

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

Doubletree by Hilton Austin Austin, Texas

APRIL 4, 2016

VOTING MEMBERS

- 10 Greg Stunz.....Texas
- 11 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 12 John Greene.....Alabama
- 13 Kelly Lucas (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
- 14 Lance Robinson (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
- 15 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana
- 16 David Walker.....Alabama
- 17 Roy Williams.....Florida

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

- 20 Kevin Anson (designee for Chris Blankenship).....Alabama
- 21 Martha Bademan (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
- 22 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- 23 Doug Boyd.....Texas
- 24 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- 25 Myron Fischer (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana
- 26 Campo Matens.....Louisiana
- 27 John Sanchez.....Florida

STAFF

- 30 Steven Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
- 31 Douglas Gregory.....Executive Director
- 32 Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
- 33 Karen Hoak.....Administrative and Financial Assistant
- 34 Morgan Kilgour.....Fishery Biologist
- 35 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
- 36 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 37 Emily Muehlstein.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist
- 38 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
- 39 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 40 Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Director

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

- 43 Pam Anderson.....PCBA, Panama City, FL
- 44 Patrick Banks.....LA
- 45 Steve Branstetter.....NMFS
- 46 J.P. Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL
- 47 Gary Bryant.....Gulf Shores, AL
- 48 Chris Conklin.....SAFMC

1 Nick Farmer.....NMFS
2 Toby Gascon.....Baton Rouge, LA
3 Jim Green.....FL
4 Ken Haddad.....American Sportfishing Association, FL
5 Chad Hanson.....Pew
6 Bill Kelly.....FKCFA, FL
7 Mark Kinsey.....
8 Ed Lello.....Austin, TX
9 Kari MacLauchlin.....SAFMC
10 Corky Perret.....MS
11 Clay Porch.....SEFSC
12 Brandi Reeder.....TPWD
13 Clarence Seymour.....

14
15
16

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Contents.....3
4
5 Table of Motions.....4
6
7 Adoption of Agenda.....5
8
9 Approval of Minutes.....5
10
11 Action Guide and Next Steps.....5
12
13 South Atlantic Amendment: Modifications to Charter Vessel and
14 Headboat Reporting Requirements.....6
15
16 Update: Commercial Electronic Reporting Pilot Program.....8
17
18 Review Electronic Reporting Program Flowchart.....17
19
20 Other Business.....35
21
22 Adjournment.....35

- - -

TABLE OF MOTIONS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

PAGE 31: Motion to convene the Technical Data Committee to review the minimum data elements that the SEFSC deems necessary and look at different hardware/software options and advice the council on findings. The motion carried on page 35.

- - -

1 The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery
2 Management Council convened at the Doubletree by Hilton Hotel,
3 Austin, Texas, Monday morning, April 4, 2016, and was called to
4 order at 8:54 a.m. by Chairman Greg Stunz.

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

10 **CHAIRMAN GREG STUNZ:** We will go ahead and call the Data
11 Collection Committee to order. It looks like all of our
12 committee members are present. If you guys have had a chance to
13 look at the agenda, are there any changes to the agenda?

14
15 I don't see any, and I might make one recommendation. We're
16 going to need every minute of the hour that we have today, and
17 Dr. MacLauchlin and Dr. Porch have told me their presentations
18 are more just briefing updates. I might recommend that we move
19 Item V and VI above Item IV, because we'll have some discussion
20 surely on the flow chart and Dr. Farmer's presentation, but that
21 would allow us to address those two agenda items and then
22 reserve the rest of the time to discuss that one, because I
23 think it will need a lot of attention.

24
25 Is there any issues with that? Is there any other business
26 anyone would like to add to the agenda? If not, with those
27 minor changes, is there a motion to accept the agenda? We have
28 a motion and a second. Anyone in opposition? We will accept
29 the agenda.

30
31 The next item is Approval of the Minutes. Is there any edits to
32 the minutes? Seeing none, a motion to approve the minutes,
33 please? It is so moved. Any opposition? Seeing none, the
34 minutes are approved.

35
36 You guys may know that Dr. Froeschke has a new baby girl that
37 arrived last week, a few days ago, in fact, and so Dr. Kilgour,
38 I believe, is going to be stepping in for him, and so would you
39 like to go over the Action Guide for us, briefly.

40
41 **DR. MORGAN KILGOUR:** I could. Most of these items are just for
42 discussion, and so I can just chime in if you guys are missing
43 an action item, if that works for you.

44
45 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That's great. That would let us move along.
46 Then, just to -- I will bring up where we are with the
47 electronic reporting flowchart in a minute, but, Dr.
48 MacLauchlin, would you like to update us on what's happening in

1 the South Atlantic with that amendment and data collection,
2 please? By the way, this is Tab F, Number 5, if you're looking.

3
4 **SOUTH ATLANTIC AMENDMENT: MODIFICATIONS TO CHARTER VESSEL AND**
5 **HEADBOAT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**
6

7 **DR. KARI MACLAUHLIN:** Good morning. I'm Kari MacLauchlin from
8 the South Atlantic staff. You do have on there that you were
9 going to take final action, and so I'm going to explain. You
10 are not. This is just informational for you guys.

11
12 I am going to tell you a little bit about the amendment, who it
13 applies to, the timeline, and why the Gulf will eventually have
14 to take final action on it. This will apply to vessels fishing
15 under the South Atlantic charter and headboat permits for
16 snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and coastal migratory pelagics,
17 and all of these are open-access permits.

18
19 The purpose is to improve the accuracy and timeliness of the
20 landings data, effort, and socioeconomic data from our for-hire
21 vessels and improve the for-hire data used in management,
22 monitoring, and compliance.

23
24 The current South Atlantic preferred alternatives in the three
25 actions that are in here would require these charter and
26 headboats fishing under our snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and
27 South Atlantic CMP permits to report electronically on a weekly
28 basis. The reports would include catch on each trip and
29 location information about each trip.

30
31 They would be due by the Tuesday after the week ended, and there
32 would be a provision for the RA to lift the requirements if
33 there is a catastrophic situation, such as weather, and the
34 permit holder will still be required to submit no fishing
35 reports if the vessel did not make any for-hire trips that week,
36 and they can actually do that ahead of time, if they know that
37 they're not going to be fishing. If they do not comply, they
38 will not be authorized to fish under that permit until they're
39 caught up on submitting their reports.

40
41 Currently, the headboats have the same requirements in place,
42 but this will just update theirs to change their due date to the
43 Tuesday after the week ended. Then it adds the charter boats
44 for us.

45
46 We had public hearings in January and February of this year, and
47 the South Atlantic Council was scheduled to approve the actions
48 and alternatives at their March meeting and then take final

1 action in June, but, at our March meeting, there was discussion
2 about specifying the core data elements that would be required
3 and then optional data elements.

4
5 The South Atlantic is going to work with the Mid-Atlantic
6 Council and New England Council, the Regional Offices, the
7 Southeast Science Center, and then the commission and ACCSP,
8 which is the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program,
9 which is, I think, similar to GulfFIN here in the Gulf. It's
10 where all the fisheries information goes.

11
12 The goal will be to coordinate the entire Atlantic coast so that
13 there will only be one report required and it will have all the
14 data elements that the commission, the states, and the councils
15 would want, but just in one report, and so they want to make
16 sure they have that.

17
18 Now, the plan is that the South Atlantic will review the
19 document again in June, including these data elements options,
20 and they're expected to take final action in September or
21 December, and so the Gulf Council will need to approve this,
22 because it has an amendment to the joint mackerel plan. It's
23 Amendment 27 under that plan, even though it will only apply to
24 vessels fishing in the South Atlantic under the South Atlantic
25 CMP For-Hire Permit.

26
27 What you will need to do is myself or another South Atlantic
28 Council staff will come to a future meeting. I don't know if --
29 That will probably be in the fall, maybe, and present the
30 preferreds and then you guys would consider those, select your
31 preferreds, and then consider approval for secretarial review,
32 and you've done this before with our Comprehensive Ecosystem-
33 Based Amendment 2, and that was in 2011, because that made
34 changes to allowable gear for CMP harvest in South Carolina.
35 Then, also, the South Atlantic has approved some of the Gulf
36 amendments, because they were part of the Mackerel FMP.

37
38 That's all I have. I just wanted to give you guys an update on
39 that, and we'll be sending someone back to a future meeting to
40 give a presentation and get final approval from you.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Dr. MacLauchlin. I think that
43 cleared it up for me and why we're considering that, since it's
44 under that joint amendment, but, also, I think this is going to
45 give us some good indication as, we're developing things similar
46 along those lines, of how it's working and what's happening over
47 at the South Atlantic, and so thanks for updating us.

48

1 Up next, Dr. Clay Porch is going to give us a presentation on
2 the commercial electronic reporting pilot program. Are you
3 ready for that, Clay?

4
5 **UPDATE: COMMERCIAL ELECTRONIC REPORTING PILOT PROGRAM**

6
7 **DR. CLAY PORCH:** I am going to update the progress on the
8 commercial electronic logbook pilot project. I am doing this on
9 behalf of Brett Pierce and Dave Gloeckner on the team. First, I
10 just want to start out with why are we bothering to do this, and
11 it's basically to get better data, more timely data and more
12 detailed data.

13
14 If you look at what we've been collecting before, on our current
15 commercial logbook system, we get area fished for basically
16 where the majority of the fish were caught, we get when the trip
17 begins and ends, but that could be a two-week trip and so it's
18 not very precise. We get general hours fished and soak time, et
19 cetera.

20
21 When we go into this new system, the eLog system, we will get
22 latitude and longitude for each set. We will get when the set
23 begins and ends, and you just have to press a button so that it
24 starts the timer. We also we will get then -- The eLog itself
25 will calculate the soak time and things like that.

26
27 For the gear, we used to just get number of sets, lines, hooks
28 per line. For reef longline, for example, we would get the
29 length of the soak, hooks per line, et cetera. With this, we
30 will get a little more information. We're asking for a hook
31 type, hook size, bait type. For instance, for the reef
32 longline, it would bait type, hook type, hook size, number of
33 hooks, length, and all of this is going to be very useful for us
34 when we use this information both for management and for stock
35 assessments.

36
37 A lot of times, we use the logbook information to generate catch
38 per unit effort indices of abundance that we use directly in the
39 assessments. We also use it to help determine where the fish
40 were actually caught, as opposed to where they're landed, and so
41 having more detail, more timely information, will be very, very
42 useful for us.

43
44 Just to go through now exactly how it was implemented, we had
45 three vendors participating in the Gulf. It was Electric Edge
46 and Olrac. Then we also had ACCSP in the South Atlantic. More
47 vendors are expected to produce operational versions once these
48 data collection standards are finalized. The reason why

1 Electric Edge and Olrac were the only ones used in the Gulf is
2 because they were able to collect all the types of information
3 that we're looking for from the Gulf.

4
5 In terms of participants, we ended up using eight laptops and
6 three iPads on eleven different vessels, and then one vessel had
7 their own existing onboard personal computer that we were able
8 to load the software onto. Of the twelve vessels, nine
9 submitted data in some capacity, totaling fifty-eight trips.
10 There were two that did not fish and one had software problems,
11 and so that's why we didn't get information from all twelve.

12
13 The gears include the whole range, bandit, rod and reel,
14 longline, both reef and pelagic, one with buoy gear, traps, and
15 three vessels were using multiple gears. We had six from the
16 South Atlantic, two for highly-migratory species, and four from
17 the Gulf.

18
19 The vendors finalized pilot software and delivered to the
20 Southeast Fisheries Science Center in early May of 2015. We
21 finalized the infrastructure to receive the electronic logbooks
22 for the pilot shortly after that. The receipt of the electronic
23 logbooks is based on a secure FTP server set up by the ACCSP.

24
25 We had our volunteers, ten fishers and vessel owners with twelve
26 vessels, and testing a variety of gear, as I mentioned, and
27 then, by January and February of 2016, the data collection was
28 completed and the feedback from the fishers was provided to the
29 vendors so the vendors can refine their software.

30
31 The fishers submitted electronic reports in several capacities.
32 Some were submitted through the dock Wi-Fi, some took it home,
33 and then another through a vendor's web portal. The hardware
34 has been reclaimed from all of the vessels, and some fishermen
35 will retain hardware for some additional testing.

36
37 In terms of feedback, we've gotten regular feedback on the eLog
38 use, including feedback on the hardware, the software, and the
39 overall experience. That feedback is being provided to the
40 vendors and they're incorporating that into the development of
41 their operational version.

42
43 The perception and use of eLog varies, as you might imagine. It
44 depends a lot on the gear use. For instance, for some of the
45 rod and reel sets, where you're picking up and moving, you're
46 interacting with it an awful lot. For buoy gear, it's something
47 that you might only interact with it a couple of times a day.
48 Also, the more species you catch, the greater amount of time you

1 spend on the eLog, and so perceptions vary with that, too.

2
3 It also depends on your previous experience with computers, as
4 you might imagine, the space available in the cabin, and the
5 software version being used.

6
7 The results showed some changes to data collection standards
8 were needed. Many of the data points could be obtained from
9 other sources, such as dealer reports, and so we didn't need to
10 ask those questions on the eLog forms, and most of the gear
11 types can be entered in a more set-based reporting. For
12 instance, with the rod and reel, hand line, and cast nets, they
13 scaled it back to sub-trip reporting every twenty-four hours,
14 just trying to make it a little more efficient and easier for
15 the fishermen to use.

16
17 Hardware issues were a major concern for the fleet, and I
18 mentioned we had one that had some real problems, but the other
19 issue was that they need to be weatherized when they're in small
20 cabins, especially exposed cabins. Some people might prefer to
21 use tablets rather than a big PC, because you just don't have
22 that much room, and so improvements need to be made there.

23
24 The bottom line though is we've got a big increase in the
25 quantity and quality of the catch and effort data, above what we
26 get from our normal logbook program.

27
28 In terms of feasibility of eLogs for the Southeast, we found
29 that they were feasible. There is a range of technical options
30 to fit into specific fisheries and some refinements still
31 needed. Of course, as I mentioned, we get data collection at
32 finer scales, reports can be submitted more timely with fewer
33 errors, and the electronic logs also can retain the catch
34 history and notes on conditions for specific trips that the
35 fishermen can access later, and so it actually can be useful for
36 the fishermen. Finally, improving technology will allow better
37 flexibility and hardware choices, and that's all I have.

38
39 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Dr. Porch. Is there any questions
40 for Dr. Porch concerning his presentation? Roy.

41
42 **MR. ROY WILLIAMS:** Clay, do you have a timetable for
43 implementing this fleet-wide in the Gulf?

44
45 **DR. PORCH:** I don't know that we have a final timetable. There
46 are some refinements that need to be made, and then, of course,
47 we're looking for the council's input here.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Boyd.
2
3 **MR. DOUG BOYD:** Dr. Porch, a question. Regionally, were the
4 participants -- Do they have acceptance of the concept and the
5 methodology of the reporting by region and the security of the
6 system and the data?
7
8 **DR. PORCH:** I'm chatting with some of the authors of this now,
9 to see if they have any further input. My understanding was
10 that there was general acceptance of it, but there are some
11 technical issues that need to be overcome. Now, I know that
12 there's a couple of you that have actually participated in this
13 program here, and so they might have some input, too. I also
14 got some input here that we're hoping by January of 2017 to
15 implement this eLog in some capacity.
16
17 **MR. BOYD:** As a follow-up, when I attended the South Atlantic
18 Council meetings, there was a lot of discussion about this kind
19 of reporting, and there seemed to be a real desire not to have
20 this in the South Atlantic region, whereas in the Gulf region we
21 didn't see that kind of an opposition. Did you all encounter
22 that at all?
23
24 **DR. PORCH:** I'm not certain about that. I'm not aware of it.
25 We'll see if I get a message that tells me otherwise.
26
27 **MR. BOYD:** Okay. Thank you.
28
29 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Ms. Bosarge.
30
31 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** Maybe Chris can speak more to it, but I
32 attended that last South Atlantic meeting, and they do have some
33 qualms, I guess some fears about things, and it's funny, because
34 we're both coming at this type of data collection from two
35 different perspectives, and our fears are on opposite ends of
36 the spectrum, but what we run into is issues end up being the
37 same on both sides, minimal data collection, core elements and
38 things of that nature.
39
40 To me, a lot of their fear was where we want to make sure we get
41 more and more data, their fear was almost I don't want you to
42 start asking the fishermen how many pounds of ice are you
43 putting on the boat.
44
45 In other words, they didn't want to get too detailed. They were
46 worried that it may go to the extreme where we start asking more
47 socioeconomic questions of these fishermen that are out on the
48 water. They have a purpose. They're trying to catch fish, and

1 so I think that was some of their fear, that they just didn't
2 want it to get too extreme as far as what data they collected in
3 that direction.

4

5 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Conklin.

6

7 **MR. CHRIS CONKLIN:** Hi. I'm Chris Conklin. I'm your liaison
8 this week from the South Atlantic Council. To speak to Doug's
9 question there about the commercial electronic logbook pilot
10 program, as a pilot program, we had some pretty good feedback.

11

12 The commercial guys are ready to step up to the plate and be
13 accountable for the majority. On the charter boat for-hire
14 reporting amendment, which you guys were briefed on a little bit
15 ago with the coastal migratory pelagics, some of the charter
16 fishermen had really shared the concerns that Leann was
17 expressing of don't ask us too many questions and stuff like
18 that.

19

20 We did have discussion on that, that side of the for-hire
21 reporting, of what would be the minimum amount of data to go
22 into it, because it seemed kind of like that there were some
23 concerns that the Science Center kind of wanted us write a blank
24 check and they could put whatever they wanted into the
25 questions.

26

27 That was some concerns there, but that pretty much sums it up,
28 but the commercial guys are ready to move on forward and be
29 accountable. Then, on the for-hire part, I mean we had our Law
30 Enforcement Advisory Panel -- They had some real concerns about
31 the enforceability of a new program like this hitting the market
32 immediately, and so they've got to take that back to the drawing
33 table with OLE, the Science Center, and General Counsel. Thank
34 you.

35

36 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Go ahead, Clay.

37

38 **DR. PORCH:** I just wanted to follow up with that. That's
39 consistent with Brett's perception. He said the fishers really
40 didn't oppose the pilot. Yes, there were some little details
41 that we're trying to work out, but, generally, everybody was
42 onboard.

43

44 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Walker.

45

46 **MR. DAVID WALKER:** You're always going to find some people
47 that's not going to like change, but I think it's good. The
48 VMS, when you were talking about the different types, the older

1 type we had, we had a keyboard and we had some issues. The iPad
2 has worked a lot better with the VMS. The CLS system is easy to
3 operate. I mean it's like -- I mean if you can operate a
4 plotter or if you can operate a fish recorder or if you can
5 operate a radar, the iPad is very simple when you're doing your
6 VMS entries. I just think it's very efficient and it's worked
7 very well.

8

9 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Simmons, go ahead.

10

11 **DR. CARRIE SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a question
12 as far as timing, to probably Dr. Porch and Dr. Branstetter.
13 We've had this on our to-do list I guess since February of 2013,
14 when Mr. Pearce was chairing the Data Collection Committee, and
15 I guess I'm just wondering, when do we start getting involved as
16 far as developing an amendment to this program and the council
17 providing input in that venue? Are there yet or in 2017, at
18 that time, after the program has been running for a while? Then
19 will the regulations go into effect? Just a little bit more
20 information about the timing and when we become involved.

21

22 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Was that a question for Dr. Branstetter or Dr.
23 Porch?

24

25 **DR. PORCH:** We're trying to see who is going to respond to that
26 first. I can mention that we're hoping to put it in place in
27 January of 2017, and so I expect between now and then we'll get
28 some feedback that will help refine the system, but, as far as
29 an amendment goes --

30

31 **DR. STEVE BRANSTETTER:** At this point, I doubt we could have an
32 amendment put in place by January of 2017, but that would be --
33 I think the council could take action, start taking action, on
34 this as soon as -- As Clay and I were discussing, as soon as
35 they shake the bugs out of their system and get it refined and
36 sort of have a better description of what they would like to see
37 in their system. That gives the council the opportunity to
38 start developing very specific guidelines for how you want the
39 e-program to work.

40

41 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** So, Steve, what general timeframe would that
42 look like, would you guess?

43

44 **DR. BRANSTETTER:** It wouldn't be January 2017, because obviously
45 we haven't even started it, and so -- We know the glacial speed
46 of this council or of our actions, and so I would say sometime
47 within 2017 we might have an amendment in place. You might want
48 to postpone it to January of 2018, and I know that just sounds

1 like it's dragging it down the road, but it will take time to
2 develop this, and I think the Science Center has got a lot of
3 education and outreach to do. There's a big difference in
4 twelve boats and a thousand boats.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I have Mr. Swindell on the list, but to that
7 point, Clay?

8
9 **DR. PORCH:** Just to follow up on the last thing Steve said, I
10 think we would like to incorporate a volunteer program first,
11 and so that's what would really commence, and so I don't know.
12 Maybe we don't need an amendment to initiate the volunteer
13 program.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Swindell.

16
17 **MR. ED SWINDELL:** Mr. Chairman, I guess I'm a little confused.
18 I didn't see it anywhere here, but there is any ground-truthing?
19 Is there any data collection assurances that what is being
20 reported is accurate, like catches and even locations?

21
22 If you're going to give people the option to push the button
23 when they start to set and push it when they stop, do you know
24 this accurate? How accurate is the system? The system only
25 does you good if indeed the accuracy is there. Have you done
26 any work to ensure that the system is indeed accurate? There's
27 a lot of data that's being collected, and I don't know whether
28 it's being properly validated. Thank you.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Porch, did you or Steve want to comment on
31 the validation procedures in place for the future?

32
33 **DR. PORCH:** There is certainly always some ways you could just
34 not press buttons and not start recording sets. I mean it's --
35 Just as the existing logbook program, people can report zero
36 discards when they have them. They just write zero discards.
37 It's not necessarily a perfect system, but the alternative is to
38 put observers on all the boats, which isn't feasible, especially
39 on some of the smaller boats.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Williams.

42
43 **MR. WILLIAMS:** Clay, will the system be adaptable to small, open
44 fishermen that might be making day trips out of the Keys or out
45 of South Florida somewhere?

46
47 **DR. PORCH:** I'm sure it would be. You just probably would want
48 one of the little tablets, the waterproof tablets.

1
2 **MR. WILLIAMS:** There are such things?
3
4 **DR. PORCH:** Yes.
5
6 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Anson and then Dr. Lucas.
7
8 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not on your
9 committee, but going back to Dr. Branstetter's comment regarding
10 trying to answer the timeline, Steve, you mentioned that they're
11 still kind of collecting information, obviously, as they're
12 going through this and that could be helpful to understanding
13 potentially what we might want out of the system, but that's an
14 ongoing process even after we get that system established. How
15 much longer do you anticipate this pilot program to go that
16 would be beneficial to the council, inasmuch as formulating some
17 idea of an amendment?
18
19 **DR. PORCH:** I think you meant me.
20
21 **MR. ANSON:** Steve made the comment, but either one.
22
23 **DR. PORCH:** Again, we're hoping to get a larger-scale volunteer
24 program in January of 2017. All along the way, we'll be working
25 out kinks, but, in terms of when it would be mandatory, we'll
26 have a full update in June. We'll probably have a better idea
27 of the timeline by then.
28
29 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Lucas.
30
31 **DR. LUCAS:** On some of our boats, our open boats or whatever, we
32 have some of these electronic logbooks that are weatherized or
33 whatever. They work great with water. The problem we've had is
34 the sun more than anything. As it heats up, it heats the
35 battery and then it won't work. We're constantly restarting,
36 and did anybody experience any of those type of situations that
37 you're aware of?
38
39 **DR. PORCH:** What type of hardware were you using?
40
41 **DR. LUCAS:** I don't know. We have several different versions,
42 but they're all weatherized different tablets or whatever, but I
43 just -- Maybe if you had a brand, I could switch over there to
44 something.
45
46 **DR. PORCH:** The message I'm getting here is that the tablets for
47 the pilot worked and they used iPad.
48

1 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Ms. Bosarge.

2
3 **MS. BOSARGE:** Thank you. You're sweet to entertain me, because
4 I'm not on your committee, but, to Kelly's point, I thought
5 something that was interesting when I was over there, speaking
6 of hardware, and I forget who gave the presentation, but,
7 anyway, they had actually gotten with the fishermen when they
8 developed the hardware. You're right that the sun was an issue.

9
10 Whereas most things on iPhone, when we swipe it, the background
11 is usually light. When they talked to the fishermen, they made
12 the background black, because of the sun, and then all of the
13 elements that are on the screen are yellow, so you can see it,
14 even with that sun.

15
16 Now, that doesn't address your issue of the battery or anything,
17 but there were some very interesting things in that
18 presentation, where you could tell they really did a lot of work
19 with the fishermen.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Branstetter.

22
23 **DR. BRANSTETTER:** Just to follow up a little bit on Kevin's
24 question a while ago, I was just trying to think about what the
25 amendment would look like. As you know, for the charter boat
26 electronic reporting, the council has sort of tried to get into
27 the weeds a little bit, and has been cautioned for that.

28
29 I could see this document not being all that specific, more like
30 the dealer reporting requirements, where you're outlining
31 concepts and you don't get into the specific details of what,
32 when, where, why, and how, but just that it does need to occur.
33 Maybe with Clay's pilot program, as they begin to learn, they
34 can rapidly feed it to the council and you could have something
35 in place for 2018.

36
37 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That's certainly one way to move forward. I
38 think with the for-hire, when you were talking about it, Steve,
39 part of the problem was that helped us move it along, but then
40 that's where a little bit -- I wouldn't say opposition, but a
41 lot of concern from the fishery came that they had somewhat of
42 an issue of what would that look like in the end, and they may
43 not end up with something that we have envisioned.

44
45 I know, Mr. Fischer, you had your hand up, and we probably
46 should move on here, if there's not too many more pressing
47 questions, and, Dr. Simmons, I want to ask you one question
48 about if that's going to fit in the timeline in just a second,

1 but go ahead.

2
3 **MR. FISCHER:** Mine will be real quick. It's before we
4 deliberate various inputs and what the data elements are, I
5 always felt it's the other way around. The Center tells us what
6 they need and we approve what they need. We might add on
7 something if we feel it's necessary, but let the Center come
8 forward with these are the minimum data elements necessary to
9 control this fishery and we just move forward from that.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Carrie, does that give you some information
12 that you and your staff need to move forward with this?

13
14 **DR. SIMMONS:** Yes, and so my understanding is we'll have more in
15 June. We'll have this again as an agenda item, with additional
16 information, and then have maybe a timeline that we can all talk
17 about and agree upon as to when we start working on this. Thank
18 you.

19
20 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Does that work for everyone on the committee
21 concerning this agenda item? Is there any other questions or
22 comments? Moving on, that accomplished most of the things we
23 wanted to talk about, other than going through the flowchart.
24 Dr. Farmer has a presentation for us, for the request that we
25 made at full council last time.

26
27 While Nick is getting that presentation together, just to remind
28 everyone, because I had to go back and look through the minutes,
29 but if you remember, we passed a motion in this committee last
30 time to convene the technical workgroup, but, after thinking
31 through that and talking with staff at full council, Leann made
32 a substitute motion that what we really needed is a little
33 broader guidance, with a flowchart type of information, before
34 we can proceed.

35
36 That's where we left this topic, and so, with that information
37 in mind, Dr. Farmer is going to talk about where they are with
38 developing this flowchart, and so whenever you're ready, Nick,
39 go ahead.

40
41 **REVIEW ELECTRONIC REPORTING PROGRAM FLOWCHART**

42
43 **DR. NICK FARMER:** Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name
44 is Dr. Nick Farmer. I'm with the Southeast Regional Office. I
45 am presenting this on behalf of Dr. Bonnie Ponwith from the
46 Science Center. She couldn't be here today.

47
48 This was developed in collaboration with Regional Office staff

1 and also with many members of the Southeast Fisheries Science
2 Center and the Office of Science and Technology, and I
3 definitely want to point out the substantial contributions from
4 Ken Brennan and Karolyn Stillman, who put together a lot of the
5 budgetary estimates that you see in here.

6
7 This will differ slightly from the first version in your
8 briefing book. After some consultation with folks who were at
9 the previous council meeting, we felt that some of the decisions
10 in the more detailed flowchart that we had sent out originally
11 had already sort of been made by the council.

12
13 This flowchart starts with the assumption that you want a census
14 with daily trip-level reporting. One of the things that I want
15 to note right off the bat is that NMFS can't implement unfunded
16 programs, and so just note that a lot of these different stages
17 in this flowchart have substantial price tags attached to them,
18 and the funding will have to be available for those to be
19 implemented.

20
21 In the flowchart that you're going to see, the purple text is
22 going to denote things that could be cost to industry. That's
23 not a definite. There are potential pathways for the government
24 to pay for some of the items. However, I think a conservative
25 assumption would be that those might be cost to industry. Also,
26 please note that all the costs are approximate and that NMFS
27 would want to implement a program where the costs were
28 commensurate with the benefits. We really want to have this
29 program providing high-quality data.

30
31 With that in mind, this census with daily trip-level reporting
32 increases costs above what we're currently doing with the MRIP
33 charter survey by about \$3.6 million per year, and that's going
34 to involve increase dockside validation sampling, that's both
35 for biological sampling and also for effort sampling. You will
36 have increased requirements for data managers, and you will also
37 have increased requirements for enforcement agents.

38
39 Once you've made that decision of a census with daily trip-level
40 reporting, we're going to hit different question points that the
41 council -- We would love to have clarification on.

42
43 The first question point is do they need to report before they
44 hit the dock? If they do, then we move up to the next question.
45 If they don't, we also move to the next question, but one of the
46 risks of having them not report before hitting the dock is that
47 you have potential validation bias, and so you're going to adapt
48 your trip record if you're intercepted, potentially, is the risk

1 that you run there.

2
3 You also have an increased enforcement burden, because the
4 enforcement agents don't know what to expect when they're
5 hitting the dock. After you've addressed that question, your
6 next question is do you want self-reported or automated spatial
7 data?

8
9 If you want self-reported location data, that's similar to what
10 we're collecting through the Southeast Fishery Headboat Survey
11 right now, and there is a risk for increased error with that.
12 It depends on the spatial resolution that you ask for that self-
13 reported data, and it also depends on the accuracy of the
14 captain's reporting of that spatial information. That leaves
15 you with an electronic logbook, which is basically that base
16 cost of \$3.6 million per year.

17
18 Some pros for an electronic logbook is that it's similar to the
19 existing headboat system, and so we know how to do that. That
20 has a lot of infrastructure already in place, and also you would
21 obtain vessel-specific catch data. One of the cons would be
22 that you need some validation for spatial and catch data.

23
24 **MR. WILLIAMS:** As we go along here, these costs are not
25 cumulative? That \$3.6 million is the same as the \$3.6 there?

26
27 **DR. FARMER:** Correct. When those bottom boxes -- I'm going to
28 have a couple of boxes show up at the bottom with the names of
29 different programs, and they will have either a base cost or
30 else a range of a base cost, and that's going to be of the total
31 cost for that system, and that's the program system.

32
33 In some of the flowcharts, you will see some purple costs
34 showing up, and those will be the costs to industry that are
35 feeding into that total programmatic cost, but we don't hit that
36 with the electronic logbook in this example.

37
38 If you do decide that you want self-reported or automated data,
39 if you decide you want automated data, then you ask yourself,
40 what ping frequency do you want it at? How frequently do you
41 want those positions? You could look at less than five minutes,
42 which probably would require a VMS-type system, and that would
43 be a cost to industry of about \$0.6 to \$7.6 million per year,
44 depending on the technology that's used.

45
46 If you chose a range of five to sixty minutes, you're looking at
47 at \$0.3 to \$0.8 million per year. Then if you choose a range of
48 greater than an hour, you're looking at \$0.3 to \$0.8 million per

1 year. A risk of having a less-frequent ping is that you reduce
2 your spatial resolution and you also limit yourself in terms of
3 the ability to do spatial enforcement.

4
5 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** Those costs to industry, that's for the
6 entire industry, the entire fleet that would be participating?

7
8 **DR. FARMER:** Correct. Yes, that's across the fleet and not per
9 captain. If you have automated data and you choose your ping
10 frequency, the next question is do you want to have a hail-out?
11 If you don't want a hail-out, one of the risks with that is that
12 it's harder to validate effort, because you would like to know
13 when people are going offshore and be able to validate that.
14 It's also less ideal for an IFQ program.

15
16 If you do want a hail-out, your next question is do you want a
17 hail-in? If you want a hail-in, or if you don't want a hail-in,
18 you will still go to the next question, but if you don't choose
19 to have a hail-in, it makes dockside validation a little bit
20 more difficult, because the enforcement agents might not be able
21 to intercept the vessels as easily to validate what the catches
22 are.

23
24 Now, with the for-hire program, one of the nice things about the
25 structure of some of the for-hire vessels is they have a fixed
26 trip length, and so they could potentially hail out and hail in
27 at the same time, and so hail out and say we're going to be back
28 at two or whatever, and the enforcement agents could intercept
29 them there if they were chosen for an intercept.

30
31 **MR. FISCHER:** By enforcement agents, you do mean, at times,
32 biologists sampling the vessel?

33
34 **DR. FARMER:** Correct. Yes, it's any validation sampler.
35 Correct. Then the next question is, after you decide about a
36 hail-in and hail-out, is do you want real-time locations? If
37 you don't want real-time locations, you're looking at an
38 electronic logbook with archived GPS, and that program costs
39 we're estimating between \$4.3 and \$4.9 million per year. Costs
40 to industry there would be about \$0.3 to \$0.8 million, as a
41 startup, and then \$0.03 to \$0.04 million per year after that.

42
43 Now, some of the cons with this is you may have some
44 compatibility issues with the boat GPS. Some of the lower cost
45 estimates here assume that you're using some sort of a logbook
46 that's interfacing with the boat GPS, maybe through a Bluetooth
47 connection or a USB connection, and obtaining GPS fixes from
48 that. Some of the higher cost estimates here are assuming that

1 the technology that the fishermen are using has a built-in GPS
2 system.

3
4 If you don't have real-time locations, you're going to have
5 reduced ability to do spatial enforcement. You will have a
6 reduced ability to do at-sea location validation, and you may
7 have some reduced safety at sea, because nobody is going to be
8 actively reading where these vessels are.

9
10 In general, the electronic logbook with archived GPS, some pros
11 there would be the design could be flexible. You could set some
12 minimum standards, and it could be programmed to operate on many
13 different devices. Some cons would be that it's untested. You
14 would require some new hardware, some new software. It might
15 not be flexible enough for a IFQ-type of program, and there is
16 likely going to be a lot of upfront troubleshooting at the
17 beginning of the program, probably due to technology and
18 compatibility issues.

19
20 If you do choose to have real-time locations reported, then the
21 next decision point is do you want VMS? If you don't choose to
22 have VMS, you're looking at about probably \$0.5 million at the
23 beginning to industry as a start-up cost, and then about \$0.3
24 million per year as a fixed cost to the industry after that.

25
26 That would bring you over to an electronic logbook with real-
27 time GPS. We're looking at a program cost of about \$4.6 million
28 for that. Again, with that system, you may have some
29 compatibility issues with boat GPS, if you're doing an interface
30 with the boat GPS to get the position fixes. It may be easier
31 to disable or circumvent that system, simply by not turning on
32 the system, as compared to VMS.

33
34 Another risk that you're going to run into is just that without
35 a signal coming from up above the boat, it may be hard, at
36 times, for the technology to get position fixes through that
37 system, and so some pros for an electronic logbook with real-
38 time GPS, you're looking at possible daily or set-level trip
39 reporting. It would be well suited to an IFQ program.

40
41 Some cons would be that it would require a new online platform.
42 It's going to require new hardware and software. You're going
43 to need personnel for field validation and enforcement and
44 database development, and some of those actually repeat
45 themselves for the electronic logbooks of any format. You will
46 also need some GPS data management to handle that real-time flow
47 of information, and there likely would be a lot of early
48 troubleshooting in that program.

1
2 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** When you talk about real-time locations, would
3 those be received in grids, or are we talking down to specific
4 detailed information on where they're actually at?
5

6 **DR. FARMER:** I think that's a question for the council and the
7 Science Center to work together on, in terms of what sort of
8 resolution do you guys want to report and what sort of
9 resolution are the fishermen willing to report?
10

11 Obviously, I think for scientific purposes, the more detailed
12 you can get the data, the more useful it is, in terms of
13 validating the effort and finding out what depths are being
14 fished at, so you can properly assign release mortality rates,
15 based on barometric trauma curves and the like, and also for
16 mapping out where fishing pressure is and maybe identifying
17 where different types of bottom are and controlling for that in
18 an index of abundance type of approach.
19

20 The more fine-scale you can get it, probably the more useful it
21 is scientifically, understanding that obviously there are some
22 concerns about the release of fishing locations, but these
23 locations would be housed by the Fisheries Service, similar to
24 how the VMS data is currently housed for the commercial fleet,
25 and they wouldn't be available through say like FOIA-type
26 request or that sort of thing, and so this would all be
27 confidential data that would be maintained confidentially.
28

29 That kind of brings me to my next point on the VMS system. If
30 you did choose a VMS system, those pathways already exist, and
31 one of the nice things that that provides is a secure transfer
32 system for data, and that would have to be worked out for any of
33 these other programs.
34

35 With VMS, you're looking at some pretty high start-up costs.
36 You're looking at \$5.6 to \$8.9 million as the start-up costs to
37 industry, and then about \$1.3 million per year after that,
38 bringing you to a total programmatic cost of about \$10.5 to
39 \$13.7 million.
40

41 Some of the pros for a VMS is we've got many NMFS-approved
42 designs. Some database infrastructure exists. You can get that
43 daily set and trip-level reporting. It's well suited to an IFQ
44 program. We already have IFQ program running that have that
45 sort of information coming in. It's harder to circumvent a VMS
46 system, and it's probably the easiest option for enforcement.
47

48 The con would be that high cost to industry. You're also going

1 to require a lot of extra personnel on the NMFS side for the VMS
2 management, similar to the other real-time system. If you want
3 to actually leverage and take advantage of the fact that data is
4 coming in real-time, you would require individuals to be able to
5 look at it in real time.

6
7 That concludes the flowchart. I have a summary slide with the
8 pros and cons from the different systems here, but I suspect
9 that most of the discussion might come off of the flowchart, and
10 I think what we're looking for, from the Regional Office and
11 from the Science Center, is guidance on those different question
12 boxes there, and if the council has some opinions or can at
13 least elaborate kind of where their thinking is heading on those
14 different checkpoints, that would be very useful.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Dr. Farmer. First, I want to point
17 out that we really appreciate you guys putting this together,
18 especially in a relatively short amount of time, and so thank
19 your group that helped do this.

20
21 I think this is very informative, largely, and hopefully it will
22 set the stage for the staff to begin to develop some
23 alternatives around these. At least I think this is very good.
24 Obviously we're going to have a lot of discussion concerning
25 this, but thanks for putting it together, and so if we want to
26 open it up to some questions, either for Dr. Farmer or in
27 general. Go ahead, Myron.

28
29 **MR. MYRON FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to
30 be clear on the bottom box, the \$10.5 million to \$13.7. Did
31 that include an up-staffed National Marine Fisheries Centers to
32 monitor this, or was that going to be something in addition?

33
34 **DR. FARMER:** The boxes, the costs that are in the boxes with the
35 program titles, are an all-inclusive cost for the programs.
36 That includes the costs to the industry as well as all the staff
37 side and enforcement side and dockside, at-sea, any type of
38 sampling and validation that's going on, database
39 infrastructure, hardware and software development. That's an
40 all-inclusive price.

41
42 **MR. FISCHER:** Thank you, because, at the end of your
43 presentation, you stated that National Marine Fisheries could
44 monitor it if they increased staff, and I wanted to make sure it
45 was in this price.

46
47 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I think it's sort of the goal today, obviously
48 in the short amount of time we have left of about fifteen

1 minutes, is to talk through this and see what we like and what
2 we don't like and where we kind of go with this. To me, I think
3 this captures somewhat of a range of alternatives, but then
4 hopefully, at the end of the day today, I don't know if we want
5 to resurrect the motion we made last time for the technical
6 workgroup to get together and talk through this even more, and
7 maybe Dr. Simmons can comment, towards the end, if this is going
8 to be enough to do that or do we need to still continue some of
9 our discussions, but, Doug, you had your hand up. Go ahead.

10
11 **MR. BOYD:** Just a quick question. The flowchart is great. I
12 love this. A question. In the upper-right-hand corner, it says
13 National Marine Fisheries cannot implement unfunded programs.
14 Is that unfunded programs for the agency or unfunded programs
15 for the industry?

16
17 **DR. FARMER:** I think all of these programs that we're discussing
18 here would include a substantial amount of NMFS hiring, in terms
19 of personnel and support staff. I don't know -- There are
20 probably opportunities within these to get certain types of
21 funding to support some of the industry costs, for example the
22 hardware or the software. I mean the industry might be able to
23 find some ways to get that stuff funded, but I think with the
24 permanent personnel infrastructure that would need to be
25 developed, you would probably need some federal funding for
26 that.

27
28 **MR. BOYD:** A follow-up question. With that definition, these
29 boxes that are the responsibility of the industry, we could
30 implement those, because the industry is going to pay for them.
31 If it's unfunded for the agency, then you all couldn't implement
32 the monitoring and the controls?

33
34 **DR. FARMER:** I think one of the things you run into here is if
35 this program were to be implemented, which I think we all want
36 it to go that direction, is that you're going to need to run it
37 probably side-by-side with the existing MRIP survey for a few
38 years in order to calibrate between the two of them.

39
40 Then you're also going to want the infrastructure in place so
41 that you can continue this thing forward. You don't want it to
42 be a short-term type of a program. I think you want it to be
43 kind of an in perpetuity, with improvements through time.

44
45 I think that it would require some form of appropriations for
46 NMFS to get the personnel in place. Obviously anything the
47 industry can do in terms of getting their portion of this
48 covered in terms of the on-the-boat software and stuff would be

1 huge in terms of pushing it in the right direction, but Mara
2 might have some more details.

3

4 **MS. MARA LEVY:** I think that the council could move forward with
5 putting together the plan or whatever it is that you want to
6 implement. It was submitted for approval, the caveat would be
7 that it can only get implemented if the agency has the funds to
8 implement it.

9

10 Yes, the industry would be bearing a cost here, as shown by the
11 flowchart, but in order to actually implement the whole program
12 and make it work, the agency is going to need money to do that,
13 and the council can't send something in that says implement no
14 matter what. It can be implement as long as the agency has
15 funds to implement it, because what would happen then is if it
16 was like implement this and we don't care if you have the money,
17 then the agency would end up disapproving it, because they can't
18 approve something that requires them to spend money that they
19 don't have.

20

21 I think for it to work that you need to have all the pieces.
22 Like there's no -- I don't think we could implement part of it
23 and say, industry, buy all this stuff, but the agency doesn't
24 have the money to actually verify it or run the program or take
25 the data. That just doesn't seem to be a workable solution. I
26 think you have to sort of do it all at one time.

27

28 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Well, this certainly isn't cheap. Just by my
29 basic, back-of-the-envelope math here -- Of course, depending on
30 how many individuals are in this system, but it's like \$3,000 to
31 \$10,000 for vessels, and so you've got to begin to wonder, where
32 are you guys getting the bang for your buck, but I would have a
33 question for Steve or Clay or maybe you, Nick. Is there any
34 insight into the availability of funds or where NMFS would go to
35 seek some funding? In other words, are we talking about
36 something that's never likely to get funded, or is there some
37 chance or a good probability or what? You guys may not know,
38 and so feel free to --

39

40 **DR. BRANSTETTER:** Thank you. I don't know, but obviously there
41 would need to be that push to Congress to identify those
42 specific funds to be -- Maybe not earmarked, but made available
43 to the Center and to SERO, if they do the VMS monitoring.

44

45 One thing, to follow up on Mara's point real quickly, is when
46 you did the reef fish observer program in Amendment 22, that was
47 set up to NMFS will implement an observer program when funds are
48 available, and that was the way it came out of the amendment.

1
2 At least you didn't have to design that system. In this case,
3 you would have to design that system, but it was implement an
4 observer program. The National Observer Program came along
5 three or four years later, and it was implemented, but, in this
6 case, it's a little more detailed, but we have done this in the
7 past. We did it for the shrimp ELBs and we did it for the reef
8 fish observer program. It was to implement when funding is
9 available.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Lucas, did you have your hand up?

12
13 **DR. LUCAS:** Unless somebody had more questions relating to
14 budget, but I had a question relating to the confidentiality of
15 the data, which you mentioned. It's kind of a two-part
16 question. One was yes, it's confidential and there's no FOIA
17 that can get to it, but I'm assuming that that means the Science
18 Center itself will still be able to use whatever data is
19 collected to inform better stock assessments or whatever.

20
21 **DR. FARMER:** Yes, that would definitely be the intent.

22
23 **DR. LUCAS:** Right, and so the second question comes into,
24 considering the confidentiality of the data, what is meant by
25 spatial enforcement? Are you meaning that law enforcement will
26 be able to see where these people are and go to it?

27
28 **DR. FARMER:** If you selected real-time reporting, then that
29 could be a feature that could be incorporated into the program,
30 similar to the VMS with the commercial industry right now. We
31 have VMS staff that are there watching and sending out warnings
32 to folks as they get close to closed areas and those sort of
33 things, and saying, hey, that's closed and don't go in there and
34 that sort of thing. That could be a component of it.

35
36 Obviously there is a lot of participants in the charter for-hire
37 program. We're talking 1,700 some odd vessels, and so it would
38 be a pretty high burden to try to really do a lot of real-time
39 enforcement on them, but it is something that you could add as a
40 feature here, and that's kind of incorporated into the costs
41 there, is having those personnel for that. If you felt that
42 that wasn't necessary, then you might lean more towards an
43 archived GPS type of reporting methodology, because it's less
44 expensive.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Ms. Bosarge.

47
48 **MS. BOSARGE:** Thank you. My question is kind of the difference

1 between the very base case, the electronic logbook, and then the
2 other cases, which have a heftier price tag on them associated
3 with them.

4
5 If we went with the base case, that base electronic logbook, is
6 the hardware and software that would actually be put onboard the
7 vessels, is it scalable? In other words, if at some point in
8 the future we decide, okay, we've had this and it seems to be
9 working and the fishery has changed and we want to go to an
10 electronic logbook with archived GPS or real-time GPS, what's on
11 the boats with that electronic logbook, is it scalable? Is
12 there some -- I don't know technically how you do it, but is
13 there a chip you would put in it that you would have to buy or
14 something, but is it scalable or will we have to start from
15 scratch with the hardware?

16
17 **DR. FARMER:** I think the vision with the electronic logbook is
18 that's something where you could set minimum standards and not
19 lock folks into a particular type of technology, and there's
20 some of that flexibility built into the other programs, the more
21 elaborate automated spatial data type of programs as well, but
22 you run into the risk -- Let's say that I'm running it off of my
23 cell phone and maybe I can't get a GPS signal offshore, or my
24 cell phone doesn't interface with my boat's GPS. In that case,
25 it wouldn't be scalable.

26
27 It really depends on what the individual brings to the table in
28 terms of technology. Now, the council could request to start at
29 one level, but make it scalable to the other, but then, at that
30 point, if it's already scalable, then why not go the extra
31 amount and get the actual position fixes, because they're going
32 to probably be more accurate and more detailed and probably more
33 useful.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Just to that point real quick, Mr. Greene, and
36 I know you're next, but, Dr. Farmer, just for your discussion
37 with your groups here, going with whatever the system that Leann
38 is saying, this cheaper version, I don't see why some of those
39 components couldn't be pulled out of the spreadsheet to the right,
40 for example the hail-in and hail-out. There is pilots that have
41 shown that works, as well as I don't know as a council and when
42 you have 1,700, or whatever the number ends up being, the
43 enforcement issue -- I don't think we're really talking about
44 knowing exactly where someone is, other than maybe some
45 generalized zones.

46
47 Yes, I get all the issues about depth and barotrauma and that
48 kind of thing, and maybe that could be built in, but it seems

1 like some of the features on the right side could be built into
2 the left side for very little to no cost, to keep that number
3 cheaper. I don't know, but that's a point of discussion for
4 your groups, but it seems like it's not all -- It's kind of like
5 not all and none, since our real decision point here is this
6 automated sort of spatial data.

7
8 **DR. FARMER:** Yes, and I guess you could have a hail-out for a
9 self-reported spatial location. That's something that maybe the
10 flowchart doesn't adequately illustrate, but then you would
11 probably need validation on that hail-out. Someone would
12 probably need to go out periodically and look and see that the
13 vessel is not there at the dock, whereas with an archived GPS or
14 a real-time GPS type of system, then you look at the track
15 instead, and you have an easier post-hoc way of validating that
16 hail-out.

17
18 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Yes, and I think you're right. I think this is
19 great and don't get me wrong, but I think there's ways that it
20 can -- This isn't the end-of-the-day system we end up with, but
21 a good start for us to continue the discussion. Mr. Greene, you
22 had your hand up?

23
24 **MR. JOHNNY GREENE:** Thank you. Greg, you covered part of my
25 point and so did Leanne. Dr. Farmer, thank you for being here
26 and going through this with us, because, when I first looked at
27 it, it was extremely overwhelming, but going through it piece by
28 piece and breaking it down for the redneck boat captain at the
29 table was very helpful, and so thank you.

30
31 A couple of things I want to point out is that as we've looked
32 at trying to do this, and we've wrestled with it, especially
33 myself, some of the reasons that I was supportive of a VMS type
34 of unit in particular was that there is an existing VMS system
35 already in place for the commercial fishery.

36
37 Then it was kind of modified a little bit to allow the Headboat
38 Collaborative to work, and I was assuming, and I know about the
39 word "assume", but I was assuming that it could be somewhat
40 expanded upon and not have to create an entirely new system to
41 move forward with that.

42
43 I guess we've had the discussion of the chicken-and-the-egg
44 thing for about the last six meetings, and so I guess I will
45 continue it, but for us to get some of the information to you
46 guys, we kind of need some information from you all. Is it
47 prudent for us to provide to the Science Center and the stock
48 assessment people that fish were caught within a one-mile

1 square, within a ten-mile square, and where does that come back?
2
3 Is it beneficial to get down to a half a mile or a quarter of a
4 mile? I mean how much detail do you need? One thing I do know
5 very well is fishermen, and if you ask them to click on a grid,
6 we're not going to lie by more than fifteen or twenty miles.
7 That's a fact, and I can promise you that nobody wants to tell
8 anybody where they're fishing, but it's part of life and it's
9 part of things that move on, and if it helps us feel that we're
10 participating in a manner that we're contributing and we're
11 actually becoming to where what we're seeing on the water is
12 more directly reflected upon what we're seeing in the stock
13 assessments and what's being turned out through management, then
14 I think we're winning.

15
16 Now, we've got a couple of different options before us. It
17 seems to me that we have essentially three different paths to
18 move forward. As Mr. Diaz and I have talked in the past, you
19 have a Cadillac system, where you have the VMS. Then you have
20 maybe the Pontiac version of it, where you have an iSnapper type
21 of program. I am not showing any favoritism toward it, but it's
22 a different type of program, electronic logbook potentially with
23 the archived GPS or real-time, so you have that. Then you have
24 a basic weekly reporting.

25
26 You have these three different systems before us, and so what
27 are the benefits for us to choose from, from stock assessments
28 and from the Science Center point of view? Do we look at it as
29 if we're going to institute something, why not just go ahead and
30 do it all at once and be done with it and make it a VMS, here it
31 is, and there are parts of it that perhaps you've got 1,300
32 charter boats, and maybe there's a ton of information out there
33 and maybe it's overwhelming to people, but if an enforcement
34 officer is trying to make a case and there is some portion of
35 that information that he can use that is available to them, then
36 it's there.

37
38 I'm not saying they need to check all 1,300 boats, and I'm not
39 saying they need to be at the dock when all 1,300 come in, but
40 if all that information is there, then people can, in turn, turn
41 around and use it to the manner they see best.

42
43 I think that there's a lot of things that are built into this,
44 and so, at some point, we need to try to figure out which
45 direction we want to go, but, in some ways, when I read back
46 through the South Atlantic's document that they provided to us,
47 Tab F, Number 5, and I was reading through that and I got to
48 page 63 and they made a recommendation to National Marine

1 Fisheries.

2
3 It stated, in the South Atlantic fishery, that their intent was
4 to extend reporting requirements in the for-hire amendment and
5 so on, but it's there for you to read, and I encourage you all
6 to read it, and perhaps when we get to full council, we'll look
7 at it, because it seems like -- I feel like I'm the one that's
8 having to design a program and having to burden these costs,
9 which I don't really understand what's there.

10
11 I mean I have a VMS unit on my boat now. I don't know how that
12 factors into that. I don't know how many existing VMS are out
13 there that could be used, and so you have these clichés and
14 these little niches that fit in here, but where does it all
15 really go? That's the part that we're really struggling with
16 here as well.

17
18 I really don't expect you to answer any of that. It's more of a
19 comment type of thing. There's not a direct question, but
20 mainly things for the committee and the council to think about
21 as we get there, because we've got a -- We need to do something,
22 but we need to know, in my opinion, at what level is it going to
23 be -- Where are we going to get the most bang for our buck?

24
25 Is it going to be one-mile squares or ten-mile squares or what's
26 going to help the stock assessments? What's going to help us
27 get the biggest bang for the buck? If we have to go all in,
28 that's fine. If we can get by with weekly reporting and it's
29 going to make a tremendous impact, then maybe that's what we
30 need.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Chairman, as you know, we have reached the
33 end of our allotted time here, and obviously there's a lot more
34 points of discussion. I don't know if you want to give us some
35 guidance of if you want to go a few more minutes or what's the
36 pleasure of the committee of what's the next step.

37
38 I mean I feel like we made a lot of progress with this
39 flowchart. I feel a lot better, in my mind, that I have more of
40 a conceptual idea of at least what a variety of type of plans
41 might look like, but there is still a lot more things to
42 discuss, like all the points that Mr. Greene brought up.

43
44 **MR. ANSON:** I was just conferring with Ms. Bosarge about her
45 time needs, and she feels like she needs as close to the full
46 two hours as possible, but we are getting down to some good
47 discussion here, and so another five to ten minutes, certainly
48 you're able to use that.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** With that caveat in mind, so we can move along
3 and keep the ball rolling, I saw a hand go up over here. Myron,
4 go ahead.
5

6 **MR. FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. **I would like to make a**
7 **motion.** I forwarded it to staff. **Briefly, what the motion is,**
8 **it's to move forward to convene the technical committee to**
9 **review all of the elements involved in the spreadsheet, but**
10 **really what we need, before we can build a program, is**
11 **communication with the Science Center, and that's what the**
12 **motion states.** It's to have what data elements are necessary in
13 this program.
14

15 We could build it, but we have to know what they need, and the
16 other thing that has to be discussed, and whether it's at full
17 council or at future meetings, is we keep centering this, and it
18 was on one of the slides, I believe it was Slide 6, but I don't
19 have it up now, but to cover maybe 1,700-plus vessels.
20

21 We're not covering the guideboats, and that's a big issue. In
22 Louisiana, we have about 115 permitted vessels, but we have 745
23 in-state guideboats. We get a lot of out-of-state boats, and
24 who is going to cover these other 630 boats if they don't fall
25 under this program?
26

27 We were told, at a previous directors meeting, that there is
28 only funds for one program, and so the system we build has to
29 encompass the entire charter fishery and not just the reef fish
30 fishery. We can't continue with blinders on that we're building
31 a red snapper or a reef fish program. It has to cover the
32 entire array of everything brought to the dock, as MRIP does.
33

34 I would like to see the technical committee have this in mind
35 when they meet, considering the amount of state guide vessels
36 and considering where we're going in the future. **My motion**
37 **would be to convene this committee.**
38

39 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** They're putting up that motion right now,
40 Myron, if you want to look over that when they finish. Dr.
41 Farmer, go ahead.
42

43 **DR. FARMER:** Just to address some of the comments that have come
44 up, in the price quotes that are provided in the flowchart, the
45 assumption is that all vessels would need to purchase new units.
46 We do recognize that that might be an overestimate. There is, I
47 think, 200 to 300 vessels now, and maybe even more, in the Gulf
48 of Mexico that either have or are getting VMS through different

1 programs.
2
3 Those vessels, there could be opportunities to develop some sort
4 of compatibility with whatever system was implemented, and so
5 they might not need to buy VMS systems. There's also a bunch of
6 vessels that are dually-permitted in the Keys, and the
7 assumption is that those vessels are built into the Gulf price
8 estimate, because it looks like the Gulf's requirements are
9 going to be more rigorous and require a higher expense to
10 industry than what the South Atlantic is currently
11 contemplating.

12
13 That would address one of those comments, but I also have a
14 series of slides following that that you're welcome to review
15 and talk to me maybe afterwards, since we're running low on
16 time, but they kind of get into the weeds on what price is
17 coming from where and kind of how they all break out, how many
18 agents we think we're going to need and all those sorts of
19 costs.

20
21 We didn't want to get into those, because those aren't really a
22 huge council concern. Our question really, from the agency, is
23 what do you guys want these guys to report? Then we'll figure
24 out what it takes to make that happen and ensure that that data
25 comes in as high-quality as it can and as useful as it can.

26
27 To Myron's point about the state boats, this current flowchart
28 and what's coming out of it, they're for federally-permitted
29 vessels only. That's the way those prices are built in. Either
30 the MRIP charter survey would continue to cover those state
31 boats or something else would need to happen or this program
32 would need to be expanded to encompass all of those boats.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Doug.

35
36 **MR. BOYD:** Just a quick question. On one of your slides, it
37 says "breakdown of alternative archived spatial data options".
38 The numbers in there have a minus sign in front of them. Does
39 that mean that if we use these options that you subtract this
40 amount of money from some of the previous slides?

41
42 **DR. FARMER:** Let me see if I can advance to that slide.

43
44 **MR. BOYD:** I think it's Number 9 of 18. I didn't want to take
45 up a lot of time on that. I'm sorry, but --

46
47 **DR. FARMER:** This is the detailed flowchart that I think you're
48 all glad we didn't go through. Is this the one that you're

1 referencing?

2

3 **MR. BOYD:** That's it.

4

5 **DR. FARMER:** Those aren't minus signs. They're approximate
6 signs. They're those squiggles. They're estimates, and the
7 purple boxes at the bottom are cost to industry. Then the boxes
8 above them are the program costs, and so basically we have it
9 broken out with the program costs and then the sub-box
10 underneath and the different color is what it would cost to
11 industry.

12

13 **MR. BOYD:** Thank you.

14

15 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. We need to move on. I know some people
16 have their hands up, but we do have a motion on the floor. If
17 we can dispense with this motion, or is it related to that,
18 David?

19

20 **MR. WALKER:** Yes, it's just -- As long as we're forward. Johnny
21 mentioned a Cadillac for a VMS and it was a Pontiac or something
22 and I guess a Yugo for a -- I kind of look at it is the VMS is
23 almost like a tuna. Then you've got a warsaw to something a
24 little less, or you can go to where we're at now, is an oyster.
25 I think we need to just move a little bit faster with it and
26 just keep moving forward with it. That's what I would like to
27 see.

28

29 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** We're trying, David. Trust me. It's as fast
30 as we can go. Myron, is this your motion or do you have a --

31

32 **MR. FISCHER:** That's the motion. The only item is -- Ed
33 seconded it, and I didn't think you heard the second.

34

35 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I didn't get the second, but Mr. Swindell
36 seconds.

37

38 **MR. FISCHER:** I was waiting for once he was acknowledged, and I
39 was going to say that we feel we have a very good system in
40 Louisiana with LA Creel. We would like to see how that could be
41 incorporated into this, just as the other states would like to
42 see how they could be incorporated, and I believe the technical
43 committee has a pretty good geographic makeup and they
44 understand what's taking place in the states. I think they
45 could come back to us with some real good insight on where we
46 should go forward and what data elements that are going to be
47 necessary to be collected in this.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Any more discussion to this motion?
2 Roy.
3
4 **MR. WILLIAMS:** Who is on this technical committee? Is this the
5 state directors?
6
7 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** No, it's more than that. It's the Science
8 Center and the Regional Office and some of the council staff.
9 I'm trying to remember who else is on this committee.
10
11 **DR. SIMMONS:** I think that's correct. We'll get a list by full
12 council, but we sent each state a letter. They responded with a
13 representative. It's folks from the Science Center. I think
14 Ken Brennan is on there with the headboats. We'll get a list,
15 but it's a pretty large list.
16
17 I think we removed some of the South Atlantic staff after we
18 broke away and separated the documents, but we'll have the list
19 by full council of the group, and we are prepared to convene
20 them. The only thing will be, between now and the June meeting,
21 is just everyone's schedule, making sure that we can get all
22 those people involved at the table together to review this and
23 hopefully provide recommendations to the council in June.
24
25 **MR. WILLIAMS:** So if I could follow up. If we do this, if we
26 approve this, what happens after that? They give us the minimum
27 data elements and then what does the council do? Is it time to
28 begin a plan amendment or some kind of fishery management plan
29 to require this stuff at that point?
30
31 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That would be my understanding, Roy. I mean I
32 think it would obviously come back to us for some discussion,
33 because of these issues we have about just what Dr. Farmer said
34 and what Myron said. We need to know what the minimum things
35 are that the Science Center needs, and they need to know what it
36 is of those do we want to add to that -- Is that good enough or
37 do we want to add to it, but then, at that point, I would
38 assume, we would have this general plan in mind and that's when
39 the amendment process would begin to take place to incorporate
40 all of that.
41
42 **MR. WILLIAMS:** Just one other follow-up. Maybe Mara answered
43 this a little bit, but you can't implement any of this until
44 some of it is funded by the Congress, and so if the council
45 moves forward and approves an amendment that requires
46 congressional funding of a couple million dollars, the National
47 Marine Fisheries Service could approve the amendment, but hold
48 it in reserve or something like that or approve it contingent

1 upon Congress providing you guys the money to hire people and
2 develop the infrastructure to actually implement it? I find
3 this a little confusing, and so I'm trying to figure out how it
4 would happen, how it would go forward.

5
6 **MS. LEVY:** Right, and so I think, as Steve mentioned earlier,
7 that's happened with some of the other amendments that require
8 funding to implement, is that in the amendment it basically says
9 implement this or this is contingent on getting the appropriated
10 money to actually implement it.

11
12 You can approve it and submit it. The Secretary can approve it,
13 because it's contingent on having the money to actually do it.
14 In a sense, that sort of sends a signal to the people that
15 appropriate the money that this is what you want to do and you
16 need the funds. In that way, it potentially tells Congress that
17 this is something that this council wants to do and would like
18 to get appropriations for.

19
20 **MR. WILLIAMS:** So we should keep moving. Even if the money
21 isn't there to do it, but we think this is the right thing to
22 do, we should keep moving on it.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** We have the motion on the floor. Do we need to
25 read this motion into the record or not? Do you want me to read
26 it into the record for you, Myron, or do you want to do that?
27 The motion on the floor is to convene the Technical Data
28 Committee to review the minimum data elements that the SEFSC
29 deems necessary and look at different hardware/software options
30 and advice the council on findings. If there is no more
31 discussion, I will call the vote on that. Mr. Swindell seconded
32 that. **Is there any opposition to this motion? If there is no**
33 **opposition to the motion, the motion carries.** Is there any
34 other business that we need to bring before this committee?

35
36 **OTHER BUSINESS**

37
38 **DR. SIMMONS:** Just to let you know, the Data Collection
39 Committee is on our website. Morgan pointed that out to me, but
40 we will also include it in the committee report for full
41 council, of the individuals that are on that technical
42 committee.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** So, Roy, they will have that for us on the
45 website. That concludes the business for the Data Collection
46 Committee.

47
48 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m., April 4, 2016.)