's two seasons per year, and it overlaps the  
9 calendar years a bit, and so what we do is we use the intercept  
10 data that Texas provides, in order to break up those seasonal  
11 estimates and assign in to a wave, in order to kind of match  
12 with the MRIP stuff.

13  
14 Another thing that they do is they provide some estimates that  
15 are grouped together, just as other species, and so we need to  
16 break that into their individual species estimates, and, again,  
17 we use the Texas intercept data and their non-target species  
18 list in order to do that.

19  
20 The LA Creel survey, this is done by SERO, at the moment. They  
21 are receiving the data from the state, and they reformat it,  
22 again, in order to integrate it with MRIP. They use average  
23 weights of each species, using the LA Creel biological sampling  
24 data. They also use the thirty-fish minimum size sample. Then,  
25 if they have less than thirty weights, then they adopt the  
26 Southeast Center weight estimation methodology to continue and  
27 get that weight.

28  
29 Here, I have just listed some of these other adjustments. We  
30 have species ID corrections that we put into the ACL file. We  
31 are assigning some identified tilefish to blueline, for example.  
32 We also assign the migratory group definitions. Currently,  
33 those are those three species of cobia, Spanish, and king  
34 mackerel. We do the whole to gutted weight to conversions, and  
35 then SERO goes ahead and assigns landings to fishing year, when  
36 necessary.

37  
38 SEDAR recreational landings are a bit different, currently,  
39 because we need to adjust for the change in the APAIS survey,  
40 and so the APAIS is the Access Point Angler Intercept Survey,  
41 and so they had this change in their intercept survey starting  
42 in 2013.

43  
44 From 2004 to 2012, the adjustment accounts for this time-of-day  
45 differences between the two intercept methods, and I can go into  
46 more detail of that. I'm not sure how much you're all familiar  
47 with or not, but, basically, it means that, before this change  
48 in protocol, samplers could leave a site prior to the completion

1 of the time that they're supposed to be there, and so, in 2013,  
2 they had to remain, no matter how many interviews they had  
3 conducted.

4  
5 Again, there was another MRIP calibration workshop that was  
6 conducted for this, and they came up with these calibration  
7 methods. Some are long-term and short-term, and so we have been  
8 using the one recommended by that workshop. We receive programs  
9 and guidance from S&T on how to make those adjustments, and then  
10 we go ahead and adjust the historical data as well, the 1981 to  
11 2003, and we use the same methodology that the first calibration  
12 workshop recommended for that part of it.

13  
14 In summary, we have more datasets that we are incorporating. We  
15 are using some management jurisdiction information in order to  
16 assign landings. We have species ID corrections. The weight  
17 estimation methodologies are different, and I should point out  
18 here that some of the old MRFSS estimates for the weight  
19 estimates, they had a two-fish rule. As long as they had two  
20 fish, they would be able to assign an average weight, and so  
21 that's distinct from our Southeast Center method, which uses  
22 thirty fish. That's one of the key differences between the  
23 older MRFSS weight estimation methodology and ours.

24  
25 Again, we make conversions for ACLs that are monitored in gutted  
26 weight and also for ACLs that are monitored in MRFSS units.  
27 Again, we have the historical calibrations for the for-hire  
28 survey and MRIP. Are there any questions?

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Committee, that was Dr. Matter, by the way,  
31 with the Science Center. Are there any questions for her? Mr.  
32 Anson.

33  
34 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Dr. Matter, I have a couple of questions and  
35 then a comment. The first question I have is it relates to a  
36 comment that was made to me when trying to look at red snapper  
37 landings in recent years, and it relates to, on the MRIP site,  
38 they would have an estimate in state waters, and obviously  
39 federal waters. When the analysis came back on catch rates per  
40 day in state and federal waters, to determine the season, the  
41 numbers did quite add up in a couple of years.

42  
43 I was wondering, and I didn't see in this presentation anything  
44 relating specifically for red snapper, in regards to how or why  
45 those two would change, outside of the weight of the fish. The  
46 comment that was made to me was that, during times when both  
47 state waters and federal waters are open, that the Southeast  
48 Fisheries Science Center associates a certain percentage of the

1 trips to state waters and then another percentage of trips to  
2 federal waters.

3  
4 If that's the case, it struck me, because, at least in Florida,  
5 they conduct the MRIP survey, and the MRIP survey gathers that  
6 information. They ask directly of the angler where the catch  
7 was made, in federal or state waters, and so do you have any  
8 information about that particular circumstance?

9  
10 **DR. MATTER:** I do not. We would have to look into that.

11  
12 **MR. ANSON:** All right. My second question then relates to the  
13 species ID corrections. You mentioned that there was SEDAR  
14 recommendations relative to species ID corrections, specific  
15 particularly to gag and black grouper, but I know, in the past,  
16 historically, way back when, there may have been some issues  
17 related to some of the commercial dealers and how they would  
18 assign those fish, but, here recently, since the state has taken  
19 over the MRIP sampling, their samplers, I would assume, go  
20 through rather extensive fish identification training, and, at  
21 least for those fish that are readily available that are  
22 identified by the sampler as Type 3 landings, there should be  
23 very minimal changes, or necessary changes, for species  
24 identification for those two species, and can you further  
25 elaborate?

26  
27 **DR. MATTER:** For that gag and black grouper correction in the  
28 Gulf, that's only occurring prior to 1990, for the exact same  
29 reason that you are describing, the increase in the sampler  
30 training. That came into the MRFSS survey in 1990, and there is  
31 no correction after that date.

32  
33 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you. Then a comment would be, on your Slide  
34 13, we have a bulleted item here of 2004 to 2012 adjustment  
35 accounts for time-of-day differences, and you made a comment  
36 that the samplers were leaving the sites early on the old MRFSS  
37 protocols, and I just wanted to let you know that the old MRFSS  
38 protocols had two kind of cutoffs for why a sampler would leave  
39 early, and that would be they had a maximum of thirty interviews  
40 per day and that they could leave a site when they expected to  
41 receive or collect less than one interview per hour, and so  
42 there wasn't any time restrictions back then. It was those two  
43 criteria that allowed samplers to leave their sites early.  
44 Thank you.

45  
46 **DR. MATTER:** Thank you.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Donaldson.

1  
2 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Vivian, you  
3 mentioned that MRIP and the Southeast Science Center estimate  
4 weight differently, and I think you said that MRIP has to have  
5 at least two fish, and you guys use thirty. Are there any  
6 actions in place to kind of get those two methodologies more  
7 inline? Two versus thirty is a fairly significant difference  
8 and could account for some different weight estimates.

9  
10 **DR. MATTER:** That is being discussed. It's one of the long-term  
11 things we're working on, in order to reconcile those two  
12 different methodologies, and we're trying to integrate all of  
13 the different surveys and data.

14  
15 We are actually working on a recreational integration data  
16 project now that will streamline a lot of this stuff on our end,  
17 but then what you're referring to is more coordinating with S&T  
18 to work on those weight estimations, and so it's a work in  
19 progress.

20  
21 **MR. DONALDSON:** I think that's important, so we can minimize the  
22 differences, and there is a lot of eyes on this data, and so  
23 anything we can do to make sure that we're more consistent would  
24 be a good thing, and so I'm glad to hear that you guys are  
25 working on it.

26  
27 **DR. MATTER:** Thank you.

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Any other questions for Vivian from the  
30 committee? Seeing none, thank you, Vivian. Seeing no other  
31 comments regarding this recreational data, we will move on to  
32 the next item on the agenda. Dr. Porch, that would be you, to  
33 discuss some of the MRIP methods and protocol.

34  
35 **DISCUSSION OF MRIP PERCENT STANDARD ERROR METHODS AND PROTOCOLS**

36  
37 **DR. CLAY PORCH:** Thank you, Greg. Last June, at the joint  
38 meetings of the Gulf and South Atlantic Councils in Key West,  
39 Dave Van Voorhees gave a presentation that talked about the  
40 challenge of the high uncertainty of recreational catch  
41 estimates for so-called rare-event species, the high PSEs, and  
42 the steps that could be taken to address these issues.

43  
44 At the last South Atlantic Council meeting, they discussed the  
45 idea of holding a workshop where MRIP staff, Southeast Fisheries  
46 Science Center staff, and members of the Gulf and South Atlantic  
47 SSCs could all work together to set some minimum standards for  
48 the precision of the estimates and steps that can be taken in

1 cases where those minimum standards aren't met, and so it's  
2 somewhat analogous to what we were just talking about with the  
3 weights. Do we have some minimum number of intercepts that need  
4 to be included to make an estimate, and then how do you combine  
5 across strata? It's similar kind of concepts.

6  
7 There aren't any materials at this point. What we're looking  
8 for is to get an agreement, in concept at least, to hold a  
9 workshop. Then, of course, the next step would be to put  
10 together a steering committee and draft up the terms of  
11 reference.

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Any comment from the committee about Dr.  
14 Porch's recommendation to convene a workshop to deal with some  
15 of this variability? Mr. Donaldson.

16  
17 **MR. DONALDSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Not necessarily a  
18 question, but just a comment that, a number of years ago, ACCSP  
19 conducted a similar workshop, and so I would recommend that you  
20 touch base -- The commission and several of the Gulf States  
21 participated in that, and so touch base with them for any  
22 findings or recommendations, and I think that would be a good  
23 idea.

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Ms. Bosarge.

26  
27 **MS. BOSARGE:** I will comment just a little bit. I attended the  
28 last South Atlantic meeting, as the representative from the  
29 Gulf, and this was something that they discussed, and they  
30 passed a motion that actually included the Gulf in this meeting,  
31 and so, essentially, I think -- One of their big issues over  
32 there, and, Chris, you can stop me any time, if you want to jump  
33 in, was they have some cobia landings that maybe they're just  
34 getting one intercept here or there and there is some really big  
35 percent standard errors around these numbers.

36  
37 Their question was, to MRIP or the Southeast Science Center,  
38 whoever the right party should be, is, hey, what can we do about  
39 this? Is there some alternative method, when we get ourselves  
40 into this position where we're looking at some of these  
41 estimates that have these big errors around them, what else can  
42 we do, and their discussion was that, well, you know, the MRIP  
43 people have actually said there are some other ways that we can  
44 look at things and maybe go down a different path or see what we  
45 can do.

46  
47 I think the analogy that was used at that meeting was that you  
48 have MRIP and you have the councils and the SSC and the Science

1 Center and everybody standing around the pool and nobody is  
2 jumping in, and so it's time to push somebody in.

3  
4 That's what the meeting essentially does. We're going to jump  
5 in the pool and start having a conversation about what can we  
6 do? Are there some alternatives that we can look at to give us  
7 some leeway on some of these things, so we'll maybe look at them  
8 differently, and so I told them -- I said, yes, well, I will  
9 bring this back to the Gulf and I will talk to them about it and  
10 see if it's something that we want to participate in as well,  
11 but I thought it sounded like an issue that maybe we have run up  
12 against with some of our intercepts and different species, and  
13 so I would love to hear some discussion of if you all think it's  
14 a worthwhile endeavor or not.

15  
16 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Anson.

17  
18 **MR. ANSON:** I think it would be a worthwhile endeavor, and I  
19 think it's time to start pushing people in the pool. Your  
20 comment though, Leann -- You made a comment about MRIP staff  
21 saying that there are other ways or other means by which  
22 landings estimates can be calculated, and did I hear that  
23 correctly?

24  
25 **MS. BOSARGE:** No, I don't know if I said exactly that. They  
26 just said -- Maybe Dr. Porch might be the right one, or maybe  
27 Dr. Crabtree, to talk about this, but, essentially, they said,  
28 look, when you get these high standard errors around some of  
29 these point estimates, you need to sit down and talk to us, and  
30 I don't know what the other methods are for. Is it for  
31 estimating that point estimate or is it for how you use or -- I  
32 am not sure. I would have to sit down with the people with more  
33 brain power than me and let them tell me what are our options  
34 here.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Go ahead, Kevin.

37  
38 **MR. ANSON:** I guess a comment then. That got me thinking about,  
39 well, if there are other ways -- I want to make sure that any  
40 and all of these things can be included, and I don't know, Dr.  
41 Porch, if you had any comment to that or such, but, if there are  
42 other ways for recalculation, that's one thing, but I was  
43 thinking more of taking the MRIP estimate with the high PSEs and  
44 how do you incorporate that into modeling and how do you  
45 incorporate that potentially into management, those types of  
46 things.

47  
48 If they're two separate issues, or if those can be included in

1 the discussion, that's great, but I was thinking more of the how  
2 do you include, how do you treat the data, in modeling and in  
3 management, and not so much that, hey, let's actually calculate  
4 it different, so we can get a different number, I guess.

5  
6 **DR. PORCH:** I think both angles are fair game for this kind of a  
7 workshop. I guess the sorts of things they could look at, in  
8 terms of how do you get estimates with lower PSEs, less  
9 uncertainty, would be some sort of pooling. That could be  
10 either across time, or it could be within space, something like  
11 that, and I think that's the ways they would talk about it. It  
12 wouldn't be so much re-estimating. You have what you have for  
13 intercepts.

14  
15 Think of it this way. Here is an example. We used to try and  
16 estimate the recreational catch of billfish in the Caribbean,  
17 where we didn't have a whole lot of sampling going. There were  
18 a lot of trips, but there weren't a lot of samples.

19  
20 Most of the trips, most years, nobody would be intercepted who  
21 caught a billfish, and so it looks like you have zero billfish.  
22 Every once in a while, you would get that one guy who got two.  
23 Now you've got to multiply two by 100,000 trips or something.  
24 So you go zero, zero, zero, zero, 200,000. What we did was some  
25 kind of running average, trying to smooth that out, and so it  
26 would be something along those lines.

27  
28 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Any other comments or questions for Dr. Porch?  
29 I have one, but, before I do that, Clay, it sounds like we're  
30 building consensus around the table that this workshop is a good  
31 thing, and obviously you agree, and so, Madam Chair, is that  
32 something we need a motion to do? Does that need to come from  
33 us or that's just happening or how would we proceed, if we feel  
34 strongly this is something that needs to happen?

35  
36 **MS. BOSARGE:** I would suggest that we have a motion, and maybe -  
37 - I am going to put staff on the spot here. We would have to  
38 find that motion from the South Atlantic Council, and it would  
39 probably need to mirror whatever their motion -- Because their  
40 motion included us, and, essentially, what their motion said, if  
41 I remember correctly, was get some sort of representation from  
42 both SSCs, the councils, MRIP, and the Southeast Fisheries  
43 Science Center together, some sort of group, whether it's a  
44 workshop or a working group or whatever it is, to start this  
45 discussion and push everybody in the pool and let's see if we  
46 can improve upon things somehow. Maybe if we can find that  
47 motion at some point during your committee, we can look at it  
48 and see if that will work for us.

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Unless someone wants to speak up, I am  
3 not seeing anyone that doesn't think that that's a good idea.  
4 If they can't find it between now and then, we can always make  
5 this motion at Full Council, I guess.

6  
7 If there is no other comments, I just had a quick question for  
8 you, Clay. We see landings estimates, obviously, each meeting,  
9 and we will here soon, in a couple of days or so, and so I was  
10 sitting here thinking, and I'm not real clear. Just  
11 recreational landings, for example, we get the landings and  
12 where we are in relation to ACT and ACL and all of that, but  
13 where does that error get built in? We get a number, but I  
14 don't ever recall really seeing the percent error around that  
15 number, unless that's something the SSC handles. I know I've  
16 seen it there, and so where is that built into the process for  
17 us, or do we just go with the number that is given, I guess, by  
18 your or Roy's office?

19  
20 **DR. PORCH:** I guess we deal with it more at the science level  
21 than we have here at the council, but, if the council wanted to  
22 see the standard errors around all the estimates, some  
23 confidence limits, they could be provided.

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Maybe this is a question we can bring up when  
26 we actually see some landings, because it's hard to talk about  
27 that without having landings right in front of you, but I would  
28 recommend -- I would like to maybe at least see that, at least  
29 once or twice, to see what we're talking about. Are they really  
30 big or are they sort of big?

31  
32 A good example is we have split the recreational sector now,  
33 obviously, between for-hire and private rec, and I would like to  
34 know what the error is around each of those estimates that we're  
35 getting at some level, and so maybe we can discuss that when we  
36 see landings data and have something in front of us. Did you  
37 have a question, Kevin?

38  
39 **MR. ANSON:** Your comment brought something to mind for me, and,  
40 ten years or so ago, I remember looking at yellowfin tuna  
41 landings through MRIP, and particularly for Alabama landings,  
42 and, Clay, you described the zero, zero, zero, 200,000, zero,  
43 zero, zero.

44  
45 At least back then, and I haven't looked at them here recently,  
46 but, back then, we had a bunch of zeros and then like 75,000 or  
47 100,000 pounds, and it was based on the scenario that you just  
48 described. You have one or two interviews during that year



1 where you had the landings.

2  
3 Thinking of that in ICCAT, and I know ICCAT is a totally  
4 different beast than what we're dealing with with MSA species,  
5 or what our purview is here on the council, but have you all --  
6 I mean, you've got some methodology already that you've used in  
7 ICCAT, for instance, that deals with some of those PSEs, or you  
8 can just say you defer or not comment on it.

9  
10 **DR. PORCH:** From U.S. submissions of data, yes, we look into  
11 those sorts of things, and that's where I mentioned that  
12 sometimes we use a smoothing algorithm, but, at the ICCAT level,  
13 many times the U.S. landings are small in comparison to some of  
14 the other countries. It depends on what species we're talking  
15 about, and many of them have large artisanal fisheries, where  
16 the data aren't actually even reported, and so we have to get  
17 even rougher estimate from various means, and so it's not the  
18 best example for us to follow.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I am not seeing any more hands raised. In the  
21 meantime, the staff was able to find the motion from the South  
22 Atlantic regarding this topic, and so, if someone would like to  
23 read through that and make a motion to the committee to move  
24 forward with this. Leann.

25  
26 **MS. BOSARGE:** I am not going to make a motion, but I will just  
27 read it, for the group. The South Atlantic, their motion was to  
28 direct their staff to work with the Gulf of Mexico Fishery  
29 Management Council, the Southeast Science Center, SERO, and MRIP  
30 to convene a joint Gulf/South Atlantic SSC meeting to address --  
31 These were the two big items they wanted to address, to address  
32 regional MRIP issues, such as excessive catch estimate  
33 uncertainty and the challenges of developing estimates for rare-  
34 occurrence species, and to consider unit stock definitions, as  
35 applied in management and stock assessment, with the goal of  
36 identifying stocks that require further stock ID evaluations in  
37 stocks that have adequate and acceptable definitions to address  
38 management and assessment needs.

39  
40 After reading back through that, I don't know that we need to  
41 make that huge -- That might not be our exact priorities. I  
42 think, if the council is acceptable, I think the main goal is to  
43 make everyone aware that we do want to be part of this meeting,  
44 that the Gulf does want to participate in this meeting and  
45 explore some of these issues, and possibly others that we may  
46 want to put on the agenda.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Leann. I think that's a good point.

1 If someone agrees and is willing to make a more concise and  
2 streamlined motion along these lines, that would be appropriate.  
3 Mr. Gregory.

4  
5 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUGLAS GREGORY:** If there is no concern  
6 about doing it, we will just work with them, when they organize  
7 the workshops, and we will participate, because they're both of  
8 interest to us also. They're two separate topics, and the  
9 second topic is definitely one that we need to pay attention to,  
10 because there is a tendency now to interpret genetic studies to  
11 the point where you say, if we didn't find any differences, that  
12 means they're one population, and that's an important point, to  
13 not allow that to happen on an ongoing basis, that it's the  
14 opposite. You need to prove differences to prove separate  
15 populations, but, anyway, we're interested in that, and, if  
16 there's no opposition, we will just work cooperatively with the  
17 South Atlantic Council and let them take the lead on this.

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That's fine. Ms. Bosarge.

20  
21 **MS. BOSARGE:** Will you write them some sort of letter or  
22 something like that, so that they know, in writing, that we do  
23 want to be a part of this? I just would hate to see a breakdown  
24 in communication somewhere and we don't get our invite to the  
25 party.

26  
27 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Yes, and the only reason I was going down this  
28 route because I was understanding that we needed a motion, but I  
29 just would maybe point out, for the record, a point of  
30 clarification. We're in the Data Collection Committee right  
31 now, which certainly goes to Point A there. Point B is a little  
32 bit more maybe Reef Fish or something. That's not so much some  
33 business we carry out in this Data Collection Committee, and so  
34 it's beyond this, but anyway, that's just to clarify matters.  
35 Mr. Donaldson.

36  
37 **MR. DONALDSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just another point of  
38 clarification. When it says "MRIP", since the commission  
39 coordinates the data collection in the Gulf of Mexico,  
40 hopefully, if there's a need, we can be involved as well, at  
41 least for Point A.

42  
43 **OTHER BUSINESS**  
44 **SAFMC LETTER**  
45

46 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Yes, and so, Doug, obviously involve the Gulf  
47 States with this. I think that's a major component that would  
48 be good. Regarding this topic, is there any more questions or

1 comments? Seeing none, that moves us to the two items we had in  
2 Other Business.

3  
4 The first is this letter on the coastal migratory pelagics that  
5 was coming out of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council.  
6 John, did you want to take us through this letter, or what do  
7 you recommend? Do you want to give us a summary of what the  
8 situation is here?

9  
10 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I can, but it might be better for Leann to do  
11 this, since she was actually at the meeting. If not, I am happy  
12 to do it.

13  
14 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That is fine. Ms. Bosarge, since you were  
15 there, or whoever wants to brief us on what the intent is here.

16  
17 **MS. BOSARGE:** The buck stops here. At the South Atlantic  
18 meeting -- You remember we took our data collection amendment to  
19 final at our last meeting in January, and then the South  
20 Atlantic needed to bless it, right, at their meeting in March.

21  
22 As that discussion came up and they went through any changes  
23 that we made, which we did make some changes. I think we  
24 changed -- Mr. Anson found the grand compromise for us about  
25 offloading. You report your catch before you offload instead of  
26 land, and so that was a tweak that we made.

27  
28 Anyway, the big discussion, or debate, I guess, that came up at  
29 the South Atlantic meeting was what about the people that are  
30 dually-permitted between -- In other words, they have a for-hire  
31 permit in the South Atlantic and in the Gulf, and so we're  
32 talking about for-hire all the way around when we say dually-  
33 permitted, but it's just in two different bodies of water.

34  
35 In both the South Atlantic's data collection amendment, which  
36 has already gone final and been submitted, I believe, and the  
37 Gulf amendment, we both had that verbiage in there, that  
38 language, that said essentially you don't have to report under  
39 both systems if you have both permits, but you do have to report  
40 to the more extensive or the stricter of the two systems, and so  
41 there is going to be a group of South Atlantic-permitted  
42 fishermen that maybe mainly fish out of the South Atlantic, or  
43 maybe purely fish out of the South Atlantic, but hold a Gulf  
44 permit. The South Atlantic, I think, is weekly reporting for  
45 their for-hire, I believe it is, and ours is not. Ours is a  
46 trip-level deal.

47  
48 They're going to have to report more frequently, and I see Mara

1 raising her hand, but anyway, that was their concern, what about  
2 these dually-permitted people that are going to have to go with  
3 the stricter of the two, and they were pretty passionate about  
4 it, which is good. I mean, they were passionate about their  
5 fishermen, and I am going to stop, and I'm going to let Chris  
6 jump in. I'm sorry. I am not the Chairman. Dr. Stunz, go  
7 ahead.

8  
9 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That sounds like a great plan, Madam  
10 Chairwoman. Go ahead, Chris.

11  
12 **MR. CHRIS CONKLIN:** Thanks. I'm Chris Conklin from the South  
13 Atlantic Council. I am delighted to be here. I think there is  
14 twelve permit holders in North Carolina and three in Georgia  
15 that I know of and a couple in South Carolina. The conversation  
16 that we had was mainly about those guys having to report to the  
17 Gulf system on a trip-level basis, and I know there was a huge  
18 amount of heartburn in south Florida, especially amongst the  
19 Keys guys.

20  
21 It just didn't make sense for someone fishing strictly out of  
22 North Carolina that held a Gulf charter permit to have to back  
23 into the slip and hail-in and hail-out while the guy next to him  
24 didn't, and so this is just a friendly letter to ask for you  
25 guys to accept these changes and let's move forward with the  
26 amendment.

27  
28 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mara.

29  
30 **MS. MARA LEVY:** I just wanted to clarify a couple of things.  
31 The Gulf amendment that you already took final action on to  
32 submit, basically it says, if you have a Gulf permit, this is  
33 how you report, regardless of where you are fishing, and so  
34 there is no exception in there about more strenuous or whatever,  
35 more exhaustive. It's like, if you have the Gulf permit, it  
36 doesn't matter where you're fishing. You are required to have  
37 the GPS, and you are required to do the before-you-offload  
38 reporting and that sort of thing.

39  
40 The South Atlantic amendment, recognizing that there are other  
41 reporting systems that folks might have to report to that might  
42 have more onerous requirements, like the Gulf, if that gets  
43 implemented, and like the Northeast program, made an exception  
44 in their document and said, if you have a South Atlantic permit,  
45 this is how you're going to report unless you have to report  
46 under a different system that is more onerous.

47  
48 I think that's really important, because the Gulf requirement is

1 based on the permit. There was no exception made for anybody.  
2 The South Atlantic, recognizing the duplication and the fact  
3 that there are other, more onerous reporting systems, made the  
4 exception in their document. I am not saying that you can't  
5 change the requirements, go through some other amendment or  
6 framework or whatever, but it's a little bit different. I just  
7 didn't want to let stand that there are somehow exceptions in  
8 both documents.

9  
10 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** To Mara's point, and when I first read this  
11 letter, and, Roy, maybe this is a question for your shop, but I  
12 fully see what you guys are trying to do, Chris, and you've got  
13 this issue, but, to me, when I first read it, I was kind of  
14 like, well, if you're going to maintain a Gulf permit, you  
15 follow by the rules that we just had all this debate for however  
16 long we've been talking about this stuff.

17  
18 You follow that rule, but, also, from a practical data  
19 collection standpoint, it seems like that non-fishing that  
20 they're doing is just as important as those catching fish, in  
21 terms of the data that we're collecting, and so I'm really on  
22 the fence on this. I don't want to create all of these  
23 burdensome things, but, also, we need to know when they're not  
24 fishing, if they're not using it, because my understanding was  
25 there was a lot of people that have this permit, but they're not  
26 really doing anything, and so I don't know. Roy, I don't know  
27 how this affects your operation. I guess that's the question  
28 that I'm asking.

29  
30 **DR. CRABTREE:** I think, when we did this, we were trying to  
31 avoid a situation where a vessel is reporting into two separate  
32 systems and both systems, and, since the Gulf requirements were  
33 more rigorous, that was the decision that was made. If you had  
34 that permit, that's where you had to report.

35  
36 These guys who have both permits are still going to have to  
37 spend the extra money to acquire the Gulf system and put the GPS  
38 unit on the boat, but I think we felt like having them have two  
39 different systems to report in and have to be familiar with two  
40 different systems and decide when to report in one or the other  
41 was not a situation we wanted.

42  
43 Presumably, if there are vessels in North Carolina or South  
44 Carolina that have Gulf for-hire permits, they must occasionally  
45 fish in the Gulf. I am not quite sure why they're maintaining  
46 their permits on those boats, but that is their business  
47 decision to make.

48

1 The other thing is I think we're at a point now where, if we  
2 were to change this, somebody would have to go back in, I think  
3 us. We would have to go back in and make some sort of change to  
4 the plan or the regulations somehow, and that would mean several  
5 more meetings and potentially more public hearings and things.  
6 I don't know that this is something that can be fixed right at  
7 this moment, and it may be best just to move forward with the  
8 decision we've already made. Then, if it appears this is a  
9 problem down the road, we could readdress it.

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Kevin.

12  
13 **MR. ANSON:** I guess this brought up a question in my mind, Dr.  
14 Crabtree. We have quite a few latent permits out there, or at  
15 least we believe there is a bunch of latent permits in the Gulf  
16 of Mexico, and so, for those owners of the permits, on the  
17 vessel that they have identified being associated with that  
18 permit, and we're talking about latent permits, as long as they  
19 are -- At what point would they be required to have the GPS?

20  
21 Is it the time that the vessel goes into the water, whether it's  
22 a private fishing trip or not? Is it as soon as the vessel goes  
23 into the -- If it's just private fishing, and if they get  
24 boarded, and that vessel number comes up as having a Gulf  
25 permit, they will have to have it, even though they're not on a  
26 charter fishing trip, correct?

27  
28 **DR. CRABTREE:** Yes, and I mean they will -- As soon as this  
29 requirement becomes effective, they will have to have the  
30 equipment. Now, when we get to a final rule, we will give some  
31 period of time for people to purchase the equipment, but, from  
32 that point on, they're going to have to have it. If they're not  
33 fishing, they're going to have to file no-fishing reports.

34  
35 Now, if a vessel owner is going to be out of the area and not  
36 fishing for an extended period time, I think we make allowances  
37 for a power-down, and they can file an extended no-fishing kind  
38 of report, but, if they come in and haven't reported and haven't  
39 put the equipment onboard, we are not going to renew their  
40 permits. If they're out fishing and not reporting, they would  
41 be subject to a violation, I think.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Kevin, was it to that point? Ms. Guyas had her  
44 hand up.

45  
46 **MR. ANSON:** It is to that point. I liken the South Atlantic  
47 vessel that has both the Gulf and the South Atlantic permit to  
48 what you had mentioned earlier, is that they would have to

1 report, but they don't necessarily have to have the equipment,  
2 as long as the vessel stays in the South Atlantic jurisdiction.

3  
4 **DR. CRABTREE:** No, they will be required to have the equipment  
5 if they have the permit, period. In that situation now, they  
6 would have to report to the Gulf system, because the exception  
7 is that, if you have both permits, you report to the more  
8 rigorous system, which, in this case, is the Gulf.

9  
10 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Ms. Guyas and then Chris.

11  
12 **MS. MARTHA GUYAS:** Thank you. I'm not on your committee, and so  
13 thanks for recognizing me. We have heard a lot about this  
14 issue. I guess one of the questions, Roy, that just came to my  
15 mind was how are you going to ensure that the boats actually  
16 have the system on the boat?

17  
18 I mean, there is a number of vessels, and I have the list in  
19 front of me here, that are not in the Gulf at all. There is a  
20 number in Florida that this is affecting. One thing that I  
21 think we could do, should the councils want to take some action  
22 here, is, for these vessels that are spending the majority of  
23 their time outside of the Gulf jurisdiction, they could do no-  
24 fishing reports for the Gulf part of their reporting and then  
25 whatever fishing reports they need to do for whatever  
26 jurisdiction that they're in, as usual.

27  
28 If they're fishing out of Jacksonville, more than likely they  
29 are not transiting to the Gulf on a single trip, and so they  
30 could do no-fishing reports until maybe they jump across the  
31 coast, for red snapper season or whatever, and then they start  
32 reporting on the Gulf system once they get into the Gulf, but I  
33 am curious to know how we're going to figure out who exactly has  
34 this system on their boat.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I agree, Martha. Maybe, as Roy said, we  
37 already sort of have a fix in place, at least for now, and to go  
38 with it and see how it goes and fix it at a later point, but,  
39 Chris, go ahead.

40  
41 **MR. CONKLIN:** I just wanted to point out that there is one  
42 permit holder in Illinois. If he runs a charter on the Great  
43 Lakes, does he need to report his catch to the Gulf system as  
44 well? It's questions like that that we need to iron out.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Good point. Mara.

47  
48 **MS. LEVY:** As to whether they have it or not, right now, the

1 requirement is that you have it. The GPS part is affixed to  
2 your vessel and it's on, and so we'll know whether they have it  
3 or not, because it will have to be on for them to be in  
4 compliance with the requirement.

5  
6 Then there was no no-fishing report. The no-fishing report was  
7 only if we didn't have the requirement to permanently affix the  
8 GPS portion to the vessel. Once that became a requirement, you  
9 don't have to do no-fishing reports, because you have the GPS,  
10 and so you can track where the vessel is.

11  
12 Now, there is the whole idea of a power-down exemption, if your  
13 boat is in for repairs or something like that, but that wasn't  
14 meant to be a you turn it off this day and you turn it on this  
15 day. It was a more narrow exception about how you power-down  
16 and how long you do that, a minimum requirement, and obviously  
17 all those details are still in the works.

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Well, we are having some good discussion, and I  
20 don't want to curb that, but I want to defer to our chairwoman  
21 just for a minute. We are just right at our time, and there are  
22 a couple of other items in Other Business. I know you had one,  
23 and then there's a brief update on where we are with the  
24 amendment, which will just take a minute or two, I think. Do we  
25 want to continue this discussion at Full Council or what would  
26 you recommend?

27  
28 **MS. BOSARGE:** Well, my Other Business item can definitely wait,  
29 and that's why I said that when I put it on the agenda, because  
30 I figured this might be an extensive discussion, but I think  
31 let's go a few minutes longer and see if we can't come to some  
32 sort of -- If we can figure out what we're going to do.

33  
34 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Other comments?

35  
36 **DR. CRABTREE:** I think your only option, at the moment, is this  
37 moves forward as we planned it. I don't know that staff has  
38 transmitted this to us yet. I don't think you have. If you  
39 wanted to change it, you would have to not transmit it and put  
40 it back on the agenda for the next council meeting and come in  
41 and readdress the whole thing, and that's going to substantively  
42 delay it. Otherwise, you can let it go forward as is, but then,  
43 to change it, you would have to come back in and amend the plan  
44 somehow.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Briefly, John, do you want to update us on  
47 where we are, because that will play into this discussion, and  
48 that will also take care of that Other Business item.



1  
2 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Absolutely. Since that time - As you recall,  
3 there were a number of changes made at the last council meeting  
4 before taking final action. We have updated the document to  
5 reflect those, and we're in the process of our internal reviews  
6 and our IPT reviews. The document has been sent to the Science  
7 Center. They are undergoing their review, and we're addressing  
8 some changes, and so we plan to have this submitted by the end  
9 of April.

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Based on that, it does sound like there  
12 is some time, if we chose the path of what Roy is suggesting,  
13 but, before we go there, Ms. Bosarge and Captain Greene.

14  
15 **MS. BOSARGE:** This is for Ms. Guyas. When we were at the South  
16 Atlantic meeting, Florida was leading that discussion on this,  
17 and I had asked Martha's counterpart on the South Atlantic to  
18 send Martha armed with some ideas for us, and so do you have any  
19 ideas on how we could fix this without completely pulling this  
20 document back and going through something that we've spent a lot  
21 of time on?

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Martha.

24  
25 **MS. GUYAS:** Thank you. I don't know that we could change it  
26 without actually changing anything, or fixing something in the  
27 document, and so I think the simplest fix to address this  
28 problem is to only require this when the vessel is working in  
29 the Gulf, and that would require going back and changing some of  
30 the codified text that we have. It would be relatively simple  
31 to do, but it would require, I think, pulling the document back  
32 in some shape or form.

33  
34 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Captain Greene.

35  
36 **MR. JOHNNY GREENE:** Martha kind of hit at what I was mulling  
37 around in my mind, but understand that fishermen look at permits  
38 as access to opportunities to make money. If I was to go  
39 purchase a South Atlantic fisheries permit and pay money for it  
40 or whatever, and I don't know how their situation is, but, if it  
41 was to go and acquire one, and it required me to do certain  
42 things, I would have to understand that.

43  
44 If I wanted to leave the Gulf in the winter and go to North  
45 Carolina and chase giant bluefin, then there would be a certain  
46 -- I would have to sit down, as a business owner, and think, is  
47 it worth the effort to go through to get the permit?  
48

1 Now, I understand that that's a little different than the  
2 situation that a guy in Illinois or a guy in North Carolina who  
3 has had this permit for a long time is in a different situation,  
4 where the regulations have changed, and so I think -- I kind of  
5 think that -- I think the best way forward might be just to come  
6 back through a framework and identify it, because there may be  
7 another situation that we're just not fully thinking out right  
8 now that may pop up between now and then.

9  
10 It may inconvenience those people, I understand, but, at some  
11 point, we have to just draw a line in the sand and move forward  
12 and go on. Granted, I didn't really see this one coming, but I  
13 think that's the way to move forward from here.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Kevin.

16  
17 **MR. ANSON:** Kind of along the lines of Johnny, is that, based on  
18 this, Mara, what would be the process, or Dr. Crabtree, then --  
19 Since it's a requirement, since you have the permit, and, again,  
20 I was thinking for use, and I was going back to the reporting.  
21 You can report and just say I am not doing any trips.

22  
23 For those folks that have latent permits, they are going to have  
24 to come to the agency now and show proof that they have mounted  
25 GPS hardware on that vessel that they've got identified being  
26 associated with the permit. If they don't, what happens? I  
27 mean, do you revoke it? They have got one year, essentially, to  
28 get it, and, when they go to renew and they show no proof of it,  
29 the permit comes back to the agency or what happens?  
30 Potentially, there could be a lot of permits now that go away  
31 here very quickly.

32  
33 **DR. CRABTREE:** I'm sure, if we do it like VMS in the reef fish,  
34 we won't renew your permit without proof that you have it and  
35 it's been installed. The way the requirement is written up,  
36 because it has the GPS component on the vessel that has to be  
37 on, I presume it's going to have to download position  
38 information to us on, I guess, a daily basis.

39  
40 If they're not doing that, and they don't have some kind of  
41 power-down exemption, they could potentially be in a violation  
42 at that point, but I don't have the final rule language, and so  
43 I'm not sure, but they certainly wouldn't be able to renew their  
44 permit without proof that they've met all the compliances.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mara.

47  
48 **MS. LEVY:** You can decide as a council or a committee what you

1 want to recommend doing, but I think you also need to think  
2 about -- There would need to be a number of changes made to the  
3 document, either if you decided to bring it back or you decided  
4 to move forward and then change it in a subsequent amendment or  
5 framework or something.

6  
7 It's not just about when they report. It's who has to have the  
8 equipment and how do you know when they're going to have the  
9 equipment and exactly when -- I think, at the South Atlantic  
10 meeting, there was talk about, in the Keys, if they made two  
11 trips in a day and one was in the Gulf and one was in the South  
12 Atlantic, there was an expectation that they would be required  
13 to report under the Gulf system, because they actually went into  
14 the Gulf.

15  
16 Well, that is great, but that means that everyone down there,  
17 potentially, is going to have to have the equipment, regardless  
18 of when they fish here and when they fish there, because how  
19 else will you know? Then they won't be equipped to actually go  
20 into the Gulf, and so I just think there are a number of things  
21 to think about when you're thinking about the request and how  
22 you could answer it and what would have to change to answer it  
23 and make it doable.

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Lieutenant Commander.

26  
27 **LCDR LEO DANAHER:** Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I guess the point on  
28 that that you're making, and from like an enforceability  
29 standpoint, the concern would be that, if you're not going to  
30 require them to have all the equipment associated with that  
31 permit, but if they are adjacent to those waters where the  
32 permit allows them to catch those species, I think there is some  
33 enforceability concerns there with regards to permitting them to  
34 not have the equipment onboard.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Ms. Guyas.

37  
38 **MS. GUYAS:** To that point, I think the way that the VMS  
39 requirement is set up for the IFQ program is that the VMS  
40 requirement requires to the Gulf and adjacent states, and so  
41 that could be an option as well. At least, for the way I  
42 understand it, if you have an IFQ account and the permits  
43 associated with it, if you're operating in Florida, you have to  
44 run under a VMS, I think.

45  
46 **MS. MARA:** I think it's any commercial reef fish permit holder  
47 has to have a VMS, a working VMS, and so what you've done with  
48 the for-hire reporting is very similar to the VMS. It's based

1 on the permit, and it doesn't -- I think you declare your trip,  
2 and so the whole thing with you declare if it's a commercial  
3 trip, or, in this case, with the for-hire one, you were  
4 declaring whether it was a for-hire trip, and that then  
5 indicated whether you were expecting a report when you came  
6 back, but I think all the commercial reef fish permit holders  
7 have to have the working VMS.

8  
9 **MS. GUYAS:** I think the CFR says though for only the Gulf and  
10 adjacent states that you actually have to have the VMS working,  
11 I think.

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Well, I guess we've had some good discussion.  
14 Leann, I'm trying to see where we need to go with this, and,  
15 given the time -- This is kind of new, and I don't know if  
16 others have had a lot of time to really think about this either,  
17 and so maybe I might recommend that we think about this for a  
18 few days and bring this back up at Full Council.

19  
20 My personal take on this is I kind of feel like we should just  
21 go with what we've got. We talked a lot about this, and then,  
22 either way, I think we're going to have to reconsider the  
23 document. Either way, it's going to be a drawn-out process.  
24 Then we can see if perhaps there's a way to fix this as we go  
25 along. Go ahead, Dr. Simmons.

26  
27 **DR. CARRIE SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just going  
28 to suggest also that staff could put some information in the  
29 committee report regarding the number of recent permits and the  
30 homeports, so you have that information to look at in the  
31 committee report, and they may have some information now to give  
32 you, but we could also include it in the committee report, to  
33 help inform the discussion.

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That would be great, Carrie. Ms. Bosarge.

36  
37 **MS. BOSARGE:** I think that sounds great, and I like your idea.  
38 Let's take it back up at Full Council. Let's have a few days to  
39 chew on this and think about it. Maybe staff can present us  
40 with some more data, and hopefully we can come to some sort of  
41 conclusion on that. My Other Business item, if we have time, we  
42 can take that up at Full Council too, if you would like.

43  
44 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. We can just do that at Full Council  
45 then, if that works, and I am not seeing any -- Mr. Gregory.

46  
47 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** I presume part of the concerns with  
48 the State of Florida is based on the public hearings or scoping

1 meetings that were held in the Keys. If so, then we can get  
2 copies of those reports for you to read.

3

4 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Martha.

5

6 **MS. GUYAS:** I know there was definitely heartburn down there. I  
7 was at some of the South Atlantic hearings, and they were pretty  
8 upset, but I think there was some concern north of there about  
9 this issue.

10

11 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Certainly more information is better,  
12 and so, Carrie, if you want to add that to the permit  
13 information you were compiling, that would be good, for Full  
14 Council. That, I think, completes our agenda. We stand  
15 adjourned.

16

17 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on April 3, 2017.)

18

19

- - -