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ADOPTION OF AGENDA

APPROVAL MINUTES

ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS

CHAIRMAN HARLON PEARCE: The agenda is Tab F, Number 1. Are there any changes or additions to the agenda? If not, can I hear a motion to adopt the agenda as written?

MR. JOHNNY GREENE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: We’ve got a motion and a second. Any opposition to the adoption of the agenda? Hearing none, the agenda is adopted. The minutes are Tab F, Number 2. Any changes or additions to the minutes? If not, I would like to hear a motion to adopt the minutes as written.

MR. GREENE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: I’ve got a motion and a second by Greg. Any opposition to the approval of the minutes? Hearing none, the
approval of the minutes passes. Next is the Action Guide, Tab F, Number 3. The action guide basically is going to be to electronic charter boat reporting recommendation discussion paper and they are looking for our input to advise staff on the preferred course of action. Any questions about the action guide? Hearing none, we will move into the next part of the agenda, the Discussion Paper on Joint South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Generic Charter Boat Reporting Amendment, Tab F, Number 4. Dr. Froeschke, are you ready?

DISCUSSION PAPER - JOINT SOUTH ATLANTIC AND GULF OF MEXICO GENERIC CHARTER BOAT REPORTING AMENDMENT

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: Yes, I am. Good morning, everyone. Tab F-4, this is a joint document. As you recall from the last meeting, this was recommended that we proceed jointly with the South Atlantic Council.

What we have done since the last time is we’ve appointed the IPT process, which does take some time. The South Atlantic Council met earlier this month, in March, and reviewed this document, which was put together by the South Atlantic Council. It, as you will see, is very early in the process and is really more of a proposed workflow or something to solicit your ideas in how to move forward.

What will happen after this meeting is we will take your input and we will meet the IPT and get the full range of perspectives and we can fill out the appropriate range of actions and make sure that the no-action alternatives and those things are sort of characterized correctly and integrate whatever guidance you give us at this meeting.

If you look through the document, it is a South Atlantic sort of document. By the next meeting -- We are the administrative lead and it will be more something that you’re probably familiar working through.

What I am going to do is just ask you to move to page 4, the purpose and need. As you all know, we’ve discussed the needs for better data and faster data for a long, long time and so I don’t think we need a lot of background information on that. It seems I think we’re all well aware.

Some things to think about in this is the way that the South Atlantic Council has considered it, is to roll some aspect of headboat reporting modifications into this document and so I am curious as we move through this if that’s something that you’re
interested in at this time or you would prefer we address that separately in another item.

Any questions on the purpose and need and whether that needs to be changed at this point? If not, we will proceed to talk about the actions.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: I don’t see any questions and so keep going, John.

DR. FROESCHKE: Let’s move to Action 1 and it’s on page 5. What this action is, it’s really to modify the data reporting timing and for some of you who have also been through this process both with the dealer reporting and the headboat reporting -- We do have some experience with this.

The action alternatives build on what we’ve learned in the process and so what we’ve done, just for a bit of background, the first thing we did was the dealer reporting and we have weekly reporting and the reports are due the Tuesday following the week end, which is on a Sunday. The week end is on Sunday and you would file your reports on Tuesday. That seems to work well.

In headboats, we have weekly reporting, but the reports are not due for a week after. In terms of the timing that we’re always pushing for, it might seem more appropriate that we have the reporting due Tuesday rather than a week following the Sunday and so it would be -- If we didn’t address the headboats, which we could do later, it would be out of sync, but I think, based on the technical subcommittee and discussions and things, timeliness is always better and so that’s one option.

The status quo option really in here would be considered Alternative 2 and then Alternative 4. Alternative 5 is sort of what we have recommended, or at least discussed. It would be weekly or intervals shorter than a week for specific issues or fisheries that we have addressed in headboats, with the reports due the following Tuesday.

Again, things for daily reporting and that are always possible as alternatives and at this point, I guess I’m just soliciting feedback as to whether this range of ideas is within the ballpark of what you all are thinking.

DR. GREG STUNZ: John, I know we’re early in the process and I have questions about the timing and the weekly nature of this and it concerns me a little bit not to have a little bit faster
of a reporting, one for just recall of the anglers and fishermen entering the data, but also from a validation standpoint.

You know if you’re reporting a week after the fact, that could be problematic in ensuring the quality of the data we’re getting in and so what I would like to see is maybe another alternative for a more rapid response time and I believe that you’re going to see that the charter captains are going to want that as well.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Do you have a motion or do you just want to talk about it or what?

DR. STUNZ: I can offer a motion if we need one, or do we just need to talk about it? I am not sure. John had mentioned this was early in the phase and I guess I would leave to him what he needs to proceed.

DR. FROESCHKE: Greg, two points. Alternative 3 in here has a daily reporting with two different reporting options and so that’s one, but I do think we could get some clarification on this, but if it is weekly reporting, it doesn’t mean that you can’t turn in daily reports. It just means that it would be tabulated through the data flow process on a weekly basis.

We could probably get some clarification, but yes, please provide any guidance like this that you want. We would love to have it, so it helps us flesh out the document.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: I kind of agree. You’ve got daily almost in three sections.

DR. BONNIE PONWITH: In the pilot that was run in the Gulf, we ran into some challenges with reporting and certainly you do have a good range of alternatives here for the timing, including daily. I think it would be advantageous to add one more alternative, from a science perspective, and it is daily in real time.

Another consideration is that if you are designing this to be a real time data collection and a census, then having an alternative that requires the vessels to report before they hit the dock, so that when they hit the dock their data have already been submitted and you can compare those submitted data against a dockside intercept, it enables you to do a one-to-one match.

In the pilot study that we did, the validation was done based on averages and by that, I mean since it was impossible to match what people put into the system against the landings on a one-
to-one basis, we took what was the average catch of vessels that were intercepted versus the average catch of vessels that were not intercepted and reported electronically in this study and were there differences.

When you do averages like that, you get a lot of variance and it confounds the signal, whereas if you have a requirement that you submit that before you know whether you are going to be sampled or not, it enables us to be able to match what was reported at sea to what was observed on that dock, to be able to look for reporting errors and do correction factors for those reporting errors.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: I think what Bonnie is saying is that she wants us to move at the speed of business this time and get things done a little quicker. I think, John, it’s duly noted that both Greg and Bonnie want something in this document that’s real time and so I think that’s something you would -- If you could come back and figure that out for us, please.

DR. FROESCHKE: If you have a chance, look at Alternative 3. There are two subalternatives. One is the reporting is noon of the following day and 3b is prior to arriving at the dock. Does that encapsulate what you are discussing or is something additional to that needed?

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Greg, just follow that up and then I’ve got other people.

DR. STUNZ: Yes, John, that would capture that. I guess Bonnie made my point better about that, but if you looked at via computer or the internet, I think that’s what I was -- I know that’s addressed later on in the document, but maybe some verbiage there about other means to enter that much more quickly, because the biggest complaint we had, and I hear from the captains, is the last thing they want to do is go log on a computer after they are cleaning up and preparing for the next day and so offer some of those options in 3.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: I think Mr. Greene has got something to solve that problem.

MR. GREENE: I’ve got a motion I want to put up. I had emailed it earlier and it’s specifically to what Dr. Stunz is talking about in Action 3, Subalternative b. I move to change the language in Subalternative 3b that currently reads “via computer or internet” to read “via National Marine Fisheries Service approved electronic logbook devices”.
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CHAIRMAN PEARCE: There is a motion on the board. Do we have a second to this motion? We have a second from David Walker. Is there discussion of the motion? It’s pretty straightforward.

DR. FROESCHKE: That would apply to just Alternative -- It would also apply to Alternative 3a and so would you just want to make that Alternative 3, rather than a subalternative?

MR. GREENE: Yes, you’re correct. I missed that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Does the seconder agree with that? All right. It’s not much of a change. Any more discussion on the motion?

MR. DOUG BOYD: Would that exclude some method of reporting that may be in the near future?

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: John, any comments on that?

DR. FROESCHKE: I don’t think it would and since I’ve got the mic, perhaps what you should do is just to broaden it all the way and just make it appropriate for this action in general, because even if you chose a different alternative in this, you would still likely want that or very similar language and so perhaps we could just make it a NMFS approved electronic logbook for each alternative in this action.

MR. BOYD: My concern is that there may be some limitation with technology moving so fast and I wouldn’t want to limit us to something that the government is currently doing that may take a while to change when we have other alternatives available.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: I agree completely, Doug.

DR. FROESCHKE: For example, in the commercial for VMS and things, there is a certification process and so long as your unit meets the qualifications and becomes certified, it is eligible to be used and it isn’t restrictive of someone -- If I came out with a new one today and I got it certified, I could use it and so I don’t think this would prohibit new things from coming to the market that are better than what we currently have.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: I agree, John. There could be different options for each boat to utilize. One might like VMS and one might like iSnapper or different programs that could be certified by NMFS to use and so I think that would be an ongoing process, I would assume, and so that should cover the problems,
Doug. Any opposition to this motion?

MR. GREENE: I just wanted to -- I think that Dr. Froeschke had said is prudent and I think that I would like to modify it just to change the language in Action 1 or in the document or however it needs to be. I just want to make sure they’re straight with what we’re doing. I think the intent is there, but I am just trying to get it to reflect on the board.

In Action 1 and then strike the “Alternative 3”. I move to change the language in -- Just do it in the document. Just take out “Action 1” and just put it in the document, that should it read anywhere “via a computer or internet” that it’s changed to “National Marine Fisheries Service approved electronic logbook devices”.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Does everyone understand the change?

DR. ROY CRABTREE: That’s saying that this is not going to be a program where you go home and get on your home computer, but I guess I don’t understand changing it broadly like that, because we have alternatives here to report once a week and so why couldn’t they just get on their home computer and access the internet? Why would we have to have a NMFS approved logbook if they are not going to report on the vessel?

I can understand a logbook if we’re going to have them report before they hit the dock, but if they’re going to report after they hit the dock, it doesn’t seem they need a NMFS approved logbook to do that, right?

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: According to this, yes, you’re right. John, have you got an answer for that?

DR. FROESCHKE: Most of the applications I would see would kind of have a complementary PC-based login that you could do and so they would have a piece of software that you could use from your home computer that I would view that could be NMFS logbook approved and I don’t see a PC at home being an unapproved device in this way and so it doesn’t seem at odds to me.

MR. MYRON FISCHER: Mr. Chairman, mine is more from the dumb side and so my question is who or what is the Science Research Director?

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Dr. Ponwith.

MR. FISCHER: In one action we discuss sending the information
directly there and in another action, we are discussing sending
it through GulfFIN and so I want to make certain that we are not
boxing ourselves in in the first action.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: I agree with you, Myron. I think there is
some motions you will hear later on that will help us with that.

DR. STUNZ: Mr. Chair, maybe just a point of clarification. I
think this is probably implied, but in that Alternative 1, it
talks about individuals, John, that aren’t required and what
they do have to report, but, just to be clear, we’re talking
about -- In all of these alternatives, we’re talking about --
Like in Alternative 3, we would require that all charter vessels
submit these.

In other words, just to alleviate what might be some confusion
from this full census that we’re talking about, or maybe I am
confused, but, just to be clear, all of these other
alternatives, other than 1, is talking about everyone is going
to do this.

DR. FROESCHKE: I guess depending on how you define everyone,
but how I think we are discussing it is federally-permitted
charter boats and so if you have that permit, then this would be
applicable.

DR. STUNZ: Right and so I am wondering if we just shouldn’t, in
a future modification, say something like require that all
federally-permitted charter vessels, for clarification purposes,
in those alternatives, where it’s appropriate.

DR. FROESCHKE: We could certainly add that to the wording.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: All right. Let’s get back. We’ve got a
motion on the table. It’s changed a little bit from the
beginning motion. Any opposition to the motion on the table?
Hearing none, the motion carries. John.

DR. FROESCHKE: Next, let’s go to the Action 2 on page 11. This
action deals with the data reporting in terms of location, which
we have heard from multiple sources that this is very important
for release mortality and where effort is occurring and all
sorts of things.

As you are aware, there are lots of different ways that this
potentially could be done. Some other preliminary discussions
at the South Atlantic side, from what’s been communicated to me,
is they have a different idea of what they don’t want, which is
they are not interested in VMS technology on charter vessels at this time.

It doesn’t mean that it couldn’t happen in the Gulf by any means and that’s for you all to decide, but just have a look at these kinds of things and if it’s something where we want reports of primary area fished by a grid, sort of what we do with the headboats, and it would be a self-reported kind of thing or if we would rather that information be captured passively by a device, whether it be VMS or the app or something like that, or if we wanted to rely really on true VMS and so is there any discussion on that?

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Anybody?

MS. MARA LEVY: Just a question about Alternative 4. I understand what you just said about the South Atlantic not necessarily being interested at this time for doing VMS, but is there any reason not to structure it like Alternative 3, where you say require the use of VMS and then have an option for South Atlantic and Gulf, so there can be an explicit decision and reason for not doing it in the South Atlantic versus doing it in the Gulf?

DR. FROESCHKE: In my view, the way that Alternative 2 and 3 are worded -- It would be appropriate for Alternative 4 and, again, this hasn’t gone through the full IPT gamut and all that stuff and so some of this we can work out, but the reason that it is the way it is is that the South Atlantic -- I don’t think they felt that VMS was in the range of appropriate alternatives for their region, based on what they feel their needs are, and so they didn’t want that in there and so that’s why it’s that way and perhaps Ben or someone could provide a little more insight from them, but if you feel that it should be changed, please let us know.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Ben, did you want to chime in on this?

MR. BEN HARTIG: Yes, Harlon. I mean he’s right. I mean basically we’ve been told loud and clear by the fishermen in our area that VMS is not something that they want to use and so that’s why it’s been structured as just a Gulf option.

Like I say, I mean looking at the way the other subalternatives are in the other two alternatives, I mean certainly you could do that, but it’s just that we would not do it in the South Atlantic. I think we wanted to send a strong message from our fishermen that VMS -- We are not going to entertain VMS in the
South Atlantic.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: All right. Thank you. John, do you need a motion or you can handle this on your own?

DR. FROESCHKE: I guess I’m not totally clear. Do you want me to leave it the same or make it different?

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Let’s hear from the committee.

DR. STUNZ: I want to add something and I don’t have specific changes to alternatives, but as a scientist, I am certainly not opposed to collecting more catch location information, but from a practical standpoint, when you go beyond just generalities, general locations, the charter captains probably aren’t going to like doing that, but when you start specifying where you are fishing, that also implies you are going to have to keep separate catch logs of what you’re catching at each location and before long, that becomes very, very problematic from a data entry standpoint and it gets very cumbersome.

In some of our experiences, you don’t want to disenfranchise them from having ease of entry kind of thing and so while I am very much for getting location information, I think we need to make it as simple as possible and as streamlined as possible. If they’re fishing five spots in a day, how you’re going to keep track of all that becomes very difficult.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Thanks for that, but let’s go back to Alternative 3 and 4. Do we want to put a subalternative of in the Gulf of Mexico and in the South Atlantic as an option on 4? Any discussion? How does everybody feel? John, I guess no discussion means we keep it as is.

DR. FROESCHKE: Okay. To summarize sort of the idea about the location, and I agree it’s complicated, I think the biggest philosophical difference is do you want the location information to be specified by a person who reports a general area or do you want that location collected passively by a device and I guess the resolution and all that you could work out, but that seems to be the fundamental difference between Alternative 2 and then 3 and 4.

MR. FISCHER: I guess my question is what location data -- What are the needs of the data? Before we vote on -- I know this is the inception of this paper, but before we get into what elements we want taken, I think it should come from the top, meaning it should come from Bonnie’s section telling us what we
need and not for us to build something with a whole series of
data and find out they use 10 percent of it.

I would like to know what’s the necessary data points for a
stock assessment and if they’re going to use the standard grids
in the Gulf and not the headboat grids, but the statistical
zones, which are roughly sixty-miles across, then we don’t have
to micromanage to someone’s private individual spot that no one
else has and down to four decimals. I really think things like
that, before we get into the details, we have to know what the
needs are.

**DR. PONWITH:** That’s really smart, Mr. Fischer, to make sure
that your data collection actually aligns with the questions
that you’re asking of the data and so I think that that’s a
right-minded way to approach this.

The first thing is looking at this and what are we trying to
accomplish? Are we trying to bypass the use of paper, where we
collect data exactly the way we do right now except we don’t use
paper, or are we trying to create a completely new and different
approach to the way we account for effort and landings in this
segment of the fishery?

If the latter, one of the things that having an electronic
device that gives you location of that vessel does is validates
the effort in addition to the location. Basically, we need
effort to be able to understand what the landings are and if you
see that a boat is afloat, that has a higher probability of
being actual fishing effort than if you see the boat at the
dock.

The second thing that those data are for, and it gets back to
Dr. Stunz’s comment, and that is knowing the location of those
landings is very, very valuable from a science standpoint and I
don’t necessarily think we need to go so far as to assign this
fish right here, Fish Fred, was caught at this depth, but
understanding the distribution of sampling effort in a trip
gives us the ability to understand and assign release mortality
ratios.

As you know, our understanding is that there is a gradient in
release mortality that maps to the depth that people were
fishing and if a vessel fishes three different locations, we
don’t necessarily need to assign each individual fish to which
location, but knowing that that happened at three different
depths gives us an ability to further refine those discard
mortality ratios.
MR. FISCHER: Bonnie, one thing we’ve heard from discussion and one thing we have to remember, has to be considered, is it’s not the depth the boat was in, but it’s the depth the hook was in. They may be sitting in 200-foot of water and fishing sixty-foot down and from the videos I’ve seen and what I’ve seen personally in snapper, you could catch them on a fly rod on the surface these days and so release mortality is not this depth issue it once was. When the population drops back down, it will be.

MR. GREENE: I think I’m just going to pass at this point. I am curious to see what the South Atlantic comes back with. I mean they’re sending a pretty bold statement that they don’t want VMS, but I am curious to see what they are interested in and as Ben mentioned earlier, they can certainly choose not to pursue an option that we have laid out in front of us and so that’s really all I’ve got right at this particular moment.

MR. DONALDSON: I was just going to ask Ben what options are you looking at other than VMS?

MR. HARTIG: We are looking at a tablet. I mean we’ve had some presentations on a tablet that has GPS within the tablet, so it can give you the location. We are not so much looking at the VMS, but we are looking at locations through GPS and so we are certainly looking to get location information from this.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Anything else on Action 2?

MR. GREENE: I just want to go back to Mr. Hartig for a minute and I want to make sure I understood. You said you were looking at a tablet that does do location as opposed to a VMS and that’s correct?

MR. HARTIG: That is correct, Mr. Greene.

MR. DAVID WALKER: Is this a tablet because of the cost versus the VMS?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, that’s a good point. There is a cost associated with the tablet and I am not sure what that is. I will have to ask Gregg and I will get back with you about that, but it’s been used. In New England, they had a pretty interesting pilot program and we had an extensive presentation on it and actually the fishermen designed the tablet.

They designed the buttons and they had these bells and whistles that they wanted in that tablet and that actually helped them
participate more in the project, because they were collaborators
in developing that tablet itself and so that helped as well in
the project as far as getting participation and so that’s kind
of the direction that we’re going in, as we’ve seen this
presentation. I will get back with you on the cost.

MR. WALKER: Of course, they’re not opposed to like a hail-in
and hail-out and so forth?

MR. HARTIG: I don’t know that we’ve talked about the hail-in
and hail-out so much, but I may be wrong. Maybe John can answer
that.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Do we need to discuss hail-in and out? Is
this the place for it? If so, just let me know.

DR. FROESCHKE: One thing I would like your input on regarding
this is there’s a little paragraph at the end of page 11 and it
deals with what or how these data from a VMS or any sort of
golocation device would be used.

I think what would be helpful is to have some background, which
I am not privy to necessarily, about how the commercial VMS data
are used, because it’s a similar device, and whether it’s a law
enforcement tool or do we intend this to be a science tool or
something like that, because I think that could affect your
perspective on what data are collected in terms of what’s being
used.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Before we leave this, Mike Eller, are you in
the audience?

MR. MIKE ELLER: Yes, I’m here.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: You have got a device you wanted to show us
quickly, so there is other alternatives out there.

MR. ELLER: This is a VMS that came off my boat. It was
installed about a week or so ago. It’s also what the partyboats
use for their collaborative effort. It’s an Android device and
it Bluetooth’s to a little box on my boat. It’s about this big
and then that has an antenna.

On my boat, there is a little box about this big and then
there’s an antenna and that’s it. The boat is out fishing right
now and that thing is pinging and it’s doing its thing and then
I have the interaction device right here. I could submit his
trip ticket right now from here. This is what they gave me and
it’s waterproof and it’s pretty simple.

The greatest thing about is that it’s -- The things that you have to fill out, once you fill it out one time, that’s it. It’s done and it saves that and so I don’t have to go in there and put my boat name in there, like I do with a paper logbook, put my boat name and my boat number and all that stuff.

I hit the button and it pulls it up and it’s already pre filled out and then if there’s any data that changes for today, I can enter that in pretty quickly and hit “submit”. The future is here and we’ve got it and it works really well and it’s pretty basic and it’s very, very user friendly.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: You are doing that at sea?

MR. ELLER: Yes, sir. That is correct.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Thank you for coming up. Any other questions or anything on Action 2?

MR. SANCHEZ: I am just curious. How specific are these GPS coordinates that you’re interested in, because it seems like a fisherman works all his life to find his spots in areas that are kind of likened to a business trade secret and then for you to just be putting them out there and God knows where they’re going to go, there is some reluctance.

We seem to manage other things in very large square-mile grids and I am just curious to see how this is going to evolve into something extremely specific or not.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: I know in discussions with what Bonnie has said, it’s important they know the pretty much exact areas to help them with their management tools and also in the last paragraph, the vessel location would be treated as highly-confidential information and so it’s something that’s not public information and it’s not public knowledge. I think those two together kind of make it work. Any other discussions on Action 2? All right, John Froeschke, what else?

DR. FROESCHKE: The next thing I have for you is Action 3 and it says to amend the Gulf Reef Fish, South Atlantic Snapper Grouper, Coastal Migratory Pelagics, and Atlantic Dolphin and Wahoo to specify certain aspects of reporting for for-hire vessels.

What this is really outlining, that we haven’t talked much
about, is specifying a flow of data. I talked a little bit with
Harlon this morning about this and so there are a couple of
alternatives in here and we won’t go into the details unless you
want to, but I think there are two ways.

One is we could do something like this and you could specify the
data go from here to here to here and then it ultimately ends up
at Bonnie’s office for use or we could do something where we
provide what we want at the end. We want it to be available at
this quality at this time and let the process evolve how it does
to accomplish what you all request.

The other thing regarding this is would we want to address this
sort of flow thing to charter boats and headboats or just
charter boats and address headboats at a later time in a
different amendment?

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: A quick question. Myron, does this satisfy
your GulfFIN thought or is there someplace else we need to put
it?

MR. FISCHER: No, it’s fine.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: You’re fine? Okay.

MR. GREENE: I had a motion I wanted to put up under Action 3
and it will be the third motion that I had sent to staff earlier
and it’s going to work on Subalternative 3a. Basically, it’s
just going to incorporate the GulfFIN into the process. If I
could get staff to pull the third motion I had sent to you.

I will go ahead and read it for you. It says I move to change
the following language of Subalternative 3a. Number 1, in line
i, include GulfFIN so that the line reads “National Marine
Fisheries Service and/or ACCSP or GulfFIN”. Number 2, in line
v, include language that states “devices that can transmit data
from sea”. Number 3, add a line 6 that states “National Marine
Fisheries Service is to specify data elements necessary for
vessels to report that are equal to or greater than reporting
requirements of the federally-permitted headboats”.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Okay. Do we have a second to the motion?

David.

MS. LEVY: Just a minor point. So I assume you want to change
the language in 3, right? Because then 3a and b give you the
choice of charter boat and headboat, but it’s really 3 that you
want to change.
MR. GREENE: Yes and that’s the same mistake I made earlier and that’s correct.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Are you okay with that, David? Okay. Thank you, Mara. Is there discussion?

DR. FROESCHKE: I guess just to broaden this discussion a little bit, do you have any guidance on whether you would like to restrict the document entirely to just charter boats at this time and address headboats later, to simplify and keep us from getting off the path, or is this something you would want to consider incorporating headboat in various actions where it’s appropriate? If not, we could just make perhaps some sort of broad motion that we want to just address charterboats now.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Do you want to handle this one and maybe come back to that, Johnny?

MR. GREENE: We will get to that I guess as we go through this. I was just trying to use the headboats as the data that -- The reporting requirements that they’re using kind of is similar to what we’re trying to do as well.

MR. BOYD: Just a question. I am not sure I really understand what we’re doing here. Are we saying that we might propose or we would propose to have different types of reporting for charter boats and headboats, when we’re talking about a common recreational fish?

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Right now, they are not together. They are independent and that is what John Froeschke is talking about, is to pull them together, so they are under the same program.

MR. DONALDSON: Wouldn’t it make it simpler if we included both headboats and charter boats, so they are both reporting? Because they are both for-hire vessels and obviously there is some characteristics between the two types of vessels, but I would think it would make it simpler if we just included both headboats and charter boats.

MR. BOYD: That’s my question also, because by having two subalternatives, one for charter and one for headboat, you are implying that you can have separate types of reporting and implicit in any reporting is going to be the intercepts and dockside validation and enforcement and I don’t think you want to have separate reporting methods for enforcement at some point in time.
CHAIRMAN PEARCE: I agree with both of you guys. Johnny, do you have something later on that you’re going to present that’s going to do this?

MR. GREENE: Yes and I am just trying to get my notes.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Do you want to get through this one and then come to the next one or what do you want to do?

MR. GREENE: Let’s see what Dr. Froeschke has got.

DR. FROESCHKE: One challenge is that we currently have different reporting requirements for charter boats and headboats and if you recall when we started revising the current headboat requirements to what they are now two or three years ago, originally we discussed if we would want to just address this for charter boats and headboats at the same time.

After some preliminary discussions, you all decided that no, they are different both in the number of vessels that are affected -- It’s an order of magnitude different, but the biggest difference is the headboats were reporting through the Headboat Survey Program, whereas the charter boats were not.

I think that’s the reason why we discussed whether or not -- One thing that concerns me is I wouldn’t want to run into something that we hadn’t thought about and then get tangled up and delayed and so that would be, I guess, one rationale for just doing charter boats, but you’re right that it certainly could be done both ways. I don’t know if that would lead to some complications that I am not anticipating.

DR. CRABTREE: That was going to be my point, that you already have separate reporting methods for charter boats and headboats. You already have electronic reporting on the headboats and whether you want to make changes to that or not, I don’t know, but I would think you would want to look at how well the headboat program is performing right now before you start changing it again, but you have had, for many years, separate reporting methods for the two fleets.

MR. GREENE: To Dr. Crabtree’s point, I think he’s right and that’s why when I was putting this together that I wanted to make sure it was either greater than or equal to what the headboats have done. That seems like it’s worked pretty well and that was my attempt here to do that and I may need to just circle back and pick this up a little bit later, but I mean I
certainly think that we’re trying to combine them, I would assume, although having separate requirements is something we’re going to have to work through.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Any other discussion?

MR. FISCHER: What are the requirements for headboats, being it’s part of the motion? I don’t know what the requirements are.

DR. FROESCHKE: I don’t know the flow off the top of my head. We could certainly find that out and get back to you, but in terms of the -- To me, the crux of the matter is the reporting timing and the headboats are weekly, with reports due one week after. That part is relevant.

MR. FISCHER: The motion says to specify the data elements and I would like to know what the data elements are before I vote on it and that’s all I was getting to.

DR. FROESCHKE: I don’t have those at the tips of my fingers. We could get them and one of the things that I mentioned earlier is perhaps another course of action, instead of getting into this part, is to allow that to be worked out in conjunction with the Science Center and you specify the output, the management metrics, that you all are interested in in terms of timing.

If the elements are exhaustive, but they don’t get you what you need in the time to make the decisions that you require, that doesn’t do you any good and so I think you could do it a different way if you chose and I am not even suggesting that you need to decide that now.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Remember we are in the early stages of this whole document and so we’re trying to shape it right now.

DR. PONWITH: The way this action is worded, it doesn’t seem to match what the alternatives are. The action says to specify certain aspects of reporting for for-hire vessels. Certain aspects. Then Alternative 1 says there is no time for the data to be made available to the public and the councils and then Alternative 2 says specify the following data flow and there is no mention of the councils and there is no mention of the public.

You have two things that seem completely disconnected from one another and then Alternative 3 says to specify the following aspects of data reporting and so I don’t know whether you are
getting at flow or whether you are getting at timing the way
this is structured.

My view is this needs a lot of work to be able to bring clarity
and so there is point number one and point number two is it
seems odd, to me, to dictate the data flow in a regulatory
amendment. It seems odd to me.

It seems less odd to say we are regulating the fishing fleet to
have this desired outcome and I am concerned about regulating
the flow of what direction the data go in what steps as opposed
to saying the council’s desire is to have a weekly estimate of
what landings are in-season, so we know whether the fishery
needs to be open or needs to be closed.

That is the kind of question that I think should be answered and
then if you put your requirements in, what is the council’s aim,
and you put that in as a requirement, then it becomes a
technical task to figure out what are the many ways of achieving
that requirement and, of those, which one is the most
affordable, the most expedient, the most advisable?

It is concerning to see those interim steps put in a regulation
and so I think it would strengthen the document to have a
clarity in the title of what that action is intended to do and
then some continuity in the actions so each of those actions can
be connected to the action or the alternatives can be properly
connected to the action that’s stated.

That’s the flow issue and then in the timing, timing is
mentioned, but I don’t see a lot on timing in here and it could
be that the other action, where we talked about the timing of
the reporting, was mentioned, but I am not seeing a lot of
timing in this one and so I think it’s a matter of thinking
about what you want to achieve in terms of timing and stating it
explicitly.

MR. GREENE: I guess I am guilty of just trying to give too much
information and trying to do too many things at once here. With
that, I want to modify the motion and just delete Number 3 on
the board and that should clarify it a little bit. I was just
trying to add in the option for GulfFIN, after going to the Gulf
States meeting the other day. I just wanted to make sure that
option was there if they chose to use it. Then Number 2 is
pretty simple, but that’s my motion, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Does the seconder agree? Okay.
DR. FROESCHKE: Just building off of Bonnie’s comment, one thing that could be done is Gregg Waugh just emailed me and he reminded me that the reason the flow information I think is probably in there is that that was sort of a sketch of what was recommended from the technical subcommittee report.

It doesn’t necessarily mean, at least from my view, that it needs to be a regulation, apart from whatever consequence that it may happen. It seems like if you have it as a regulatory thing and you come up with some new and better flow, then it might slow down your ability to incorporate that in.

One way to maybe address this is to strike the Action 3 as we have it and craft a new action entirely that focuses more on what you want out of it and the timing and leave that part to whomever else is best. Just focus on the deliverables instead of the mechanism.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: All right. Are we all thoroughly confused now?

DR. CRABTREE: Is there a motion on the board anymore?

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: There still is.

MS. LEVY: I am just going to agree with that, that the issue with being so specific about something like a process, number one. Whether the process can actually happen the way you’re saying it should, I don’t know.

Once you have it in your FMP that this is the process, that if anything happens that you want to change that process, you have to go back and go through the FMP amendment or something to change it and it seems more advisable to address what you want the regulated community to do, what do you want the permitted vessels to do and how you want them to do it, rather than how that information will be funneled through to someplace like the Science Center.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: We have a motion on the board and let’s get some closure on this motion. Any more discussion before I shut the door? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion raise your hands, two; all opposed raise your hand, three. The motion fails.

DR. CRABTREE: I only voted against it because I am not sure what it does, but I am coming back to what Mara said and others. I am just not sure we need this level of specificity in here.
We ought to be focused on how we want them to report and how quickly they want to report and those kinds of things, what units we want them to use. I don’t see why we need to get into this level of detail.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Got you. Dr. Froeschke, what’s next?

DR. FROESCHKE: That’s pretty much what I have at this time. I think you guys have had a really good discussion and so that gives us a lot of information that we can bring to the IPT and refine these. I guess do you want to give us some formal guidance about what to do with Action 3 in its entirety and if you would prefer us to come back with a revised action that deals more with deliverables and timing rather than nuts and bolts?

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: What is the pleasure of the committee? I think everybody must just be hungry or something.

MR. GREENE: I think we need to do what Dr. Froeschke is saying. I think that it makes a lot of sense and I want to look at it the way he’s laid it out. I can offer some other stuff if he wants. I mean I want it to kind of get into some idea of how to handle people not reporting and that kind of stuff, but it may be too early. I was just trying to help it along as much as possible.

What are you looking for? Do you want more information from us? I can give you information until tomorrow, probably, and really slow things down, but I don’t want to be too specific like I just attempted to be there earlier as well.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: The only question I still have is Dr. Froeschke is asking us if we want to tie the charter boats, the private charters, with the headboats together and I would like to hear discussion on that before we get away, so he’s got some ideas of what to do. No discussion?

MR. GREENE: Well, I mean I am curious to see the report from the headboat program. From everything that I’ve heard on the dock and offshore fishing, it seems like it’s worked pretty well and most of the headboat users seem to like it. Now, I mean Captain Randy Boggs is out there and he might could speak to that.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: I am going to ask Randy to come up, Johnny, if that’s okay. Randy Boggs, can you come up and tell us about your program and any problems? I’ve got ten minutes left, Mr.
Chair.

**MR. RANDY BOGGS:** With the headboat program that we’re doing right now, we report daily instead of weekly. It’s all computerized now and there’s a smartphone app you can do it with. We have the same VMS that they’re using on the commercial boats. We had very little to no reporting issues.

There is a couple of things in there that we would like to see changed to maybe make it a little bit simpler, but it’s no big deal to do, because you can do it on your cellphone or you can do it from the computer in your office or wherever you’re at. It makes it really, really easy to work with.

**CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** As a headboat, do you think we should put the headboats and the private charter boats under the same reporting program?

**MR. BOGGS:** The headboats have always been held separate because we report to the Beaufort Center and so I think it would be -- If you mirrored the headboat thing, I would be simpler, or expand the Beaufort Program to include them, but that’s up to the Science Center and Beaufort, but I mean it is considered the best information available.

**MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Just, Randy, you’re talking about the Headboat Collaborative as far as your daily reporting and is there much difference between --

**MR. BOGGS:** If you’re not in the program, then it’s weekly and I think it has to be completed within seven days of the final and so there is a small lag time.

**MR. ANSON:** Is that also electronic? Is that through like an app or is that just by fax or how is that?

**MR. BOGGS:** It is all electronic. You can do it on your computer or you can do it on your telephone app and we still have some of the old paper forms around and we keep up with them and we still keep them on the old paper forms just in case something goes wrong and we have to reproduce it, but that’s just in my company for safeguards.

**MR. DONALDSON:** As I stated earlier, and I realize that we’ve had different reporting systems in the past, but it just seems like a good opportunity to combine those and simplify things.

However, if it’s not going to simplify things and complicate it,
I certainly don’t want to put more burden on the industry, but I think we ought to look at the possibility of if we combine the two, headboat and charter boat. If we can do it the same way, then it seems like a simpler way to do it.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Randy, thank you. John, I am hearing at least Dave say that we would like to look at the possibility of combining them together and so you can think about that as you move forward in the document.

MR. FISCHER: I guess I have two questions. One is where are we in this document? We are just creating a paper that maybe after next meeting we may all agree to and it goes out for scoping? Would that seem close?

DR. FROESCHKE: Perfect timing. What I was going to refer you to is page 16.

MR. FISCHER: But I had a second one. The timing may not be --

DR. FROESCHKE: Okay. It was just regarding the timing of the document.

MR. FISCHER: Right and my timing may not be perfect on my second question and it was to Dave, because I was not at the Gulf States meeting and don’t know what the TC agreed to, but you did have the five state directors and their data, with input from the data people in their home states, and I just wanted to know what decisions they may have made and how it works into what we’re using, some of this information here.

MR. DONALDSON: Are you referring to the NFWF RFP that’s -- I mean we talked about -- The five state directors talked about looking at developing a reporting tool for federally-permitted vessels through NFWF. I know there is other groups that are submitting proposals as well, but we are examining the possibility of doing that. We haven’t made a decision yet.

MR. FISCHER: Okay and I am not sure what part of the meeting it was, because I was not at the meeting, but I heard some talk about the table briefly about attending and John said he was in attendance and I would like to make sure that whatever elements and whatever comes out of that is not excluded and that it’s at least included in some type of way.

DR. FROESCHKE: If we could just quickly look at page 16, it has the timing and the reason I ask this is Carrie Simmons just reminded me -- She is Deputy Direct-ing from afar, but the
timeline that we have on here essentially says that we would bring back a document that you could approve for public hearings in June.

If we were to do that, I think we would need to have the actions reasonably well ironed out and I am still not certain about what your intent is about Action 3 or how we might bring that back to you at the next meeting and so I guess it’s a two-part question.

One is are you comfortable with the proposed timeline? If so, could we, either now or at full council, get some more guidance on Action 3?

MR. DONALDSON: Action 3 -- As it was pointed out, I am concerned about putting it in this particular document because it could potentially tie our hands on how we want to do things. However, I think it’s very important that data flow and those issues that are raised are addressed and I guess my question is where can we address those issues? If not in this document, where would that be appropriate?

MS. LEVY: I think it can be addressed in the document. If you recall when we had the dealer reporting amendment where we went to electronic reporting, it wasn’t a decision point. It wasn’t a how do you want the data to flow? It was weekly requirements and this is what’s going to be used and there was a description about how the data flows at that time, because that’s what was going to happen. You would include it, but it just wouldn’t be a decision point as to we want it to specifically flow in this way for all time.

MR. DONALDSON: Then I think that that’s how Action 3 needs to be presented, as a discussion and this is how we would like to see it, but not necessarily as action points.

CHAIRMAN PEARCE: Good point. Dr. Froeschke, any comment to that?

DR. FROESCHKE: Sure. I think that the idea is when -- The flow and things perhaps the reason that you created the technical subcommittee in the beginning, is to hash out that stuff and provide guidance, which was done without obligating yourself forever in a regulatory thing, which seems now to have been a good way to go.

If we provided the discussion and rationale in Action 3, I am not certain what the actions would be or alternatives at this point. If it was just rationale, if that was just something
that we would cover and the flow and the reporting is part of the rationale that we always do or if there is some actual management alternatives that we would be thinking about in terms of timing or something.

**DR. PONWITH:** I have a suggestion and that is rather than getting down into the weeds about the design of this interworking of where the data go and in what chain, I think it would be a really valuable piece of input to that technical subcommittee -- These were the people named by the councils and by the states and by the FIN folks and by the fed to look at how do we tackle this long-term.

They are really smart and capable people and my view if the best gift you could give them as the council is to say what are you trying to do? What do you want to be the outcome at the end of the day? Is that outcome the ability to make in-season course corrections if the burn rate of landings within that sector of the recreational fishery changes fast enough to be able to make a change to the way the fishery operates?

I mean those are the kinds of things that I think would be valuable in this. What is the council trying to do and what kind of reporting rate would lend itself to enabling the council to do that?

**CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Thank you, Bonnie. John, does that finish your report?

**DR. FROESCHKE:** Yes, for now. Perhaps between now and full council we can hash it out in our brains a little bit and make sure that we’re all on the same page moving forward.

**CHAIRMAN PEARCE:** Thank you, John. Unless there is any other questions to come before the committee, we have done the business of the committee and the committee stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m., March 30, 2015.)