

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SHRIMP COMMITTEE

Webinar

SEPTEMBER 28, 2020

VOTING MEMBERS

- 10 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- 11 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
- 12 Roy Crabtree.....NMFS
- 13 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- 14 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 15 Jonathan Dugas.....Louisiana
- 16 Robin Riechers.....Texas
- 17 John Sanchez.....Florida
- 18 Chris Schieble (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

- 21 Susan Boggs.....Alabama
- 22 Phil Dyskow.....Florida
- 23 Tom Frazer.....Florida
- 24 Lt. Nicholas Giancola.....USCG
- 25 Martha Guyas (designee for Jessica McCawley).....Florida
- 26 Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi
- 27 Greg Stunz.....Texas
- 28 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana
- 29 Troy Williamson.....Texas

STAFF

- 32 Matt Freeman.....Economist
- 33 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
- 34 Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
- 35 Karen Hoak.....Administrative & Financial Assistant
- 36 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
- 37 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
- 38 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 39 Jessica Matos.....Document Editor & Administrative Assistant
- 40 Natasha Mendez-Ferrer.....Fishery Biologist
- 41 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
- 42 Kathy Pereira.....Meeting Planner & Travel Coordinator
- 43 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist & SEDAR Liaison
- 44 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 45 Charlotte Schiaffo.....Administrative & Human Resources Assistant
- 46 Camilla Shireman.....Administrative & Communications Assistant
- 47 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director
- 48 Carly Somerset.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

Anna Beckwith.....SAFMC
David Gloeckner.....SEFSC
Peter Hood.....NMFS
Paul Mickle.....MS
Clay Porch.....SEFSC

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Contents.....3
4
5 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes.....4
6
7 Action Guide and Next Steps.....4
8
9 Gulf Fishery Analytical Requirements, Program Updates, and
10 Reporting Options.....5
11
12 Adjournment.....22
13
14 - - -
15
16

1 The Shrimp Management Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery
2 Management Council convened via webinar on Monday morning,
3 September 28, 2020, and was called to order by Chairman Leann
4 Bosarge.

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

10 **CHAIRMAN LEANN BOSARGE:** I will call the Shrimp Management
11 Committee to order. The members are myself, Mr. Banks, Mr.
12 Anson, Dr. Crabtree, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Donaldson, Mr. Dugas, Mr.
13 Riechers, and Mr. Sanchez.

14
15 The first thing on our agenda is the Adoption of the Agenda.
16 Were there any edits or items to add to the agenda? Seeing
17 none, the agenda is adopted as stated. The next item would be
18 the Approval of the April 2019 Committee Minutes, which that's
19 when we had our last Shrimp Committee, and that's found under
20 Tab D, Number 2. Did anybody have any edits to those minutes?
21 I am not hearing anything, and so, seeing no edits, the minutes
22 are approved as written.

23
24 Next is our Action Guide and Next Steps, and that can be found
25 under Tab D, Number 3. We have a pretty short agenda today.
26 Dr. Freeman, would you like to take us through the Action Guide,
27 or would you like me to run through that, real quick?

28
29 **DR. MATT FREEMAN:** Certainly, and I can do that. The Science
30 Center will present on analytical requirements, program updates,
31 and reporting options for the Gulf shrimp fishery. Current
32 vessel reporting will be impacted, as cellular reporting through
33 the 3G network is being phased out. The Science Center has also
34 provided background information in Tab D, Number 4(b) to the
35 committee, further outlining analytical requirements and
36 reporting options.

37
38 The committee should consider the presentation, review the
39 background information, ask questions of Science Center staff,
40 and then provide feedback to the Science Center on how these
41 changes will affect shrimp industry participants in the Gulf.
42 The committee may then consider development of an amendment, if
43 necessary, to address the options presented by the Science
44 Center.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Dr. Freeman. Do we have Dr.
47 Gloeckner, Dave Gloeckner, on the line?
48

1 **DR. DAVID GLOECKNER:** Can you hear me?

2
3 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, sir. I can hear you. Are you ready to
4 take us through your presentation?

5
6 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Sure.

7
8 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. You have the floor, sir.

9
10 **GULF FISHERY ANALYTICAL REQUIREMENTS, PROGRAM UPDATES, AND**
11 **REPORTING OPTIONS**

12
13 **DR. GLOECKNER:** All right. I'm Dave Gloeckner, as Leann said,
14 and I am the Division Director for Fisheries Statistics at the
15 Center in Miami, and I'm actually a little bit new to the shrimp
16 reporting for the vessels, and so bear with me if I stumble
17 through this a little bit. I just gave this presentation last
18 week to the Gulf Commission Data Management Committee, and so
19 hopefully we can move through this quickly and you can guys can
20 take a look at the information that we sent you.

21
22 There is four types of shrimp data that are required to complete
23 the very wide array of Southeast Center and SERO outputs,
24 including the regulatory requirements and annual council and
25 industry requests and additional national reporting requirements
26 that we have at the Center, and so that's effort data, bycatch
27 rates, landings data, and then there's additional data for
28 economic and regulatory analyses, and this should be included in
29 the background information we sent you.

30
31 The current data collection, we have bycatch rates that we
32 acquire through one observer program, and this is a
33 representative estimate of the average catch per tow of sea
34 turtles, red snapper, and other species. With our current
35 funding level, that covers only around 2 percent, and so that
36 leads to imprecise estimates for most of those species.

37
38 The current data collection on landings, economics, and
39 regulatory data, they are collected through dealer-reported trip
40 tickets, and annual gear, landings, and economic surveys as
41 well. The gear, landings, and economics survey are paper-based,
42 and they are mailed annually to permit holders, and so that's
43 not the most efficient use of resources.

44
45 The shrimp landings are currently required to be submitted
46 monthly on state trip tickets, as opposed to the species
47 included in the Gulf and South Atlantic permit, which get
48 submitted weekly.

1
2 For effort data, currently, we have tow-by-tow effort that's
3 derived from time-stamped GPS coordinates, using the 3G cellular
4 electronic logbook system, what we call cELBs, and the coverage
5 is less than 40 percent of the Gulf shrimp fleet, and, since 3G
6 technology is being discontinued, beginning January 1 of 2021,
7 new shrimp effort data collection methods and reporting
8 requirements are warranted.

9
10 A little bit of background on dealer permitting, and a Gulf
11 shrimp dealer is a person who purchases shrimp from a vessel or
12 person that fishes in the Gulf of Mexico EEZ or in adjoining
13 waters and that lands shrimp in the adjoining states.
14 Currently, shrimp dealers are required by states to report
15 monthly, but they're not required to do that electronically.

16
17 Requiring federal shrimp dealers to have a GSAD and adhere to
18 those weekly electronic reports would ensure that NMFS receives
19 timely and accurate shrimp data, and so, right now, we get blank
20 market size category fields that have been increasing, and so
21 they're not quite what we need, and so then SERO could enforce
22 dealer reporting requirements, if we had this federal permit.

23
24 The current vessel reporting, the unit of shrimp effort is days
25 fished and is derived by an algorithm developed by LGL
26 Ecological Associates. The cELB GPS data is transmitted
27 electronically via a 3G signal to NMFS, establishing a trip
28 start and stop that can be matched, theoretically, to a state
29 trip ticket, using a twenty-four-hour match window. Match
30 efficiency using this algorithm ranges from 50 to 80 percent,
31 depending on the year.

32
33 Time-stamped GPS data recorded at ten-minute intervals by the
34 cELB units are used in the algorithm to estimate vessel speed,
35 which is then used to infer time spent fishing, and so effort in
36 units of days fished. Unmatched trips do not get used in the
37 effort estimation, and cELBs are mostly on offshore vessels, and
38 so this may bias the estimates.

39
40 When looking at options for vessel reporting, we established
41 four possible options moving forward, and the potential for each
42 option to provide sufficient data is summarized in the following
43 slides.

44
45 The first option is no vessel-based reporting, and that requires
46 no effort data through the vessel, and we would move to using
47 only state trip ticket data, which appears to not capture all
48 trips reported to NMFS, and it has less spatially-explicit

1 information and so, instead of those lat and longs, we have
2 areas.

3
4 Further, efforts could only be estimated through days at-sea,
5 which would be incomparable to the historic units that we use
6 now and that's used as the basis of various regulations, and so,
7 for example, the shrimp biological opinion and the Gulf shrimp
8 amendment.

9
10 Option 2A and B is GPS vessel reporting. In general, Option 2
11 requires basically the status quo, where the vessels would need
12 to transmit time-stamped GPS data at ten-minute intervals, with
13 the trip start and stop date and time, upon returning to port.

14
15 With Option 2A, in addition to the above, it would require a
16 trip ticket link, and so trip ticket number transmitted with GPS
17 report. Survey-level GPS reporting still requires an algorithm
18 approach, but the link would improve that match efficiency
19 between the trip ticket and the lat and long position
20 information. survey-level reporting may still poorly reflect
21 the inshore fishing activities, and that's a caveat of
22 continuing to do this.

23
24 For 2B, in addition to the requirements that we just mentioned,
25 it would require census-level coverage of the federally-
26 permitted shrimp fleet, and so a census provides greater
27 coverage of the inshore effort, which is important in various
28 regulations, and a census would improve the accuracy of total
29 shrimp effort estimates. No algorithm would be needed to
30 estimate that effort. With a census, there is no need to link
31 to the state trip tickets to estimate effort. However,
32 establishing a link to the trip tickets would allow for
33 validation purposes.

34
35 Option 3 would be enhanced vessel reporting, and so this would
36 essentially have vessels reporting gear information upon
37 returning to port, and so gear information is required to be
38 reported annually via that twelve-page mailed paper survey.

39
40 The electronic reporting application could be developed such
41 that gear information could be saved, eliminating the need to
42 update gear information, and then transmitted with the GPS and
43 trip ticket number upon the vessel returning to port.

44
45 This leads to more accurate dealer data, and it would be more
46 efficient than the paper survey that we get currently, and it
47 would eliminate that data collection, and so fishermen wouldn't
48 have to fill out that annual survey, and they would just be

1 reporting their gear information through the application.

2
3 Option 4 would be even more enhanced, and we would get tow-by-
4 tow vessel reporting, and this requires vessels to report
5 landings and weight by shrimp species at the tow level.
6 Currently, effort is derived by matching that cELB effort to
7 trip ticket landings and allocating it to the area and the stat
8 zone.

9
10 With tow-by-two landings, we would have an exact measure of
11 effort for each tow, which would be precise by the stat and
12 depth zone, and it could be derived, improving the accuracy of
13 effort estimates used in the turtle bi-op and the red snapper
14 bycatch analysis.

15
16 With 3G technology being discontinued at the end of 2020, a new
17 shrimp data collection program and reporting requirements are
18 warranted. For the council's consideration, we have presented
19 these four options to update the current vessel reporting
20 requirements, and so, once again, that Option 1 would produce
21 incomparable units, because we would just be using trip tickets,
22 and those will be coarse and less accurate.

23
24 Option 2A and 2B would achieve status quo reporting, with some
25 refinement, and Options 3 and 4 would provide enhanced vessel
26 reporting, incrementally improving the accuracy of the
27 analytical information.

28
29 The council will need to pursue an amendment, if it chooses, to
30 make changes to the expiring effort data collection and/or
31 require shrimp dealer permits and all permitted shrimp dealers
32 to submit weekly electronic reports to NMFS. I think that may
33 be it. I'm sure that there will be lots of questions, and I
34 will try my best.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Dr. Gloeckner. Were there any
37 questions from the committee or others for Dr. Gloeckner? Let's
38 see. I see Robin Riechers' name popping up on my screen.
39 Robin, go ahead.

40
41 **MR. ROBIN RIECHERS:** Dr. Gloeckner, I am wondering about -- When
42 we say the end of 2020, and so, obviously, in the current
43 situation we're in, it's going to be hard to roll out new
44 reporting requirements, and certainly new reporting technology,
45 and so are we -- I mean, tell me a little bit about the time
46 table and what your thoughts are, as far as how we continue what
47 we have, if there's a stop-gap measure, and what are the
48 thoughts there?

1
2 **DR. GLOECKNER:** For the time table, 3G may be going away, but I
3 think those units will continue to work for a little while, and
4 so, at this point, we are just trying to get the ball rolling on
5 developing some other method to collect this information, and,
6 currently, we have been working with Benny Gallaway and
7 researching whether or not we can just use the P-Sea Windplot
8 software that is used by most of the fleet and modifying that,
9 so they can just output the vessel tracks.

10
11 That is, I think, where we're going to try to go here very
12 quickly, and so I think what we'll do is roll that out to the
13 fleet as soon as we can, and I think that would be very soon
14 after the beginning of the year, so that we can start using that
15 information reported from the selected vessels and use the
16 current information on the 3G units to calibrate that cELB with
17 this new method and then switch over to a new method.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I will jump in here, just for a second,
20 Robin, to kind of expand upon that a little bit. The industry
21 was made aware that this technology is going to go away, and we
22 realized, at that point, that, as you just said, we're on a
23 pretty quick schedule to have something done.

24
25 The council and government wheels turn kind of slowly, which
26 that's fine, and there is good points to that, but we know that
27 that information is important, right, and we don't need any gaps
28 in it, if at all possible, because it's used for a lot of
29 different things.

30
31 He mentioned a few things, and you can remember the coral
32 amendment that we worked on here recently, and we saw that
33 effort data quite a bit, to see where the shrimp fleet trawls in
34 relation to a lot of that coral, to make sure that we get our
35 boxes as tight as possible, when we draw boxes around that
36 coral, and so we know how important it is, and we don't want it
37 going away either, and so here's what industry has done to try
38 and assist and do our part in this.

39
40 This effort is collected kind of like in the background on our
41 boats, and it doesn't actually require active human involvement,
42 right, and it's not like reef fish, where you have to -- Those
43 guys, the IFQ guys, have to hail-in and hail-out, and they have
44 to call the government, and there's a lot of interaction from
45 the man on the boat.

46
47 Ours actually tracks our movement, and it has a formula that it
48 uses to see, in between pings, how far did the boat move, and we

1 tow for certain species -- When our nets in the water, we're
2 moving a lot slower than any other time that we're moving, and
3 so that formula can tell when we're towing and trawling and when
4 we're not.

5

6 **MR. ED SWINDELL:** Good morning.

7

8 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Hi, Ed. We hear you, and you can go ahead
9 and mute yourself, if you don't mind. So, anyhow, where was
10 that? So the problem is the algorithm and the formula and
11 everything is fine, and the problem is the platform that it's
12 being used on, which is the cellular electronic logbook
13 platform, and the technology is rapidly expanding, and the boxes
14 that we have on the boat are going to be invalid pretty soon.

15

16 That expanding technology is not going to go away, and that's
17 always going to be something we're fighting, and so what the
18 industry looked at is what can we get up and going quickly, very
19 quickly, and, well, on our shrimp boats, on most of the Gulf
20 shrimp boats, we use a computer plotter, and so it tracks our
21 movement on a computer, and there is a software program called
22 P-Sea Windplot in that computer.

23

24 That software program actually has the capacity for us to do a
25 little tweaking to it, with the manufacturer of the software,
26 and allow it to track our GPS movement and use the same
27 algorithm that NMFS currently uses to collect the data in
28 exactly the same way, using the P-Sea Windplot platform instead
29 of the cELB that's going to be going out pretty soon.

30

31 What industry has done is they have kind of come up with a
32 proposal to get out to some of these boats and getting the
33 technology developed and put onto the boats and have that effort
34 data collected and then turn that over to NMFS and let them take
35 a look at it and make sure that it's comparable to the old
36 effort data.

37

38 If it is, if that works well, then NMFS would be able to take
39 that proof of concept project that the industry gets up and
40 running and essentially scale it up and run with it. We would
41 have to have that proof of concept up and running within a
42 matter of months, and hopefully the early part of next year, and
43 we hope to have some data before that, but, to be able to hand
44 it off to NMFS and let them scale it up, it would probably be
45 early next year.

46

47 Essentially, what industry is waiting on to pull the trigger on
48 that, because there's a hefty price tag for us to do this, is to

1 have some feedback from the council and see if the council is
2 interested in us doing that, so that we don't have a gap in this
3 data and so that we do have something up and running, and
4 industry, just FYI, would partner with Dr. Benny Gallaway at
5 LGL, who was the -- Dr. Gallaway and his company, LGL, were the
6 original creators of the algorithm and the electronic logbook
7 program that was originally on the boat. I will open it back up
8 to questions, and, Robin, did that answer yours?
9

10 **MR. RIECHERS:** Well, certainly my question was just more at not
11 all the history, Leann, to some degree, because I do, obviously,
12 remember Benny being real participatory in this and the ELBs
13 being used, but I was just trying to get at the whole notion of
14 -- Both you and Dr. Gloeckner answered it with the notion of
15 modifying the current, some of the current, technology that you
16 now have on vessels to try to go ahead and basically -- I am
17 guessing, and I would have to go back up to the screen, but
18 that's more of the Option 2A and B options, is what it seems
19 like, as opposed to more of the higher bells and whistles
20 options further down. That's kind of what I'm assuming that
21 means.
22

23 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, Robin, and you're correct. When you get
24 into Options 2A and 2B, you start getting into some trip tickets
25 and electronic transmittal of trip tickets, and we can probably
26 take that up at a later date and another committee, maybe where
27 we have some more time, but I have done a little research on
28 what is causing the issue with matching effort to landings,
29 matching an actual trip, effort trip, to the trip ticket for
30 that trip.
31

32 I think, before we get to in-depth with electronic reporting of
33 the trip ticket to NMFS, I think what we need to do is sit down
34 and take a look at the unmatched trips and landings, because
35 that is a list that kicks out of the program, the algorithm
36 program, every time it runs, and we need to try and understand
37 what's causing the mismatches.
38

39 I have some ideas, and I think, honestly, when you go the P-Sea
40 Windplot system, where you're not using that antenna that is on
41 the current cELB, your matches are going to get a lot better.
42 What happens is those antennas on the cELB -- They are just
43 really not made to be out in the weather like they are, and so
44 your transmitting doesn't work as well as you would like it to
45 sometimes, and we may not know it's not transmitting until we
46 get back to the dock.
47

48 I think that that will help, when you go to the P-Sea Windplot

1 system, and you will have a lot better matches, and I think
2 going through that unmatched list to figure out what the other
3 issues are and addressing the actual issues and trying to get
4 better matches that way, whether it be adding another field to a
5 state trip ticket program, so that we get the end date of the
6 trip narrowed in a little better -- I think there's ways to fix
7 that.

8
9 I think, right now, we better focus on the 3G that's going to
10 expire, and making sure that we don't lose the data that we
11 have, and then, once we get that off the ground and running,
12 let's see what issues we still have, or what issues didn't go
13 away, and then we can look at maybe fixing those. Were there
14 any other questions for Dr. Gloeckner?

15
16 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** Leann, I have a couple of questions and a
17 comment.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Go ahead.

20
21 **MR. DIAZ:** All right. First, I do -- I am happy to see that the
22 industry is stepping up to try to help fill the void and head off
23 the problem, and I want to commend the shrimp industry for doing
24 that, and I do realize that we have to have good data to manage
25 this fishery also, and so all of this stuff is very important.

26
27 I do have two questions, and the first one, Leann, is for you,
28 and the second one is for Dr. Gloeckner. The industry effort
29 that you're talking about, right now, we have about 40 percent
30 coverage on the system that we're using now, and what percentage
31 coverage do you anticipate in this industry-led effort that
32 you're talking about?

33
34 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** The industry-led effort, Dale, that would
35 just be a proof of concept, and so how NMFS decides to scale it
36 up after that, whether they go 40 percent or 100 percent,
37 however they choose to do it, that would be determined by them,
38 and I would probably let Clay answer that question, but I assume
39 that he would at least want the coverage that he has now, but
40 the proof of concept --

41
42 We would get out there and get this technology downloaded into
43 some of the vessels that currently have cELBs on them, and, that
44 way, they will have both running at the same time, the cELBs and
45 the P-Sea Windplot program, using the same algorithm, and get
46 that data back to NMFS, and it won't be many boats. It will
47 just be a handful of boats, and it's just a proof of concept,
48 right?

1
2 The industry cannot afford to do a full-scale project, and you
3 start getting into seven figures, when you want to look at
4 something like that, and it's bad enough that we're in six
5 figures and sorting out the money for that, but, anyway, I will
6 let Clay answer the question about 40 percent or greater.

7
8 **DR. CLAY PORCH:** Thank you, Ms. Bosarge. 40 percent would be
9 okay if we could do a better job with matching, which you were
10 already talking about, and that's why we were recommending
11 including the trip ticket number associated with each trip, and,
12 that way, we can do a much better job figuring out what fraction
13 of the total effort we're actually picking up with that 40
14 percent coverage, and we could do the expansion.

15
16 We're still recommending that, and I'm not quite so optimistic
17 that, just by going to the unmatched list, we'll be able to
18 resolve all those issues of how we can match better, and it's
19 still going to be a lot of work down the road, and there will
20 always be that kind of thing coming up, whereas, if everybody
21 reported their trip tickets, it would be a lot easier to match.

22
23 I do like the idea of using the P-Sea Windplot platform, and I
24 think that could work very well for us. Ideally, we would get
25 something closer to 100 percent coverage, and that was the
26 Option 2B, I believe, but, again, we could live with 40 percent
27 if we could do a better job matching, and the trip tickets would
28 help a lot with that.

29
30 The other thing that I wanted to point out was that those
31 Options 3 and 4 give us a lot of the information that we collect
32 rather inefficiently now for a lot of the economic analyses, and
33 so some of the things that the council has been asking for could
34 be better provided if we collected it in the manner that Dave
35 described with those three and four options.

36
37 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dale, did you want to go ahead with your
38 question for Dr. Gloeckner?

39
40 **MR. DIAZ:** Dr. Gloeckner, as you were going through your
41 options, one of the things that kept popping into my head was
42 cost, and so could you speak a little bit to what costs might be
43 borne by the industry with relation to going to the monthly
44 tickets for the dealers, and also the other options that might
45 impact people in the commercial fishery?

46
47 **DR. GLOECKNER:** If we want to talk about the going from monthly
48 paper to weekly electronic submissions by the dealer, it just

1 depends on what the dealer currently has on hand, whether they
2 actually have a computer on hand if they're still doing
3 everything the old-fashioned way. If they have to buy a
4 computer, you're probably talking about three-hundred-bucks
5 worth and an internet fee of a monthly recurring internet fee,
6 somewhere around eighty-bucks.

7
8 Time-wise, it really doesn't cost any more to do it weekly, and
9 you're entering the same number, but you're just doing it a
10 little bit sooner, and so I think what we put together when we
11 did the reef fish was an estimate somewhere around three-
12 hundred-bucks for the dealers to take on electronic reporting,
13 if they're not already doing it, and so we would have to go
14 through, and I think Florida is pretty good, with most of their
15 dealers already reporting electronically.

16
17 It would be the other states in the Gulf that we would have to
18 work with, right along with the Gulf States Commission, to
19 implement that change in reporting. Does that get at that
20 question?

21
22 **MR. DIAZ:** It does, and, on the other options related to the
23 commercial fishermen, do you have any idea if there would be any
24 additional costs to commercial fishermen?

25
26 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I don't see it being an additional cost over and
27 above what is already paid. It's still operating in the
28 background, and it's still using -- Actually, it's using a
29 system that's already onboard, but it's just working with P-Sea
30 Windplot to export that data somehow and transmit it, and
31 probably using the same cellular method that the current logbook
32 does, and so I don't see that changing much, unless we expand it
33 to the rest of the fleet and require that.

34
35 There may be some vessels that don't have computers onboard and
36 aren't using P-Sea Windplot, and so we would have to get an
37 estimate of that number of vessels from Benny and figure out how
38 much that would cost. I think a license for P-Sea Windplot is
39 \$900, plus you would have to put a computer on the boat, and so
40 that's probably somewhere between \$500 and \$1,000, but I think,
41 after that, you've got a recurring cost of transmission, and I
42 think that's it, unless there is upgrades that you want to make
43 to your P-Sea Windplot.

44
45 **MR. DIAZ:** Thank you, Dr. Gloeckner.

46
47 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Those are the costs that I kind of expect, but I
48 will need some feedback from Benny, and we were hoping to meet

1 again before this meeting, but we couldn't work it out.

2
3 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. I have a question. You mentioned
4 that there's a twenty-four-hour window for matching. I am kind
5 of getting into the weeds, but I would like to delve into it
6 just for a second. Essentially, you get the effort information
7 from the vessel, and you can see when the trip ended for the
8 boat, based on when the boat quit moving.

9
10 Then you get a trip ticket from Mississippi or Louisiana or
11 Texas or something, and that trip ticket has a date, I guess an
12 offloading date, and it would depend on which state as to what
13 date they list on there, and some of them will have a number of
14 days for the trip.

15
16 Are you telling me that the offload date on that trip ticket has
17 to be within twenty-four hours of when that boat landed, when
18 the boat hit the dock, in order for the system to make a match
19 out of it? If that's the case, there's a lot of issue right
20 there with your matching, because we don't always offload within
21 twenty-four hours of hitting the dock.

22
23 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I think what we're using is we're using a three-
24 day buffer to try to incorporate those differences between --

25
26 (There is a gap in the audio recording due to a dropped phone
27 line, but there is no lost data.)

28
29 **DR. TOM FRAZER:** Leann, I think we're going to get started.
30 Give it a whirl.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Thank you so much. Now we're
33 under the gun, and we have about six minutes to finish our
34 committee, and so what we need to come out of this committee is,
35 if the industry is going to move forward with this proof of
36 concept project, where we actually get this same program
37 algorithm up and running on a different platform on the vessels
38 that currently have it, we really need to hear council
39 encouragement for that idea, because it's well over \$300,000
40 that will come out of the industry's pocket to make that happen,
41 so that we don't have a large gap in our data.

42
43 If the council is encouraged by that, using the P-Sea Windplot,
44 to collect that same data that we have always been collecting, I
45 would like to hear some feedback from the council, as well as
46 from the Science Center, so that the industry can make a
47 decision and get this program done.

48

1 I heard Dr. Porch speak positively about the idea of using the
2 P-Sea Windplot earlier, but did I interpret that correctly, that
3 the Science Center is onboard with the idea, Dr. Porch?
4

5 **DR. PORCH:** Yes, absolutely. I think it's a great idea, and, if
6 we don't do something soon, the whole system is going to fall
7 apart, and that's not only going to affect our ability to
8 determine where the shrimp fishery is in regard to that 66
9 percent regulation, but it's going to affect a lot of our stock
10 assessments, and so it's really important to get on the right
11 track here.

12
13 The only thing I would say though is, as we move forward, I
14 think we need to give strong consideration, again, to
15 incorporating the trip ticket information, because, if we had
16 that, we can automate things. If we don't have that trip ticket
17 information, and we have to kind of use the fuzzy logic that
18 we're having to use now to do the matching, we can't really
19 automate it, and it becomes very labor intensive.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Dr. Porch. Anybody else? Dale,
22 how do you feel about it?
23

24 **Mr. DIAZ:** Earlier, I commended the shrimp industry for doing
25 it, and I think I encourage you all to go forward, and I would
26 suspect that, if everything matches, we would take that into
27 consideration down the line, and that's my perspective. Thank
28 you.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Riechers, you come from a big shrimp
31 state. Tell me how you're feeling.
32

33 **MR. RIECHERS:** I certainly like the notion of using the Windplot
34 and using something that they already have on the vessel, and so
35 I think that's certainly a beginning and an approach we need to
36 attempt to take, if the Science Center -- The Science Center
37 seems to be okay with that, and so I guess what I'm trying to
38 figure out, Leann, is whether you still need an amendment if we
39 do that sort of approach or what does the action need to be
40 here.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I will let staff, and maybe Mara, speak to
43 that, and I would assume, as long as you're simply changing the
44 platform that you're collecting the data on, and everything else
45 is staying the same, and your algorithm is staying the same, and
46 what you're requiring to be submitted stays the same, then I
47 wouldn't see where the council needs any kind of amendment for
48 that. It's simply a change of platform.

1
2 Now, if, at some point down the line, we start getting into some
3 of these other alternatives, where it's a much more in-depth
4 reporting program, and there is new requirements, I would think
5 an amendment might be called for at that point, but does staff
6 or Ms. Levy want to chime in on that?

7
8 **MS. MARA LEVY:** I think that's right. I guess we just need to
9 look back at what you've done through council action. I mean,
10 one of the things that you did more recently was the cost-
11 sharing between industry and NMFS, and just to make sure that
12 whatever happens with this new platform is still consistent with
13 that framework action that provided the cost-sharing, and I
14 don't know exactly how this new thing is going to be set up, and
15 so I can't really comment to that right now.

16
17 Then, when you put the ELB requirement into place, there was an
18 option to have all shrimp vessels participating, or a
19 statistically-valid sample participating, and the council chose
20 the statistically-valid sample, and so, to the extent there's a
21 desire to increase the number of participants, to make it more
22 of a census of everyone, that type of thing, even though it's
23 the same platform, is going to probably require some sort of
24 council action.

25
26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Mara. Then do we have Louisiana
27 on the phone? I don't know if we have Mr. Banks or Mr.
28 Schieble, but how do you all feel? Do you like the idea of the
29 pilot program and getting that up and running through industry
30 and then letting NMFS take that and scale it up, as appropriate?

31
32 **MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE:** Yes, I agree, and I don't see any issues
33 with this. I know that our reporting comes in a little bit
34 differently, how it's done, but I don't think that will affect
35 that, and so, yes, we're in agreement with it.

36
37 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, and so I'm hearing --

38
39 **MR. DIAZ:** Leann, there are some people with their hands raised,
40 just so you know.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. My hands are not over on the right of
43 the screen, and it's the middle. I'm sorry. Robin, did you
44 have another comment?

45
46 **MR. RIECHERS:** No, ma'am. I am through.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Mr. Anson. I was coming to you next

1 anyway.

2
3 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Thank you. I agree as to provide an
4 opportunity where we won't have a loss of data, and, if industry
5 is willing to step up, I appreciate and commend them for doing
6 so and offering to do that. Mara brought up one of the
7 questions that I had relative to the sample size, or the
8 participants, who would be getting the Windplot software and to
9 have the ability to provide the data, and I just was curious as
10 to if that was going to be the same group of folks.

11
12 My understanding is that it's somewhat of a static sample size,
13 and not necessarily a random draw of vessels, and I could be
14 wrong, but, if Clay or Dr. Gloeckner has any comments to that, I
15 would be curious to know about the participation, or the
16 selection.

17
18 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Clay, do you want to chime in for that?

19
20 **DR. PORCH:** I am not sure what the statistics are there. I
21 don't know if, Dave, you know off the top of your head.
22 Otherwise, we can find out.

23
24 **DR. GLOECKNER:** It seems like it's a static sample, because we
25 have actually put those hard drives out onto the vessels, and
26 we're not planning on replacing them on other vessels, and so it
27 would seem like it's a static sample.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I would concur with that, but I will say
30 that, before those devices were placed onto those vessels, there
31 was a lot of thought that went into stratifying that sample and
32 making sure that it was the best it could be, and, from what I
33 understand, as we go through this again, there may be an
34 opportunity to look at that sample again and see if it needs
35 some tweaking, since it is somewhat static, and so thanks for
36 bringing that up, Kevin. Then, Dr. Frazer, you had your hand
37 up?

38
39 **DR. TOM FRAZER:** Thank you, Leann. I am just trying to
40 familiarize myself with a little bit of the history here. The
41 Science Center was responsible originally for covering the cost
42 associated with the units, right, and, right now, the industry
43 wants to step in and essentially provide a bridge, and are there
44 recurring costs, in that regard, to the industry?

45
46 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Most of the offshore fleet does use the P-Sea
47 Windplot system software, right, on their computer plotters,
48 but, if there are vessels that don't use that, and that's the

1 platform we decide to go with, they would have to purchase that
2 software program and get it solved.

3
4 Because we're moving away from the cellular logbooks, where it
5 uploads to a cellphone tower when you get within range, you're
6 going to eliminate that cost, the monthly cellphone coverage
7 that we have to pay for. The software that's going to have to
8 be downloaded into P-Sea Windplot, I'm guessing there is
9 probably going to be a cost to the industry for that, and we're
10 at such the beginning phases of this that I really don't know
11 what those costs are going to be yet.

12
13 If we went with some of the other platforms, we would probably
14 be having to purchase a new device for the vessels, if we try
15 and go with 4G or 5G, and, yes, you would have to purchase new
16 devices, and we don't think they could even get manufactured in
17 time, but, to circle back, those are some of the questions that
18 we really need the industry to give us some more feedback on.

19
20 What I would suggest, to answer some of those questions, is that
21 we get together the Shrimp AP, and the industry knows a little
22 bit about this already, because we've, obviously, been talking
23 amongst ourselves, but let's have a formal discussion with the
24 Shrimp AP, as far as some of these other options, after we do
25 this proof of concept project, what the costs may look like,
26 because hopefully we'll know more then, what some cost-sharing
27 ideas could be, and just anything else that they find relevant.
28 I would suggest we send it to the Shrimp AP.

29
30 The other thing that I would request at that Shrimp AP meeting
31 is an in-depth discussion with some specific examples of the
32 unmatched list for the landings versus effort, because I can
33 think of a few things, off the top -- I am not necessarily
34 opposed to having us submit the trip ticket number when we
35 submit the effort information, but I just don't know that that's
36 going to fix the problem, and I worry that we have an issue, but
37 we don't really know what the problem is, what's causing it, in
38 a lot of cases, and I think, before we put another regulation
39 and burden on the fishermen, we should really look at the
40 unmatched list and find what's driving that thing not to be
41 matched.

42
43 We have an electronic logbook on several of our boats, and one
44 of them does mainly endangered species relocation all year, and,
45 even if you make me submit electronically, you're still going to
46 have lots of effort that has no trip tickets attached to it,
47 because we're not catching shrimp. We are catching turtles to
48 relocate them, so they don't get killed.

1
2 The past month, we've had a boat out shrimping that's been to
3 the dock three different times, usually for five or six days at
4 a time, because of these hurricanes. Well, in the effort data,
5 that looks like it's the end of a trip, but you're not going to
6 have a trip ticket submitted with it, because we're not
7 offloading. It's not the end of the trip, but we're just at the
8 dock because of weather, although an extended period of time.

9
10 These are the kinds of things that we need to look through and
11 see, on this unmatched list, what is causing it, and look at
12 that match window and see if there's some things that can be
13 tweaked to increase the number of matches before we put the
14 burden on industry. If there's not, then okay. We will just
15 have to submit our trip tickets to both the states and the feds.
16 We get it, although that's what we're trying to avoid with other
17 fisheries and having them report the same information twice, but
18 we'll do if it we need to, but, first, I think we need to look
19 at what is driving the matches.

20
21 So give it to the Shrimp AP, and my last comment, real quick, on
22 funding is the industry is going to come together and try and
23 fund this pilot program, or this proof of concept project, let's
24 call it, and I mentioned before that it's over \$300,000, and
25 it's not cheap, and we're a poor industry. We don't make big
26 money.

27
28 I am hoping that all the people on this call -- You are very
29 well connected, and we have lots of S-K funding that comes
30 through, and that S-K funding is based on tariffs that come on
31 the backs of the shrimp fleet, and most of the imports in this
32 country, most of the shrimp eaten in this country, are imported,
33 and it's what has made us a poor industry. Those imports drive
34 our prices down.

35
36 I am hoping that some of that CARES money could finally be
37 rerouted to the people that feel the pain because of it, and
38 maybe we can get some funding through there, and so I just ask
39 you to all keep your ears open, and keep the shrimp industry in
40 mind as we move forward with this and need some funding.
41 Anything else? Any other feedback from the group? If not, then
42 I am going to -- Go ahead, Mara.

43
44 **MS. LEVY:** I just -- Again, as I hear you talk about it more, I
45 mean, to the extent that there is going to be new funding
46 burdens on people, to the extent we're going to require people
47 to buy additional equipment, potentially, or software, that
48 wasn't contemplated in the framework action that divided the

1 cost of the ELB program between industry and NMFS, and we're
2 likely looking at some sort of council action, rulemaking, and I
3 don't think we can just impose burdens like that on industry
4 without that.

5
6 Again, I don't know enough about it, but I just -- I know this
7 is a time-sensitive thing, but, to the extent we get more
8 information about what types of things you're going to be asking
9 industry to do, it may not be as simple as just saying do it.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mara, so, whether we go with P-Sea Windplot
12 or we require industry to buy some other device, some other
13 platform, either way, it's a cost to industry, and so I think
14 you're right. As we get closer to this, we'll have to look at
15 it. Really, the biggest cost is just the cost of getting to the
16 boat, getting somebody to get to the boat, for us, for the proof
17 of concept.

18
19 We actually need to send someone to the boat to download the new
20 software into the P-Sea Windplot program and then gather that
21 information back up and get it to NMFS, and so you would think
22 that wouldn't be that costly, but I guess nothing is cheap these
23 days. Then I had another hand from Matt Freeman.

24
25 **DR. FREEMAN:** Thanks, Leann. Just for clarification, for staff,
26 you were suggesting having the AP meet towards the end of
27 completion for this proof of concept, or if you could provide a
28 little more guidance on when you would like the Shrimp AP to
29 meet, and, also, sort of timewise, when that might be.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** That's a good question, Matt. I will have to
32 get back to you on that one. I need to think about that a
33 little bit. It's not just the timing of the project, but we
34 need to think about shrimp season and peak shrimp seasons and
35 when is the best time to do it for industry, and so I will
36 circle back with you on that.

37
38 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay. You've got my email.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thanks. Any -- I don't see any more hands
41 up, and I appreciate everybody's patience with this. I think we
42 had some good council feedback, and I hope that it was enough
43 positive feedback that industry feels good about making that
44 kind of financial commitment to get something off the ground and
45 running quickly, and I will be sure to report back to you all
46 and let you all know how all that's going.

47
48 Mr. Chairman, I'm about eleven minutes over, but, if there is no

1 Other Business -- Any other business? Seeing none, I turn it
2 back over to you, Mr. Chairman.

3

4 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on September 28, 2020.)

5

6

- - -