

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2
3 STANDING & SPECIAL REEF FISH, MACKEREL, AND SOCIOECONOMIC
4 SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEES

5
6 Webinar

7
8 October 29, 2019

9
10 **STANDING SSC VOTING MEMBERS**

- 11 Joseph Powers.....
- 12 Lee Anderson.....
- 13 Harry Blanchet.....
- 14 David Chagaris.....
- 15 Benny Gallaway.....
- 16 Bob Gill.....
- 17 Robert Leaf.....
- 18 Kai Lorenzen.....
- 19 Campo Matens.....
- 20 James Nance.....
- 21 Will Patterson.....
- 22 Sean Powers.....
- 23 Kenneth Roberts.....
- 24 Steven Scyphers.....
- 25 Jim Tolan.....

26
27 **SPECIAL REEF FISH SSC VOTING MEMBERS**

- 28 Jason Adriance.....
- 29 Judson Curtis.....
- 30 John Mareska.....

31
32 **SPECIAL MACKEREL SSC VOTING MEMBERS**

- 33 Jason Adriance.....
- 34 Kari MacLauchlin-Buck.....
- 35 John Mareska.....

36
37 **SPECIAL SOCIOECONOMIC SSC VOTING MEMBERS**

- 38 Kari MacLauchlin-Buck.....
- 39 Andrew Ropicki.....

40
41 **STAFF**

- 42 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
- 43 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
- 44 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 45 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist & SEDAR Liaison
- 46 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 47 Camilla Shireman.....Administrative & Communications Assistant
- 48 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director

1

2 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

3 Steven Atran.....FL

4 Patrick Banks.....GMFMC

5 Patricia Clay.....NEFSC

6 Richard Cody.....NMFS

7 Lisa Colburn.....NEFSC

8 Michael Drexler.....Ocean Conservancy

9 Abigail Furnish.....NMFS

10 Susan Gerhart.....NMFS

11 Sarah Gibbs.....NEU

12 Martha Guyas.....FL

13 Sepp Haukebo.....EDF

14 Costa Kouzounis.....

15 Ben Martino.....

16 Michael Norberg.....FWC

17 Laura Picariello.....TAMU

18 Ashford Rosenberg.....Reef Fish Shareholders Alliance

19 Skyler Sagarese.....NMFS

20 - - -

21

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Contents.....2
4
5 Introductions and Adoption of Agenda.....3
6
7 Scope of Work.....7
8
9 Review of NMFS Report to Congress: Section 201 of the
10 Modernizing Recreational Fisheries Management Act of 2018.....7
11
12 Review of A Practitioner’s Guide to Fisheries Social Impact
13 Assessment.....19
14
15 Other Business.....36
16
17 Adjournment.....37
18
19 - - -
20
21

1 The Standing, Reef Fish, and Mackerel Scientific and Statistical
2 Committees of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
3 convened via webinar on Tuesday, October 29, 2019, and was
4 called to order by Chairman Joe Powers.

5
6 **INTRODUCTIONS AND ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

7
8 **CHAIRMAN JOE POWERS:** Good afternoon. My name is Joe Powers,
9 and I welcome all of you as the Chair of the Scientific and
10 Statistical Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management
11 Council. We appreciate your attendance at this webinar and
12 input to this meeting.

13
14 Representing the council is Patrick Banks, and council staff in
15 attendance are John Froeschke, Ava Lasseter, Ryan Rindone,
16 Carrie Simmons, Bernadine Roy, and Camilla Shireman.

17
18 Notice of this meeting was provided to coastal newspapers
19 throughout the area, Marine Extension and NMFS port agents and
20 the Federal Register. Notice was also sent to subscribers of
21 the council's press release email list and was posted on the
22 council's website.

23
24 Today's meeting will include the following topics: Adoption of
25 the Agenda, Scope of Work, and then the Review of the NMFS
26 Report to Congress on Section 201 of the Modernizing
27 Recreational Fisheries Management Act. Also, we will have the
28 Review of *A Practitioner's Guide to Fisheries Social Impact*
29 *Assessment*, and then any other business that may come up.

30
31 This webinar is open to the public, and this meeting is live and
32 is being recorded. A summary of the meeting and verbatim
33 minutes will be produced and made available to the public via
34 the council's website. For the purpose of voice identification
35 and to ensure that you are able to mute and unmute your line,
36 please identify yourself by saying your full name when your name
37 is called for attendance. Once you have identified yourself,
38 re-mute and so on. Lee Anderson, can you identify yourself,
39 mute and unmute yourself?

40
41 **DR. LEE ANDERSON:** Lee Anderson, here.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Luiz Barbieri is unable to be here. Harry
44 Blanchet.

45
46 **MR. HARRY BLANCHET:** Harry Blanchet, here.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. David Chagaris.

1
2 **DR. DAVID CHAGARIS:** David Chagaris, here.
3
4 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Benny Gallaway.
5
6 **DR. BENNY GALLAWAY:** Benny Gallaway, here.
7
8 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Bob Gill.
9
10 **MR. BOB GILL:** Bob Gill, here.
11
12 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Doug Gregory was not able to
13 attend, and Walter Keithly was unable to attend. Robert Leaf.
14
15 **DR. ROBERT LEAF:** Robert Leaf, here.
16
17 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Kai Lorenzen.
18
19 **DR. KAI LORENZEN:** Kai Lorenzen, here.
20
21 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Camp Matens.
22
23 **MR. CAMPO MATENS:** Camp Matens, here.
24
25 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Jim Nance.
26
27 **DR. JIM NANCE:** Jim Nance is here.
28
29 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Will Patterson.
30
31 **DR. WILL PATTERSON:** Will Patterson is here.
32
33 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Sean Powers.
34
35 **DR. POWERS:** Sean Powers is here.
36
37 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Ken Roberts.
38
39 **DR. KENNETH ROBERTS:** (Dr. Roberts' comment is not audible on
40 the recording.)
41
42 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Steven Scyphers.
43
44 **DR. STEPHEN SCYPHERS:** Steven Scyphers is here.
45
46 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Jim Tolan.
47
48 **DR. JIM TOLAN:** Jim Tolan is here.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Jason Adriance.
3
4 **DR. JASON ADRIANCE:** Jason Adriance is here.
5
6 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Judson Curtis.
7
8 **DR. JUDSON CURTIS:** Judson Curtis is here.
9
10 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** John Mareska.
11
12 **MR. JOHN MARESKA:** John Mareska, here.
13
14 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Kari Buck.
15
16 **DR. KARI MACLAUHLIN-BUCK:** Kari Buck, here.
17
18 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Jack Isaacs. Andrew Ropicki.
19
20 **DR. ANDREW ROPICKI:** Andrew Ropicki is here.
21
22 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Patrick Banks.
23
24 **MR. PATRICK BANKS:** Patrick Banks is here.
25
26 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Ryan Rindone.
27
28 **MR. RYAN RINDONE:** Ryan Rindone is here.
29
30 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** All right. Camilla Shireman.
31
32 **MS. CAMILLA SHIREMAN:** I am here.
33
34 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Carrie, do you want to --
35
36 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** Yes, I'm here.
37
38 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** I think that was the only ones left on the
39 list.
40
41 **DR. AVA LASSETER:** This is Ava Lasseter.
42
43 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. All right. Then we're going to
44 the agenda. Let me find it first here. The agenda -- We will
45 now adopt the agenda, and there's basically only two items on
46 there and the discussion of the scope of work of the meeting.
47 Is there any objection to adopting the agenda? If not, then the
48 agenda is adopted.

1
2 In the scope of work, Ryan, you crossed out the scope of work,
3 and I'm not sure when, but do you want to just quickly go over
4 it?

5
6 **SCOPE OF WORK**
7

8 **MR. RINDONE:** Sure. Like Dr. Powers said, we have a couple of
9 items here on our scope of work. There's the review of the NMFS
10 Report to Congress on Section 201 of the Modernizing
11 Recreational Fisheries Management Act, and the council has
12 already provided some comments on Section 201, and we'll go
13 through what some of those comments were, and, generally, this
14 section talks about incorporating data into stock assessments
15 from state and other non-governmental sources. You guys should
16 try to provide some specific recommendations to augment some of
17 the council's comments before we submit an official letter
18 providing the council's combined recommendations.
19

20 Then the second thing that we have today is reviewing *The*
21 *Practitioner's Guide to Fisheries Social Impact Assessment*, and,
22 as with Section 201, we'll have some NMFS folks help present
23 this information to you guys, and this is just mainly designed
24 to provide information to agencies and communities about the
25 social and cultural factors to be considered when doing these
26 sorts of analyses, and Dr. Lasseter will help when we're going
27 through any comments you might have on that agenda item.
28 Without further ado, we can proceed.
29

30 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you, Ryan. We're going on to the actual
31 discussion of the document that we have there, the review of the
32 NMFS Report to Congress. I will also reiterate what Ryan said.
33 The council has provided some draft comments already, and those
34 were passed out this morning, and so if you could download
35 those, because that will, I think, kind of be our starting point
36 for discussion of this particular document. Is there going to
37 be some presentation of the document then, Ryan?
38

39 **DR. RINDONE:** Yes, and Dr. Cody should be on the line with his
40 presentation that he's going to give to you guys, and that will
41 serve as a great jumping-off point, and so, if Dr. Cody is
42 ready, we can proceed.
43

44 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Thank you. Dr. Cody.
45

46 **REVIEW OF NMFS REPORT TO CONGRESS: SECTION 201 OF THE**
47 **MODERNIZING RECREATIONAL FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT OF 2018**
48

1 **DR. RICHARD CODY:** First of all, I would like to thank the
2 council SSC for giving us this opportunity to follow-up on the
3 request that we made to the council back in September for input
4 to a report to Congress. This report goes to the Senate
5 Committee's on Science, Commerce, and Transportation, and then
6 also the House Committee on Natural Resources.

7
8 The focus of this report, and it's one of several that are
9 required as a part of the Modernizing Recreational Fisheries
10 Management Act is on cooperative data collection, Section 201 of
11 the report, and it's the first of several reports that are due,
12 and I think the only one that's due by the end of this year.

13
14 Just to summarize what's in the report, it's a fairly high
15 level, and I presented this to the Full Council just last week,
16 and, basically, what we tried to do was incorporate as much as
17 we could from the different regions into the report without
18 getting into the weeds of specifics for the various regions, and
19 my goal on trying to present this to you is really to try and
20 see if we could get some input, and we know that there is a
21 draft report already posted on the website.

22
23 Anyway, this report really is to facilitate greater
24 incorporation of data analysis into stock assessments, basically
25 focusing on state surveys and non-governmental sources of data,
26 and so for greater incorporation of those sources into the
27 management process and the assessment process.

28
29 The report itself was to be done in consultation with the
30 council SSCs and the commissions, and we realized that the
31 timeline for this was pretty short, the end of this year, and
32 so, at the request of the councils, we extended the time for
33 input to the end of this year for council input, and so
34 hopefully we can still get the report as close to the end of the
35 2019 deadline as possible.

36
37 At this point, you have the draft report, and it's fairly short,
38 that high-level document, and it references, or relies on
39 referencing, other documents, really, for the details, and that
40 includes references to National Standard 2, the Stock Assessment
41 Improvement Plan, and various MRIP procedures and policy
42 directives, but also NAS reviews.

43
44 The focus has been on demonstrating that there is a process in
45 place to incorporate different data sources into management and
46 assessment processes, but acknowledging that there is a need for
47 improvement, and we provide some high-level recommendations for
48 improvement in the draft report that we're hoping that you can

1 add to.

2
3 The report itself is set up as a series of different sections.
4 As I said, there is a brief description of what we have in place
5 currently and how data are incorporated, and so the first
6 section is on types of data and analysis, and the second is on
7 inclusion of state and non-governmental sources, and the third
8 is on improving accuracy and precision of data, and that's where
9 you see references to the NAS reviews and also Stock Assessment
10 Improvement Plan recommendations.

11
12 This is followed by the best scientific information available
13 for the basis of fisheries management, and there is some
14 reference in there, or guidance in there, to incorporation of
15 non-traditional data sources, such as citizen-science-type of
16 information, and then it's split up into the Stock Assessment
17 Improvement Plan recommendations, National Standard 2, and MRIP
18 as well. Those are referenced in there.

19
20 Then, finally, the last part deals with the recommendation there
21 to look at two different levels, I guess, state and non-
22 governmental partners and then also on the NMFS and the fishery
23 management councils. They are broad in their scope, and they
24 are basically focusing on ways to improve the current process,
25 through things like provide more notice of data being available,
26 or data sources being available, that kind of thing, and so I
27 don't know if, Abbie, you want to add to that.

28
29 **MS. ABIGAIL FURNISH:** No, I think that's a pretty good overview.
30 We're interested in hearing some of the different perspectives
31 from the region and some of the issues that we have tried to
32 keep the -- Recognizing that the regional processes vary a lot,
33 and that may or may not be one of the strengths or weaknesses,
34 but we tried to keep the report pretty simple, in that sense of
35 what's really being described.

36
37 **DR. CODY:** That's it for the presentation, and it's pretty
38 short. We can answer any questions you might have.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Again, before we get into
41 questions, we do have the council's response to this, and so,
42 again, take a look at those. My initial reaction, when I read
43 this, is there's a lot of -- It's basically documenting what's
44 already in place, in terms of various review sort of processes
45 that we go through with data, not only here in the Gulf of
46 Mexico, but also in general throughout NMFS. Is that kind of
47 what the report is trying to do? Is this basically documenting
48 the existing things?

1
2 **MS. FURNISH:** I would say that we did try to make a few towards
3 the end, and we would love to hear if there is things that
4 should be changed or added in there as well, and we do recognize
5 that there are some places for improvement or recommendations,
6 but I do think that we did want to, overall, make the statement
7 that we do include a lot of non-governmental and state data
8 currently, and we do have a lot of processes in place for
9 reviewing that data, as-is, and so I think, yes, there is some
10 wanting to make sure that that was understood and on the record.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Well, by non-governmental data, all
13 fisheries data is non-governmental, and it comes from the
14 fishery, but, anyway, I think what you mean by non-governmental
15 data is things that are not collected by the government, and is
16 that correct?

17
18 **MS. FURNISH:** Yes, and that's the language that's used in the
19 report. I think one of the primary things we were thinking of
20 there is probably academic sources or studies, but it could also
21 even be other organizations, potentially, that have projects
22 that they would like to submit into the stock assessment
23 process.

24
25 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Also, the report, and this is something the
26 council has pointed out, is it refers to peer review, and I have
27 a broad review of what peer review is, and I think some of the
28 council members were interpreting peer review as submitting to a
29 journal kind of thing, which it really isn't very useful in this
30 process, and so making clear what peer review is, and I think
31 all the councils have a form of peer review, with the SEDAR and
32 the STAR process and so on, and I think that is something to
33 make clear.

34
35 You sort of refer to it when you talk about best scientific
36 information is the basis for fisheries management, and you go
37 through a process, in SEDAR, of looking at the data and what
38 will be included in an assessment and what will not, and that is
39 a process of peer review, which includes non-governmental
40 sources and also reviewed by non-governmental people, either
41 state or federal, and so that's something to include. I will
42 open the floor. If there is any questions or comments that
43 people want to make, then I would appreciate it.

44
45 **MR. RINDONE:** Dr. Powers, would you like me to go through some
46 of the council's comments?

47
48 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Yes, why don't you do that.

1
2 **MR. RINDONE:** All right. I will breeze through these briefly,
3 and these are on the website. The council discussed a few
4 different things, but one thing that wasn't included in the
5 State of Florida's feedback that they provided this morning was
6 that the council -- The report does not, but should, reference
7 efforts of the council and NMFS to implement electronic logbooks
8 for the for-hire component and that it's intended that the
9 implementation of electronic logbooks will improve -- It will
10 both reduce the uncertainty and improve the accuracy of catch
11 and effort data for the for-hire fleets and that, by using
12 electronic logbooks, the data should become much more timely
13 than what we receive now through the current MRIP collection
14 system.

15
16 Specifically, from the State of Florida, we received several
17 different points that address all of the sections that are
18 contained within the report.

19
20 Generally, the State of Florida thought that there should be
21 streamlining involved to reduce the burden on states and non-
22 governmental organizations trying to submit data, and they had
23 similar concerns about peer review and what that actually meant,
24 and they note in their comments that the SEDAR process, in
25 particular, and likely the rest of the formal stock assessment
26 processes throughout the different regions, have several steps
27 in place at which data are reviewed by people who are experts in
28 the appropriate field, and so the definition of "peer review" is
29 something that definitely should be fleshed out, but, also, the
30 thought that all these data have to be peer reviewed prior to
31 coming in to being considered they thought was overly burdensome
32 and required an awful lot in the way of time and funding in
33 order to achieve.

34
35 They thought that, for the types of data analyses used in
36 fisheries management, that, under the catch paragraph, that it
37 should be noted that Louisiana, Texas, and Alaska do not use
38 MRIP, and they have their own reporting systems, and the report
39 should also note the California, Oregon, Washington, NMFS HMS,
40 the Southeast Region Headboat Survey, and NMFS invertebrate
41 surveys as other established and previously-used non-MRIP
42 sources for recreational catch and effort in stock assessments.

43
44 In the inclusion of the state non-governmental sources, where it
45 states that state and non-governmental data are frequently
46 incorporated into fisheries management decisions, such as MRIP
47 state supplemental surveys, in actuality, none of the state
48 supplemental surveys are directly incorporated, as per the

1 recent white paper that came out that you guys looked at at your
2 last SSC meeting in September. The supplemental surveys from
3 Florida, Mississippi, and Alabama have been certified by MRIP,
4 but this does not mean that they are certified for use in stock
5 assessments by MRIP.

6
7 I am trying to find some things to highlight that haven't
8 already been mentioned, but the peer review thing is probably
9 one of the biggest things, the peer review thing and the
10 certification process by MRIP for the state surveys, and
11 defining a peer review process would seem a priority, and also
12 reducing a burden on states for being able to submit data,
13 states and non-governmental entities, for being able to submit
14 data into the stock assessments would allow for the provision of
15 additional data that otherwise, under the way that this report
16 is currently written, would imply that those data would not be
17 able to be considered, because they haven't been subjected to an
18 external peer review prior to being included in the assessments.

19
20 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Thank you.

21
22 **MR. RINDONE:** Any questions on that?

23
24 **DR. CODY:** I just have a comment. We got similar feedback from
25 the Caribbean Council's SSC this morning, in terms of that they
26 were given the impression that data would be excluded, or could
27 be excluded, based on the way the paper was written, from the
28 stock assessment process, and so that wasn't the intention of
29 the paper, and we will address that.

30
31 **MS. FURNISH:** I think our mindset is we know that, occasionally,
32 across the country, some data does get excluded, or is rejected,
33 and so I think our goal is, in the interest of eventually
34 leaning towards more data getting included, just clarifying a
35 little bit what the protocols are that exist.

36
37 **MR. RINDONE:** Okay, and that also reminds me of something else
38 that was discussed at the council meeting and that the State of
39 Florida mentioned specifically, which has to do with the
40 spatiotemporal requirements for data consideration, and we have
41 some datasets in the Southeast that they may only be for a year,
42 and they may be over a smaller area, but they may address a
43 specific question about selectivity or catchability or something
44 that otherwise helps reduce uncertainty in the model, and,
45 though the spatial and temporal coverage for some of these
46 studies may be small, they are still very informative, and so
47 some consideration of that should also be included.

48

1 **DR. CODY:** Ryan, that was exactly what we heard this morning
2 too, that, depending on the use of the data, and there were
3 different uses for certain datasets. In fact, sometimes it
4 could be used to determine how your traditional sources of catch
5 information might be interpreted, and so I think those are very
6 good suggestions for improvements to the paper.

7
8 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Also, the references to MRIP, it kind of
9 implies there that MRIP is certified in one sense, but then
10 might not be used, and it isn't so much that -- I mean, the
11 white paper that we went through at the last meeting, it isn't
12 so much that people are neglecting the MRIP, but it's trying to
13 reinvent the time series, the history, of catches, to make the
14 datasets compatible, and that's what is the limitations that
15 we're going to have to go through, and, from our understanding,
16 this is basically going to have to be on a region-by-region
17 basis.

18
19 **DR. CODY:** Yes, I think that's correct.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Are there any other comments? We've
22 got an hour-and-a-half for this, you know.

23
24 **DR. CODY:** You don't have to spend the whole hour-and-a-half.

25
26 **MS. FURNISH:** We don't need all of that.

27
28 **MR. BLANCHET:** One of the things that I don't think is extremely
29 well brought out in this is the difference between certification
30 of a survey or dataset and calibration, and it is kind of
31 mentioned, in a couple of places, but that's something I think
32 that should be brought out, because those are very different
33 processes, and, really, until you get past the calibration piece
34 of it, it's very challenging, and that has not been as well laid
35 out as the certification process.

36
37 **DR. CODY:** Thanks, Harry. That goes back to what Ryan brought
38 up earlier, and Joe as well, about there are some constraints on
39 how data can be used at this point and haven't been probably --
40 That could be addressed a lot better in the paper. Thanks.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Just because of the kind of people that will
43 probably be reading this, I think it's important to mention
44 every region's assessment process, SEDAR, et cetera, just within
45 a few sentences, just so a reader, congressional type, would now
46 that there is a formal process for every one of the council's
47 regions.

48

1 **DR. CODY:** Thanks. That's a good point.
2

3 **DR. LORENZEN:** I was wondering -- There is a section, and this
4 is sort of a general suggestion for that report, but there is a
5 section about types of data and the analyses, and I was
6 wondering whether there is any point in explaining a little bit
7 more how the different types of data are used in the stock
8 assessment process and the management and what are the important
9 features of those types of data, because that comes out later in
10 the details, but I think it would be good to maybe explain that
11 a little bit more upfront.
12

13 For example, one thing I can think of that I think is important
14 for people to understand is that, with abundance indices, for
15 example, those only really become useful once they have been
16 collected for a period of time, and so, even if you do
17 everything really well, they're not going to be very useful
18 after one or two years, and then I think, if we can explain a
19 little bit more what those sort of requirements are that we have
20 of certain types of data, that might help.
21

22 **DR. CODY:** Thanks. What you mentioned is what we heard this
23 morning too from the Caribbean SSC, in terms of distinguishing
24 the different data types and the fact that there are long-term
25 and short-term needs, and there are non-traditional and
26 traditional types of datasets that are -- How they are handled
27 will be very different depending on how they are used, and they
28 vary also by region, depending on the stock assessment process
29 that's in place.
30

31 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** One of the impressions that is left by the
32 document is that the use of the data is for stock assessments,
33 and, of course, it is, but you might want to put in a paragraph
34 or so of talking about the use for socioeconomic sorts of
35 situations, given that that's the next agenda item in our
36 meeting, about how that information is used.
37

38 Again, that has a different set of criteria and where smaller
39 spatial and temporal sorts of issues could still be very useful
40 in defining communities and so on and so forth, and so you might
41 mention something like that, too.
42

43 **DR. CODY:** Thank you. Ryan, we're taking notes here on the
44 different comments that are made, and will the draft document be
45 edited to reflect those comments, just so we don't miss
46 anything?
47

48 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes. I am going to take the document that you see

1 on the screen and clean it up a little bit and add in the SSC's
2 comments that have been discussed this afternoon, and we will
3 have a more formal letter put together to send out to you guys
4 as soon as is reasonable.

5
6 **DR. CODY:** But we still have access to the draft document right
7 now, and so that helps with that a lot, in terms of getting
8 ahead of it a bit.

9
10 **MR. RINDONE:** By all means, go ahead and start. That's
11 available to you.

12
13 **DR. CODY:** Thank you.

14
15 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** So is the intent to try to
16 incorporate these comments from all regions before the report is
17 submitted, or will there be another draft, I guess, after the
18 draft we just saw?

19
20 **DR. CODY:** Given the timeline, we're going to try and use sort
21 of an iterative report, where we try to keep you informed of
22 what we're doing. I don't know how it's going to work out, in
23 terms of getting this thing in by the end of the year.

24
25 **MS. FURNISH:** I think the last thing we discussed is that we did
26 push this deadline to make sure that everybody had a --
27 Including that we need to talk to the SSCs and have ample time
28 to review, and I think it limits our ability to give another
29 round of the document, and, I mean, we'll obviously share the
30 final document with all the councils, and I'm not sure -- I
31 don't think there will be another round for review and comment
32 though, after these are incorporated.

33
34 **DR, CODY:** What we might try to do is -- What we will try to do
35 is to keep you up-to-date on what we've done or how we have
36 incorporated the comments, just to get some feedback, if that's
37 possible.

38
39 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Great. Thank you. The other
40 question, just general question, I had on our council feedback -
41 - One of the big issues that came up, as Ryan mentioned, and I
42 think it was kind of at the end of the meeting, and I don't know
43 if you were still there, Dr. Cody, but the fact that we're
44 working on this large electronic logbook program for the for-
45 hire sector and trying to get that online and get that that
46 incorporated into the assessment process and monitoring process,
47 long-term effort calibrated and all those types of things, and I
48 know there is lots of other regions that are working on those

1 types of programs for fishery-dependent data, but where would
2 that live, or are you planning to put a section about what other
3 regions are also doing on those efforts and trying to work
4 towards improvement in these processes, and how do you see that
5 fitting into this report, I guess is what I'm trying to ask.

6

7 **DR. CODY:** You're really talking about inter-region sort of
8 collaboration or coordination, I guess.

9

10 **MS. FURNISH:** Speaking off the top of my head, it seems a little
11 bit more specific than the level that we were getting at in this
12 report. I mean, I think, obviously, when we have this early
13 section about catch, we can also talk about the advances being
14 made in monitoring and collecting catch data, but a lot of the
15 improvements in here weren't necessarily targeted either, the
16 continual improvements that are being made, which we
17 acknowledge, from the NMFS perspective, but kind of trying to
18 keep it a little broader and more just about the incorporation
19 of the process.

20

21 **DR. CODY:** I think that we can probably at least reference some
22 of the work that's been going on. There are some reference
23 documents that we can probably, without getting into the weeds,
24 which one is the for-hire workshop report, which hopefully will
25 be out soon, and that's an ACCSP-led initiative that deals with
26 the coordination between the different management regions and
27 trying to cut down on things like duplication of reporting and
28 efficiencies in the data collection, but I think that this was
29 more about improving the system as it stands and its ability to
30 incorporate different data sources.

31

32 Obviously, going to electronic reporting for the for-hire sector
33 will involve quite a leap, in terms of database structure and
34 management and those kinds of things, and so I think we can
35 probably, without getting into the weeds, reference the couple
36 of documents that are out there and some of the work that's
37 going on with the southeastern initiative as well, SEFHIER.

38

39 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** I think that would be great,
40 because I think it does fall under content, and so thank you.

41

42 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. I was just looking at the chat
43 thing at the bottom of the page here. Ken, did you have a
44 comment that you put in the chat section?

45

46 **DR. ROBERTS:** Yes, and thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a general
47 observation on that section, inclusion of state and non-
48 governmental sources, and it says in there that the data must

1 undergo a rigorous peer review, and I know you commented
2 somewhat on the peer review, but I am wondering -- Two things.
3 Number one, how do you conduct a rigorous peer review of
4 probably non-sequential, qualitative information, and then the
5 second thing is, in parentheses there, it says more information
6 to follow, and that may kind of open the door to what
7 information and when and where will it be shown, and so that's a
8 general observation. Thank you.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you.

11
12 **MS. FURNISH:** I think, overall, our fisheries perspective is
13 that National Standard 2 and the guidelines that are out there
14 is what we were talking about when we talk about peer review,
15 and the acceptable regional programs as well, and I don't think
16 we were intending to put additional burdens on any step that
17 than that exists.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Any other comments?

20
21 **DR. ROBERTS:** Joe, one more, please?

22
23 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Go ahead.

24
25 **DR. ROBERTS:** On the recommendations section, the one that deals
26 with -- It says, "for NMFS and fishery management councils (and
27 their SSCs)", and I don't know why that's there, that "and their
28 SSCs", that it's put in it that way. Then, on the Number 2 item
29 down there, it says consider identifying a liaison at councils
30 to assist non-governmental entities, and I don't know what
31 relationship that might have to the SSC, but, if somebody could
32 clarify that, I would like it. Thank you.

33
34 **DR. CODY:** My interpretation of that was really to help identify
35 sources of data, and maybe Abigail can correct me here, but
36 there has been an acknowledgement that, oftentimes, data shows
37 up at a stock assessment data workshop at the last second,
38 sometimes on the last day, maybe, and, if there was a process in
39 place where sources of data could be identified ahead of time,
40 so that there's enough notice to include them in a stock
41 assessment, that would be helpful, and so that was just a
42 general recommendation to help develop a communication path for
43 that.

44
45 **MS. FURNISH:** I think, just in general, that first one is --
46 Honestly, not all the other regions have the SEDAR process, and
47 so that's kind of encouraging, potentially, and it's up to the
48 regions and councils to decide if and when they would want to do

1 something similar to that, and so it does potentially involve
2 the SSCs in that process, but it's not mandated to them, and it
3 would sort of be as they decide.

4
5 I don't think that the second point is particularly meant to
6 increase any workload on the SSC. I think that would more be
7 under the consideration of the Science Center, or potentially
8 the council. Hopefully that helps.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Are there any other comments?
11 Again, I think my bias, and perhaps it has to do with years of
12 doing these kinds of reports and reports to Congress, is
13 sometimes it's better to over-explain to congressional types,
14 congressional staff, because what you don't want is to leave the
15 impression that you're not doing something when in fact you are.

16
17 **DR. CODY:** Yes, true.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Any other comments?

20
21 **MR. BLANCHET:** Mr. Chairman, one of the things that --
22 Unfortunately, in trying to update all of my files when the new
23 ones got available this morning, I deleted all of the comments
24 that I had on prior versions of the files that were earlier
25 available, and so I'm struggling a bit.

26
27 One of the things that I thought could -- Several months ago, we
28 had a paper come from NOAA that was discussing on the
29 recommended use of current Gulf of Mexico surveys of marine
30 recreational fishing and stock assessments, and I know that,
31 when that was initially sent to us, it was -- We thought that
32 there was still opportunities for corrections to it, even though
33 it did say final, but I was trying to read the two documents,
34 the one that was provided here and that document, together, and
35 I think it would probably be useful if some of the information
36 in that earlier document on the use of those surveys was folded
37 into here a little bit more clearly.

38
39 **DR. CODY:** That's a good point, Harry. We are in the process of
40 getting those comments from the different states, and we have
41 only received from a couple of states so far and some of the
42 councils, but we hope to have a more updated version of that
43 document out pretty soon, and there were some inaccuracies there
44 that were pointed to us by the states, and I know you provided
45 comments, and Mississippi, and a number of other states, and so
46 thank you for that. We can certainly reference that document in
47 here and do a better job of tying it in.

48

1 **MR. BLANCHET:** I thought that that really was a much broader
2 explanation of what you were trying to do in this particular
3 case, and so it was pertinent to this document, and I didn't see
4 it very well outlined.

5
6 **DR. CODY:** Yes, agreed.

7
8 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Are we running out of comments? I
9 think this has been very useful, and, as Ryan mentioned, he will
10 collate them and help to pass them along, along with the
11 council's comments, and with the idea of being able to finish
12 this by your deadline of December 31, and so no more comments,
13 correct?

14
15 If not, then we will move to the next agenda item, which is the
16 Review of *The Practitioner's Guide to Social Impact Assessment*,
17 and it actually is mentioning some of the uses, or a lot of the
18 uses, of the data, things like recreational data, and not just,
19 but as you go into the social impact assessment. Is there going
20 to be some sort of presentation of this?

21
22 **MS. SHIREMAN:** Yes, we have a PowerPoint that we sent yesterday.

23
24 **DR. LASSETER:** If I could just interject for one moment, as a
25 way of introduction, I guess, but I just wanted to give the SSC
26 a little bit of context for this agenda item. This document was
27 originally sent out to the Executive Directors of the councils,
28 and it was a little unexpected, and there was quite a short
29 opportunity, time period, for reviewing.

30
31 The Executive Directors were kind of communicating with each
32 other, real briefly, and some councils expressed that they would
33 go ahead and have their SSCs review it.

34
35 **REVIEW OF A PRACTITIONER'S GUIDE TO FISHERIES IMPACT SOCIAL**
36 **ASSESSMENT**

37
38 **MS. LISA COLBURN:** I am Lisa Colburn from the Office of Science
39 and Technology and the Northeast Fisheries Science Center, and
40 I'm with my colleague, Trish Clay, from the Northeast Fisheries
41 Science Center, and we put together this *Practitioner's Guide*.

42
43 I wanted to give you -- Before we talk in depth about it, I
44 wanted to give you just a little bit of history about it
45 originally was intended for the Northeast only, but it shifted
46 to being national in scope when we began to get feedback,
47 especially from new practitioners with no SIA experience, that
48 they were looking for direction, and so this is a process that

1 began a number of years ago, and there were a number of bumps in
2 the road, but we finally have this product that we are looking
3 for feedback from regional councils, and, largely, up until now,
4 it has been reviewed by multiple different NEPA practitioners
5 and human dimensions staff at the Regional Science Centers, but
6 we also recognize that the way that SIA is done is unique to
7 each region.

8
9 In the Northeast, the SIAs are done at the Science Center level
10 and at the council level. In the Southeast, I don't think
11 anybody at the Science Center does SIAs, but they are done at
12 the Regional Office and at the council, and so each region is
13 unique in its approach to SIA, and, therefore, we are really
14 looking forward to the feedback that we can get, so that we can
15 make this as broadly applicable as possible. With that, Trish
16 will give you an overview of the manual itself, and I will
17 finish, and then we can have questions anywhere along the way or
18 at the end, and it's up to you.

19

20 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Go ahead.

21

22 **MS. PATRICIA CLAY:** Lisa has given a little bit of background on
23 this, but why develop this manual? One reason is that we want
24 to create more standardization on SIAs, in order to make sure
25 that, in all cases, best scientific information available is
26 used for National Standard 2, and it's not that we think any of
27 the SIAs out there now are bad, but we just thought that it
28 would be a good thing to kind of get everybody on one page, so
29 that we're sure that everybody knows what the options are and
30 how to proceed.

31

32 Plus, as Lisa said, we were getting information from some people
33 who were new hires, who had never done an SIA, and they wanted
34 to know more about how that should be done, and I think all of
35 us who have done SIAs for many years -- Sometimes a little
36 brush-up on all the details is not bad.

37

38 Next, we wanted to talk a little bit in more detail about the
39 relationship of the manual here to the official SIA guidance and
40 some of the legal and policy framework that SIAs are based on.
41 The reason why many staff said that we have looked at the SIA
42 guidelines, the official guidelines, but they're actually fairly
43 high level, giving sort of broad ideas about what should be
44 included, but they don't really provide a step-by-step guide,
45 and so we thought that this might fill a nice niche, and, as I
46 said, not all staff have formal SIA training, and so they're
47 kind of coming into this cold, and this was thought to be
48 helpful.

1
2 The relationship to the official SIA guidance is that it
3 supports it, but it does not replace it. The official SIA
4 guidance is still the official SIA guidance, and this is just a
5 tech memo.

6
7 What's in the SIA guidance, the official guidance, it's noted at
8 one point that individual fisheries and issues will call for a
9 range of social factor analysis methods and techniques, and
10 selection of these tools will require a case-by-case judgment,
11 and I emphasize case-by-case judgment. We know that every
12 region is different, and every fishery is different, and the
13 types of data available are different, and the issues that
14 confront those regions and fisheries are different, and so we
15 tried to provide just enough detail that people could say, okay,
16 I know how to figure out what my SIA should look like. We have
17 given some background for making some of those case-by-case
18 judgements.

19
20 There are a number of laws that require SIA. Here, we're
21 highlighting the two most important ones, the National
22 Environmental Policy Act and, of course, the Magnuson-Stevens
23 Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and NEPA requires a
24 systematic interdisciplinary approach integrating natural and
25 social sciences, and any federal action, major federal action,
26 that significantly affects the quality of the human environment
27 must discuss how the impacts are made to social, economic, and
28 other requirements of Americans, and so that's a clear call for
29 social impact assessment within the NEPA process.

30
31 The Magnuson-Stevens Act, obviously, also has a fishery impact
32 statement requirement, which is generally taken care of within
33 the EIS, and it contains requirements for social analysis in
34 many different locations, in the section on fishery impact
35 statements, when implementing a limited access system, on
36 limited access privilege programs, under National Standard 8 on
37 fishing communities, and, of course, it includes a definition of
38 fishing communities, which includes that they need social and
39 economic needs. There are also some specific instances
40 referencing tribes or indigenous peoples, which we include for
41 the regions where that is something that's relevant to them.

42
43 Then one of the critical items, which in the official guidance
44 is listed as something that must be discussed, is E.O. 12898 on
45 environmental justice, and this requires analysis of impacts on
46 low-income and minority populations, and, within the manual, we
47 include the official definitions of those two terms, and so it's
48 not just, well, what does that mean.

1
2 The guidance for review of catch share programs also includes a
3 requirement to analyze the program's biological,
4 ecological/environmental, economic, social, and administrative
5 effects, and that is something that also provides a general
6 background for why we need to do social analysis, and National
7 Standard 8, of course, says that fishery managers must take
8 account of the importance of fishing resources to fishing
9 communities, and so that is one reason why we are so careful to
10 always conduct analyses at several levels, including the
11 community level.

12
13 We wanted to talk a little bit about where the SIA fits within
14 the context of the EIS, and one way to think about that is to
15 discuss the SIA versus the affected human environment section,
16 and another way is to talk about what constitutes social versus
17 economic impact assessments.

18
19 Simply stated, the affected human environment is the baseline,
20 and it includes the baseline -- There is a baseline biological,
21 baseline economic, baseline social. In all of those factors,
22 there is a baseline of where the fishery is today, before any
23 new regulation might be implemented, and then the SIA takes that
24 base section of the affected human environment and says, if the
25 currently-planned regulations are implemented, what are the
26 likely changes that will occur to the social fabric of the
27 fishery based on the implementation of these new measures?

28
29 Then, looking at social versus economic, it can be confusing,
30 because we both use some of the same data, but, while the -- I
31 quote here again from the official guidelines, but, while SIAs
32 focus on social and cultural values and systems, economic impact
33 assessments focus on market and non-market values and systems,
34 and, for both of us, this can include looking at fleets, firms,
35 industries, communities, and so there are a lot of common topics
36 and common related impacts, and, often, there will be an
37 economic impact that has a follow-on social or cultural impact,
38 or there may be something that has a straight direct social or
39 cultural impact, and so you have to be able to assess what is
40 happening, in terms of what is affecting which groups.

41
42 The next section of the manual is all about developing an SIA
43 and what are some common types of regulatory actions and who is
44 likely to be affected by those actions, what are key social
45 factors to consider, where do you find the data, how do you
46 write the SIA, once you've got everything collected.

47
48 We created this list to be basically encompassing of all the

1 likely types of regulatory actions that a council might
2 implement. If anyone sees something that they think does not
3 fit in any of these categories, that we have somehow left off,
4 please let us know, and we would like to add that in.

5
6 Within the body of the manual, we discuss each of these
7 regulatory actions a little more in-depth, along with the known
8 or likely social impacts that can result from these actions, and
9 that assessment is based on both the literature and expert
10 knowledge.

11
12 If you know what the regulation is, then you say, well, whom
13 does that affect, and one category of groups is something we
14 call interest or fleet-based groups, and this could be fishermen
15 who all fish with the same gear type or who all target the same
16 species or who are all members of a specific permit category
17 that is going to be differently regulated.

18
19 Then there are the place-based communities, places where people
20 live and dock and sell their fish. This is a little trickier to
21 figure out. It's not hard, but you can basically say we know
22 who has this kind of permit and we know who has this kind of
23 gear and we know who is landing this kind of fish, but how do
24 you choose which place-based communities?

25
26 In the past, we did kind of a quick-and-dirty thing, where you
27 said, well, let's rank the pounds and the value in order and see
28 where the top people come out. Now we have, with the community
29 and social vulnerability indicators, we have fishing engagement
30 and fishing reliance, which include a lot of other different
31 types of data, including permits held and number of dealers,
32 things like that, so that it's a little bit of a broader, more
33 encompassing measurement of the relative dependence and reliance
34 on fishing or the species that's in question.

35
36 We also have a regional and a local quotient, which can be
37 looked at as well, and the regional quotient looks at the
38 percent of that fish caught in a given community in relation to
39 the total amount of that fish caught in the region. The local
40 quotient is something similar, but it looks at, within a local
41 community, how much of the total landings in that community are
42 the fish in question, how dependent is the community on that one
43 fish.

44
45 Looking at both the engagement and reliance and regional and
46 local quotient, it can give you an even broader sense of what
47 might have been missed by one, but caught by another, and you
48 can get a more holistic sense of who is really going to be the

1 most heavily impacted, because of their dependence on this fish
2 or this group of fish.

3
4 It can also be helpful to query stakeholders, perhaps even just
5 in some casual conversations, something more if you have time,
6 to find out if there are any details which they think are
7 important which our statistical measures might not have
8 captured, something related to local history or cultural
9 dependence or something along those lines.

10
11 Once you have then your different groups, your fleet interest
12 groups and your place-base communities, then you want to look at
13 social groups. These are a long list of different kinds of
14 social groups that may be impacted by the regulation in
15 question, but it may not be, and so we discussed each of these
16 groups in a fair amount of detail, to tell you what to look for,
17 if this is something that you think -- If this is a group that
18 you think will be impacted, but, if you do kind of an initial
19 assessment and say, well, this is something that's only about
20 commercial fishermen, and it doesn't have any impact on
21 recreational, which some things will -- You can have commercial
22 regulations that have an impact on recreational fishermen, and
23 others that don't, and so you can decide if you need to actually
24 look at every one of these groups, and probably not, but this is
25 a way to make sure that you've covered all your bases and you
26 know that you are looking at all the groups that you should be
27 looking at.

28
29 Key social factors, these are directly out of the SIA manual,
30 but we try to sort of demystify them in the manual, and these
31 come out of the official guidance, and so size and demographic
32 characteristics, and that's things like age, sex, income, and
33 employment, and you could look at these for the community as a
34 whole, through the census. For fishery groups solely, you may
35 have some existing surveys, or maybe your permits have date of
36 birth on it for owners, or maybe you have a captain's license
37 that also gives age of the fisherman, and anything that you have
38 can be used in support of this.

39
40 You may not have the full range of information that you would
41 like, and it's certainly not in quantitative form, perhaps, but
42 then, also, what do you know about this fishery, just because
43 you know the fishery, or from the literature, and do we have a
44 sense of the gender base of the fishery, and so is it primarily
45 male? Are there more and more female captains, but not very
46 many, and these are things that you probably know, even though
47 they're not documented somewhere.

48

1 Cultural attitudes and beliefs, there's a lot of research that
2 shows that people base their actions on their perceptions, which
3 may not be what we would consider to be the objective truth, and
4 these perceptions are influenced by their beliefs, their values,
5 their culture.

6
7 To assess what these perceptions are, it usually requires
8 primary data collection. If you know far enough in advance, you
9 may be able to get a survey in place. If not, you may be able
10 to conduct a few focus groups, or maybe you just make a few
11 phone calls. There are different levels of data collection
12 which are acceptable, depending on what you have available, in
13 terms of base data and how much time you have.

14
15 The idea is just to provide what information you can, rather
16 than saying, oh, we don't know anything about this, which, a
17 long time ago, used to be the attitude. It was, oh, we don't
18 have any social data, and so we can't include any. There are
19 things that we know, even if they're not as complete as we would
20 like them to be.

21
22 Social structure and social organization, these are like
23 anthropological terms, and, basically, social structure is
24 formal institutions, the town government, the harbor commission,
25 the fishery management council, NMFS, the state government, and
26 social organizations are more informal ways of organizing
27 relationships, the fisherman that everyone looks to in the town
28 as the guy who really knows what's what. Then relationships
29 onboard a vessel, who gets to move up to captain and why, and
30 what are the -- How do different crew positions -- What kind of
31 respect do they garner? All these kinds of things are social
32 organization.

33
34 Looking at lifestyle issues, health and safety, non-consumptive
35 recreational, et cetera, here, you are looking at things like
36 the importance of fishing as a way of life, for which there is a
37 lot of literature, health and safety on vessels and in ports,
38 and there are a number of studies that have come out in recent
39 years on vessel safety. Then things like whale watching and
40 seabird watching and recreational fishing, or shell fishing, and
41 even people who just go to the beach and they collect shellfish
42 for their annual clambake.

43
44 You may have literature on some of this, and you may not have
45 statistical data, but you can at least reference the kinds of
46 activities that may be occurring.

47
48 Historical dependence on and participation in the fishery, this

1 is something where the community social vulnerability indicators
2 come in handy, and they are now being produced in trend data,
3 and so it's more useful than they were previously, and you can
4 get some historical sense of participation by looking at the
5 trends in fishing engagement and fishing reliance.

6
7 I just wanted to say, must all social factors be addressed, and
8 this is the same question as before, when I said that -- Again,
9 you don't have to look at every social factor, if it's not a
10 factor that is going to be affected by the specific regulation
11 that is being discussed, and so that's a judgment call, but,
12 often, it's fairly clear who will be affected, the kinds of ways
13 that they are most likely to be affected, and so you don't ever
14 have to study or list within the SIA information for every
15 social group and every social factor.

16
17 It's what would you consider -- It's kind of like a jury. What
18 would an average person believe is reasonable, when you talk
19 about reasonable doubt. Well, here, we're saying what would you
20 reasonably expect to be impacted, and who, by this regulation,
21 and then those are the areas you need to concentrate on. Next,
22 we come to the appendices, and Lisa will be taking over.

23
24 **MS. COLBURN:** I think we skipped a slide. If you could go back
25 one, that would be great. Trish, do you want to do this? I
26 will go ahead and cover this one then. We also cover finding
27 the different types of data, from primary data collection to
28 literature review, secondary data and primary data, and then
29 different kinds of interviews, such as semi-structured and oral
30 histories, focus groups, and surveys, and so we go into a bit of
31 depth into each of these, in terms of the process and what to
32 look for and the types of information that might be available
33 that fall into these different categories of data. Then we look
34 at writing the SIA, in terms of key sections to include and a
35 basic description of each of those sections.

36
37 Now I will talk about what is in the appendices, which is some
38 additional laws and executive orders that can be considered, as
39 well as other policy directives, and then a description of tools
40 and methods.

41
42 Trish already covered some of the key laws and executive orders
43 and policy directives, and I think, here, what's important to
44 focus on are any of the executive orders related to
45 environmental justice and treaty tribes, as well as the same for
46 policy directives, anything related to environmental justice and
47 tribal groups.

1 Also, it's helpful to look at the ecosystem-based fishery
2 management policy as well as the guidance for conducting a
3 review of catch share programs, but these are really intended to
4 provide context and background that, once you have looked at all
5 of these and had a chance to think about them, it provides the
6 broader context for why we do SIA.

7
8 In terms of tools and methods, we cover the basic types of
9 secondary data that are available to work with, and we also go
10 over the community social vulnerability indicators and provide
11 some context for what they are and what information was used to
12 develop them.

13
14 We also have some climate vulnerability indicators that may be
15 useful, and one of them is currently available on the Science
16 and Technology website for the community vulnerability
17 indicators, and we have a new one, a hurricane storm surge risk
18 indicator, that will be available very soon.

19
20 We also provide background information on semi-structured
21 interviews and oral histories and how to choose people to
22 interview, conducting the interviews, and transcribing and
23 analyzing the interviews.

24
25 In terms of other tools and methods, focus groups are a
26 possibility, and, in this particular section, we go over how to
27 set up a focus group, conduct a focus group, and then, again, in
28 analyzing the data. In terms of surveys, I forgot to mention
29 earlier that one of the things that we do talk about, or make a
30 distinction, on in the manual is when the Paperwork Reduction
31 Act -- When the need for it is triggered if you're doing a
32 survey of more than nine people, and so that's something to
33 consider in the process of you've been assigned an SIA, how much
34 time do you have, what are the resources available to you, and
35 what is needed in order to conduct a survey.

36
37 We do go through the different aspects of it, including beta
38 testing, choosing the sampling strategy, the survey method, and
39 analyzing the survey data, and I think that's it. Are there
40 questions or comments?

41
42 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. If you have a question, feel free
43 to interject it now.

44
45 **DR. LASSETER:** I have a question about just that very last part,
46 Lisa, that you mentioned, because you did loop in the PRA, the
47 requirement for PRA approval to do a survey, and would you say
48 that doing surveys that would require PRA approval are practical

1 for working on SIAs?
2
3 **MS. CLAY:** It all depends on how much time you have in order to
4 prepare the SIA. Sometimes it's a year, and you know it's
5 coming, but you have over a year to prepare for it. I think, in
6 my experience with SIAs, I rarely have that much time.
7
8 **DR. LASSETER:** Have you? Have you had an experience where
9 you've been able to complete a PRA process to get a survey
10 approved for an SIA?
11
12 **MS. CLAY:** I did not do surveys when I had written SIAs, but I
13 have done surveys recently that are surveys that are intended to
14 feed into SIAs, but are not addressing explicitly a specific
15 SIA. We just completed a crew survey, which is providing time
16 series information, which will feed into -- It's already being
17 used in SIAs in the Northeast.
18
19 **DR. LASSETER:** I think that's a really important distinction,
20 perhaps, to make, because this does seem to be geared towards
21 people that are beginners, and it is not standard practice. I
22 have never heard of an example of anybody getting PRA approval
23 for something that is going directly into an amendment SIA.
24
25 **MS. CLAY:** I actually have an example from the west coast, where
26 Suzanne Russell knew that a limited-access amendment was coming
27 down the pike, but she knew that they were starting to discuss
28 it probably two years in advance, and they hadn't made final
29 decisions, but she was able to then get a survey in in advance
30 and gather some data that way, and so it can be done, but it's a
31 really specialized situation, and usually it's something really
32 major, like limited access, that you might know is coming down
33 way in advance, but, with other things, there is just not going
34 to be time.
35
36 **DR. LASSETER:** Right, and I think that distinction would be -- I
37 didn't see that kind of a distinction noted or kind of addressed
38 in the document, and so that might be something -- I don't know
39 if you want to get people's hopes up and expectations that that
40 is actually feasible on a routine basis.
41
42 **MS. CLAY:** Sounds good. I mean, we do try to be clear that it
43 can take a long time, but, yes, we should make an extra note on
44 that point.
45
46 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you.
47
48 **MS. CLAY:** I also seem to recall that there was a survey -- I

1 think wasn't it for the Gulf grouper-tilefish IFQ review?

2
3 **DR. LASSETER:** Yes, exactly, and that's a good example. Those
4 types of reviews, and the studies going into those reviews, are
5 planned over a long period of time, and part of that time does
6 incorporate recognition that they have to go through the
7 process. We don't consider those -- Those five-year reviews are
8 not our SIAs for our amendments, and the sense that I had from
9 this document was that this was really for writing the SIAs and
10 regulatory documents, but that's exactly an example. The PRA
11 for that took a very long time, and that was completely outside
12 of the amendment process.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Any other comments?

15
16 **DR. LASSETER:** I have a couple more things, and I guess I could
17 kind of carry on and give other people maybe a chance to kind of
18 think and chat. You did, in the presentation, and I can't
19 remember, Trish, if this was you or Lisa that was going through
20 this part of it, but the Slide 9, when you said, hey, if anybody
21 else can comment on this list, or if you think of anything else
22 that we may be -- I forget how you put it, but wanted to think
23 about.

24
25 What really struck me from that list was how those all seem to
26 be -- Just the terminology you used, and, of course, the
27 terminology could apply to recreational, and recreational are
28 one-half of the side that would get some allocations, but I look
29 at this list, and I really think, wow, people are used to
30 working with the commercial sector only.

31
32 Like the trip and fish-based limits -- Bag limits is what we
33 call them for recreational fishing, and I think that's kind of
34 getting at a point that maybe is -- I'm not sure if it's in the
35 document, but should maybe be brought out a bit, that we do have
36 a lot more information that we can use to talk about the
37 commercial sector than we do on the recreational sector.

38
39 I wouldn't say that this is a -- I don't want to use the term
40 missing something so much as that's kind of -- It's something
41 that we're not always even aware of, that a lot of the analyses
42 that you talked about, and a lot of what's been kind of
43 advanced, when we're looking at the indicators work, Lisa, that
44 I know that you and Mike Jepson are very much a part of
45 developing, we have a lot more information to analyze and to
46 talk about the commercial sector that we do for recreational.

47
48 **MS. CLAY:** I will say that, in the section where we go through

1 each of these categories, wherever there is relevance to
2 recreational fishing, there is a discussion of commercial and a
3 discussion of recreational, and so we tried to be much aware
4 that we needed to include recreational, and we had Scott
5 Steinback go through all of this and make sure that we had not
6 left something out that was important to recreational. Lisa, I
7 will let you talk about recreational and community and social
8 vulnerability indicators.

9
10 **MS. COLBURN:** Well, I agree with you, Ava, and I take your point
11 about the limitations on recreational data for the purpose of
12 SIA, and so there is definitely a difference between what's
13 available between commercial and recreational.

14
15 **DR. LASSETER:** That's unfortunate, and that's something that
16 stymies us.

17
18 **MS. COLBURN:** It's highly regional as well, and so, from the
19 Northeast, we think the Southeast has much better recreational
20 data, but you're right, and I agree.

21
22 **DR. LASSETER:** It is what we -- We work with what we have, the
23 best available, but that is something that -- Maybe, if there's
24 some way you could kind of note that, that it's an unfortunate
25 reality that we just do not have comparable information to talk
26 about the recreational sector the way we can about the
27 commercial sector, and then hopefully, in time, that information
28 -- Those information gaps are going to be narrowed, but, right
29 now, the reality is that our documents -- We do more analyses,
30 and we have to say, hey, this speaks to the commercial sector
31 only, and, unfortunately, we don't have the comparable
32 recreational data available.

33
34 **MS. COLBURN:** Thank you for bringing that up. That is very
35 true.

36
37 **DR. MACLAUHLIN-BUCK:** Trish, I had a few comments that I got
38 from reading it, that, as a former SIA writer, and especially in
39 the Southeast, I guess a couple of things that I think would be
40 helpful for somebody who is just entering the field and could
41 give them some guidance.

42
43 One of the things is, especially in the Southeast, and I don't
44 know if it's like this in all the other regions, but, even
45 though these are serving as regulatory NEPA documents, as far as
46 NMFS is concerned, they are integrated documents that are used
47 as decision documents and public outreach documents, and I think
48 that may be kind of worthy of a mention, is that, yes, this SIA

1 is meeting any federal mandatory requirements to talk about the
2 social impacts, but they are also informing the decision-makers
3 and the public, and, I mean, I feel like that's really important
4 for folks writing that, and so keep that in mind. I think that
5 is what is cool about our documents, is that they're these
6 integrated things.

7
8 Then another one is I always try to think of how will these
9 proposed actions change someone's life, and sometimes that's an
10 economic impact, impact on the business community, but sometimes
11 there is just no impact. I mean, if it's minimal to none, and I
12 feel like that may be -- Just to mention that sometimes that
13 nothing is expected to change because of this regulatory action.
14 It's administrative, or it's dealing with the Sargassum Fishery
15 Management Plan in the South Atlantic, and like that just --
16 Nobody is harvesting that, and it's not going to affect
17 anybody's life, things like that.

18
19 I think that, when I started, I felt like I had to find
20 something to write about, and, in some cases, it just wasn't,
21 and that's fine. I think that's something --

22
23 **MS. COLBURN:** That's an excellent point, because I guess I
24 always presume that that's obvious, but I guess it's actually
25 not.

26
27 **DR. MACLAUHLIN-BUCK:** Yes, and, when you first are starting,
28 really, you feel like you're supposed to talk about --

29
30 **MS. COLBURN:** There's got to be something that I'm missing.

31
32 **DR. MACLAUHLIN-BUCK:** Yes, a cost or a benefit, and that's
33 fine. Sometimes there's just not, and then the other one that I
34 also struggled with, especially at the beginning, were not just
35 the endpoints in regulatory actions that affected harvest or
36 something, but like the protected resources issues that ended up
37 becoming some kind of council decisions, and those are really
38 tough, the marine mammal stuff, any kind of habitat stuff, and
39 that was actually challenging, and I know that other regions
40 have these non-fishery, non-extractive type of council actions
41 that are requiring an SIA, and I don't know, but maybe try to
42 put some of the different potential social impacts to think
43 about for those types of things. Anyway, but I feel like this
44 will be great for new folks getting in, just to get some
45 direction as they figure out how their region meets their SIAs,
46 and so thanks.

47
48 **MS. COLBURN:** Great. We've been sort of taking some notes, but

1 I am presuming that all of these comments will come in as part
2 of the official comments from the Gulf States Fishery Management
3 Council?

4
5 **DR. LASSETER:** We're actually the Gulf of Mexico Fishery
6 Management Council, and the commission is a different body.

7
8 **MS. COLBURN:** Sorry.

9
10 **DR. LASSETER:** As I explained in the beginning, I will be
11 putting together a letter, and we'll be incorporating feedback
12 that I get from any of the SSC members today.

13
14 **MS. COLBURN:** Okay. Cool.

15
16 **DR. ANDERSON:** First, I want to say thanks to Trish and Lisa. I
17 enjoyed reading the document, and I enjoyed the presentation,
18 and I'm going to take kind of a detour, or not a detour, but I'm
19 going to let this spring to something we talked about last time,
20 when we talked about the allocation reviews.

21
22 This is a very interesting thing, because you're doing an SIA of
23 a management action. Now, what does -- The regulatory review
24 says we're supposed to look and see if we need a regulatory
25 review, and I'm sorry that I am changing the topic, but I can't
26 help but think that this format would be very useful to starting
27 that allocation review thing and the concept of the affected
28 human environment.

29
30 If we can find an SIA, or the guys who are doing that work can
31 find an affected human environment document that is published,
32 then the whole notion of the allocation review is are we meeting
33 our objectives, and, well, could that be able to help us? I was
34 very frustrated by the discussion we had, and I think the
35 discussion we had was as good as it can get, but it says to go
36 look at this and see if we need to have a reallocation, and
37 that's the first step. Then, after you do that, you have the
38 steps, but how do you know what you're going to look at? This,
39 I think -- Let's get Trish and Lisa to write something on this
40 same sort of a thing for procedures for starting this thing.

41
42 It's my view that that allocation stuff is pretty much social,
43 and you're changing the distribution and allocation. That's
44 what it's about, and so these are the things we want to know.
45 Are these criteria, these different -- You know, the fisheries
46 engagement and those other things that they talk about in there,
47 are they showing us what we want? Are they meeting our
48 objectives? If not, then that could give us some spring-up to

1 say, well, no, they're not and maybe we do need it. If we look
2 at this and we say that we're meeting the objectives, we can
3 stop.

4
5 I really would hope that the group in the Gulf that is looking
6 at this will study this paper and perhaps work with Trish and
7 Lisa to take some of these things into their framework when they
8 do these studies. Thank you.

9
10 **MS. COLBURN:** I will say that, as far as I know, there is an
11 official guidance on allocations, which is being written right
12 now, and not by us.

13
14 **DR. LASSETER:** The allocation review, yes, and, actually, if I
15 can build off of what Lee just said. Lee, yes, that list of all
16 the things to put into the allocation review, any of them that
17 are socially related are reproduced here as well, every single
18 one of them, the RQ, the LQ, the vulnerability, and those lists
19 overlap, and my understanding is that Lisa Colburn actually did
20 reach out to -- And Trish. You guys did reach out to the
21 Regional Office, Southeast Regional Office, and my sense is that
22 all of the things that Mike Jepson and our Southeast Region
23 social scientists team work on, that those are incorporated in
24 this SIA document.

25
26 **MS. COLBURN:** That is correct, yes.

27
28 **DR. ANDERSON:** Well, I will rest easier when -- When I walked
29 away from that discussion, I was frustrated, because there was a
30 big long list of things, and here's what you're supposed to look
31 at, but it didn't really say in what regard, and, when I looked
32 at it, what am I supposed to learn, or what am I supposed to
33 take away, and I think, by adapting some of this SIA stuff, that
34 would make that first allocation review a little more valuable.
35 Thank you.

36
37 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. Any other comments?

38
39 **DR. ROBERTS:** In Section 201 that we just reviewed previously, a
40 lot of mention was made about the effort of NOAA to have
41 dependent and independent fisheries data for a long time series,
42 and that makes a lot of sense, and that's what you need to be
43 doing, but we're now dealing with an SIA assessment, as opposed
44 to a stock assessment, and the data are just not there for the
45 time series analysis, unless there is some secondary data that
46 you can pull out of a government report or a time series.

47
48 What concerns me most is that I think the SIA people who do the

1 investigations, or put them together anyway, need to spend a
2 little bit of time working on building some of the key time
3 series necessary in many of the SIA data points that they need,
4 and I think it would be really important, and it really troubles
5 me sometimes, on these things that are much based on feelings,
6 human feelings, and human feelings are very --

7
8 I think it would be well advised that you're dealing primarily
9 with cross-section data in an SIA, for most part, as opposed to
10 time series data, and that there needs to be some mention made
11 to the group of people who do these kinds of analyses to
12 eventually get the government working on building some time
13 series capabilities in some of the data points that they need
14 for the SIAs to be more powerful. Thank you so much. I
15 appreciate it.

16
17 **MS. COLBURN:** We definitely agree with you that we need more of
18 those data, and people are slowly trying to build up those kinds
19 of databases of information, and it's, unfortunately, costly,
20 and we started from basically zero in the mid-1990s, when I was
21 the only person in the region who was looking at these issues,
22 but we definitely are trying very hard to increase the datasets
23 that we have available, and we are very, very conscious of the
24 fact that we need to develop more information, but, yes, I'm in
25 total agreement.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you.

28
29 **DR. ROPICKI:** You know, I have looked at some of the things that
30 are kind of -- You know, the fishing engagement indicators and
31 reliance indicators for communities and stuff, and has there
32 been any thought to the idea of simplifying them, so that
33 they're almost automated?

34
35 Like you could get that time series at least started on
36 something basic, and if it's just some measure of how much of a
37 community's economic activity was driven by commercial fishing,
38 or recreational fishing, based off of some type of basic
39 measure.

40
41 **MS. COLBURN:** I think the automation of the indicators is
42 something that's happening as we speak, and individual regions
43 are putting effort into automating the whole process for the
44 engagement and reliance indices, and so that's something that we
45 can begin to look at and have access to more easily.

46
47 I think additional indicators, as I think you're suggesting,
48 it's really a question of acquiring the data and does the data

1 exist and what we can do with it. I think, for social analysis,
2 we have really had to dig deep and to rely quite a lot upon
3 secondary data to accomplish some of the analysis that we're now
4 able to do today.
5
6 I agree with you that automating it is the first step, and that
7 is happening as we speak, and then the need for additional data,
8 so that we can do some of these analyses, like you suggested, I
9 think would be very helpful.
10
11 **MS. CLAY:** Some of what you described also sounded a lot like
12 input-output analysis that the economists do, where they look at
13 how much -- I think you said something about how much the
14 fishery depends -- How important it is to a community?
15
16 **DR. ROPICKI:** Well, I wasn't really trying to dig into the
17 input-output analysis, and, I mean, I realize that it sounded
18 like that a little bit, but it was -- I think there was a 2010
19 paper in *Marine Policy* with Mike Jepson and a few others, where
20 they used some data that looked like -- They came up with one
21 indicator, and it looked like something you could automate, but,
22 no, I didn't mean to imply that I was looking at input-output or
23 something like that.
24
25 **MS. CLAY:** Lisa, would that have been the RQ and OQ?
26
27 **MS. COLBURN:** It might have been. Mike is listening in, and he
28 could speak to that, potentially.
29
30 **MS. SHIREMAN:** I don't actually see him on here.
31
32 **MS. COLBURN:** He was communicating with me as we were speaking,
33 and so --
34
35 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** He might be listening.
36
37 **MS. COLBURN:** He said that he can't speak right now, and so the
38 2010 paper in *Marine Policy* could have been the Steve Jacob and
39 Priscilla Weeks and Ben Blount and Jepson paper that came up
40 with the initial social indicators that we then adopted, and
41 then there was an LF SSI that Mike and I think that it was Steve
42 Jacob also developed, and so I think -- Is what you're saying,
43 Andrew, the idea of coming up with a single indicator?
44
45 **DR. ROPICKI:** Yes, and, I mean, what I remember -- I'm sorry
46 that I don't have it in front of me, but it looked different
47 than your RQ and LQ, and, I mean, it took into account not just
48 the fishing community size, relative to its neighbors, in terms

1 of fishing, but it took in kind of just general size of the
2 local economy and how important fishing was to it.

3
4 **DR. LASSETER:** I think this is the vulnerability stuff, where
5 you use the different measures underneath the census. From what
6 I remember is that fishing is often a very small part of the
7 respective economy of whichever community is measured, and so
8 you were trying to get at what are social factors within a
9 community that could contribute to vulnerability, whether or not
10 a particular regulation is going to affect community-wide.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Thank you. This has been useful, and I
13 learned some things, and particularly what's on the screen here
14 about the different regulatory actions, and one of the things
15 that all of us in fisheries management realize is that all of
16 them have allocation kinds of issues with them, in the sense
17 that different user groups are affected differently for each one
18 of these things, and so it's a management call about which --
19 When you're implementing a regulation, there are going to be
20 differential impacts, and to be able to try to evaluate those, I
21 think, is very important. Do we have any other comments? If
22 not, then, Ryan, were you taking notes for this?

23
24 **MR. RINDONE:** I thought you were. Yes, I have taken some notes,
25 and Ava has taken some notes, and we've got some things down,
26 and so we'll incorporate those into the summary.

27
28 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. That would be very useful then. All
29 right. If there is no other comments, then is there any other
30 business, with the agenda item of Other Business? Ryan, you
31 sent out something, which I haven't read, and it was just before
32 the meeting started, about the January meeting.

33
34 **OTHER BUSINESS**

35
36 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes, and so I sent you guys a doodle poll for the
37 week of January 6th, and it's about the best that we can do to
38 hold the meeting in enough time ahead of the January council
39 meeting to be able to get a summary drawn up and available to
40 the council to review, but it's still late enough to allow
41 everyone to have a good amount of time to holiday travel.

42
43 Just as an idea -- Please fill out this doodle poll and indicate
44 your availability as soon as possible, and, just to give you
45 guys an idea of some of the stuff that's going to be on the
46 agenda, we have some technical memos from NMFS on the economic
47 analyses, a report from the GAO about allocation, a discussion
48 about the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary expansion with

1 the Coral SSC, and we'll discuss the May joint meeting for
2 reviewing the yellowtail snapper and cobia stock assessments.

3
4 Then some stock-assessment specific things are a review of the
5 FES data and projections for lane snapper, a review of the FES-
6 adjusted allocation and projections for red grouper, which you
7 guys saw a little bit of at the last meeting in September, and
8 then the big thing is the SEDAR 62 presentation of gray
9 triggerfish, which will include the FES-adjusted allocations and
10 projections for that one as well, both the way the allocations
11 are now and what they would be if we used the FES numbers for
12 the same informative time series. I am thinking about a day-
13 and-a-half right now.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. Thank you. So fill out the poll, the
16 doodle poll, and you said the week of January 6th, and is January
17 6th on a Monday?

18
19 **MR. RINDONE:** Yes.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN POWERS:** Okay. All right. If there are no other
22 comments, then I thank everybody for attending. If there is no
23 objection, then we will adjourn the meeting. Any objections to
24 adjourning the meeting? If not, then thank you very much, and I
25 think this has been useful. We're adjourned.

26
27 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on October 29, 2019.)

28
29 - - -
30