

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
SHRIMP MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Battle House Renaissance Mobile Mobile, Alabama

October 22, 2014

VOTING MEMBERS

- Harlon Pearce.....Louisiana
- Kevin Anson (designee for Chris Blankenship).....Alabama
- Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- Roy Crabtree.....NMFS, SERO, St. Petersburg, Florida
- Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- Myron Fischer (designee for Randy Pausina).....Louisiana
- Corky Perret.....Mississippi
- Robin Riechers.....Texas

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

- Martha Bademan (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
- Doug Boyd.....Texas
- Jason Brand.....USCG
- Pamela Dana.....Florida
- Dale Diaz (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
- John Greene.....Alabama
- Campo Matens.....Louisiana
- John Sanchez.....Florida
- Greg Stunz.....Texas
- David Walker.....Alabama
- Roy Williams.....Florida

STAFF

- Stephen Atran.....Population Dynamics Statistician
- Assane Diagne.....Economist
- John Froeschke.....Fishery Biologist
- Doug Gregory.....Executive Director
- Beth Hager.....Financial Assistant/IT Coordinator
- Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
- Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- Emily Muehlstein.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist
- Charlene Ponce.....Public Information Officer
- Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
- Charlotte Schiaffo.....Research & Human Resource Librarian
- Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Executive Director

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

- John Anderson.....

1 Pam Anderson.....Panama City Beach, FL
 2 Billy Archer.....Seminole Wind, Panama City, FL
 3 Steve Ashby.....MS
 4 Dylan Atkins.....Galveston, TX
 5 Randy Boggs.....Orange Beach, AL
 6 Steve Branstetter.....NMFS
 7 JP Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy
 8 Gordon Burdette.....Orange Beach, AL
 9 Rick Burns.....MDMR
 10 Katie Chapiesky.....
 11 Glenn Delaney.....
 12 Michael Drexler.....Ocean Conservancy
 13 Brandon Eclar.....Extreme Offshore Charters
 14 Troy Frady.....Orange Beach, AL
 15 Benny Gallaway.....LGL Ecological, TX
 16 Sue Gerhart.....NMFS
 17 Brad Gorst.....Palm Harbor, FL
 18 Ken Haddad.....American Sportfishing, FL
 19 Ben Hartig.....SAFMC
 20 Scott Hickman.....Galveston, TX
 21 Chris Horton.....Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation
 22 Kelly Lucas.....MDMR
 23 Billy Murph.....Orange Beach, AL
 24 Joe Nash.....Orange Beach, FL
 25 Dennis O'Hern.....FRN, FL
 26 Bonnie Ponwith.....SEFSC
 27 Jim Roberson...International Game Fish Association, Shalimar, FL
 28 Lance Robinson.....TX
 29 Phil Steele.....NMFS
 30 Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS
 31 Joe Tyner.....Fort Walton Beach, FL
 32 Jack White.....Summer Hunter Charter
 33 Libby Yranski.....American Sportfishing Association
 34 Bob Zales.....Panama City, FL

35
36 - - -

37
 38 The Shrimp Management Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery
 39 Management Council convened at the Battle House Renaissance
 40 Mobile, Mobile, Alabama, Wednesday morning, October 22, 2014,
 41 and was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chairman Harlon Pearce.

42
 43 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
 44 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 45 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**
 46

47 **CHAIRMAN HARLON PEARCE:** Good morning and we're ready to go.

48

1 **MR. CORKY PERRET:** I am first, Mr. Pearce.
2
3 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** You are first? All right.
4
5 **MR. PERRET:** I have an announcement to make. One of our council
6 members, today is her birthday and that's Ms. Leann Bosarge and
7 Happy Birthday, Leann.
8
9 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Mr. Perret, is it okay to proceed now?
10
11 **MR. PERRET:** Yes, sir, Mr. Pearce.
12
13 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** We will call the Shrimp Committee of the Gulf
14 of Mexico Fishery Management Council to order and members
15 present are myself, Kevin Anson, Leann Bosarge, Dr. Crabtree,
16 Myron Fischer, Corky Perret, Robin Riechers, and Dave Donaldson.
17
18 Next up is the Adoption of the Agenda and do we have any changes
19 or omissions or anything for the agenda? If not, I would like
20 to hear a motion to adopt the agenda as written. We have a
21 motion and do we have second? We have a second. Any opposition
22 to adopting the agenda? Hearing none or seeing none, the agenda
23 is adopted.
24
25 Next, Approval of Minutes, any changes to the minutes? If
26 everybody is okay with the minutes, I would entertain a motion
27 to adopt the minutes. We have a motion and a second. Any
28 opposition to the adoption of the minutes? Seeing none, the
29 minutes are adopted.
30
31 The Action Guide is Tab D-3 and it's pretty self-explanatory.
32 Any questions about the action guide or any changes to the
33 action guide? If not, we will move on. Next is Shrimp
34 Amendment 15, Final, Tab D-4. We are ready to go and are you
35 going to take it?
36
37 **SHRIMP AMENDMENT 15 - FINAL - STATUS DETERMINATION CRITERIA FOR**
38 **PENAEID SHRIMP AND ADJUSTMENTS TO THE SHRIMP FRAMEWORK PROCEDURE**
39
40 **MS. SUE GERHART:** Shrimp Amendment 15 covers stock status
41 determination criteria as well as the framework procedure.
42 There are three actions. The first action, Action 1, is the
43 overfishing level.
44
45 There are three alternatives and the council has chosen a
46 preferred alternative. The first, no action, is to maintain the
47 parent stock number being the overfishing threshold, whereas the
48 other two alternatives deal with the new model that was being

1 used for the stock assessment.
2
3 Currently, the thresholds do not match the outputs of the models
4 and the preferred alternative is Alternative 2. Here is the
5 Preferred Alternative 2, which uses the maximum fishing
6 mortality threshold, defined as the apical fishing mortality
7 rate, and this is the current preferred and I believe Mr. Perret
8 has something to add to that.
9
10 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** We had a shrimp meeting about three weeks ago
11 in New Orleans and the committee came up with FMSY as the proxy
12 for the overfishing definition and with an ACL that's at the
13 MSY.
14
15 **MR. PERRET:** But do we have a specific motion that was presented
16 for us to consider? Do we have some wording?
17
18 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** We had a motion, but I don't think it's -- We
19 don't have the document yet. We don't have the report yet, but
20 I don't remember exactly what it was and do you remember?
21
22 **MS. GERHART:** They didn't make a motion, but they just approved
23 the MSY values and the FMSY values that were presented to them,
24 but the full SSC has not seen this yet and so it's not been
25 approved by the full SSC. They will meet in March to look at
26 that.
27
28 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** But I believe we need to put this in as an
29 alternative now.
30
31 **MR. PERRET:** That's my question. Do we need to put it in at
32 this -- Well, I don't know what the language is, but I would
33 like to have it included so I could make that motion to add it,
34 please. Do you have some wording?
35
36 **MS. GERHART:** I think you would just add an alternative to
37 Action 1 that uses the FMSY as the overfishing threshold.
38
39 **MR. PERRET:** I so move to add that as an additional alternative
40 and I guess that's Alternative 4 and that's going to be the
41 preferred now?
42
43 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** If we make it so, yes.
44
45 **MR. PERRET:** I move that be the preferred alternative.
46
47 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Do we have a second to that motion? Leann
48 seconds it. Any discussion on this motion? Basically what

1 we're doing is --
2
3 **MR. PERRET:** We need to get the motion so we can see what we're
4 --
5
6 **MS. MARA LEVY:** Can we take it one step at a time? Can we make
7 it a new alternative and then we -- You are making it a
8 preferred before we even know what it is and what the full SSC
9 thinks of it. I mean I don't have any problem with you putting
10 it in as an alternative, but then I think maybe make a separate
11 motion to make it a preferred and discuss why that's appropriate
12 at this time.
13
14 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Is that okay, Mr. Perret?
15
16 **MR. PERRET:** All right. I just move that we add it as an
17 additional alternative, once we get the correct language. Not
18 as a preferred at this time.
19
20 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** It's Amendment 15, by the way, and not 16, for
21 the board. As soon as we get it up, we'll read it.
22
23 **MS. GERHART:** I think if you say just an alternative that sets
24 the threshold using FMSY.
25
26 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Corky, you're going to add to that I'm sure.
27 That should be the overfishing threshold.
28
29 **MR. PERRET:** Is that what we want to do?
30
31 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** That's in Action 1.1 as well.
32
33 **MR. PERRET:** That will be my motion, to add an additional
34 alternative, which is Alternative 4, to set the overfishing
35 threshold using FMSY, to Shrimp Amendment 15, Action 1.1.
36
37 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Are you okay with that, Leann? Yes.
38
39 **DR. ROY CRABTREE:** When I look at the existing alternatives,
40 they all list what the F values are for brown, white, and pink
41 shrimp. Can you add the F values into your motion, so that it
42 is --
43
44 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** We can get that done on this end.
45
46 **DR. CRABTREE:** I would like to see those before we vote on this.
47
48 **MR. PERRET:** Thank you, Dr. Crabtree. Good point. Please add

1 that.
2
3 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** We are getting it looked at right now.
4
5 **MS. GERHART:** For pink shrimp, 1.35; white, 3.48; and brown,
6 9.12.
7
8 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Will that satisfy this for you, Roy?
9
10 **DR. CRABTREE:** Well, why are they so different than the F's in
11 the other alternatives? For example, pink shrimp in Alternative
12 2 is 0.23 and 0.20 in Alternative 3 and there, it's 1.35. Those
13 F's all seem to be orders of magnitude higher than the F's in
14 the other alternatives and so I think we need an explanation of
15 that.
16
17 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I don't see -- Is Jim Nance in the audience?
18 They went over in detail the different models that they used and
19 this is what they came up with and we beat that up pretty good
20 at the meeting.
21
22 **DR. CRABTREE:** "They" being who?
23
24 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Jim Nance and his group at the meeting we had
25 in New Orleans two weeks ago or three weeks ago.
26
27 **DR. CRABTREE:** Well, I assume their report is which tab that
28 presents all of that?
29
30 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** We don't have the report written yet.
31
32 **DR. CRABTREE:** We don't have anything then that supports doing
33 this, do we?
34
35 **MR. PERRET:** We have not seen the report.
36
37 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** It's on the FTP site.
38
39 **DR. CRABTREE:** Well, can we -- I mean you're asking us to vote
40 on this and we don't have any rationale or the report.
41
42 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** All right. Can we pull that up? We are going
43 to try to pull it up and get it printed for you or get it so you
44 can see it.
45
46 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** When we were discussing this earlier, we
47 wanted to add this alternative and, Corky, did you say that you
48 wanted the SSC to give us the feedback on it or were we simply -

1 - The feedback would be the report that we're waiting on from
2 the working group that analyzed it?

3

4 **MR. PERRET:** Just a second. I am looking.

5

6 **DR. CRABTREE:** I mean with the condition that, one, we're not
7 taking final action today, at this meeting, and it's going to go
8 back to the SSC after that, then I don't particularly have
9 problems adding it in there, but I wouldn't want to see us have
10 a discussion of choosing this as a preferred at this point,
11 because I just don't know what this means.

12

13 It seems to me these F's are somehow generated differently than
14 the other ones, but I'm having a hard time understanding what
15 all this means.

16

17 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I understand. I understand. So we're not
18 going to pick a preferred, but we're going to put this in as an
19 alternative and you're okay with that, right?

20

21 **MR. PERRET:** But we will not be taking final action on this one
22 today.

23

24 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** No, we're not.

25

26 **MS. GERHART:** Charlotte, could you fix the brown number? It
27 should be 9.12.

28

29 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** All right. Does everyone understand what
30 we're doing and is everyone satisfied with what we're doing?
31 Bonnie, any comments? Any comments from the Center?

32

33 **DR. BONNIE PONWITH:** At this point, no. I can check in with
34 staff and learn a little bit more about their report and the
35 plan for getting it to the full SSC, but at this point, no.

36

37 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Okay. We have a motion on the floor and we
38 have a second on the floor. **Any opposition to this motion?**
39 **Hearing none, the motion carries.**

40

41 **MS. GERHART:** Action 1.2 deals with the overfished threshold and
42 that is changing for the same reason as the overfishing
43 threshold. The current conditions or the current thresholds do
44 not match the outputs of the model, the newer model.

45

46 Alternatives 2 and 3 match with the model, the outputs, and the
47 preferred alternative currently is Alternative 2. This
48 alternative uses the apical value from the fishing years of 1984

1 to 2012 minus the 95 percent confidence limit and so that is the
2 current preferred.

3

4 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Any questions?

5

6 **MS. GERHART:** Action 2 is the framework procedure and this is
7 the same update that's been done with the Reef Fish Framework
8 Procedure and the CMP Framework Procedure. We add the ability
9 to adjust accountability measures as well as making some other
10 editorial changes to the framework. The full list of those
11 things that can be changed is in the document and this is the
12 shorter version of the preferred alternative and so this is
13 where the council is right now.

14

15 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Any discussion, questions, or additions?
16 Hearing none, we will move on.

17

18 **MS. GERHART:** Okay and so that's it for Amendment 15. You won't
19 be taking final action at this time and we have not so far
20 gotten any public comments on this either.

21

22 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** No public comments? None at all? Okay. We
23 are going to be moving off of 15 and any more discussion on 15?

24

25 **MR. PERRET:** Just a question. When is the SSC going to get a
26 chance to give us some more guidance on this thing? Do we have
27 a scheduled webinar or conference call or meeting?

28

29 **MS. GERHART:** I'm not sure if it's scheduled, but the meeting is
30 supposed to be in March, I believe.

31

32 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** All right and we will move on to Amendment 16.

33

34 **SHRIMP AMENDMENT 16 - FINAL - ADJUSTMENTS TO THE ANNUAL CATCH**
35 **LIMIT AND ACCOUNTABILITY MEASURES FOR ROYAL RED SHRIMP**

36

37 **MS. GERHART:** Amendment 16 is royal red shrimp and this
38 amendment was necessary because there were some conflicting
39 regulations. When the Generic ACL/AM Amendment was put in, a
40 new ACL and accountability measure were entered, but the current
41 ones were not listed currently in the no action alternative and
42 so this is a draft supplemental environmental impact statement
43 to that Generic ACL one.

44

45 There are two actions and the first deals with the ACL. The
46 council has picked their preferreds for these and so the first
47 action, the no action alternative would be to retain both
48 values, the quota that was already on the books as well as the

1 new ACL from the Generic ACL Amendment.

2
3 The second alternative would keep the new ACL and remove the old
4 quota and the preferred third alternative would remove both of
5 those and update the ACL to match the new ABC that the SSC put
6 forward, which is slightly higher than the old one. That is
7 your preferred at this time, Alternative 3.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** All right and any discussion from the
10 committee? Is everyone satisfied? All right. We will move on.

11
12 **MS. GERHART:** Action 2 deals with the accountability measure.
13 Again, there are two different accountability measures right now
14 and the no action alternative would retain both of them.
15 Alternative 2 would retain the old one, which is an in-season
16 closure and monitoring of the landings, and Preferred
17 Alternative 3 is from the Generic ACL/AM Amendment and in this
18 case, it would not have in-season closures or monitoring unless
19 the ACL is exceeded in the previous year.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Any discussion or any questions? Hearing
22 none, we will move on.

23
24 **MS. GERHART:** That's it for 16.

25
26 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** All right. That's Amendment 16 and any public
27 comments on that?

28
29 **MS. GERHART:** There were no public comments. However, we did
30 publish a draft supplemental environmental impact statement.
31 There were some comments submitted. Quite a few of those didn't
32 really have to do with the direct actions in this amendment, but
33 they talked about things such as allowing the states to manage
34 royal red shrimp and prohibiting shrimping altogether to protect
35 bycatch and habitat and removing all management from shrimp and
36 setting a spawning season for royal red shrimp.

37
38 The ones that were directly addressed to the actions talked
39 about asking the council to be conservative, because we don't
40 know what the impact of Deepwater Horizon has been on these
41 shrimp. Then the second comment commented that there were a lot
42 of permits out for royal red shrimp that aren't being used and
43 if those individuals started fishing that we may exceed the
44 annual catch limit.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** All right.

47
48 **MS. BOSARGE:** I did receive a few phone calls from a couple of

1 fishermen that received the mail-outs about Shrimp Amendment 15
2 and 16 and they just had a few general questions, because it was
3 a very technical document and so we talked about it and they
4 were okay with it. They were fine with it.
5

6 **MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN:** I just wanted to let you guys know what
7 we did, because at the last meeting you had talked about how we
8 were going to get comment and so we did send out a mail-out with
9 the different amendment guides that we do for Shrimp Amendment
10 16 and also 15 and we also got a number of different phone calls
11 that were asking questions, but it sounded like once we sort of
12 explained what was happening and it wasn't that we were reducing
13 quotas and things like that, most of the public didn't seem
14 terribly concerned with the amendment and so we didn't actually
15 get any official comment given to us, but we did get a lot of
16 inquiries after that send out.
17

18 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Thank you. This amendment is the final
19 amendment and so I think we need to move it on.
20

21 **MR. PERRET:** I am ready to make that motion, but the thing is we
22 are going to have public testimony this afternoon on a number of
23 things, Amendment 16 being one of them, but I guess if the
24 committee passes the motion I am ready to make and we do have
25 substantial comments relative to 16, we may or may not want to
26 modify anything and so keep that in mind.
27

28 I think the language is -- Where is my buddy, Robin, who has got
29 it down pat, but I think the language is something to the effect
30 of recommend Amendment 16 as necessary and appropriate with
31 editorial license to council staff and final approval given to
32 the Council Chair. Is that the language?
33

34 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Kevin, is that good enough for you?
35

36 **MR. PERRET:** **Shrimp Amendment 16 be submitted to the Secretary**
37 **of Commerce for implementation and that the regulations be**
38 **deemed as necessary and appropriate and that staff be given**
39 **editorial license to make the necessary changes in the document.**
40 **The Council Chair is given the authority to deem any changes to**
41 **the codified text as necessary and appropriate. So moved, Mr.**
42 **Chairman.**
43

44 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Do we have a second? We have a second from
45 Leann. Any discussion on the motion?
46

47 **MS. LEVY:** I just want to note that you do have the codified
48 text in your briefing book, D-5(b) and it essentially removes

1 the provisions, the quotas, because that's what we're doing, and
2 we're keeping the annual catch limit and the closure provisions
3 and the AMs related to that, but you can take a look at that.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Okay. Mara, do you want us to do that before
6 we pass this motion?

7
8 **MS. LEVY:** I just assumed you had already been well versed in
9 it.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Thank you. All right. We have a motion on
12 the floor and we have a second. Any discussion? **Hearing none,**
13 **any opposition to the motion? The motion carries.** Shrimp
14 Amendment 17, D-6.

15
16 **SHRIMP AMENDMENT 17 - SCOPING DOCUMENT OF THE SHRIMP PERMIT**
17 **MORATORIUM**

18
19 **MS. GERHART:** Amendment 17 is being developed at the council's
20 request to address the expiration of the permit moratorium in
21 October of 2016. A little history on the permits. The Shrimp
22 FMP was put into place in 1981 and the commercial permits were
23 first required in 2001 and those were open access permits.

24
25 The moratorium was put in place in 2006 and it was a ten-year
26 moratorium and so 2016, on October 26, is the expiration date
27 for these permits.

28
29 The qualifications for those permits, for the moratorium
30 permits, at the time were that they had to have had a permit, a
31 valid permit, by December 6, 2003, the control date, and there
32 was an exception made for some vessels that had been lost for
33 whatever reason and there were some appeals and such and so, in
34 reality, the last permit was issued in 2007.

35
36 If we look at the number of permits that were involved, from
37 2001 to 2006, 2,951 open access permits were issued. Of those,
38 2,666 actually qualified for the moratorium, based on having a
39 valid permit on the control date. That means 285 did not
40 qualify. Of those 285, only 159 of them were actually active in
41 2002, which was the year that was the last year that was full at
42 the time of the analysis.

43
44 Of those 159, only seventy-two were active in federal waters and
45 so those were the vessels that were most affected by the
46 moratorium, were those seventy-two vessels. There is a
47 breakdown in size, because it was thought that the smaller
48 vessels were probably mostly state vessels anyway. There were

1 1,933 permits issued for the moratorium out of those that
2 qualified.

3
4 Since that time, the only way that permits are terminated is if
5 they aren't renewed within one year of their expiration date and
6 so the permits are good for a year and then there's an
7 additional year after that in which the owner can renew those
8 and so this shows you a little bit of how many permits were
9 terminated each year since the moratorium went into place and,
10 of course, this is not complete for 2014, but a total of 451 of
11 those permits were terminated because they weren't renewed.
12 None of these terminations were permits that were taken away
13 from anyone. They were because they were not renewed by the
14 owner.

15
16 The purpose and need developed by the IPT for this amendment and
17 for your review is the purpose is to determine if limiting
18 access to permits is still necessary for the shrimp fishery and
19 the original reasons were to prevent overcapacity and promote
20 economic stability and the need is, of course, to maximize the
21 efficiency of the Gulf shrimp resource and help achieve optimum
22 yield.

23
24 Options for what to do about this expiration and, of course, if
25 there's no action, it's to allow the expiration of the
26 moratorium and then those permits would become open access
27 again. We could extend the moratorium for another certain
28 number of years or create a permanent limited access system. In
29 other words --

30
31 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** We have a question.

32
33 **MS. LEVY:** Going back to the purpose and need, I would suggest
34 adding something about conservation and having a moratorium
35 being also necessary for conservation of the species and sort of
36 looking at whether it's still necessary for that purpose at this
37 time.

38
39 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Okay. Duly noted and I don't think we need a
40 motion for that. I think staff can do that. All right. Keep
41 going.

42
43 **MS. GERHART:** I just want to point out by permanent limited
44 access system what we mean is it would generally be the same as
45 the moratorium, but it wouldn't expire as the moratorium does
46 and so, in other words, no additional permits would be issued.

47
48 Looking at each of those options, first, the moratorium

1 expiring, it would go back to being open access, meaning that
2 the NMFS Permits Office would issue permits to anyone who
3 applied to it. However, you could still have qualifications and
4 I will talk about qualifications in a little bit more detail.

5
6 If the council chooses this option, then we may not need a full
7 plan amendment of Amendment 17, although we would need some sort
8 of rulemaking to change the regulations and so it might be more
9 of a framework procedure or something we would have to explore
10 what that is, if that's the case. We would like the council, if
11 they choose this route, to discuss why a moratorium is no longer
12 needed for this fishery.

13
14 The second choice is to extend the current moratorium. You
15 would choose the number of years. Again, the first moratorium
16 was a ten-year moratorium, but any number of years could be
17 chosen for that.

18
19 Another question would be would all the current moratorium
20 permits be rolled into the second phase of the moratorium or
21 would there be a re-qualification period? Again, I will talk
22 about qualifications in a minute. Then, of course, the council
23 would need to discuss why they still feel a temporary moratorium
24 is needed.

25
26 The third option is the limited access system, which would be
27 permanent. Again, a question about whether all current permit
28 holders would be rolled into this system or there would be
29 requalification. The permit conditions should be discussed,
30 such as renewal levels and transferability, if any restrictions
31 would want to be on that, and, again, discussion on why this
32 limited access program is needed.

33
34 Getting to the qualification issues, if the council would choose
35 to do qualifications, there is a couple of ways to do that. We
36 have had income qualifications for permits in the past.
37 However, we removed that for Reef Fish and CMP and the only
38 permits that currently have any income qualifier is the spiny
39 lobster permit, to match what is done by the State of Florida.

40
41 Then landings, of course, can often be used as a qualifying
42 level. You would have to determine the time period to use and
43 the number of years and, for example, not using 2010, because of
44 the oil spill. This is not a necessary thing to do, the
45 qualifications. You could, again, just roll over everyone who
46 currently owns the permit to have either the extended moratorium
47 permit or limited access permit and, in fact, if the council
48 doesn't want to do any kind of requalifying, then I suggest that

1 we remove this from the document.

2
3 If you are interested in a little bit of information, this is
4 preliminary data about landings from 2009 to 2012 at different
5 levels and so if those thresholds were used, these are the
6 number of permits that would not qualify and so this is just to
7 give you a sense. This isn't all the permits, but this is the
8 database that we had to just kind of give you a sense of how
9 those landings are going.

10
11 Another thing to think about is the royal red shrimp
12 endorsement. Right now it's open access, in the sense that
13 anyone who has a shrimp permit can obtain the endorsement. In
14 September, when I checked our database, we had 285 valid
15 endorsements, which is a lot of endorsements, considering that
16 only a maximum of seventeen vessels have landed royal red shrimp
17 in any one year in the past ten years and usually it's less than
18 ten vessels landing royal red shrimp and so there's a lot of
19 permit holders with that endorsement that aren't using them.

20
21 Options for the endorsement could be to, of course, just
22 maintain it as it is, as a more or less open endorsement, in the
23 sense that anyone holding a shrimp permit could get it, or limit
24 those endorsements, again, with some sort of qualifying, such as
25 landings, or just eliminate the endorsement altogether. That's
26 kind of the range of options there, if you choose to do it.
27 Again, the council doesn't have to do anything and so if you
28 choose not to do anything, we could remove this from the
29 document.

30
31 I wanted to talk a little bit about the analytical needs,
32 because there were a couple of council and SSC motions. The
33 council requested us to be working on this document and include
34 such analyses as biological yield, economic yield, CPUE, shrimp
35 effort, and permit activity status over time.

36
37 The SSC reviewed that and agreed with those things and also
38 wanted consideration of ecosystem considerations, such as
39 bycatch and several other -- Community makeup as well. The SSC
40 did pass a motion to endorse the creation of a working group to
41 address these data analyses in regards to the shrimping permit
42 moratorium.

43
44 We do have an IPT put together for this document currently that
45 would work on a lot of that and so it would be the council's
46 choice if they wanted to also have this working group or just
47 leave that in the hands of the IPT.

48

1 The things that we would ask you to discuss today in relation to
2 this document are: Are the three options that we've put forward
3 for the shrimp permits adequate or are there other options that
4 we could do; whether you want to consider requalification under
5 any of those scenarios and if you want to consider the royal red
6 shrimp changes; if you want to create the working group; and if
7 you want to approve this document for scoping at this time.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I will open it up for discussion and there
10 should be plenty of discussion here dealing with qualifications.
11 I know in Louisiana that we're moving towards apprenticeship
12 programs and educational components to enter our fishery and so
13 this might be a good time to think about something like that.
14 Corky, do you have anything?

15
16 **MR. PERRET:** Well, I will start with the -- Sue, thank you very
17 much for that presentation and are we ready to approve for
18 scoping? I don't think so. The S&S unanimous motion for a
19 working group, I am prepared, at the right time, to try and make
20 a motion to get that, to have that working group established,
21 and for them to meet. I have got a moving target.

22
23 The royal red and the requalification, I think that's something
24 we need some more input from. I don't think three options are
25 adequate. Those two-hundred-and-whatever-the-number-is that
26 have been inactive, that might be another option that we set up.
27 Do we need to set capacity at where the current effort is now?
28 Effort is not a good word, insofar as the amount of activity
29 each of those vessels that are fishing or is involved with the
30 fishery, but to cap at the number of vessel that are active now
31 or do we want a 10 percent over or 20 percent or whatever.

32
33 It seems to me there's a lot of things that have been addressed
34 in the April council motion to look at moratorium and look at
35 effort and look at bycatch and that sort of thing, but it seems
36 like we need some additional input relative to the economics and
37 the catch per effort trend and capacity and things of that sort.

38
39 What I would like to see is have this working group that the S&S
40 has recommended meet in conjunction with our Shrimp Advisory
41 Panel and I would even like to have some of the Shrimp Committee
42 members be involved with that, but to have that group get
43 together and iron out these, as well as other things that I'm
44 sure other members will bring up, and then have a document
45 prepared for the council prior to the council meeting, so we can
46 evaluate it and then take a look at it and after a little
47 discussion, if others agree, I will be prepared to make a motion
48 that we have our AP and the S&S working group address these

1 issues.

2

3 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Okay.

4

5 **MS. BOSARGE:** I agree with Corky. To add on to that, at that
6 meeting, we had these three options on the table and especially
7 in that last option, there are a lot of variables in there to be
8 considered.

9

10 Corky mentioned the latent permits, but he also mentioned
11 possibly some sort of cap on permits where they are right now,
12 which follows along with the moratorium, but possibly in the
13 future these permits that are not renewed have -- I would like
14 to see an option in there for this working group and the AP to
15 consider that takes those permits that are not renewed from this
16 point on out and essentially places them on hold, in some sort
17 of pool.

18

19 That pool would provide an avenue for new entrants or old
20 entrants to reenter the fishery at some point in the future, if
21 and when we ever get to that point. I would like their feedback
22 on that and I'm just trying to be proactive because of some of
23 the things that we talked about yesterday with red snapper and
24 how it's a limited access system as well and one of the issues
25 is new entrants trying to get into the fishery and we're doing a
26 lot of work on that right now and what are the options for that.

27

28 I would rather be forward-thinking about this and maybe set
29 something up on the front-end, where we have that option
30 available if conditions present where people want to do that at
31 some point in the future and so if that could be added for
32 consideration by that AP working group, I would like that.

33

34 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Any other --

35

36 **DR. CRABTREE:** Can someone refresh my memory? Corky talked
37 about the S&S working group and what exactly is that? Is that
38 an AP or what is that?

39

40 **MR. PERRET:** It's a working group that the SSC recommended be
41 set up to -- At the last SSC meeting, their motion was passed
42 unanimously for the creation of a working group to address data
43 analysis in regard to the shrimp permit moratorium.

44

45 It seems to me we should follow that recommendation, but I would
46 like to also have the Shrimp Advisory Panel members meet in
47 conjunction with that group, to discuss that as well as a number
48 of other issues that I spoke about a little earlier and that

1 Leann referenced.
2
3 **DR. CRABTREE:** Okay and when are we going to appoint people to
4 this working group? We're going to need to do that, right?
5
6 **MR. PERRET:** Sue, did you say you have a group that's set up?
7
8 **MS. GERHART:** We have the IPT, the Interdisciplinary Project
9 Team, that we use to create our amendments and those are staff
10 members and not --
11
12 **MR. PERRET:** Okay and so the SSC working group would be made up
13 of members of the Standing as well as the Shrimp Scientific
14 Committee, I guess.
15
16 **MS. GERHART:** I think that's what they had in mind.
17
18 **DR. CRABTREE:** Okay and so those groups already exist and are
19 populated and we just have to convene a meeting?
20
21 **MR. PERRET:** I don't think the working group exists that the SSC
22 is recommending. We would have to select those members and is
23 that the idea or let them select the members that would be in
24 attendance?
25
26 **MS. GERHART:** I'm not sure I thought that the SSC would select
27 their members. There were people who volunteered at the meeting
28 to be on this, but there was not any formal formation of it.
29
30 **MR. PERRET:** My idea, Roy, is if we set this group up, it would
31 be this SSC working group, the IPT group, the Shrimp Advisory
32 Panel, and because shrimping effort in the western Gulf, in that
33 ten to whatever fathom zone, is tied into bycatch reduction on
34 red snapper juveniles and incidental take of turtles throughout
35 the Gulf with shrimp trawls, we ought to probably have, and I
36 see Bonnie is going to give us a presentation next relative to
37 ELBs, relative to effort and so on, and perhaps Dr. Gallaway or
38 whoever is the appropriate one to present information on shrimp
39 effort to add to the group. That's just my thinking.
40
41 **DR. CRABTREE:** I'm fine with all that and it's just we've got --
42 We need to have the rule that comes out of what we're doing
43 implemented basically two years from now and that seems like a
44 lot of time, but it's not as much as you think and I'm just
45 trying to make sure if we're going to convene a working group,
46 we need to decide who that working group is today, so we can
47 convene it. I don't know, Mr. Gregory, if you have thoughts. I
48 mean is this working group going to be just existing groups or

1 do we need to form a working group and appoint members to it?
2 What do we need to do to make this happen?

3
4 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG GREGORY:** If you just give us general
5 guidance and like Corky was saying, the AP, some members of the
6 IPT from the Regional Office and the Science Center and staff
7 and SSC, we can form that group of the people most appropriate
8 for it.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Does that satisfy you, Roy?

11
12 **DR. CRABTREE:** Yes, that's fine. I just want to make sure we do
13 whatever we need to do at this meeting so we can get it done.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** All right. Do we need a motion for that?

16
17 **MR. PERRET:** Let me try. I would move that we have staff
18 convene a meeting of a shrimp working group of the SSC, and that
19 includes Special Shrimp SSC, the Shrimp Advisory Panel, IPT
20 group, and our new Chairman Anson will make the decision. I
21 think two or three and I don't know. I would like to see the
22 whole Shrimp Management Committee there, but probably that may
23 not be necessary, but the council will be represented and so
24 staff convene a meeting of the shrimp working group made up of
25 members of the SSC and Special Shrimp SSC members, Shrimp
26 Advisory Panel, and the Shrimp IPT group.

27
28 Because of the effort implications, I would like to have Dr.
29 Gallaway, I guess, who has been working on shrimp effort for
30 some time also be available, if he can fit that into his busy
31 schedule. Thank you.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** We have a motion and do we have a second?
34 Leann seconds it. Any more discussion on this motion? Mara,
35 are we okay with this? Corky, do you mean all the people on the
36 SSC, everyone, or just members?

37
38 **MR. PERRET:** Their recommendation was for a working group of SSC
39 and Shrimp Special SSC members and so staff will work with the
40 Chairman and Council Chair and whoever they think that group
41 should be and so not that entire group.

42
43 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** If I may, we will coordinate with
44 the Council Chair and the Shrimp Management Committee Chair and
45 Corky.

46
47 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** I think Corky is the new Shrimp Management
48 Chair. Any more discussion?

1
2 **MR. MYRON FISCHER:** I am just trying to assist Corky. How about
3 we say a working group made up of a subset of all these groups?
4

5 **MR. PERRET:** I didn't follow you. What's that?
6

7 **MR. FISCHER:** I said just made up of a subset of these groups,
8 instead of made up of groups. It's kind of open-ended.
9

10 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Is that all right? Leann, is that okay with
11 you? Okay. I will read it again. The motion is to have staff
12 convene a meeting of the shrimp working group made up of a
13 subset of the SSC and Special Shrimp SSC members, Shrimp AP, the
14 Shrimp IPT group, and Dr. Benny Gallaway. Any more discussion?
15 **Any opposition to this motion? Hearing none, the motion**
16 **carries.**
17

18 I believe that gets us out of 17 and so we're done with 17. Dr.
19 Ponwith, you're up next. Wait, first Leann.
20

21 **MS. BOSARGE:** Susan had asked for feedback on what the working
22 group was going to discuss and I didn't make it in the form of a
23 motion, but you did notate that we would like to get some
24 industry feedback for sure on taking permits that are not
25 renewed and putting them into a pool that could be used for new
26 entrants or old re-entrants to the fishery? Okay.
27

28 **DR. CARRIE SIMMONS:** I guess, just to kind of try to understand
29 timing a little bit, the idea was to have this working group be
30 convened and work on the scoping document and staff goes back
31 and continues to flesh it out more and then it would come back
32 to the council for approval to go out to scoping and is that
33 correct?
34

35 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** That is correct. Any more discussion on 17?
36 Bonnie, you're up.
37

38 **2013 SHRIMP EFFORT AND SHRIMP ELB PROGRAM UPDATE** 39

40 **DR. PONWITH:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and if you could refer to
41 Tab D, Number 7 from the Shrimp. What we're going to do is talk
42 a little bit about the status of the electronic logbook program
43 and then also give you the numbers for the 2013 effort
44 estimation.
45

46 Here are some statistics on the status of the cellular
47 electronic logbook program that we put into effect last year,
48 over the course of the year. We selected 500 vessels to

1 participate in them and of those 500 vessels, 462 have activated
2 their units. Of the remaining, twenty-five actual vessels have
3 not turned on those new units and we would recognize this by
4 them having not contacted a carrier for this and as soon as
5 those units are turned on, then we start receiving data from
6 them, regardless of where they are.

7
8 Those have been turned over to the Office of Law Enforcement and
9 again from that subset, two of them have terminated their permit
10 and one has transferred their permit and we also have nine
11 others who have permit transfers and the selection letters are
12 going to be recast and sent to the new owners of those vessels
13 and then, sadly, one vessel was destroyed by fire and so that's
14 sort of the disposition of the 500.

15
16 Then, in addition, last year we placed ten of these units on
17 vessels to do the initial calibration and those are still
18 activated and up and running. That gives you a feel for how
19 many are carrying that.

20
21 Of the activated units, we have received no data from thirty-six
22 of these vessels and that could be one of two things, either
23 there is something going on with the unit or they activated the
24 device and it's sitting on top of a refrigerator or something.
25 So what we're going to have to do is communicate with them to
26 see if we can find out what is indeed going on with those. They
27 got it and they activated it, but it's not transmitting any --
28 It's stationary, basically.

29
30 In terms of feedback, we really haven't had any negative
31 feedback, no complaints from the industry on the units thus far.
32 We have had two confirmed hardware failures. One was when the
33 instrument was being deployed. There was a power surge and it
34 fried the instrument. The instrument was under warranty and it
35 will be replaced. We had another one that took on some water
36 and that also damaged the electronics.

37
38 So far, the data transmission has been going very smoothly. As
39 you recall, those data, if they're outside of cell range, those
40 data are stored on a memory card exclusively and the unit tries
41 to feel a cell tower and if it fails, it waits for a given
42 period of time and keeps trying to hit a cell tower.

43
44 Ultimately, when the vessel comes into range of a cell tower,
45 those data that are stored on that memory card are automatically
46 transmitted in packages to a secured server and so anytime a
47 vessel comes within range, it updates those data, to make sure
48 those data are available in real time. The analysis on these

1 data will be conducted using the original software that was
2 developed by LGL to estimate effort from the units.

3
4 Regarding the claims, we have agreed to reimburse the vessels
5 for the cost of deploying those units. This is a development
6 that occurred last winter and about 75 percent of the vessels
7 who are carrying those units have submitted a claim. The claims
8 ranged anywhere from zero to \$200, which was the maximum, and
9 many of those people have not yet cashed those checks and so if
10 you know people in the industry, urging them to cash those
11 checks would be good.

12
13 I know this slide is small, but it's kind of the information
14 what's going to happen with next steps. Of the vessels that
15 were selected to carry the electronic logbooks, 274 of them were
16 also equipped with the older version of the logbooks and this
17 was intentional so that we could continue those side-by-side
18 calibrations. This is more or less about 50 percent of them.

19
20 This fall our plan is to collect the memory chips from those 274
21 vessels to continue with our side-by-side calibration. As you
22 recall, we calibrated that first year with ten vessels that were
23 double instrumented and we're going to pull the chips from the
24 other double-instrumented vessels and continue that comparison
25 and then ultimately capture those data from those chips and then
26 once that's done, we will actually focus on collecting those
27 older units, again.

28
29 This is going to be done this winter and we will do it by
30 sending a self-addressed envelope to them asking them to pull
31 that card and send it to us, so that we can collect those data
32 and run those analyses.

33
34 The tasks that we see that are on the horizon here would be to
35 correspond with the thirty-six permit holders that we haven't
36 received data, but did kick in their Verizon accounts and find
37 out what's going on with them, so we have a clear understanding
38 of that. We are going to write to the 274 double-instrumented
39 permit holders and collect the memory chip from the old unit.

40
41 We will continue to do our one-on-one sort of side-by-side
42 analysis of these units, the data that we have on the server
43 compared to the data that are coming in on the chips from the
44 old ELBs. Then we'll generate the 2014 effort estimate using
45 the composite data, data from both the old units and the new
46 ones, and then continue to do validations and peer reviews and
47 enhancements to the program and the way this is being carried
48 out.

1
2 Down to brass tacks on the next slide. Here are your effort
3 estimates for 2013 and as you will see, the landings, total
4 offshore landings, were at right around seventy-seven million
5 pounds and this is right around an average catch. I think the
6 highest we had was 101 million pounds in 2009 and the lowest
7 we've seen in recent history was in 2010, which was sixty-nine
8 million pounds and so this is sort of in the ballpark.

9
10 The statistical zone of interest for us, in terms of meeting our
11 management goals, is that Statistical Zone 10 to 21 and as you
12 can see in this slide, the effort estimate for that area was
13 73.14 percent and our target was 65 percent and so we're in good
14 shape on the effort. Then you can see just what the landings
15 and the effort was for the other statistical zones as well.

16
17 If we move to the next slide, this is sort of a very coarse
18 distribution of the effort that we're seeing in 2014 and so this
19 is this year right now and, again, it's very, very coarse, but
20 it gives you a feel for what the distribution is, based on the
21 cellular electronic logbook, the data that we've accumulated in
22 January to June.

23
24 Then if you take a look at the next slide, you can see sort of
25 the distribution for May versus August of this year, based on
26 the data that we accumulated on the server. Then if you go to
27 the last slide, it is a wonderful opportunity to acknowledge the
28 people that have contributed to the success of the transition of
29 this program.

30
31 It was hard work and it took a lot of deliberation and so we
32 want to say a word of thanks to certainly the shrimp fishing
33 industry that's been very good about cooperating and helping us
34 to get this information that is absolutely critical for
35 successful management of this fishery.

36
37 We also want to thank the Southern Shrimp Alliance. They've
38 been a wonderful vehicle for us to be able to communicate with
39 the industry and kind of a wonderful point of entry to be able
40 to strengthen those collaborations.

41
42 Benny Gallaway, John Cole, and the LGL Ecological Research
43 Associates, of course, were instrumental in getting this type of
44 monitoring put in place and really doing the pioneering work on
45 this and this transition couldn't have been done as successfully
46 as it has been without his help and certainly, of course, to
47 recognize the role that the council had in helping us with
48 getting these data so that we've got the information we need to

1 manage the fishery. That's my report, Mr. Chairman.

2
3 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Thank you. Great report, Bonnie. Any
4 questions?

5
6 **MS. BOSARGE:** Bonnie, thanks for all your hard work on this. As
7 most people know, the data that's collected by this program, the
8 ELB and then the new cellular ELB, is tremendously important to
9 our industry and has saved us many times in the past and so we
10 definitely wanted to see a smooth transition and I think so far
11 we've seen that and the industry is well aware of what's going
12 on.

13
14 I did have a comment on your twenty-five that are not activated
15 that have been turned over to law enforcement. It looks like
16 you have a few of those that we still don't know exactly maybe
17 what's going on and two comments, from an administrative
18 standpoint.

19
20 We were chosen for two of the units. We have five vessels and
21 two of our vessels were chosen randomly and they're both going
22 to have both units on there, or they do have both units on
23 there. When we went to activate the CELB, and we had this
24 discussion at the council and I know that you all have had this
25 discussion with the phone carrier, that you do not have to go
26 online to activate these units or the account, excuse me. They
27 should activate the account over the phone for you.

28
29 They did refuse to do that. They told us that we had to go
30 online and luckily I was standing there and so I got on the
31 phone and I said, no, I'm on the council and you have to do this
32 over the telephone for us and so that may be an issue that
33 you're up against with some of these that have not been
34 activated.

35
36 The other thing is if we could make a minor tweak to the letters
37 that go out. As I said, we were chosen for two units, two of
38 our vessels, and when we get any kind of correspondence on those
39 units, the reference that the government is using is the serial
40 number or something like that on the unit itself, but if you
41 have five boats and you have two of these units, if you could
42 reference the official number or the name of the vessel that
43 that unit is supposed to be working from, that would help
44 tremendously on our end. I'm doing a lot of legwork just trying
45 to figure out what unit is being corresponded about and so
46 that's the two minor comments.

47
48 **DR. PONWITH:** Just for clarification, you are asking that when

1 we write to the permit holder to refer to the name of the vessel
2 or the permit and not the name of the unit?

3
4 **MS. BOSARGE:** The name of the vessel or the official number of
5 the vessel. Those are two things that we'll know off the top of
6 our head that, okay, what boat is she talking about.

7
8 **MR. PERRET:** My only comment was I'm just amazed at how few
9 complaints there have been and how this transition seemed to
10 have worked so well and so thank you very much to you and your
11 people and hopefully it will continue with very, very few issues
12 or complaints or problems. Leann pointed out one and hopefully
13 that will be taken care of. Thank you.

14
15 **MS. BOSARGE:** On a different note, and I feel like a Negative
16 Nelly today, but I do have a little bit of fear on our next
17 steps that we're going to for this transition. We've talked
18 about it a lot in the past and I really was very comfortable
19 with the timeline that we had in the past.

20
21 Having actually experienced activating the account and getting
22 the equipment on the vessel and then the vessel actually going
23 offshore to shrimp, I don't know that the timeframe that we have
24 might not be a little too soon as far as our next step for
25 actually -- For the vessels that have both units on them, that
26 have the old unit and the new unit, this winter, which could be
27 December, January, or February, which is pretty soon, for our
28 next step to be to go to those vessels and actually not just
29 pull the data from the old unit, but essentially pull the chip,
30 so it's not transmitting anymore and then to do the one-to-one
31 analysis -- I know we've done it on ten and it turned out well,
32 but of these two-hundred-and-seventy-something, I would like to
33 see that one-to-one analysis done first and make sure everything
34 is okay and then we maybe can start pulling these chips, just
35 because of the timeframe that I've seen in getting this going on
36 our end.

37
38 **DR. PONWITH:** To that point, the challenge that we've got is the
39 cellular ELB, we have those data in hand in real time. As soon
40 as the vessel comes within cell range, those data are there, so
41 we know where everybody is.

42
43 With the other units, we have to actually go and pull those
44 chips to have the data and so what I'm hearing from you is a
45 concern that that might be a decision point that can't be
46 undone.

47
48 What we can do is I can go back with the team and discuss,

1 instead of pulling 100 percent of those chips, pulling 50
2 percent of them and doing the one-to-one analysis on the data
3 that we get, because the only way we can get the data from those
4 chips is to actually pull them out and dump the data. The chips
5 have to be physically removed from the device to be able to dump
6 those data.

7
8 **MS. BOSARGE:** What I was hoping to see, Bonnie, is in the past,
9 Peter would come around and he would pull the data from our
10 devices on the boat. For the old system, he would pull the
11 data, so that the system kept running like usual when he was
12 done pulling the information and I guess that information
13 eventually went to you all, but it would continue to record
14 data.

15
16 If there's any way that we can do that with these two-hundred-
17 and-seventy-some-odd that have both units on the boat, do our
18 one-to-one analysis and make sure that everything is how we want
19 it to be and that way, if we have any glitch anywhere, we don't
20 have any gaps in our shrimp effort data. That's what worries
21 me, to have some sort of gap if anything goes wrong, because we
22 actually pulled the chip and it's no longer recording, so we
23 don't have that fallback mechanism.

24
25 **DR. PONWITH:** I will talk with the team and, of course, our
26 absolute goal is to ensure that there are no data gaps and so we
27 have the four-hundred-and -- You know nearly 470 with the new
28 units on and roughly half of those are double instrumented. I
29 will talk with the team about what kind of risk management bet
30 hedging we should be considering and take that into
31 consideration.

32
33 One of the challenges we have with the older units is that,
34 again, the chip needs to be pulled to get the data off and if
35 you decide that you want that unit to continue to gather data,
36 there's a process that you have to go through to kind of
37 recalibrate that chip and so there are costs of encountering the
38 vessel and of pulling the chip and going through that process
39 and then encountering the vessel a second time if the desire
40 were to put that chip back on.

41
42 That's kind of contributed to the rationale for moving to the
43 CELB in the first place, because it skips all the need to be
44 physically handling those memory cards. It gives us the data in
45 real time, but I will raise that to the attention of our team
46 and we are eager to reconfirm that side-by-side that these two
47 units are functioning and giving similar data.

48

1 We are pleased that the software that Dr. Gallaway and his team
2 developed is completely -- The data feeding into it from these
3 two units are ingested exactly identically and that there has
4 been no issue at all with the data from the new unit, but I will
5 bring that up to the team and we will deal with that.

6
7 **CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Okay. Any other discussion? Great report,
8 Bonnie, and good comments, Leann. We are headed in the right
9 direction to make sure we understand and do a better job with
10 our shrimp fishery. With that, Mr. Chairman, I think that
11 concludes my committee and I will turn it back over to you.

12
13 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 9:42 a.m., October 2014,
14 2014.)

15
16 - - -
17