

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

Hilton Clearwater Beach Resort Clearwater Beach, Florida

June 20, 2016

VOTING MEMBERS

Greg Stunz.....Texas
 Roy Crabtree.....NMFS, SERO, St. Petersburg, Florida
 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
 Myron Fischer (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana
 John Greene.....Alabama
 Kelly Lucas (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
 Robin Riechers.....Texas
 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana
 David Walker.....Alabama
 Roy Williams.....Florida

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Kevin Anson (designee for Chris Blankenship).....Alabama
 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
 Doug Boyd.....Texas
 Pamela Dana.....Florida
 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
 Martha Guyas (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
 Campo Matens.....Louisiana
 John Sanchez.....Florida

STAFF

Steven Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
 John Froeschke.....Fishery Biologist - Statistician
 Douglas Gregory.....Executive Director
 Morgan Kilgour.....Fishery Biologist
 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
 Emily Muehlstein.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist
 Kathy Pereira.....Meeting Planner/Travel Coordinator
 Charlene Ponce.....Public Information Officer
 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
 Charlotte Schiaffo.....Research and Human Resource Librarian
 Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Director

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Patrick Banks.....LA
 Luiz Barbieri.....GMFMC SSC

1 Jeff Barger.....Ocean Conservancy, Austin, TX
2 Anna Beckwith.....SAFMC
3 Randall Bibler.....FWC DLE
4 Chris Blankenship.....AL
5 Steve Branstetter.....NMFS
6 J.P. Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL
7 Jim Clements.....Carrabelle, FL
8 Lee Crockett.....Pew Charitable Trusts
9 Jocelyn D'Ambrosio.....NOAA GC
10 Martin Fisher.....St. Petersburg, FL
11 Matthew Freeman.....FWC DLE
12 Susan Gerhart.....NMFS
13 Chad Hanson.....Pew Charitable Trusts
14 Frank Helies.....Tampa, FL
15 Bill Kelly.....FKCFA
16 Michael Kelly.....CLS America
17 Benny Gallaway.....LGL, TX
18 Mike Larkin.....NMFS
19 Rich Malinowski.....NMFS
20 Sharon McBreen.....Pew Charitable Trusts, Orlando, FL
21 Jack McGovern.....NMFS
22 C. Melancon.....Baton Rouge, LA
23 Cynthia Meyer.....NOAA
24 Daniel Padron.....Key West, FL
25 Todd Phillips.....Ocean Conservancy, Austin, TX
26 Bonnie Ponwith.....SEFSC
27 Lance Robinson.....TX
28 Sunny Snider.....NMFS
29 Jessica Stephen.....NMFS
30 Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS
31 Michael Travis.....NMFS
32 Tom Wheatley.....Pew Charitable Trusts, Tampa, FL
33 Marlon White.....NOAA/NMFS, St. Petersburg, FL
34 Roger Young.....FWC DLE

- - -

35
36
37

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.....6
12
13 Commercial Electronic Reporting Pilot Program and Timeline
14 Update.....7
15
16 Discussion of 2016 Appropriations for Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish
17 Research.....11
18
19 For-Hire Electronic Reporting Program: Technical Committee
20 Review and Recommendations.....13
21
22 Other Business.....35
23
24 Adjournment.....39
25
26 - - -
27

TABLE OF MOTIONS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

PAGE 37: Motion to accept the recommendations of the Data Collection Technical Committee and have staff include in the Generic For-Hire Electronic Reporting Amendment. The motion carried on page 39.

- - -

1 The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery
2 Management Council convened at the Hilton Clearwater Beach
3 Resort, Clearwater Beach, Florida, Monday morning, June 20,
4 2016, and was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chairman Greg
5 Stunz.

6
7 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
8 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
9

10 **CHAIRMAN GREG STUNZ:** Good morning, everyone. We will go ahead
11 and call to order the Data Collection Committee. It looks like
12 all of our members are present today. Andy Strelcheck is
13 filling in for Roy Crabtree, since he's been involved with this
14 data collection process, and I will start with the Approval of
15 the Agenda, if any of the committee members have any edits or
16 comments regarding the agenda.

17
18 I am seeing none. I would recommend that we make one minor
19 adjustment. Dr. Ponwith is going to talk about the Electronic
20 Reporting Pilot Program, but, right after that, I might move up
21 Agenda Item VI, which is the Appropriations for Gulf of Mexico
22 Reef Fish Research. That's just a minute or two discussion that
23 she wanted to have, and that might make sense, while she has the
24 floor, and that then would reserve the remainder of the time to
25 talk about the reporting program. Is there any objections to
26 that move? Seeing none, the agenda is approved.

27
28 Approval of Minutes, are there any edits or suggestions to the
29 minutes? Would anyone like to make a motion to approve the
30 minutes? We have a motion to approve and Roy Williams seconds.
31 Seeing no objections, the minutes are approved.

32
33 The next item of business is to go over the Action Guide and
34 Next Steps, and I think Dr. Froeschke will do that here in just
35 a second. To give you an idea of what we've got to do today,
36 Bonnie is going to talk about this electronic reporting program
37 in the commercial group, and we will spend most of our time
38 talking about the data collection program.

39
40 The technical workgroup had met and had a very productive
41 meeting, and Dr. Froeschke will go over that. Then hopefully we
42 can go through the flow chart and discuss some findings from
43 that meeting, as well as look at our preferred, in terms of that
44 amendment, and make some decisions today. With that, Dr.
45 Froeschke, did you want to -- I'm sorry. I believe that Bonnie
46 has a key staff member here that she would like to introduce.

47
48 **DR. BONNIE PONWITH:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for indulging the

1 interruption in the agenda. I do have a key staff person here.
2 Dr. Sunny Snider is the Chief of Staff at the Southeast
3 Fisheries Science Center. She's been onboard for just a little
4 over a year. She will be presenting the Regional Action Plan
5 for the Climate Science Plan on Thursday, but I wanted to make
6 sure and introduce her to you, so you know who she is and have
7 an opportunity to get acquainted. She's been a key addition to
8 our staff to help strengthen our communications with other
9 Science Centers and with the councils and with our constituents,
10 and so thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Dr. Ponwith. It's nice to meet you,
13 and we will look forward to that presentation. With that,
14 John, would you like to review the Action Guide and Next Steps
15 with us, please?

16 17 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**

18
19 **DR. JOHN FROESCHKE:** Sure. Good morning, everyone. As we just
20 discussed, we're going to receive two reports from Dr. Ponwith
21 that are informational. These stem from motions made at the
22 April meeting, and so we're going to get a further update on
23 this Commercial Electronic Reporting Pilot Program. Again, this
24 is just informational. I believe she has a presentation to
25 bring us all up to speed on how this process is going and how
26 soon we can expect electronic reporting for the commercial
27 vessels in the Gulf.

28
29 The second item, again, is this discussion of the appropriations
30 for the Gulf of Mexico research. This is informational. The
31 bulk of the time is going to be spent on this reviewing the
32 summary report. At the April meeting, you asked that we convene
33 the technical committee to review the recommendations or review
34 the flow chart and make some recommendations.

35
36 They have done that. I have a summary, and so I hope to work
37 through that with you all, gather your thoughts, and we can come
38 to some agreements on how to proceed with the document, to
39 reflect or incorporate whatever you all recommend, and we can
40 discuss a timeline for implementation and those kinds of things.
41 That's essentially what I expect for the committee.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thanks, Dr. Froeschke. Before we move on to
44 that Agenda Item IV, with Bonnie's presentation, is there any
45 other matters to take up before the committee before we get
46 started? Seeing none, Dr. Ponwith, do you want to start with
47 your presentation, please?

48

1 who gave us good, constructive input on things they would
2 change, both in the way the hardware was configured and the way
3 the software was written. We incorporated that in. We have
4 reclaimed the hardware and have run some analyses on the data
5 that we've gotten.

6
7 The timeline, again, continued, is the vendors have finalized
8 the operational version of the eLogs based on all of that
9 feedback, and so, essentially, the code is in progress and will
10 be completed very, very soon.

11
12 Between June and December of this year, we need to build the
13 data storage infrastructure that would be able to ingest the
14 data collected from this method and do the quality control
15 methods that we currently use on the paper logbooks, with some
16 modifications tailored to the electronic version. Then, in
17 January of 2017, we would tentatively be able to receive
18 electronic reports from volunteer participants.

19
20 The participant feedback, fishermen have provided regular
21 feedback on electronic log use. Again, they have given feedback
22 on both the hardware and the software. Some of the concerns
23 that they had were around the smaller vessels that don't have
24 sheltered places for these logbooks, and so the hardening of the
25 logbooks is going to be really important.

26
27 The perception of the logbook was on a gradient. The simpler
28 the data collection was relative to the gear, the more favorable
29 the reviews were. The gear where there were many sets, they
30 tended to bog down a little bit or for gears that caught many,
31 many different species. The time that it took to get those data
32 in took a little bit longer.

33
34 Again, the results from the pilot facilitated changes in the
35 data collection standards and the hardware issues remain a
36 concern for some portion of the fleet, especially the ones with
37 exposed cabins. There is a large increase in the quality and
38 the quantity of catch and effort data above the current logbook
39 methods. Again, it gives us that additional granularity of the
40 data by being able to collect those data by set, which is very
41 good.

42
43 Just one word on profitability of the Southeast commercial
44 fleet. This is across the Southeast Region. They have looked
45 at some of the economic data, and you can see here that 55
46 percent of the vessels had an estimated revenue of above
47 \$10,000, 26 percent had revenues above \$50,000, and 15 percent
48 had above \$100,000. The cost analysis put the profit margin at

1 around 16 percent.
2
3 You can see the breakdown across the entire commercial fleet in
4 the region based on 2014 total estimated revenues, and you can
5 see that there were a large number that didn't fish, and then
6 you can see the breakdown of the revenue across the board there.
7 The point that I would make on this is that we want to take that
8 into consideration as we contemplate whether you want the
9 ability to submit data voluntarily or if you want to think about
10 making the electronic reporting for the commercial logbooks
11 mandatory.
12
13 Again, if a vessel has the electronic equipment onboard and it's
14 voluntary, it may be easier for the vessel to submit those data
15 electronically and not have to deal with the paper logbook, but
16 there may be other vessels who think otherwise.
17
18 Some other considerations are that commercial and charter
19 overlap. 12 percent of the vessels in the Southeast derive more
20 than 50 percent of their income from charter fishing, and 86
21 percent of the 2014 trips had the vessel owner onboard, which is
22 a valuable statistic.
23
24 We believe that the fishermen would benefit from having the
25 electronic log, because they would be able to submit the
26 required reports for both the charter and the commercial, in the
27 event that the charter electronic reporting went live, and that
28 would create some economies of scale.
29
30 The final outcome is that electronic logs are a feasible option
31 for the Southeast and HMS fisheries. There are a range of
32 options that fit the needs. The data collection can happen at
33 finer scales, which is beneficial from a science perspective,
34 but certainly beneficial from a management perspective, to be
35 able to answer some of the vexing questions you've had from the
36 geographic scope of these fisheries.
37
38 We believe that it increases the efficiency of commercial data
39 processing, which puts those data in the hands of analysts
40 faster and at a higher resolution and of higher quality. The
41 other advantage that we think comes from this is electronic logs
42 retain catch history and notes on conditions for specific trips
43 that fishermen can refer to, because, of course, the fishermen,
44 the individual fishers themselves, would have access to their
45 own data, and that is my summary, Mr. Chairman.
46
47 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Dr. Ponwith. Are there any
48 questions? Dave.

1
2 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Bonnie, you
3 mentioned voluntary versus mandatory. Did you get a feel from
4 the guys that participated in this pilot what their feeling was
5 for mandatory versus voluntary?
6

7 **DR. PONWITH:** Honestly, the discussions about mandatory versus
8 voluntary largely came from the council, because essentially
9 they would be acquiring input from the fishing industry and then
10 using that to make that decision. The feedback that we got from
11 fishermen who participated in this was you can't get this in
12 place soon enough. They want the -- The members that spoke at
13 the council meeting essentially said they are over the paper.
14 They want to stop sending paper logs and get this information in
15 electronically.
16

17 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Any other questions for Dr. Ponwith? Bonnie, I
18 have two for you. It sounds, obviously, like it's a successful
19 pilot, and so I'm wondering sort of what are the next steps, and
20 you talked about some of these mandatory/voluntary decisions and
21 things, but how can this committee help move this forward,
22 especially if the fishermen are liking it?
23

24 **DR. PONWITH:** What our intent is, it's to stand up this system,
25 so that if fishermen would like to submit their data voluntarily
26 using this system that they can do that. In a situation like
27 that -- You know what? I'm going to have to consult counsel, to
28 see what the authorization reads right now for the requirements
29 on submitting those logs, because if the language actually reads
30 that it's anything that specifies that it's a paper logbook,
31 that would require an action on the council to move from
32 anything other than voluntary.
33

34 We would also, if they did voluntarily submit it, we would want
35 to make sure that that submission put them in compliance and
36 that they wouldn't have to do paper as well, and so I will
37 investigate that and come back to you with that.
38

39 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. I guess I don't see any real opposition
40 to it. I personally think that this is a good idea to move in
41 this direction, and so I guess we'll just wait until we hear
42 from you more on where we are with this. Anyone else? Dave.
43

44 **MR. DONALDSON:** Kind of as a follow-up, if we move forward,
45 obviously, Bonnie, we're going to need -- You guys are going to
46 additional funding to do that or, if we decide to go forward,
47 how are we going to implement that with the existing resources?
48

1 **DR. PONWITH:** I gave this same presentation to the South
2 Atlantic Council, and they asked for a cost analysis of what it
3 would take to allow, on a voluntary basis, a portion of the
4 fleet that wished to submit this electronically and then what
5 would it take to put in place mandatory requirements for
6 electronic reporting, both from an agency standpoint and from
7 the fleet standpoint. We will get that formal task, and, when
8 we have that analysis worked up, we can present it at the next
9 Gulf Council meeting as well.

10
11 **MR. DONALDSON:** I think we need to make sure that's on the
12 agenda for the next committee meeting.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** We will do that. Mr. Boyd, did you have a
15 question?

16
17 **MR. DOUG BOYD:** I do. I'm not on your committee, Mr. Chairman,
18 but, Bonnie, on the slide that shows the total number, and I
19 don't know what it's called, the vessel count by 2014 total
20 estimated revenue, is that the total commercial fleet, the
21 number of the total commercial fleet? I added it, and it's
22 about 3,800 boats, if that's correct, or is that the number of
23 shareholders?

24
25 **DR. PONWITH:** These are vessel counts.

26
27 **MR. BOYD:** Vessels? Okay. Thank you.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. If there is no other questions regarding
30 that presentation, Bonnie, did you want to comment on Agenda
31 Item Number VI, related to the reef fish research?

32
33 **DISCUSSION OF 2016 APPROPRIATIONS FOR GULF OF MEXICO REEF FISH**
34 **RESEARCH**

35
36 **DR. PONWITH:** Yes, and thank you, Mr. Chairman. A question was
37 posed by the council of how is the additional funding that was
38 appropriated in 2016 going to be -- How is that work going to be
39 carried out, dealing with reef fish stock assessments being
40 leveraged for the coordination, and a workshop was held recently
41 in New Orleans to discuss that.

42
43 The notion is to devise a method of carrying out that work that
44 really makes a significant difference in our understanding of
45 reef fish populations, and particularly of red snapper, and the
46 results of that were that the Mississippi/Alabama Sea Grant
47 Consortium, on behalf of Sea Grant College Programs in the Gulf
48 of Mexico, and NOAA Fisheries announced a call for proposals to

1 develop an experimental design that will be incorporated into a
2 larger advanced technology and mark-recapture proposals that are
3 planned for fiscal year 2017.

4
5 The design that will be used to assess populations of red
6 snapper on artificial reefs and other structures and as the
7 basis for Gulf-wide estimates, which include both artificial
8 reefs and natural habitats, the design is intended to be able to
9 develop an absolute abundance, as opposed to our current
10 approach, which was to do surveys that give us a relative
11 abundance index.

12
13 This design may include traditional tagging methods and/or
14 advanced technologies for large-scale field projects to be used
15 in red snapper stock assessments. The deadline for the letters
16 of intent for this call for proposal was 5:00 P.M. on Friday,
17 June 3. Full proposals are due in by 5:00 P.M. on Friday, July
18 15.

19
20 There is more detailed information, and what I will do is supply
21 the URL to the committee email address, so that can be
22 disseminated among the council members, but, essentially, it
23 will create some opportunities to develop methods to actually do
24 some primary data collection and take a completely unique
25 approach to understanding the status of the stock, to be able to
26 compare that against the existing approach, and give sort of
27 multiple lines of evidence as to the status of red snapper in
28 the Gulf of Mexico.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Dr. Ponwith. Are there any more
31 questions of Dr. Ponwith? Mara.

32
33 **MS. MARA LEVY:** Not a question, but just I heard the reference
34 to what the regulations say with respect to current reporting,
35 and so I quickly looked up the commercial reporting regulations,
36 and they all seem to contemplate some sort of paper reporting
37 form.

38
39 They talk about being postmarked no later than seven days after
40 the reporting period, and so I think, especially if you're going
41 to require electronic reporting, we would have to do something
42 similar to what we did with the headboat reporting requirement,
43 where we changed the regulations to require electronic reports.

44
45 If it was a voluntary thing, we could think about whether we
46 could do that without actually changing the regulations and sort
47 of sending a notice that says you can comply with it by doing
48 this, if you don't want to do the paper forms. I would have to

1 look into that more, but I just wanted to let you know what the
2 current regulations say, and that's across -- I looked at Gulf
3 reef fish, South Atlantic snapper grouper, coastal migratory
4 pelagics, and so I was looking at generally the finfish type of
5 species in both jurisdictions.

6
7 **FOR-HIRE ELECTRONIC REPORTING PROGRAM: TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**
8 **REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS**
9

10 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Mara. Regarding that, we will fit
11 this into the agenda for the next time too, but is there any
12 other things that the committee would like to add to the agenda
13 concerning this commercial pilot program and moving that forward
14 for the next time? All right. If not, we will move to Agenda
15 Item V.

16
17 That was good that we moved through this rapidly, because we're
18 going to need to spend some time, obviously, on this reporting
19 program. To just brief everyone, and Dr. Froeschke will walk us
20 through this, but to remind everywhere we were, last time,
21 Bonnie's group brought forth a flow chart, which we thought was
22 really good and it has some key decision points.

23
24 From that, we made a motion to form the Technical Data
25 Collection Committee, which we did, and they met a few weeks
26 ago, and it was a productive meeting, and John has a summary of
27 that that he will walk through, and so I have asked him, if it's
28 okay with the committee, to kind of walk through that in the
29 context of the amendment as well, because, in the amendment, we
30 have actually defined some preferred alternatives for several
31 actions.

32
33 As we walk through that, that will hopefully help us make some
34 of these key decision points. The big issues that obviously
35 we're going to face, other than the technicalities of the data
36 program itself, are obviously the costs, which will influence
37 some of probably where we go, or at least think we're going to
38 go, and then also the timeline.

39
40 The timeline, from the committee, was probably 2018 was the
41 earliest that we could implement something like this, around the
42 first of the year, and, of course, Andy is here and probably can
43 comment on that as well. That's kind of how we got where we
44 are.

45
46 The other big constraint or issue that I see is that, as we move
47 forward with this amendment, the generic amendment is generic,
48 as we talked about last time, and so we want to retain,

1 obviously, some control, so, as the council, we get a program
2 that we like and we feel good about, but, at the same time, the
3 Science Center can't continually come back to us for every
4 little thing that they need to run the system, and so having
5 that balance of giving them the guidance they need and retaining
6 a good program we like, but also giving them the flexibility is
7 going to be somewhat of a challenge, and so I think we'll see
8 that as we talk through this report, as well as the amendment.

9
10 Today, with the last hour that we have, I would like to get as
11 far along with that as we can. If that sounds good with
12 everyone, I will get Dr. Froeschke to start walking us through
13 that.

14
15 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I think what might be helpful -- They are
16 bringing it up on the screen now, so we can reorient ourselves
17 to the current alternatives regarding the frequency and
18 mechanism of data reporting in the document as we last looked at
19 this, and this is the document that you reviewed at the January
20 2016 meeting.

21
22 Briefly, there are three actions in the document. Actions 1 and
23 2 just -- It's the same action, but just for headboats and
24 charter vessels, and it refers to the frequency and mechanism of
25 data reporting, and you have identified a Preferred Alternative
26 4. It requires that federally-permitted charter vessels submit
27 fishing records for each trip via electronic reporting on NMFS-
28 approved hardware. It's to the SRD, and so, essentially,
29 electronic reporting prior to hitting the dock, using some sort
30 of GPS-enabled software/hardware combination.

31
32 That's the same alternative we had for headboats in Action 2,
33 and so I won't make you trudge through that. Then Action 3
34 refers to the location reporting, and we identified Preferred
35 Alternative 2, which essentially would require the use of a
36 NMFS-approved electronic device, to submit location information
37 via a device at specified time intervals, and so the committee
38 gave us some additional feedback.

39
40 This is sort of the frame that we started with. The meeting
41 itself, we had participants from the states, from Gulf States,
42 from the Regional Office, from the Science Center, from MRIP,
43 and so we had a pretty good group.

44
45 What we did is we had some background information from Ken
46 Brennan regarding the headboat program, from Louisiana about the
47 LA Creel Survey, and we looked at -- We had a vendor from CLS
48 America that gave us a brief overview of some of their current

1 technologies used in electronic reporting that they are
2 developing, to give the committee some feel for how particular
3 management objectives may be able to be carried out, using some
4 of the available software or what could be developed.

5
6 That was sort of the background, to get everyone up to speed,
7 but what I would like to do, I think, is bring up Tab F-4(a),
8 page 3. There is a flow chart. What I would like to do is
9 bring that up and then sort of walk you through the process that
10 the committee went through and the recommendations that they
11 provided at each step.

12
13 This is what you received at the April council meeting, and we
14 started in the top-left corner with the assumption that a census
15 with daily trip level reporting is the objective, as outlined in
16 here. That's still the understanding that this committee
17 started with. I do understand that's not the way that for-hire
18 is collected for all the states. Louisiana's LA Creel does
19 something different, but that's where we started. They agreed
20 that that was the appropriate way to achieve the objectives from
21 the council. I am going to stop there and just make sure that
22 there is no feedback about that.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I think that's a good point, John, and, with
25 that, can we pull that preferred alternative up that relates to
26 that, so we all can see? It's going to be a little bit
27 confusing, because we've got the flow chart on one hand. By the
28 way, this flow chart is in the report, if you want to pull that
29 up, but then we can see the preferred alternative. Is there any
30 questions or do we want to have any discussion of if we want to
31 retain that preferred alternative? Myron.

32
33 **MR. MYRON FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. My question is about
34 the cost, and I think we're looking at a perceived cost, or
35 maybe a quoted cost, but is this a guaranteed cost to the
36 fishermen? I understand that if we select one alternative of
37 pings and if we increase that frequency, their rates could go up
38 from some quoted \$69 a month -- I don't want to say
39 astronomically, but if we go from one ping an hour to one ping a
40 minute, their rates go up considerably.

41
42 Also, being it's not government held, these rates, and it's
43 through an independent contractor or an independent company,
44 making profit, are there guarantees that these prices won't
45 escalate with time, where you can get sold a unit today at one
46 price, but, by the time you get it installed and you get it
47 running, the price is quite excessive, if you go with this style
48 unit. That might open the door for other style units.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Fischer brings up a very good point. Could
3 we put the flow chart back up there just to refresh everyone's
4 memory, and I will briefly summarize what the committee had
5 discussed.

6
7 In the blue boxes, as you follow the flow chart, it narrows down
8 and gives you the cost of what this would be, but I don't know,
9 and maybe Andy has some idea of how charges would change, based
10 upon data provided. I don't know. We didn't discuss that. I
11 do know, at the technical committee -- These are pretty good
12 estimates that Nick Farmer had done, but I don't think by any
13 means they are completely accurate of what it will be in the
14 end.

15
16 There was a group there for the VMS side of this that said maybe
17 these costs are a little bit high, and, of course, we have the
18 pilot programs going on that might reduce the cost some as well,
19 and so I guess what I'm telling everyone is to take those costs
20 with a little bit of a grain of salt of whether they will go up
21 or down, but the magnitude of that, I just don't really have any
22 feeling.

23
24 **DR. PONWITH:** To that point, Mr. Chair. The one bit of
25 experience we have on cost for units like this is that if a
26 group cost is negotiated that it can be a cost savings
27 mechanism, and I don't anticipate the government playing this
28 role, but that doesn't preclude having a consortium of members
29 participating in this and creating an organization that collects
30 the fees from the fleet and then negotiates a bulk rate price
31 for that, and that would be a way to manage both the long-term
32 volatility of those prices and the long-term overall cost per
33 unit.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Andy.

36
37 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** Certainly the VMS vendor in attendance
38 expressed some concerns about cost estimates potentially being
39 high. I will note, in terms of what you stated, Myron, the
40 committee was not recommending VMS as the sole way of reporting.
41 We were recommending that it did have some sort of GPS component
42 to it. It didn't have to be real-time, and so that gives some
43 broader flexibility, in terms of the hardware and software that
44 could be used, and ultimately reduce some of those costs that
45 would come along with a VMS-based system.

46
47 The committee did discuss though that their recommendations, in
48 part, were influenced by decisions made about future management

1 by this council and whether or not catch shares would be an
2 option moving forward, because obviously that's been heavily
3 used with VMS in the commercial fishery up to this point.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Robin.

6
7 **MR. ROBIN RIECHERS:** Bonnie, just so that we all kind of catch
8 up to where we've been on this document, what we're basically
9 saying is that, with an electronic logbook, with an archived GPS
10 type of system, you're at \$4.3 to \$4.9 million. With a real-
11 time GPS, you're somewhere in the neighborhood of \$4.6 million,
12 and, with some sort of VMS, you're at \$10 to \$13 million.

13
14 As you just suggested, what we're possibly doing here is
15 selecting alternatives that would allow you all to choose this
16 system. I say you all, but National Marine Fisheries Service,
17 and then the vessels participating in the system would be
18 carrying the burden of the cost.

19
20 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Strelcheck.

21
22 **MR. STRELCHECK:** John, maybe you can correct me if I'm wrong,
23 but the way I felt like the committee left off was we were
24 selecting a minimum data standard. If it met the minimum data
25 standard, then you could select multiple ways of reporting with
26 hardware and software, as long as it met those minimum data
27 standards, and that would give some choice to the fishermen then
28 in terms of costs.

29
30 If fishermen already have VMS and that's their preferred
31 methodology and they want to use that, great. If they want to
32 use an electronic logbook with archived GPS, and that's the
33 minimal cost and minimum standard, they could use that as well,
34 and so there would be some flexibility there.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Yes, that was my understanding as well. A lot
37 of the discussion had also centered around, depending upon what
38 happens with 41 and 42, we might obviously want to go with a
39 more rigorous type of data collection method, if we're in some
40 type of a quota system, and so that might influence our
41 decisions here. If we could make some decisions that give that
42 flexibility, at least for now, as these other amendments are in
43 the works, that would really help to move this forward, but Dr.
44 Farmer had a question.

45
46 **DR. NICK FARMER:** I just wanted to clarify, in the flowchart,
47 the text in purple is the assumed cost to industry. The text in
48 the blue box is the overall programmatic cost, and so the costs

1 to industry don't incorporate the dockside validation and
2 enforcement and all the other portions of the program that the
3 government would be responsible for. Those prices for the
4 industry are lower than the \$4.3 million to \$4.6 million, et
5 cetera, that you guys were quoting earlier.

6
7 Also, I just wanted to clarify that, yes, the industry costs are
8 based on kind of pricing as it stands now for these
9 technologies. If we get a thousand-plus participants, there
10 could be an economy of scale, as Bonnie had pointed out. The
11 assumed costs are broken out in tables in the presentation that
12 I gave you at your previous meeting and also the presentation to
13 the data committee, and so there is some details, if you want to
14 look into what the per-person assumed cost is to industry.

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

17
18 **MR. RIECHERS:** Greg, as we try to move forward with this
19 document, I guess I am -- Andy indicated it was the minimum
20 standard, but yet there is discussion in here about being the
21 gold standard regarding VMS reporting, if you're going to have
22 IFQ-type systems, and so I guess I'm struggling a little bit as
23 to the chicken-and-egg problem here.

24
25 We're trying to create the standards here without really knowing
26 what management system we have in place at this time. Now,
27 obviously there are some improvements electronically that can go
28 on no matter what, and so I think the question is where we can
29 find, either within the current document, those options that
30 allow us that flexibility and maybe doesn't abdicate our
31 responsibility as a council looking at those in future decisions
32 or do we set this aside for some period of time and wait to let
33 some of the management things catch up to? I am just trying to
34 figure out where we are in that best-case scenario here.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That's a good point, Robin, and I have a
37 comment to that, but Dr. Ponwith had her hand up.

38
39 **DR. PONWITH:** I think Mr. Riechers hit the nail on the head.
40 The reason we did that flow chart in the first place is the
41 council was asking the agency what would it take and what would
42 it cost, and the agency was responding by saying, well, it
43 depends on what management regime you have. It really truly is
44 a chicken-and-an-egg.

45
46 By having the flow chart here, the hope was that it would enable
47 you to see that if you make this management decision that the
48 cost profile looks like this. If you use this as the management

1 approach, then the cost profile tiers in a different direction,
2 but you're right that it eventually will take a decision on
3 which management approach to be able to further refine that cost
4 profile.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Well, I might make a recommendation. To both
7 Bonnie and Robin's points, that's exactly what the technical
8 committee struggled with just a little bit, because they felt
9 they were about as far along as they could get without some more
10 management decisions from us.

11
12 I might make the recommendation that we move this as far along
13 as we can today, and I guess maybe even the next meeting. I
14 don't know, and we'll see where we get, but let's either keep
15 these preferreds or select some others, so we're actually in a
16 position where we can, for lack of a better word, put this on
17 the shelf until we have better guidance of where we're going
18 with this management regime and we can begin to act more on
19 this. I don't know how much more we can do, and maybe Dr.
20 Froeschke can comment to that.

21
22 **DR. FROESCHKE:** What seems to me is to kind of go through the
23 flow chart, starting from the top-left, and give you the
24 rationale of what the committee recommended and pose that to you
25 all and see if that's still the process at which you go and then
26 where you end up at the flow chart. I think it's a little more
27 clear as to the good, better, best scenario.

28
29 I didn't hear any opposition, I guess, to the census with daily
30 trip level reporting as the framework. For example, if we were
31 to select something totally different, all of this would be for
32 naught if we want to some survey-based data collection program
33 or something.

34
35 The next box down is this report before hitting the dock. We
36 talked about that, and the language in the summary -- This is
37 where the gold standard language is used, and the reason is that
38 the reporting before hitting the dock is the way that you can
39 ensure that the information that is self-reported by the vessel
40 is not influenced by whether or not they are going to be
41 intercepted at the dock.

42
43 That's the only way that can happen without potential bias, and
44 so that's the reason the technical committee, from their
45 perspective, recommended that approach.

46
47 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Froeschke, let me stop you right there,
48 just so I can make sure that we're all on the same page. I know

1 Mara had her hand up, but it was probably related to the last
2 point. Mara, did you still have a comment?

3
4 **MS. LEVY:** Actually, I was just going to suggest that it might
5 be helpful to go through what John is doing, the committee
6 recommendations, and so thanks.

7
8 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Good. Before we move on with John, so
9 everyone is clear, at least for now, our preferred alternative
10 is the census with daily trip level reporting. We're on to the
11 question of our preferred alternative that we want the reporting
12 before the vessel hits the dock. Is that right, John? Do you
13 want to take it from there?

14
15 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Yes, that's correct. Is that the intent of the
16 committee?

17
18 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Any comments? That's currently what's in the
19 document through our preferred alternatives. Mr. Riechers.

20
21 **MR. RIECHERS:** This will go to Bonnie, I guess. I am not
22 opposed to the notion of daily trip level reporting for charter
23 and headboats. Obviously we've been trying to do with logbooks.
24 The electronic platform allows us to get it much quicker and use
25 it that way, but I have to ask the question. As we decide we're
26 going to go for the gold-plated standard here, do we have the
27 \$3.6 million to up the validation and do what we need to do
28 there?

29
30 **DR. PONWITH:** We have a dockside validation program right now
31 that's in place for MRIP, and we have a pilot that's ongoing in
32 South Carolina right now that is looking at what are the proper
33 dockside validation protocols for a fleet that is electronic
34 reporting.

35
36 That pilot was set up so that it meets the state's needs, but
37 also answers the exact same question in federal waters, in the
38 event that these regulations are put in place by the Gulf and
39 ultimately the South Atlantic Council.

40
41 That study is ongoing right now, and what that would do is give
42 us an understanding of how much of the current dockside
43 validation can be absorbed to meet the dockside validation
44 requirements for a self-reported logbook approach to
45 understanding fishing in this fleet and what, if any, additional
46 dockside sampling would have to be done. In other words, does
47 it change the amount of coverage you have or does it change the
48 protocol you use for that coverage, which would have cost

1 impacts. At this point, this is an estimate, based on our
2 understanding.

3
4 That pilot study will help us to refine that estimate. If the
5 costs are above what is being invested right now, the answer is
6 no, we don't have additional funding sitting in our hands right
7 now, but seeing the intent of the council better positions us to
8 take the steps necessary to acquire that funding. It's another
9 chicken-and-egg.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mara and then Dave.

12
13 **MS. LEVY:** Just to that point about the funding, we talked about
14 this at the last meeting, when we were discussing when the
15 council could decide to take final action on this reporting
16 program and the idea that the agency might not have the money to
17 implement it.

18
19 We talked about the fact that the council could take final
20 action, once you figure out what these reporting requirements
21 are going to be, with the understanding, and we would put this
22 in the document, that implementation is based on the
23 availability of funding, and that's been done in the past, and
24 that also shows a clear intent of what the council wants to do,
25 and, like Bonnie said, it can help the agency get the funding
26 necessary to implement it. It sort of shows that this is really
27 what you all think is necessary for management of the fishery.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Donaldson.

30
31 **MR. DONALDSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To Mara's and Bonnie's
32 points about funding, I think if we don't identify a need that
33 we're never going to get the funding, and so I think it's
34 important and it's good that we have an avenue to move forward,
35 even if we don't have the funding, but to at least show our
36 intent.

37
38 Regarding the dockside sampling, Bonnie is correct that we do
39 currently have the MRIP surveys, but, based on the Gulf logbook
40 pilot we did a number of years ago, more than likely that's not
41 going to be adequate to do the validation for a for-hire
42 logbook. We did some increased sampling with the logbook, and
43 even that -- We determined that that probably wasn't sufficient,
44 and so there is probably going to be some additional costs.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Riechers.

47
48 **MR. RIECHERS:** I certainly understand the difficulty in trying

1 to determine it exactly until we know what our management
2 measures are, and, Bonnie, you brought up the point of having
3 that study ongoing, and we certainly appreciate that, because I
4 think, if you recall, the states all sat down with you all and
5 the MRIP folks in San Antonio, and I don't remember what meeting
6 that was and exactly when that was, but we were asking that
7 exact question.

8
9 As we were doing electronic reporting, web-based type reporting,
10 what kind of validation did your scientists tell you that we
11 would need, and so we've been asking that question, and I am
12 looking forward to seeing the results, so that we understand
13 that a little bit better.

14
15 I guess, in all the discussion that went around the table, I
16 still haven't figured out whether the \$3.6 million though is --
17 Not that I am picking on just that number, but does that include
18 the current validation or is that some estimate of an increase,
19 because you also said that this was just if we were going to
20 increase our validation.

21
22 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I think Dr. Farmer is probably the best to
23 answer that question, Robin.

24
25 **DR. FARMER:** That is based on an increase in validation, and
26 we're looking at an assumption of thirty-three port agents, with
27 each agent covering approximately fifty-three vessels. That's
28 based on the headboat program and how many they were able to
29 cover. You're looking at salary, benefits, and overhead for
30 those individuals. Then there is also an assumption for
31 travel and equipment, at around \$60 per vessel. That's based on
32 initial findings from the MRIP pilot study, and the costs are
33 slightly higher for more remote areas versus ports with large
34 clustering of vessels.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I would also point to you, from the documents
37 from last time and Dr. Farmer's presentation, that -- It was way
38 too far down in the weeds to be presented at the last council
39 meeting, but there is about seven or eight slides or so at the
40 end of that presentation that show what assumptions he made and
41 how he got at these costs and where we are today, if you want
42 more information on how we arrived at these general numbers.

43
44 Bonnie, I would have a follow-up question for you concerning the
45 South Carolina pilot. You said you could refine some of the
46 costs from that. What would be a general timeline when you
47 would have that data?

48

1 **DR. PONWITH:** That work is ongoing right now. The South
2 Atlantic Council is going to request them to give a presentation
3 at the fall meeting. I know it's going to be preliminary,
4 because, again, they're in the field doing that work right now,
5 and so the analysis is going to take a while, but my expectation
6 is that, if they agree to give that presentation for the South
7 Atlantic Council, they would be willing to do the same for this
8 council and then supply the final data.

9
10 The other consideration, in terms of how much more than we're
11 spending right now, is what would it take to do the dockside
12 validation. That's sort of a statistically-driven question, but
13 the other component of that is whether you are implementing this
14 from the beach out to the edge of the EEZ or just in federal
15 waters.

16
17 If the intent is for this to take place exclusively in federal
18 waters, then the MRIP -- It would be in addition to the amount
19 of money being currently spent by MRIP, because the MRIP
20 dockside validation protocols would still have to be exercised
21 to generate those MRIP estimates for charter vessels, for-hire
22 vessels, fishing in state waters.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** All right. Andy.

25
26 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I don't have it at my fingertips, but, in the
27 original technical subcommittee report, we did put some
28 estimates of what it was costing us for current sampling
29 efforts, and so that is certainly a consideration. Keep in mind
30 that there would have to be some sort of side-by-side comparison
31 work done before we transitioned fully to a new survey.

32
33 The other component of this, which is I guess the challenging
34 part, to estimate efficiency and cost of validation, is, if you
35 recall hail-out and potentially hail-in components, there are
36 some efficiencies that could be gained there, especially with
37 the hail-out, in terms of reporting when vessels are returning
38 to the dock and where, so that validation can be set up more
39 efficiently and effectively by port agents, and so that's an
40 unknown at this point, in terms of how much cost savings that
41 could help with validation work.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Mr. Strelcheck points to that original
44 data collection and technical report, and that is very good. I
45 know there is some concern about minimum data elements and that
46 sort of thing as well, and that document, early on, points to a
47 lot of minimum data elements that I think we would all share
48 around this table too, if you would like to refer to that

1 document at some point.

2
3 I guess we can move on a little bit if we've solved or at least
4 we're in somewhat agreement on the consensus of trip and the
5 reporting before the dock. Then we can move on, but it looks
6 like we've got two more questions from Mr. Fischer and Mr.
7 Donaldson.

8
9 **MR. FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before you move on, and
10 being you brought it up, it was my motion, and the motion was to
11 convene the Technical Data Committee to review the minimum
12 elements, data elements, that the Southeast Fisheries Science
13 Center deems necessary and look at different hardware and
14 software options.

15
16 I don't know if the committee -- They did a lot of hard work,
17 but I don't -- To me, they didn't -- I'm the one who made the
18 motion. They didn't come back to me with this is the minimum
19 data elements we deem necessary and then we could look at
20 building a system around it.

21
22 Now, we did get a presentation from Ken on the headboat program,
23 but that's the headboat program. This is a different program,
24 and I thought we would have this list of this is the minimum
25 items you should be collecting, so we can manage fish, so they
26 can do assessments and we can manage fish, and I don't know if
27 it was brought up. It might be in the verbatim minutes, but
28 it's definitely not in the summary minutes, and I think that's
29 important, and that's missing.

30
31 I think, if this committee reconvenes, I would like to have the
32 same motion placed in front of them, so we can get some of these
33 elements and see where we're going with it.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That's a good point, Mr. Fischer, and maybe
36 John can shed some light on this as well. I know that he's
37 still working on the summary, which hopefully will capture some
38 of that. I know some of the minimum data elements were defined
39 early in that process, and I think that committee kind of just
40 assumed that probably those were a part of what everyone was
41 already talking about, although those haven't been clearly
42 defined in the document. Maybe John, as he prepares this final
43 document, can explicitly put that into the report. John, do you
44 want to comment or discuss that?

45
46 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Two comments. One, it's very difficult to
47 provide specific data elements in the absence of an overarching
48 management strategy or scheme, and so, given that we're still

1 evaluating whether you did a self-reported logbook after the
2 fact or something at sea, the timing, whether the GPS data are
3 collected or you would be self-reporting the information --
4 Until we have that understanding here, it's difficult for the
5 group to provide specific technical advice on that.

6
7 The other thing for your consideration is that the other
8 program, for example headboats and other things, the exact
9 elements have always been a Science Center determination. They
10 have always decided what data elements should be reported and
11 not. Those are some considerations that we struggled with in
12 terms of the list. That's my perspective.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** To that point, Mr. Fischer?

15
16 **MR. FISCHER:** It's to that point and to the whole discussion.
17 First, maybe we should have had someone, according to the
18 motion, we should have had someone from the Science Center
19 stating what is needed, so this group could discuss it, but,
20 secondly, what we're all facing here is, until 41 and 42 move
21 forward, the data -- You want the advancement of both documents
22 close, but it's difficult to create the data system before you
23 create Amendment 41. I never want to encourage this body to
24 slow down, because I think we work fairly slow as it is, but I
25 don't think we could work ahead of 41.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Right, and that's the big challenge here, and
28 to the very point I guess Robin and Bonnie both made early on,
29 about sort of the chicken-versus-the-egg thing here and how do
30 we get that until we have -- Obviously we might have very
31 different minimum data elements if we're talking about an IFQ
32 program than if we're in our current management regime. Maybe
33 John can address that some, to address your concerns, in the
34 final report, Myron, or we can entertain a motion to
35 specifically at least begin developing that. I don't know what
36 the committee's pleasure is. If you want to think about that,
37 we can move on. I know there is several people that want to --
38 Dave, you're up next and then Ms. Beckwith and then Mr.
39 Williams.

40
41 **MR. DONALDSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Bonnie mentioned the
42 pilot from South Carolina and, if that report was available,
43 that they were going to give a presentation to the South
44 Atlantic. I want to make sure that, if it is available, we get
45 a similar presentation for whatever appropriate meeting that is,
46 because I think those results are important to how we move
47 forward.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** John, could we get that added to the agenda at
2 the appropriate time?

3

4 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Absolutely.

5

6 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Ms. Beckwith.

7

8 **MS. ANNA BECKWITH:** Thank you and good morning. The South
9 Atlantic Council actually has an appendices going into our
10 charter amendment that has a set of core data elements, core
11 variables, that we have discussed. While our current plan is
12 not to put them -- To sort of force the Southeast Science Center
13 to add those, but we've had the discussion with the Southeast
14 Science Center, and we're going to be adding those core data
15 elements as an appendices to our amendment, and I think it's
16 also helpful for our fishermen, who have never been required to
17 have a logbook, to get a sense of what will be expected of them,
18 and so we do have that available, and I can forward that to
19 folks if you guys would like.

20

21 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That would be great, and, Dr. Froeschke, if you
22 could provide that to us, maybe for discussion at the next
23 meeting. Myron, would that address some of your concerns, if we
24 have the South Atlantic's minimum data requirements and we can
25 kind of go through that and see where similarities lie?

26

27 **MR. FISCHER:** That would assist. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

28

29 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Williams.

30

31 **MR. ROY WILLIAMS:** You and Myron have referenced Amendments 41
32 and 42 as possibly holding this up. I mean these electronic
33 logbooks apply to all species, right, and not just red snapper,
34 and so why do those become a bottleneck for the progression of
35 this?

36

37 **DR. KELLY LUCAS:** I was thinking the same thing, because you can
38 create a minimum level reporting, just to improve everything
39 now, but I kind of -- This may be a bad analogy, but let's say
40 you're flying a plane and you've got an aerial system on it
41 that's just going to take pictures and you've got another system
42 that's going to be doing LIDAR and all this, but there's a
43 precision there, right? Like you've got to fly the plane at the
44 speed of your slowest instrument that's capturing the data, and
45 so you can't -- Like even though the person that's just taking
46 the pictures, you can fly really fast, you have to slow down to
47 capture some of the other data elements.

48

1 I guess it's just because of the precision that you would
2 necessarily need in that, because, if we created a program right
3 now, in the absence of 41 and 42, it might not be able to
4 capture what is needed for 41 or 42.

5

6 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Fischer.

7

8 **MR. FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was going to bring this
9 up toward the end of the meeting, but Roy opened the door for it
10 now. I agree that we keep looking at red snapper with blinders
11 on, but we probably prosecute 350 species, and the entire index
12 is just shy of 1,200 species. I will admit, some you're not
13 going to catch on hook and line, but there's a lot of species in
14 the MRIP database.

15

16 We have a lot of different types of boats. This council is
17 responsible for reef-fish-permitted vessels and coastal-pelagic-
18 permitted vessels and then another division in Washington, in
19 Silver Spring, handles HMS. That probably captures a very small
20 percentage of the overall charter boats. We know what we have
21 in Louisiana, and we would be leaving out about 85 percent of
22 our charter boats that are coastal guides or inland guides that
23 are currently being sampled by the existing charter boat
24 program, and that's what we squirm with, is trying to figure how
25 will they be covered, in what program, down the road, once this
26 is complete.

27

28 I think that has to be at the beginning of all of these
29 discussions. Are we going to build a logbook that encompasses
30 them and figure out how they get these logbooks? That's
31 something that we really skirt and we don't discuss, and I think
32 we need a lot of discussion on how we capture this other
33 majority that doesn't prosecute reef fish with a federal permit.
34 They may fish state waters, or they may not fish it at all, but
35 we still need to know what they're catching.

36

37 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Mr. Fischer. Mara, you had your
38 hand up?

39

40 **MS. LEVY:** Thank you. Just one quick comment on the data
41 elements. In the document right now, there is a discussion of
42 the types of data elements that are required for headboat
43 reporting. In that amendment, as well as the dealer reporting
44 amendment that both the Gulf and South Atlantic did, we were
45 kind of careful not to put the exact data elements in the
46 alternatives or in the regulations. It was more of a discussion
47 of these are the types of things that will be required to report
48 and leave it to the Science Center.

1
2 There were two reasons for that. It was to give some
3 flexibility to the Science Center, and the other one is, if
4 you're going to specify exactly in the alternatives what
5 elements are required, then you're going to have to do some sort
6 of framework or plan amendment to tweak any one of those, and
7 that becomes a process that you really want to think about
8 whether you have to get into.

9
10 If you give people an idea about the types of things that are
11 going to be required, but leave the alternatives and the
12 regulations a little more general, you have more flexibility to
13 tweak things when what you need to manage the fishery changes a
14 little bit. I just wanted to point out that there is a
15 discussion of that in there right now, and so it's not like
16 there is no idea of the types of things that folks are going to
17 be required to be reporting.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Lucas.

20
21 **DR. LUCAS:** I have a question, and this is kind of to Roy's and
22 to Myron's points. I mean does the committee feel it would be
23 okay for us to come up with a minimum that encompasses the
24 majority of boats, a lot of the coastal boats and all of that as
25 well, and then, at some point in time, when 41 and 42 move,
26 there is another program that kind of captures their precision.

27
28 We're already asking -- Are we creating one for everyone or
29 could we possibly create more than one, and have one fit the
30 majority of the people and then, if there was above and beyond
31 for a smaller portion of the fishery, that theirs could be
32 adapted to meet them, and are there any thoughts about that?

33
34 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Let me get Mr. Greene real quick.

35
36 **MR. JOHNNY GREENE:** I think what Ms. Beckwith was telling you
37 about putting the requirements in the document as appendices,
38 there is a lot to what she is telling you there. Basically, and
39 I hate to speak for Ms. Beckwith, and if I get out of line,
40 please jump in, but, basically, they're saying, as a council,
41 we're going to do this. When we get to the point where National
42 Marine Fisheries comes in and says, okay, we need this, then
43 it's all going to be covered as part of the appendices.

44
45 Mr. Chairman, what I would encourage you to do is to take what
46 Ms. Beckwith is going to email and send out to everybody and
47 let's read it between now and full council and kind of get a
48 summary and let's continue on down this document.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That's a good point, Mr. Greene. Will you be
3 able to send that to the staff or me and then I can forward it?
4
5 **MS. BECKWITH:** I already did.
6
7 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Good. John, you will be able to send
8 that around to us? John, go ahead. I know you had a comment.
9 Bonnie, you're next.
10
11 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Yes, I just want to give you the perspective --
12 My understanding, and I think that of the committee, is that,
13 when we discussed this, that this would apply to federally-
14 permitted vessels with reef fish and/or CMP permits. Vessels
15 outside of that, for example the state-permitted vessels, we
16 have no authority to require them to do anything. It was our
17 understanding that they would continue to report through the
18 ongoing for-hire MRIP survey.
19
20 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Ponwith.
21
22 **DR. PONWITH:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the minimum
23 standards, you know I think it's fair to have a list of the type
24 of data that would be collected and included in a logbook for
25 discussion purposes, so when you go to public hearing and you
26 talk to the industry about this, they understand what's going to
27 be required of them. I think that's fair.
28
29 The thing that I would urge you to think carefully about is
30 regulating the science, basically including in the amendment
31 that these are the data that are collected and this is how they
32 are collected, because essentially what you do is handcuff the
33 science.
34
35 What my preferred approach would be is that you say that the
36 standards and the data that are going to be collected are in
37 Document X and then Document X is more of a living document, so
38 that if -- This happens all the time. Take a look at LA Creel,
39 for example, or some of the other state surveys. Do they remain
40 identical to the day they were born? The answer is no.
41
42 When you put a new system in place, often you learn from the
43 execution of that system, and improvements are made that require
44 changes to those data elements. You don't want to handcuff the
45 science and their ability to evolve to make that system better,
46 both from the industry's perspective as well as from the science
47 perspective, and so that's the note. I think these discussions
48 are great. I think it's really important for the industry to

1 know what they're going to be reporting, but you don't want to
2 handcuff the science, because then it essentially stands still
3 until you can amend the document.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Well, so I think that's a very good point, Dr.
6 Ponwith, that we want to create this as much of a living
7 document as possible, because we don't want to handcuff the
8 science by any means. You have the flexibility to tweak the
9 system as things evolve, but, related to that as well is, if you
10 remember when we met about this a few council meetings ago and
11 there was quite a bit of opposition from the fleets in this, is
12 that they also didn't know what they would be getting and how
13 things would be handled if, for example, the device broke. Were
14 they sitting at the dock in a shortened season and that kind of
15 thing?

16
17 To me, we're going to have to walk a very fine line between
18 making sure that you have the flexibility in the science, but
19 also the flexibility for us to do things as a council and retain
20 the program that we envision, but also not having to get caught
21 up in some type of framework type amendment process every time
22 we want to just minorly change something. Mara.

23
24 **MS. LEVY:** I don't know if we're talking about exactly the same
25 thing all the time. I guess I would just be cognizant of the
26 difference between the data elements that you're asking people
27 to report and the system we're using to get it reported, and so
28 that flow chart is the system. Like how do you want the system
29 to be, what information will the hail-in and hail-out -- That
30 goes to the system.

31
32 In terms of species and weight and price all of those things,
33 those are the data elements that they're reporting, and
34 sometimes I feel like we're talking about them together. I
35 think what we're trying to hit, or what the committee was
36 looking at, was what were the minimum elements for the type of
37 system that they thought was necessary to then capture whatever
38 data elements, in terms of species and such, that the Science
39 Center and the council thought were appropriate.

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

42
43 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Just let me see if I can suggest a path forward
44 here. The committee made I think two recommendations, which
45 aren't fully captured in the amendment right now, and I think it
46 would be good for the committee to weigh in on them.

47
48 One is hail-out. We were recommending that hail-out be

1 required. There is discussion in the amendment about hail-out
2 requirements, but it's not explicit. With the commercial
3 programs, we do not specify it as an action or an alternative,
4 and I guess I would propose to the committee whether or not you
5 would want to specify it as an action and alternatives, to be
6 explicit to industry in terms of a reporting requirement, given
7 that was a recommendation from the technical subcommittee. That
8 would be the first one, and I will stop there.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Strelcheck is moving in a good way, along
11 to the right-side of this flow chart, but, to me, that brings up
12 a point that Mr. Williams had, is that why do we need 41 and 42.
13 Yes, I agree this could be used for a lot of species, but we may
14 not necessarily need a hail-in and hail-out if you're still
15 staying towards the left-side of this chart, and so that's kind
16 of where the dividing line occurs.

17
18 At least my personal opinion is, if we're going down the IFQ
19 route, we do want to go towards the VMS side of this, where you
20 have real hail-out and hail-in and ways to validate that catch
21 and that sort of thing, but this is really -- What I am seeing
22 here is what we're struggling with as a council is the same
23 thing the technical committee has been struggling with, is that
24 it just seems like we don't have enough information to get this
25 where it needs to be, because we're waiting on some of the
26 management decisions to be made in these other amendments.

27
28 We have twenty minutes left here today, and I want to make sure
29 we're moving this forward. I think we have at least made it to
30 the yellow box in the center there on the self-reported, but
31 there is a lot more boxes to go.

32
33 It was suggested early on that we move as far as we can and then
34 we wait to see what management advice and bring this back up. I
35 don't know if we need to do that through a formal motion or just
36 the understanding that we have here or what's the pleasure of
37 the committee, given that we have twenty minutes left, and I
38 fully understand Johnny's point, and we will bring this minimum
39 data back to full council and have more discussion related to
40 that, but we're going to have to decide if we're going to really
41 move down this and proceed with this amendment or are we going
42 to wait until we see what happens with these others and then
43 pick up where we left off here.

44
45 **MR. GREENE:** Whether you have 41 or 42 is irrelevant, in my
46 opinion. You have charter guys that have come up before you
47 that have been asking for some type of program irregardless. I
48 don't care if 41 or 42 passes, when we speak of this.

1
2 You can get wrapped around the axle about, well, maybe we need a
3 VMS and maybe we need this and maybe we need that. Maybe we
4 need all of it. Maybe we need parts of it. Maybe we need this.
5 I don't want to throw a wrench out of the toolbox right now
6 because the boat is sinking, because I might need it a little
7 while later to beat up a deckhand.

8
9 The point of the matter is that we need everything that we can
10 get in front of us. If we're struggling with the hail-in and
11 hail-out, then let's look at it, because there were some pretty
12 good comments brought up a couple of council meetings ago about,
13 well, what if my unit doesn't work? Well, a hail-out and a
14 hail-in will certainly suffice.

15
16 I believe, in the commercial fishery, if they have a problem,
17 they pick up a phone and call somebody. I have been using some
18 of the tablet-based technology that does electronic real-time
19 GPS as well as VMS and everything else. It's really not much
20 bigger than a big Apple iPhone. It's not a problem. I don't
21 see any issue with it.

22
23 I think we're kind of getting wrapped around the axle about
24 funding this and that and the other. I think our goal here is
25 to try to figure out, on the management side of it, how we're
26 going to do things and move on, and so, specifically with the
27 hail-out, I think that should stay in the document.

28
29 I think that a hail-in should be in there, in the event a piece
30 of electronic equipment is not functioning properly, that you
31 can reach out to the state or the port agency and go forward
32 with that. I think that we should look at that, and I think it
33 should be there, and I think it's correct on the flow chart,
34 because you're going to hail-out as you leave and let them know
35 that you're leaving on a trip of this point and we should be
36 back at this time.

37
38 It also covers some of the safety at sea type of things, that if
39 you're overtime, overdue back in. There's a lot of advantages
40 to this type of program, and so, with Mr. Strelcheck's comments
41 about that, I think it's imperative that it stay in there. Then
42 if it could kind of go simultaneously with the hail-in, that, if
43 you should have any type of issue, that you can pick up a phone
44 and call someone. I mean this is the age of technology.
45 Whether or not you choose to embrace it is up to you, but it's
46 certainly available for us all.

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

1
2 **MR. RIECHERS:** Johnny, I think you made a valid point. I think
3 it's the same one that Myron was making a while ago, which is
4 what we're doing here is looking at a data collection system and
5 not a data collection system for any one particular species, and
6 so that is an important part, and we need to make sure that we
7 understand that.

8
9 The other part to that though is let's not confuse timely
10 reporting or real-time reporting with a better data system, and
11 so parts of this are all about validation and whether or not
12 that truly gets you a better estimate than the estimate you're
13 now receiving, and so I think that's why some of the pilots that
14 are going on are important.

15
16 I think that's why some of the validation exercises that are
17 going on is important, because the other part about data
18 collection systems, if they're a sample versus a census, is
19 there is a cost/benefit question that goes in that relationship
20 as well, and so we all need to just think about it from that
21 perspective also, because you might have a census and, because
22 of low validation, it may give you no better estimate than the
23 current estimate you're getting, and so we need to -- We just
24 need to all be eyes wide open about that as we approach this
25 data collection system.

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

28
29 **MR. DAVID WALKER:** I'm just going to -- I don't visualize it as
30 a burden to the fishermen, someone who made that comment,
31 because there is times that we have needed parts when we're
32 offshore fishing and maybe when you get back out -- You speed up
33 your trip to get back out and you can have those parts. There
34 is email capability with CLS and I think, if you pay for eleven
35 months, you get a month free. I have never used up all of my
36 data, and there is the capability of good communication. The
37 VMS has been very successful for us.

38
39 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Greene, to clarify your point, so I'm
40 clear, are you saying that we move forward with basically this
41 entire flow chart, with the options in it, and that we would
42 make decisions at a later point or we just all of these, as Mr.
43 Strelcheck has suggested, is that all of these would meet some
44 approved device requirement that you would later -- In other
45 words, if you go straight down from that self-reported automatic
46 data, it's very different than moving to the right-side of this.
47 Also, you know this flow chart is not completely independent.
48 You still could have hail-in and hail-out under the self-

1 reported as well. It just wouldn't be, obviously, autonomous.

2
3 **MR. GREENE:** I just really wanted to get through this document
4 and get past this page and go on into the rest of the stuff and
5 see what they presented, because I'm sure that Friday at about
6 noon, when we're all ready to get out of here, that we're not
7 going to give this document the timing it might need, because,
8 after five days, I'm beat down as it is, and I don't want to
9 raise my hand and drag it out any longer as it is, and we've
10 kind of just been paddling in a circle here, and I was hoping we
11 could get through the rest of this document before this meeting
12 was over.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Are you talking about the summary of the
15 report, because we can move that along, if that's the
16 recommendation of the committee. This document, as we're
17 talking through it, I think we've pretty much covered that
18 report, but, John, why don't you, since we have just a little
19 over ten minutes, go through some of the highlights of the
20 report, but I think we captured that. Dr. Froeschke.

21
22 **DR. FROESCHKE:** What I plan to do is, on page 6, there's a
23 concluding paragraph called "Summary Recommendations", and so
24 what I can do is just give you the decision points where the
25 committee made some recommendations on each node of the table.

26
27 Essentially, what we've discussed so far is census-level
28 reporting for each trip prior to hitting the dock. The location
29 data, sort of that whether you go straight down or to the right-
30 side of the table, would be collected passively through some
31 sort of device, meaning a GPS-enabled tablet or equivalent.

32
33 We talked a lot about how frequent that data should be
34 collected. If you collect it once per hour, it may not be
35 enough to conclusively determine whether a trip actually
36 occurred or not. If you did something on the order of every
37 five minutes, you may be much more invasive in someone's fishing
38 activities or location than you need to be for management
39 purposes, and it increases the cost.

40
41 The thirty-minute interval is what the committee recommended,
42 balancing those, and, essentially, if you think about a four-
43 hour trip, you're going to get eight points. You certainly
44 wouldn't be able to identify a specific location on that, but
45 you would have enough information to know if a trip occurred or
46 not. That is sort of in the efficiency part of the cost scale,
47 as the committee recommended.

48

1 In terms of the location, there are certainly things where you
2 could do real-time location, such as VMS. The committee
3 recommended that that's not necessary to meet the minimum goals
4 of this program, and that those data could be stored on the
5 device and transmitted later.

6
7 That was the minimum, but we also discussed that, if a vessel
8 already has a VMS or something better than that, that certainly
9 should suffice for this, and so it was presented as a good,
10 better, best kind of idea, where you could have archived data as
11 the minimum, but you could certainly have real-time data if the
12 needs changed or if vessels already had that.

13
14 One of the overarching themes is that we wouldn't want to make
15 all of the systems that are already on vessels useless. We want
16 to take advantage of the money and the infrastructure that's
17 already out there.

18
19 One other thing to think about that was new to me, but this
20 concept -- When Michael Kelly from CLS mentioned that, in terms
21 of tablets and things, that it's important that the device be
22 the sole purpose for reporting. He mentioned there there are
23 various programs that you could manipulate the location
24 reporting and things like that, and so it is important that this
25 is a single-use device and it wouldn't be just an add-on to
26 someone's personal iPhone or tablet or something, because that
27 could affect the quality of the data, and so that was something
28 that I had not personally thought about.

29
30 Then we talked a little about how long it would take to develop
31 and implement a program. In terms of the technology, that's the
32 fast part. I mean if we knew exactly how everything should be,
33 they could have it, whatever we needed, very fast. It's the
34 regulatory component and figuring it out and how long to get the
35 fleet going and things like that. The earliest that we
36 discussed would be 2018.

37
38 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** All right. Thanks, John. If we could put the
39 flow chart back up there, please. My plan today, Johnny, to
40 your point, was that most of this report was captured in this
41 flow chart.

42
43 Obviously that's why we had them do that, and so now we're back
44 to where do we want to end up today and for full council, and
45 knowing the fact that we will bring these minimum data elements
46 to the full council, do we move forward with, well, we have a
47 lot of options here.

48

1 There's if it's a tablet-based device, where you're at the
2 yellow box in the middle and you just go straight down, and
3 that's one option to have that could be approved. If you go
4 into another system on the right, which is primarily the VMS
5 systems, that's another option to go down, and so I guess we
6 don't have to be exclusionary and get rid of either or at this
7 point. We can just keep it as a full package, but we're still
8 at sort of this bottleneck of, okay, well, what are we going to
9 do, because we've got to find a way to fund it, and then what
10 kinds of questions are we going to ask, which might be very
11 different based upon what management regime we're under. Mr.
12 Greene.

13
14 **MR. GREENE:** Can we go back to the summary we had just before?
15 I hate looking at that flow chart. Can you go back down the
16 document to the summary we just read off of? Now, I read this.
17 I have really dissected this whole part of it, the whole
18 paragraph.

19
20 Although I don't agree with all of it personally, I think the
21 summary of recommendations is pretty much spot-on. Although I
22 don't like all of it, there is some of it that I do like and
23 some of it that I don't like, but I think it's pretty much
24 there. I mean the location data would be collected passively
25 through a device is fine. The ping frequency of thirty minutes
26 is fine. I think that's going to encompass the spatial dynamics
27 that they're facing with and help out with a lot of different
28 things.

29
30 I don't have any issue with that. I don't want to see the ping
31 rate get any smaller than that, from the cost side of it as well
32 as the proprietary information that could be lost, which some
33 fishermen have expressed some interest in, but I haven't met
34 very many that are opposed to it.

35
36 I think, basically, with what we asked them to and with them
37 coming back with this, I think we should expand on this, and I
38 would like to see some way to take what their summary of
39 recommendations is and move it into that document. I have
40 always liked the VMS standpoint, but if they feel that we can do
41 this with some other type of a GPS-type system that will meet
42 that, then I am certainly willing to back off of that and move
43 it forward in any capacity.

44
45 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Just so that I'm clear and the staff is clear
46 as well, you're saying take these summary recommendations and
47 build that back into the document and then see where we are at
48 the next meeting? Is there any -- We just have about five

1 minutes left. Is there any other comments or suggestions? Do
2 we need a motion for that?

3
4 **MS. LEVY:** It would be nice, so that you have a committee
5 consensus recommendation to the council as to what staff is
6 supposed to be putting in the document, because if they just add
7 it based on -- I think it would be better to have a motion, so
8 that the committee is making a recommendation to full council
9 about what they want to see in the document.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I agree that that's a good point, and before --
12 Would you consider making that motion, Mr. Greene? While you're
13 thinking about that, John, is this capturing what you need from
14 the staff perspective to move forward or do you need some other
15 information?

16
17 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Just a question about timing. Do you want us to
18 try to work on the alternatives and have them for full council
19 or is this something you want us to work on the document and
20 bring back a revised document?

21
22 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** We're talking about bringing back a revised
23 document for next time. Mr. Greene, would you like to make a
24 motion that captures your earlier comment?

25
26 **MR. GREENE:** Let's move to accept the recommendations of the
27 technical committee and have staff include them in the current
28 document.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Strelcheck.

31
32 **MR. STRELCHECK:** This goes back to John's comment. I understand
33 obviously bringing back a revised amendment, but, to me, the
34 committee's recommendations are not that far different from
35 what's already contained in the amendment, but it's just
36 providing some more explicit information. I would like to see
37 if staff could work on kind of revising the actions and
38 alternatives and at least bringing those back for consideration
39 by full council.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That's fine. Is there any opposition to that?
42 Mr. Fischer.

43
44 **MR. FISCHER:** It wasn't opposition, necessarily. It was
45 clarification, but could we -- I mean I know there's a motion on
46 the floor and therefore we're going to vote on it, but I would
47 like to see some work concurrent with the Center, and I guess my
48 question is, does Bonnie need thirty-minute ping frequencies and

1 does she need, or her people, do they need real-time -- What do
2 they need and what don't they need? That was the original
3 motion that I made the last meeting, to find out what do they
4 need. I think we could make all kinds of motions that tie a
5 yellow ribbon around it, but if she doesn't need it, it was a
6 waste of money. I am trying to get what she needs.

7

8 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Yes, and so we're kind of back to this problem
9 of constraining the science. We don't have a second on this
10 motion, but go ahead, Mr. Strelcheck.

11

12 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I will just add that there was Science Center
13 representation on the committee. We also met with the Science
14 Center, the Southeast Regional Office, in advance of the
15 committee meeting, to have discussions about some of the
16 recommendations that potentially the technical subcommittee
17 would be advising on, and so there was input in that process
18 from the Science Center.

19

20 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Before we have any more discussion on this, the
21 motion is to accept the recommendations of the Data Collection
22 Technical Committee and have staff include in the Generic For-
23 Hire Electronic Reporting Amendment. Mr. Greene, is that your
24 motion? It's been seconded by Mr. Williams. Any further
25 discussion on this motion? Dr. Froeschke, go ahead.

26

27 **DR. FROESCHKE:** One thing I just want to make sure that I
28 understand. Since we already have a preferred alternative for
29 these, am I just to edit those alternatives or create some new
30 alternatives and then perhaps you could reevaluate your
31 preferred? I just want to be clear in not eliminating things
32 that you have already done without your consent.

33

34 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Greene.

35

36 **MR. GREENE:** It would be just to add them and not to create new
37 actions or alternatives, but just add them to what's already
38 there.

39

40 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Right, and so most of those recommendations,
41 John, at least it's my understanding, would fit under one of
42 those preferred alternatives. It's basically just to flesh out
43 the details of those preferred alternatives. Is that your
44 intent, Mr. Greene? Mr. Riechers.

45

46 **MR. RIECHERS:** It's not to the motion, but it's to what Andy
47 just said and what Myron said. Andy, you said you had input,
48 and I appreciate the fact that you had input and staff there and

1 the Center had folks there, but I think Myron is continuing to
2 try to go down the road of what is the minimum elements that
3 you're asking for, what are the minimum elements we truly need
4 for management and not the I-would-like-to-have elements.

5
6 Often, in those kinds of discussions with our science folks, we
7 get some of those I-would-like-to-have elements, and so I would
8 ask that you all think about that as we continue to talk about
9 this document, just so that -- Because it really does become --
10 As you add more elements, the costs go up, as well as the burden
11 to certain reporters, if you will, in this case, and it may not
12 -- The reporters may not just be the nucleus of the charter/for-
13 hire fishermen who are in the red snapper program, if you will,
14 as we've talked about this may apply to more than just that, and
15 so let's just think about that as we move forward.

16
17 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. We are just about out of time for our
18 committee here. Is there any more discussion to this motion?
19 Seeing none, we need to vote this motion up or down. **Is there**
20 **any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

21
22 That takes us on to Other Business. Is there any other business
23 that needs to come before this committee? Seeing none, the Data
24 Collection Committee is adjourned.

25
26 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 10:01 a.m., June 20, 2016.)

27
28

- - -