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The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the Hilton Riverside Hotel, New Orleans, Louisiana, Monday afternoon, August 10, 2015, and was called to order at 4:15 p.m. by Chairman Johnny Greene.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MINUTES
ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS

CHAIRMAN JOHNNY GREENE: I will call together the Data Collection Committee. You have been provided a copy of the agenda and is there any additions to the agenda? Seeing no additions, the agenda will be adopted as written. Is there any changes to the minutes? Hearing none, the minutes are approved.

The next item is the action guide, Tab F, Number 3, that has been presented for your review. With that, we will move on to Item Number IV, Public Hearing Draft, Tab F, Number 4, and Dr. Froeschke.

DRAFT PUBLIC HEARING DRAFT - ELECTRONIC CHARTER VESSEL REPORTING AMENDMENT

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: Good afternoon, everyone. What I was planning to do, Tab F, Number 4, is just give you a Readers Digest of what we’ve changed since the last iteration of the document and then open it up for discussion and see where we go from there.
If you recall, what we did last time was a joint meeting and there were two versions of actions and alternatives and the purpose and need with slight grammatical differences and things between the Gulf and South Atlantic. You all asked us to put that together, which we’ve done.

In short, we basically took our version, with some minor non-substantive comments that are in the document. For example, we removed -- For each action, the South Atlantic put the affected FMPs and we do that in the title and so we removed those and cleaned them up and noted on Actions 1 and 2 that the Gulf Council had selected preferred alternatives and the South Atlantic has not.

At the time, there was an Action 4, which dealt with the data flow and things, and we were directed to remove that, or to move it to considered but rejected, which we did. One other note that has come up in the last time with the request to improve the clarification of what’s a charter vessel and how that’s being defined in the document and so what we did is we requested some more information and some clarification from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center.

We just received that after the briefing book, but prior to that, and so we will include that in the next draft and so we do that, but it’s not in here. I guess I will stop there and see if there are any questions.

MR. MYRON FISCHER: Can you at least tell us what it is?

DR. FROESCHKE: Well, it’s really essentially what’s in the document. If you’re fifteen or above, you’re a headboat. If you’re not -- What needs to be in there is just to make sure it’s a little more clear. Really, it’s if you’re in the headboat survey, you’re a headboat and if you’re not, then you’re a charter vessel.

MR. FISCHER: John, if you recall, I brought this up at the last meeting and this definition seems to be contrary to what we even talked about the last meeting, because I think we said over six would be a headboat and I don’t think the term of fifteen ever came up and I guess I’m incorrect, John.

DR. FROESCHKE: It’s over six in the South Atlantic and it’s fifteen in the Gulf and you really almost -- That’s why we need this clarification vessel-by-vessel, because it doesn’t really address an eight-passenger vessel, for example, that I am sure there is one of somewhere. They it sort of falls back to
whether they just are in the headboat survey.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: I remember that conversation, because I certainly do carry more than fifteen passengers, but I am not a headboat either, but I think that, after listening to the comments that Dr. Crabtree had and a few others, that you’re going to report to somebody one way or the other, regardless of who it was, and I was pretty comfortable with it at that point.

You know obviously we’ve talked about this, it seems like for two years now, but it’s one of those things that we’re going to have to accept it for what it is and move forward.

MR. FISCHER: It doesn’t matter what it is, as long as we set it and then stick with it and go with that one and so the fifteen or more is a headboat and anything under that is a charter boat. No?

CHAIRMAN GREENE: We may have to look back into that, because I believe it was Dr. Crabtree or someone, Mara or somebody at that portion of the table over there, that had made a comment that as long as you’re reporting to someone within that purview that you’re fine. If you’re selected by the SRD, you’re going to report to them and if you’re not, then you’re going to report in this other manner. I think that pretty well covered everything, as far as I remember. Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: One thing I guess you could weigh in on is the way it’s done now is the SRD has some flexibility to determine whether a boat, for example, that’s fifteen or above, but really does charter and not pay by the head, they wouldn’t be in the survey, perhaps.

Some of them, it seems, switch back and forth throughout the year and at different times and so currently it seems they have the flexibility to assign that, based on what their interpretation of how that vessel operates. If we think it should be more hard-coded or something, maybe that’s the guidance we should give and really make it so if it’s X number or above you’re in or you’re not.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Mr. Fischer.

MR. FISCHER: I think if we’re going to move forward with Amendment 41 and 42 that we have define and break it down of what group is going to be covered in the headboat amendment and what group is going to be covered in the charter boat amendment. I don’t see any other kind of way and I don’t know if we could
have boats at that stage saying they’re going to play both ways.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Well, I think you’re either going to be selected by the SRD to report to the Beaufort Lab or you’re going to have to report somewhere else accordingly. There are CFR guidance definitions, 50 CFR 622.2, and I have read them and it is what it is.

MR. FISCHER: Where I am coming from is each group is going to have a subquota and so once you get to that point, you can’t have boats playing both pools based on where the subquota is. You’re going to have to eventually divide it and these are the two groups.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Ms. Levy.

MS. MARA LEVY: When we talk about Amendment 41 and 42 in Reef Fish, I think you will see that the documents do define who is included in each one based on who has been a part of the headboat survey. That will be in there and you all can discuss that.

Somewhat of a little bit different issue in this document is who is, quote, unquote, a charter or headboat for purposes of reporting and I think we talked about it last time that if you end up covering everyone through Action 1 and 2 that it doesn’t really matter, because everyone is covered no matter what you call them, but it would potentially matter if you have different reporting requirements for, quote, unquote, who is a charter and who is a headboat.

Then those people selected under the headboat survey might have one reporting requirement and if you choose something else for charter vessels that aren’t selected -- You know people would have to know who they are, but presumably the Science Center would keep those in the headboat survey in the headboat survey and everyone else would default to the other group, unless you all decide you want to change it.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: She got what I was going to say.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DAVE DONALDSON: I think that we had that discussion of do we keep them separate or not and I think as long as the data collection tool can uniquely identify the vessels, we can
separate them out after the fact as being headboats or charter boats or guideboats, whatever classification we want. I think that’s -- Because we could just sit around and spend the rest of our lives trying to come up with definitions for it and whatever definition we are going to come up with, there is always going to be an exception.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Good point. I certainly concur. Okay. Anybody else got anything to weigh in on? All right, Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: Two other points just on the general characteristics of the document. One, I mentioned or it’s in the document, this notion of these tables of just how many headboats and charter boats by state and things there are.

It turns out that we’re still working on the chart. It turns out that’s a lot harder, because it’s separated by permits and the way the databases are set up, it’s not easy to tell which boats have more than one permit and so we are working on that. I say we, but not me. That’s the NMFS staff, which they are working very hard on this and so we will have that.

The other thing, moving forward, if you’ve had a chance to look at some of the Chapters 3 and 4, you will see that there are sections in there of analyses or sort of X’s where you might expect numbers. Part of that is that to move forward, we do need some additional guidance about -- In the alternatives, for example, we have “via NMFS approved hardware and software”.

We’re getting to the point now where we’re going to need to have some discussions about what that might be and if the Science Center has thought about that and are sort of onboard with this process, because to figure out, for example, a cost of something, we would need to know more about the hardware or the software and the process and all that and so it would be nice to get some input while we’re here.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Dr. Stunz.

DR. GREG STUNZ: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I think John brings up a good point and so I have a motion maybe, John, that might help out some there. I sent it over to you guys and I don’t know if you all got it back there.

You know we’ve got some preferreds selected and I guess, John, in nearly every case in this document and it seems like the next logical step, as John is saying, is to begin to specify what
does that electronic reporting really mean.

My experience is that this takes some time and so we don’t want
to get far ahead with this document and then it’s going to take
much longer to develop what this electronic reporting mechanism
and elements of it looks like. I crafted this and I am not by
any means stuck to all the verbiage that’s in here and if
somebody has a better idea and wants to help me with this, but I
put this up here kind of just to get us started. Do you want me
to read through that, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Yes.

DR. STUNZ: I move to request the technical subcommittee of the
Gulf and South Atlantic Councils on Electronic Logbook Reporting
Guidelines, in coordination with GulfFIN, ACCSP, SEFSC, and
council staff, develop a stand-alone reference document that
describes specific catch and effort reporting elements, data
standards, and protocols that can be used to standardize
implementation of Southeast Region-wide electronic monitoring
initiatives. The data standards and program protocols that
should be developed include, but are not limited to, the
following. I listed about nine or ten things that I generally
thought should be included in there as a good start, but things
like hardware, process and flow, data integrity, data
integration, minimum reporting elements, effort validation,
catch validation, compliance tracking, non-reporting, and
expansion of estimates. That’s my motion, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Okay. We have a motion on the board. Is
there a second for the motion?

MR. DONALDSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Second by Mr. Donaldson. Any further
discussion? Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I will just make a brief comment of is this sort of
what you’re looking for, John, or is this going to help out?

DR. FROESCHKE: I think so. I guess one thing is if once we get
this hardware or software, is this something -- How would one
get a particular piece of software approved by NMFS? I guess at
some point I am trying to understand that process and timeline.

I guess, to expand, if we did this part, would we submit that
and they would say yes, we agree or don’t and a piece of
software or hardware that could do this would be approved?
CHAIRMAN GREENE: Mr. Brainerd.

DR. THEO BRAINERD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe, as the motion stands now, it would consist of someone -- At least people from the Science Center and they would be part of a group that would decide on the software that would be appropriate for this program.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I would envision something like -- I am just speaking here just as sort of a brainstorming component, but if you had certain specified data collection elements, like some of the ones here, it could be a variety of things, as long as it met some levels of standards that NMFS and these other groups specify.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Well, I agree with you. I mean whatever the standards are, as long as it meets the protocols, I am fine with it, but I don’t know -- I don’t know. I assume that that’s what you’re looking for and is there any more -- I mean it’s a little vague, I understand, but without getting more input out of the Center, I don’t know which way to direct you here. Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: It’s intentionally vague a little bit, just from the sense that it’s a starting point to get this ball rolling. I mean I think I would caution against getting a little too prescriptive here, because you want to leave a little bit of flexibility, but I think these groups probably need some guidance from us that this is kind of where we want to go with this and this won’t be the last time we visit this issue, I am sure.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: I’m sorry. I misunderstood you. That makes a lot of sense. We have a motion. Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: One thing maybe that we could do as part of this or something -- It seems like the first thing is we would need to come up with a flow chart of how -- Whatever the standards might be, how you go from this is what we want to actually something that’s approved for use.

I hate to do it, but I don’t know if maybe Assane could look at this and tell me -- The econ groups were the ones that really flagged that they didn’t have what they needed to complete the analysis and so I’m just wondering if you guys have a thought of if this helps it or meets your needs.
DR. ASSANE DIAGNE: I think at this point, as you mentioned, to have a better idea when it comes to the cost. Not only the cost of equipment, if there is equipment to be purchased or software, but the administrative costs of managing such a program and also handling that data volume, because some of the alternatives call for reporting on a trip-by-trip basis and some of them on a daily basis. Obviously that makes a lot of data for a fleet of 1,200 vessels.

Whenever we get information, based on the technical subcommittee, we can begin to see the contours of the costs that this would entail.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Okay. We have a motion on the floor. Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the motion carries. Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: Okay. At this point, I would like to open the floor for sort of a holistic -- Is there any things that you want to talk about since the last time that we reviewed this in terms of preferred alternatives? If not, do you want to think about selecting a preferred alternative for Action 3?

CHAIRMAN GREENE: All right, committee, what is your pleasure? Okay. I guess we will go to Action 3 and attempt to select a preferred then. Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: One thing is this is a joint document and so we’re trying very hard not to wordsmith the alternatives to death, because then when you get all these version issues and things, but several of the IPT have noted that the wording of Alternative 4 in Action 3 and this idea of clicking on a geographic grid or something could be a little vague and so a request to clarify that or explain that in greater detail might be useful in a subsequent draft. I am going to recommend that you recommend that we do that.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Okay. Well, I’ll go with what you recommend.

DR. FROESCHKE: The other thing, depending on how we develop the subcommittee and things, is it might be possible, if we have standards and things, that Alternatives 2 and 3 could be enveloped in a single alternative with subalternatives or something. Some have noted that it’s not entirely clear what a VMS could do versus a tablet and things.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Thank you. Well, I agree with you. I
remember the conversation on Alternative 4 and I remember the
comment pretty well that most fishermen don’t lie by more than
fifty or sixty miles when given the opportunity of where they
cought a fish and I am certainly one of them.

I agree with you on Alternative 4. Now, Alternative 2 and 3, I
have looked at a hundred times and they appear to be very close
and very similar and I would guess that you could one or perhaps
the other, as long as it was an approved device. Am I reading
into that correctly? I am not trying to mislead anyone, but I
am just trying to make sure I understand. Ms. Beckwith.

MS. ANNA BECKWITH: Thank you. Simply from the South Atlantic
perspective, we will not merge those two alternatives if the
alternative has VMS in it. That’s just the stance that we’re
taking and so they need to be separate.

VMS is a form of electronic monitoring that is based for
enforcement primarily and what we are discussing in Alternative
2 is options to collect data electronically, but that would not
be used for enforcement. That is the distinction that we’re
utilizing and so VMS is an enforcement tool to us and it’s not a
data collection tool.

The South Atlantic is focusing in on data collection and not
enforcement and so we will not be interested in merging those
two and would kick that back to you guys if we had verbiage that
sort of asked us to do that.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DONALDSON: In reading those, isn’t Alternative 3 included
in Alternative 2? Alternative 2 is just any approved electronic
device and VMS is certainly one of those, but there is also
alternatives and so I’m not sure why we need to specify VMS.
Couldn’t that just be subsumed into Alternative 2?

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Well, that was kind of where I was going a
minute ago with my comment. I mean they seem very similar and
noting the comment from the South Atlantic. Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: The way that I read them, the difference is that
Alternative 2 is electronic device that records your locations
at specified intervals, but it doesn’t report it in real time
and so it’s recording it and you get back to the dock and it
somehow sends it to someone, as to where you were or whatever,
whereas the VMS I read as real-time reporting of your movement.
If I am wrong, then someone can correct me, but that’s how I
read them.

**CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Mr. Fischer.

**MR. FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. What does the Science Center want? What type of data do they want and need? I think that’s what we should be concentrating on.

**CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you. Mr. Branstetter. Steve, I had skipped over you and I’m sorry. Do you have a comment? Dave.

**MR. DONALDSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I believe when we did the MRIP Gulf logbook pilot, as well as the report from the technical subcommittee, I don’t think their recommendation was for real-time reporting. I think it was daily reporting or recording of activities on a daily basis, but reported weekly was the recommendation. I mean that’s real time and that may be overkill is what I’m trying to say.

**CHAIRMAN GREENE:** I agree with you. I think there was a sense of wanting to do daily reporting for in-season monitoring for some of the fish that have real short season limits. Dr. Froeschke.

**DR. FROESCHKE:** It’s at least my view that the benefit of trip-level reporting is in the validation part. The MRIP pilot and other things noted that this is very difficult to do and the trip-level allows you to report your catch before you hit the dock and then it can be validated and that can only be done if you’re reporting your catch before you hit the dock. That’s sort of the gold standard, as I understand it, and so I think that’s really the benefit of the trip-level, rather than the real-time.

If you don’t want to do that, then weekly and daily without reporting your catch before you hit the dock I see as probably the same for management purposes.

**CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Dr. Stunz.

**DR. STUNZ:** Just to add a quick follow-up to John’s comment there on the daily reporting. In addition, I think I probably brought this up to this group at our joint meeting and I know there’s a little bit of issues about whether weekly or daily reporting, but if we’re talking about sort of this gold standard of getting this, daily reporting is where it’s at.

There is a lot more literature coming out showing major issues
with recall bias and you guys know that are fishing. You know there are different clients every day and a lot of fish hitting the deck and it’s just a problem, when you put it off another day, to remember what you caught the day prior. I personally would recommend we go to a daily reporting requirement as we move this document further along.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Thank you. Anything else? Dr. Dana.

DR. PAMELA DANA: Thank you, Chairman Greene. I am not on your committee, but I would absolutely agree with what Dr. Stunz said about data reporting. You know being involved in these programs in the past, it’s very easy to forget day to day. They all mesh together, especially in your peak season, and so if we’re going to make it work, let’s do it real-time and do it right.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Thank you for your comment. Anyone else? Okay. Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: Any takers on a preferred alternative on Action 3?

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Hang on just a second. Dr. Branstetter, did you want to make a point?

DR. STEVE BRANSTETTER: Yes and I wanted to follow up on John’s comment a while ago on clarification of Alternative 4. I am afraid I am the grump that was complaining about the vagueness of the alternative.

What is report manually? Are you swimming to shore and talking to somebody or are you writing it down with an old pencil stub and a piece of paper? What is clicking on a geographic grid? I think just define these for us, please.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: The difference of this -- To start, the way that my understanding of this is reported is there is a map on their reporting software that has predetermined grids corresponding to geographic coordinates and you can mouse-over and click on a grid and that translates those coordinates into numbers that are then transmitted with the report.

The difference in terms of practical, for Alternatives 2 and 3 versus this alternative -- Alternatives 2 and 3, the location information is passively collected by a device. It’s not something that could be altered or subject to error in
reporting, whereas Alternative 4 is manually reported by this process and there could be either intentional unintentional error introduced through that process. That, to me, is the difference.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Okay. Anything else before we get on to Action 3? Okay. I guess we’re at Action 3 now. Is anybody interested in selecting a preferred for the Gulf? Dr. Stunz.

DR. STUNZ: I will float a motion out there. I will make a motion that we make Alternative 2 our preferred alternative under Action 3.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Okay. We have a motion and --

DR. STUNZ: John is telling me that I need to include Subalternatives 2a and 2b for the Gulf. It’s the Subalternative 2a and 2b included in this motion as part of our preferred alternative and so in Action 3, to make Alternative 2 be the preferred alternative, to include Subalternatives 2a and 2b.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Okay, Dr. Stunz, your motion is on the board and does it read as you wish?

DR. STUNZ: John, if that specifies it correctly, the Subalternatives 2a and 2b -- Is that how it should read? What I am trying to give there is we don’t want the 2c and 2d for the South Atlantic.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Okay. We have a motion on the floor.

MR. DOUG BOYD: I second and I have a question.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Mr. Boyd seconds it and go ahead.

MR. BOYD: In Action 3, we are talking about strictly reporting at this point, reporting location, and we’re not talking about reporting catch at this point and is that correct?

DR. FROESCHKE: Right. That’s the location of what was caught and not what was caught.

MR. BOYD: Right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Okay. We have a motion on the floor. Any more discussion? Any opposition to the motion on the board? Seeing none, the motion carries. Dr. Froeschke.
DR. FROESCHKE: At this point, I would just like to reach out and see if there are any general comments or things missing from the document. One of the things that we had talked about -- Well, this document will be reviewed by the South Atlantic at their September meeting. At that point, whatever changes probably -- We would bring it back to you all at the October and then what we had talked about was scheduling -- If we were to take this out to public hearing, we would do that in November.

I don’t know if it’s premature to solidify that and pick locations and all that or if we want to wait until you see it in October. The South Atlantic has selected their dates and locations and I have those if you are interested. Just thoughts.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: To be clear, the South Atlantic has picked dates already to review this?

DR. FROESCHKE: They have. It’s my understanding they do their public hearings and they set those for whatever amendments they happen to have and they do them twice a year and so that’s sort of a recurring activity and so this will just be part of it.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Is there any desire to pick locations to move this forward to concur along with what the South Atlantic is doing? Okay. Seeing none, Ms. Beckwith, does this document, as we’ve gone through it today, does it seem something that may be potentially agreeable with you guys?

MS. BECKWITH: We may not agree on all the alternatives, but the document seems just right to move forward.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Thank you. Okay, Dr. Froeschke.

DR. FROESCHKE: That’s what I have.

CHAIRMAN GREENE: Okay. Any other business to come before the Data Collection Committee? Seeing none, Mr. Chairman, we are adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m., August 10, 2015.)