1	GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2	DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE
4	DATA CONDECTION COMMITTEE
5	The Driskill Austin, Texas
6	
7	August 14, 2023
8	
9	VOTING MEMBERS
10	Susan BoggsAlabama
11	Dale DiazMississippi
12	Dave DonaldsonGSMFC
13	Jonathan DugasLouisiana
14	Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers)Texas
15	Bob GillFlorida
16	Michael McDermottMississippi
17	Chris Schieble (designee for Patrick Banks)Louisiana
18	Andy StrelcheckNMFS
19	C.J. Sweetman (designee for Jessica McCawley)Florida
20	Troy WilliamsonTexas
21	
22	NON-VOTING MEMBERS
23	Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon)Alabama
24	Kesley BanksTexas
25	Billy BroussardLouisiana
26	Tom FrazerFlorida
27	LCDR Lisa MotoiUSCG
28	Anthony OvertonAlabama
29	Joe SpragginsMississippi
30	Ed WalkerFlorida
31	
32	STAFF
33	Assane DiagneEconomist
34	Matt FreemanEconomist
35	John Froeschke
36 37	Beth HagerAdministrative Officer
3 / 3 8	Lisa HollenseadFishery Biologist Mary LevyNOAA General Counsel
39	Natasha Mendez-FerrerFishery Biologist
40	Emily Muehlstein
41	Kathy PereiraMeeting Planner - Travel Coordinator
42	Ryan RindoneLead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
43	Bernadine RoyOffice Manager
44	Carrie SimmonsExecutive Director
45	Carly SomersetFisheries Outreach Specialist
46	
47	OTHER PARTICIPANTS
48	Peter HoodNMFS
49	Kerry MarhefkaSAFMC

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS				
2					
3	Table of Contents3				
4					
5	Table of Motions4				
6					
7	Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes and Action Guide and				
8	Next Steps5				
9					
10	SEFHIER Program Update and Next Steps6				
11					
12	Other Business				
13	Update on Commercial Logbook Program26				
14					
15	Adjournment30				
16					
17					
18					

1	TABLE OF MOTIONS				
2					
3	PAGE 24: Motion	n to create an ad hoc charter/for-	-hire data		
4	collection AP. Th	ne motion carried on page 26.			
5					
6					
7					

The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at The Driskill in Austin, Texas on Monday morning, August 14, 2023, and was called to order by Chairman Susan Boggs.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA APPROVAL OF MINUTES ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS

CHAIRMAN SUSAN BOGGS: Good morning, everyone, and congratulations to our new council members. I would like to call the Data Collection Committee to order. The first item on our agenda is the Adoption of the Agenda. Mr. Gill.

MR. BOB GILL: Thank you, Madam Chair. Could we add, under Other Business, an update on the commercial logbook program?

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: So noted. Dr. Hollensead. All right, and so do I have a motion to approve the agenda, as modified?

MR. DAVE DONALDSON: So moved.

MR. GILL: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Thank you. Our next agenda item is the Approval of the 2023 Minutes. Does anyone have any changes to those? If not, may I get a motion to approve?

MR. GILL: Move approval of the June 2023 minutes.

MR. DONALDSON: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Thank you for that. All right, and so the next item on our agenda is the Action Guide and Next Steps, and I'm going to turn this over to Dr. Hollensead.

DR. LISA HOLLENSEAD: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to give everybody a little overview of what we're going to talk about today for the Data Collection Committee, this presentation is going to be a bit of an introduction for our new council members, a little bit of a review for folks that have been at the table for a while as well, and we're also going to summarize a little bit of the stakeholder feedback that we got from the SEFHIER program and identify some lessons learned.

The purpose of this presentation is, originally, staff had thought about getting into some technical aspects of some of the for-hire data collection in the Gulf, and we decided to postpone that discussion until the next meeting, when the Southeast Regional Office staff will also provide some summary information from SEFHIER, and we thought that would be a good time to work on a collaborative process with those staff members, to come up with something a little more detailed, and so this presentation is going to be a bit more of a thirty-five-thousand-foot view, to catch everybody up and then also to provide a little bit of launching points for some discussion, either, you know, at this meeting, to get into some high-level discussions about purpose and need and that sort of thing or also to allow for some context for that more in-depth presentation that you will so that's the purpose of the receive in October, and presentation for today. Madam Chair, if anybody has any questions, I will answer those. Otherwise, I will go right into the presentation.

4 5

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Seeing no questions, let's go ahead and get into the presentation. I'm sure we'll have many questions once that's completed.

SEFHIER PROGRAM UPDATE AND NEXT STEPS

DR. HOLLENSEAD: Okay, and so that will be Tab F, Number 4 in your meeting materials. Again, just to present a little bit of an overview, and I'll just give a background on, you know, why would you want to even collect for-hire data, for example, and so we'll start that overview.

Then we're going to review some of the stakeholder feedback and just give -- You know, touch on some points of data wants versus data needs, talk to that in a little bit of an abstract manner, but I will touch on that during this presentation. I will also discuss the purpose and need, and the purpose and need that I will be showing is the original purpose and need from SEFHIER, and I will touch on a little bit of why that probably needs to be reworked a little bit, as well as cover some lessons learned and then provide some next steps.

Why even bother collecting this information in the for-hire sector? Well, it provides data to inform stock assessments and management advice, as well as some catch limit monitoring. Basically, most of your -- Very broadly, your data collection programs are broken into two objectives to collect catch data.

That is from what anglers harvested when they went out on their fishing trip, and, in some cases, there is field samplers out that will collect those intercept surveys and sample the catch, so you can get an idea of what critters they're encountering

when they're on their fishing trips and which they're choosing to harvest and that sort of thing.

The second component is effort, and this can be collected in a number of ways, and so that could be via a phone call, inperson, by mail, a mobile app, and each survey has its own methods, depending on that program's needs. Participants are asked how long they fished, what was targeted, and the number of trips, and so you get an idea of, okay, this is what you normally go out and harvest, or catch, and how often do you go out, and then you can multiply those things together, in the little graphic that we've got here on the slide, and that will give you some estimate of total catch, and so that's why we go through sort of these procedures, very broadly, and most fisheries programs have some flavor of these two components, and so anything we do for the for-hire would work similarly.

Just a little bit of a review, for those of you who were here, and then sort of a catch-up, for those new council members. When SEFHIER was first implemented, we certainly got a lot of feedback from stakeholders, and so here's a little bit of a summary of some of the feedback that we received.

Some of the things that were perceived as feasible for participants in the program are filling out and reporting logbooks, and we got some good support for that, and the hail-in and hail-out when on fishing trips, and so the understanding -- Many of the participants understood why that was necessary and were willing to do that.

 Reporting catch before landing, there were some mixed reviews here, but, on the whole, this is feasible for captains to do that, as well as understanding the dockside intercepts, and so to take the time and have the harvest be looked at by a sampler, those sorts of things, you know, was considered feasible.

 Some comments that we got back from the program as being perceived as burdensome, it was that declaration for every time a vessel moved, even when it was not fishing, to get things such as gas, ice, pick up clients, that sort of thing, and so, every time a vessel moved from a dock or a berth, they had to hailout, and that was considered burdensome by many people, and we heard many comments to that. Some of the economic questions were considered burdensome as well, as well as that twenty-four/seven VMS requirement, and so those are the things that we had received as feedback.

Looking a little bit at the data wants and needs, again, this is

a bit of an abstraction. When we start linking these things a little bit better, we'll do that in October, sort of link these pieces together when we get into the weeds of the program, but, you know, there's a lot of discussion that has been around SEFHIER and a lot of our other data collection programs, which, actually, this is a good time to talk about this, because we're also talking about the commercial and charter logbooks, and HMS just gave, you know, a presentation on electronic reporting, and so keeping all of these things in mind.

4 5

You know, this need, or this importance, of validation of catch and effort information, sometimes the volunteer reporting sort of doesn't have as much -- You need a bit of validity to that, you know, somebody to just double-check that that might be the case, or make any corrections, and also filling in some of the existing data gaps, recognizing that the for-hire is a unique sector, and so there is things that that sector -- That we may be missing, in terms of those data gaps. We'll get into that discussion a little bit more in October, but just keep that in mind as we start these initial discussions.

Certainly there is a want and a need for more timely and accurate for-hire reporting. Again, when we start to go into a little bit of what we have currently in place, we begin to see a little bit going back into those data gaps, some things that could perhaps be improved by a refiring of SEFHIER here.

Also, the importance in the use of stock assessments and management actions, as I've touched on a little bit earlier, and then could potentially provide an individual catch history, should the council decide to take on an avenue such as that, but this program could potentially allow those sorts of things.

This is the purpose and need statement verbatim from the original SEFHIER document, and I will tell you that word "socioeconomic" will not appear publicly in any future document associated with any kind of for-hire program, and so I bring this up just to, you know, provide an overview, and this was originally proposed as the purpose and need that the council passed, and this was the language, and it will have to be modified a little bit, but also just to sort of jog everybody's memory, and then, as well, this is a link to the original document, and so, at any point during our discussion, if you want to pull that up, it's available in the presentation, and so just to have that for your reference.

Then some lessons learned, and we certainly learned that stakeholder buy-in is crucial for program success, and we

certainly saw that here with the SEFHIER program, and this sort of goes into our second bullet point here, the program compliance and the effect on data usage, and so the assumption that people are reporting, they're reporting when they're supposed to, that sort of thing.

Then consideration of what criteria of a data collection program are appropriate for use in management, and do we want this as more just as an index, or do we want it to be something that could be directly used in stock assessments, and it's going to change the experimental design of your program, and so that's something to think about.

Certainly budget and funding needs to align with program requirements is something of a lesson learned. If you want the Cadillac, but you can't pay for those sorts of things to be done, what else can we do to work with the budget and funding that we have? Validation again comes up, and calibration will need to be considered, and so you want a program that's sort of robust enough to be able to interpret the data appropriately for perhaps use in stock assessments, but you also want something that has a little bit, perhaps, of flexibility or can at least be related to some of your other data collection programs.

Then, lastly, that the program expectations and how those are translated into the final implementation, and so, you know, lots of good communication of program objectives, such that it can be a collaborative effort between the council and the agency, and that's going to be important.

Just to give you a little bit of next steps, so an IPT has been populated, and they convened on July 27. Again, as I've mentioned before, council and SERO staff will work together to present the more in-depth information on what for-hire programs are currently implemented and provide some summary information on SEFHIER, and so we'll get a little bit more technical and better relate and link those data wants and needs, as I had spoken to on an earlier slide, help piece those together for October.

The council should consider providing any guidance to staff on desirable goals and objectives for Version 2.0 of the for-hire data collection program, again perhaps thinking about what was in the original purpose and need and taking those lessons learned and begin thinking about what initial conversations the committee would like to have about drafting another purpose and need.

 Certainly council staff can convene the Data Collection AP, or another advisory body that the committee thinks would be appropriate to discuss the development of the new data collection program, and perhaps the timing of that is also something that can be discussed, or at least identify maybe those groups and a general timeline, and certainly council staff would work to convene those groups to provide comment back to the council as this progress goes on. That's all I have for my presentation, and I certainly want to open the floor to any discussion that the committee may want to have on this.

4 5

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Thank you, Dr. Hollensead. I want to start with your last question first, and I would like to get some feedback about convening the Data Collection AP. We heard a lot of comment about how important it is for the fishermen to get this program back on the water and functioning, and I would think, however, it would be a little premature for us to ask to convene this AP until we hear the presentation in October, and so I would certainly entertain -- We can discuss that later, but, since we were just discussing that, I think after October would be the most appropriate time.

I would also like to say that I would like to do it so that we could maybe move forward in January with getting this program, the document, underway, and so the timeline would be after October, but prior to the January meeting, and I would like to hear some feedback from the committee. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Madam Chair. I concur that I believe we should convene the Data Collection AP. I would suggest that, as opposed to rationalizing one side of October or the other, it depends on where it fits on the schedule. I could see it convening prior to October, because the issues, and the needs, have been well identified through all the work that we did on the SEFHIER program, and so everybody who has been part of that, and now, I grant you, not all council members here do, but that they could have a very meaningful discussion and provide valuable input to this council if it fits. If it doesn't fit, after October, but I would agree that prior to January should be a high priority.

DR. TOM FRAZER: I don't know, Susan, and it looks like, if you're monitoring the screen, that Andy Strelcheck has his hand up, too.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: I forget about our virtual participants. Mr. Andy Strelcheck.

 MR. ANDY STRELCHECK: Don't forget about me, Susan. Welcome, new council members. Sorry that I'm not there in-person. I wanted to add, with regard to the Data Collection AP, I think it is crucial that we engage the Data Collection AP. Based on, you know, Lisa's overview presentation, I think we need to spend some time, or I would recommend that we spend some time, in October going through the lessons learned and the information that staff will be sharing with us, as well as talking about revisions to the goals and objectives first and then convening the AP thereafter.

4 5

I think it's really important that, you know, we provide some initial direction and comments and conversation around this topic, before convening the AP, to help frame then their conversation, as well as their advice back to us, and, ideally, I would agree that it would be good to get input between the October and January meetings.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Thank you for your comments, Mr. Strelcheck, and, Bob, I understand what you're saying, but I feel like, since we're going to get some new information, and hear about some other for-hire programs in October, let's see what the data has done through the SEFHIER program, and that would be my intent for waiting until after the October meeting.

 With that, and your concerns about how does it fit on the calendar, I do agree with that, that hopefully, if this committee, and we can move it forward at Full Council, agrees on a timeline, then staff can go ahead and be working on that, instead of us waiting maybe until October and deciding that we need to have a meeting, and I am just trying to give plenty of notice, I guess, in trying to coordinate this, so that we can get it fit in, but I really believe after the October meeting, just because it looks like we're going to have a lot more information.

To that, Dr. Hollensead, and this will be our next discussion point after I call on you, but I want to say this before I call on you, is I think the main thing we need to look at is to try to get a well-defined purpose and need for that October meeting. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Madam Chair, and I agree with that. Are you looking for a motion? Do we need a motion for this?

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: I think we do, and do we not, to convene an AP?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS: No, but, since we were asked

explicitly if you want to pass a motion, that would be fine, but, I mean, we could capture it in the report. Either way.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Okay. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: So your druthers are for a motion?

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: I think we just need to be clear to staff, and do we want it prior to October or after October, and I think that would be the main thing, but, again, and I'm directing this to staff, if it works better, if we can't get it in after October, we look -- But I would suggest after October, the October meeting. Dr. Hollensead, do you have any comments to that, how that might work?

DR. HOLLENSEAD: Yes, ma'am, and we certainly can get it done after October.

19 CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Any other questions? J.D.

MR. J.D. DUGAS: Thank you, Ms. Chair. For the AP, do we have to repopulate those members, or --

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Chair, and so the next appointment for the Data Collection AP is not until 2025. If you want to include another group with this group, or consider a technical committee later on, like we've had before, that's up to the council, but you might want to start with this group and go from there, and I'm not sure what your thoughts were on that.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Mr. Dugas.

MR. DUGAS: I was just curious if we had to repopulate the AP, but I do have a question for Lisa. On Slide 8, the IPT has been populated and met on July 27, and can you explain that a little bit, what is an IPT?

DR. HOLLENSEAD: The IPT would be the group responsible for developing the document and writing the sections and chapters for that. This IPT meeting -- There was sort of an initial discussion of what we thought might go forward. After actually speaking with that group, and listening a little bit to what they had to say -- For example, that's when this presentation became less technical, and a little bit more of a tee-off for the presentation in October, and so we discussed that.

1 2

4 5

Some other things that we discussed were sort of what we can and can't do, based on the lawsuit, and, from my understanding, generally probably a twenty-four/seven, you know, the VMS, is not going to fly anymore, but some of the other things may still be available in our toolbox to use, and so we certainly, you know, wanted to get some of the council's feedback on some of those things for our purpose and need, and we can take that to the IPT and discuss it, and we can -- You know, perhaps creating, or drafting, some of that document for you.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Dr. Hollensead, during the IPT discussion, was there any discussion about what the purpose and need might look like? I understand that "socioeconomic" is not something we can use, and can you maybe help me understand -- Can we use "social" and "economic"? I mean, do we split it into two words now?

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: I was there, and so I think we could. I mean, to me, that's a minor issue, about how we would phrase that. There would be some later discussion about what information would be collected, and I think that would be relevant.

You know, the bigger question -- I mean, to me, the purpose is to collect the best information that we can for use in management. The questions that we have are what are the bounds of that, in terms of the legal scope, and then what are the desires of that, in terms of the council, and what kinds of a program are done, and so, you know, we have some -- When I was looking at the HMS presentation, that's one avenue to think about. The South Atlantic has a different program, and there's something we could come up with.

There is pieces of the SEFHIER program that we might want to use, or something totally different, and so that's where we're going to be trying to get some more information for you all in October and try to get some more refined guidance that we could take to the AP and develop a document.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Thank you, Dr. Froeschke, and Peter, and then I have a question for Mara.

MR. PETER HOOD: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just wanted to reiterate or not, but Dr. Stephen and Dr. Masi are -- You know, they're working on getting the data together, and certainly they can -- You know, we'll have a presentation ready for the next council meeting, and it will give you a flavor, in terms of, you know, what they were able to -- You know, what the information

can show you, in terms of, you know, management considerations in the future and whatnot, but, you know, I think it's important to see what the SEFHIER program was collecting and how it can be used, and, you know, particularly I think in terms of validation that would be an important point, and so I just wanted to make that point. Thank you.

4 5

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: To that point, Peter, I agree, and I'm going to ask this, and I had a note on another slide that we talked about, but, when Dr. Masi and Dr. Stephen provide that presentation, and I am looking back at my notes, we need to make sure the wants and the needs, the Ford or the Cadillac, and, in that presentation, why that's important, and I don't know if I'm making myself clear, but if you -- I guess the question would be, okay, if we didn't have that, what would be the outcome, because, if this council doesn't understand the importance of why we need that information, it's a little harder to get the council -- Because you've got to get the council to buy-in before you get the fishermen to buy-in, and it's got to pass the smell test with the council first, and so I think we need a good understanding of why it's needed.

MR. HOOD: Thank you, and just -- I know like Dr. Stephen is -- She is listening right now, and hearing your concerns, and so I think that, you know, she's going to take that to heart, and we'll try to put things together. She did notify me, in a chat, that there's a lot of SEFHIER data out there, and they're working through it, and so, at least in terms of what they'll be able to present, it may not be everything, but, you know, it certainly will be a preliminary run-through with the data and to be able to provide you with, you know, some ideas, in terms of what's working and what wasn't working, et cetera, and so thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Andy.

MR. STRELCHECK: Thanks, Madam Chair. I would add that, you know, there's been certainly a lot that's changed since, I don't know, 2016 or 2017, when we originally began working on the SEFHIER amendment, right, and it was ultimately implemented in 2020.

With that said, you know, I think it's going to be important that the council come back, based on the information that's now available, what we've learned from running the program for several years, and evaluate, once again, the purpose and need relative to, you know, what we want to accomplish with management and science, right, and so that, to me, is going to

be a critical conversation, and I agree with you wholeheartedly, right, that we need to be prepared to discuss kind of the pros and cons of different approaches and the, you know, reason why certain information is collected the way it's collected.

One point that I wanted to emphasize, and I believe it was Slide 4 that showed some of the concerns, or burdens, that participants expressed with the previous program, and those were all fair, right, and some of those have been resolved, or may be, you know, no longer an issue, just simply because of the litigation.

The economic questions is one where I want staff to be able to come to the table and explain, well, why is that data being collected, what's the purpose of it, so the council can weigh, obviously, the benefits of collecting that data relative to the impacts, or burden, on the industry and what ultimately would be lost if that data is not collected, and so those are the types of conversations that I think we're going to need to have moving forward, as we really drill down into the details of the program.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Thank you, Andy, and so my question, Mara, and it's been a while since I've read the lawsuit, but can we use the word -- I think the reason it was struck down is we didn't have a clear definition of what "socioeconomic" was, but we can use "social and economic", if we so choose, in our purpose and need?

MS. MARA LEVY: Yes, and, I mean, I will just reiterate that that particular portion of the court's decision was going towards notice in the rulemaking, right, and so it wasn't about whether you use the term "socioeconomic" or not, but it's about clearly articulating the type of data that you're going to collect for the rule under the Administrative Procedures Act and then making sure that that notice is clear for what you're finally going to implement.

 I mean, I guess I would -- We don't have to use "socioeconomic", and we can say "economic", right, and, as long as we're explaining what that means, it's meeting this type of data, X, Y, Z, and it's in this category, and so at least people are on notice, and, more importantly, that the agency do that in the rulemaking, and that's where the importance comes.

I really would like us not to get hung up on what we call this stuff, and I think it's more important, as Andy said, to explain why we want to collect this type of data, what's lost if you

don't, a cost-benefit analysis type of burden, much more than the terminology we use.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Thank you for that clarification. Andy, is your hand back up?

MR. STRELCHECK: No. You can take it down.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Mr. Anson.

MR. KEVIN ANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm not on your committee, but just to follow-up on what Peter was mentioning, regarding some of the analysis of the data that has been collected, and Dr. Stephen is on the call, and I would assume, and hope, there would be some analysis that looks at the validation component as it stands, at least related to the dockside surveys and comparing of what was observed at the dock, what was reported, and kind of the difference for the non-reporting, because, as Dr. Hollensead mentioned earlier, I mean, it's a significant component of the survey, and I think, from my perspective, it's of value, at least when we were conducting the Snapper Check survey and required mandatory reporting for any boat landing red snapper in Alabama.

For the federally-permitted vessels, it was roughly 60 to 65 percent were reporting, at least on the algorithm we were selecting to match the trips, and so I think there's a -- At the time, it was a large number of boats that were not reporting.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Thank you. Does anyone else have any questions? So, about the validation, from the headboat side of it, because we now -- The court struck down the ruling, and you only have to report weekly, and we don't see the validators at the dock like we used to, and I think the reporting is not coming in like it used to when it was mandatory that you had to report before you offload the fish, and we had the notification that you were coming in, so you could have the validators there to validate, and so I have seen a decline in that, and I do think that is a huge component of this program. Mr. Dugas.

 MR. DUGAS: Thank you, Ms. Chair. I'm going back to the AP, and I don't have an issue with the AP meeting about this, but my question is, is there a way for us to add members to the AP, because, looking at the list, there's not a single person from the State of Louisiana on the AP, and I would like to see some representation from Louisiana on the AP.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Dr. Simmons, and I think I know the answer, but

I think it's more appropriate that you answer.

4 5

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: I mean, I think you would have to go through a process to solicit more applicants and select them, and we have the fishing violation background checks that are done before the finalization of those members, and so that could take some time. I don't recall why -- We might not have had an applicant from Louisiana originally, and I don't know why.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Well, and, Dr. Simmons, too, I mean, if we opened it up, we couldn't open it up just to Louisiana, could we?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: That's right, and it would be to everyone who wants to apply for the position, if you're reopening that advisory panel membership.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Which I understand what you're saying, J.D., and maybe staff can go back and look and see if we had any applicants from Louisiana, but, not discounting Louisiana, I really would hate to delay this process any longer, because, right now, we're looking at 2025, and, if we go down this path of choosing, or adding, to the Data Collection AP, I'm afraid we're going to push this to 2026 or further, and I don't think this industry is going to be acceptable of that. Ms. Banks.

DR. KESLEY BANKS: Thank you. I kind of support J.D. on this, in the fact that Louisiana has a large charter fishery, and, if they don't have representation in this process, we're missing a huge component there. If we're going to do this, we should do it right. It's already been shut down in court once.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Well, I -- Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Well, I mean, maybe the council wants to consider an ad hoc advisory panel to address this charge specifically and not necessarily repopulate the current Data Collection AP, but consider some type of ad hoc AP. I mean, you can do that, and you could do a different working group structure in our SOPPs, and, I mean, there's lots of different options, but it's just going to take us some time, depending on what you want to do.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: I would look at my committee and ask them what they would like to do. Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DAVE DONALDSON: Thank you, Madam Chair, and so, Carrie, the ad hoc workgroup -- What's the process of doing that? Would

that be -- Could we convene, or create, that group and have them convene quicker than readvertising for the current AP?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: If you want to not follow the SOPPs, yes. Maybe you want to call it a technical committee or something else, but, I mean, even the ad hocs have gone through that process, where you have an explicit charge that the council is creating this body for, and the charge is developed, and we advertise, we preliminarily appoint, we conduct the fishery background checks, and then you finalize it.

I think we had some sort of -- I think it was like a technical committee, John, or a working group, when we did this last time, and it was made up of fishermen and scientists and staff from the Regional Office, the Science Center, and our -- The Gulf States and our staff, I believe, and it was a big group.

MR. DONALDSON: So I wasn't suggesting that we don't follow our SOPPs, and I was just -- The timing issue, that we want to do this sooner rather than later, I thought, if we did the ad hoc, we could -- That it might be a little quicker, but it doesn't sound like it is, and so never mind.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: I am just going to look at Dr. Simmons here for a second, and would it be possible to convene a stakeholder forum, for some initial input, and then, ultimately, think about soliciting applications, or nominations, from participants, to have, you know, a technical group moving forward?

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Before you answer that question, I would like to be really clear on what our SOPPs say we can do. I will pause.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Bernie, could you bring up our SOPPs, page 7? I mean, I think there's lots of things we can do, Dr. Frazer, but it's just what are we trying to accomplish, how big does the body need to be, how many different folks need to be involved, where do you want to hold it, how are you going to do that, and I think we just need to work out those details.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Dr. Frazer.

DR. FRAZER: I mean, the reason I asked the question, and I appreciate the conversation around the table, right, and clearly process sometimes gets in the way of what we're trying to do, and so what I understand from J.D. and Kesley is, you know,

there is some concern about just representation, and so what I'm looking for, actually, is some way to overcome that concern, so we feel like we've heard the voice of charter/for-hire folks in all five states.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: So, if we're going to do that, if we're going to go down this road, number one, this is an issue that is directed to a specific user group, and so I would encourage anything that we do initially to get with those stakeholders that are going to be directly affected by this document. If we feel like -- If this committee feels like that Data Collection AP is not properly balanced, then we -- I would assume, and I'm not going to encourage, because now we're delaying this document, but, if we're going to create a new group, then it needs to be equal, and, when I say equal, and I don't know if we can do this, equal representation from each state, two from Texas, two from Louisiana, and, I mean, however we want to do it.

If we want to be equal about it, then that's what we need to do, and I don't know if that's something we can do, and Dr. Frazer just left, and -- Because, here again, I think we're getting wrapped around the axle. I don't know who applied to the Data Collection AP, and it's the will of this council to select those AP members, and now, whether we had someone from Louisiana or not, I don't know, but we go through this process again, and so, this time, no one from Alabama gets chosen, and so are we back at the table again and saying, okay, we need more people?

If we're going to do it, and, Dr. Simmons, maybe I need to direct this question to you, but can we be very specific that we're going to create an ad hoc, and we're going to put two from each state, or three from each state, or however we do it, because I don't want to be having this discussion after we do this and saying, well, we don't have representation from Florida, and so -- I am sorry. Well, I'm not sorry. I mean, this is important. This is very important to the charter fleet, and I don't want to see it get delayed any more than it needs to be delayed. Captain Walker.

 MR. ED WALKER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm not on your committee, but I just thought I would throw this out there. We don't seem to have time to do a whole new AP, and equal representation -- Every state should definitely be included, but there's ten-times more charter permits in Florida than there is in Louisiana, and so that would get weird.

In my view, the AP is -- They're just going to give you advice

anyway, and they're not going to craft a new plan, and they're competent guys that you've already selected for this job, and so I think let them give you their advice, and you can take it or not, and then it's going to have public comment, and you can encourage charter public comment, as you're potentially crafting a new system, and you can include people that way, to at least get things rolling from the AP that you already have, and you can take or leave their advice, but you would get things rolling, and then you could get advice from every state and every person that wants to offer any.

4 5

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: I appreciate your comments, Captain Walker, and you're right. I mean, that's what public comment is for, and you can do it standing at this podium, or you can do it written, and there is many ways to do it, but, again, it's the will of this committee, and, of course, I guess we'll have this discussion again at Full Council. Mr. Schieble.

MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE: Real quick, just for clarify, back in 2021, Louisiana had two members on that Data AP, and we had Ronald Chicola, and also Nicole Smith, who is our Chief of Data Management at the department, and then, whenever we repopulated the AP, participants from Louisiana were not selected, and so just to clarify that.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Again -- Just a minute, Mr. Hood. Again, I mean, it's the will of this council, and so, if we go down this path again, and we don't choose someone from state for some reason, are we going to be having the same discussion and continuously delaying, and Captain Walker brings up some very good points.

You know, this is an advisory panel, and it's not what we're going to do, and, I mean, this council -- We've been criticized many times for not taking the advice of the advisory panels, and so I understand what you're saying, J.D., but I really would hate to delay this document for the charter/for-hire fleet, because they want to be accountable, and they want this data collection, and they want the validation. Mr. Hood.

MR. HOOD: Just Mr. Strelcheck has his hand up.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Mr. Strelcheck, and I'm sorry. I couldn't see the screen.

MR. STRELCHECK: No problem, and so I appreciate the conversation, and I'm concerned about getting bogged down in process, right, and so I'm trying to think outside the box here,

and I don't know if the operating procedures would allow this or not, but, looking at the current Data Collection AP, I know eight of the ten members, six of which are charter captains, one is an NGO, and one is a commercial, and I did not know two of the other people, to know what sectors they represent, but, given the presentation that Lisa just provided, right, and we're working toward buy-in, I am concerned about not including Louisiana, because Louisiana was one of the areas that really was most opposed to the SEFHIER program, and so I think there's a benefit to including them.

4 5

My idea, if it's allowed, is, you know, we have other APs that are populated, with maybe broader geographic representation, and is it possible, since those individuals have been vetted for other APs, that we could augment, or supplement, the Data Collection AP with some additional members, assuming they're willing, to participate, and, that way, it would bolster the representation, from a geographic standpoint, and so that's just a suggestion, and I'm not sure if the SOPPs would allow that.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Madam Chair, and so, yes, I think we could do that. We did pull up the Section 2.8, and it says the Council Chair may appoint such ad hoc or special committees, with the concurrence of the council, as needed to conduct the orderly business of the council, and so a couple of things.

When we last repopulated the Data Collection AP, we didn't have that many meetings, because we struggled with, you know, when to convene them, what materials to put in front of them, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, and so they weren't very active, and so I think we didn't get a whole lot of applications the last time we repopulated this group, because of that, likely, because they weren't very active, and so one thing you might want to consider is convene the current Data Collection AP, and maybe consider taking people from Reef Fish and CMP and others.

If you want to meet them jointly, or convene them jointly, we could do that, and then decide if you need to have a different group that would actually be formed later on to provide recommendations on the document, but I think that could happen, and this is not going to happen quickly. I mean, this is not going to happen overnight, and it's going to take us some time to do this, and so I don't know that it would necessarily slow us down if you wanted to have a separate group, or a newer group, or add to this group, and we do have a lot of

flexibility.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Ms. Levy.

MS. LEVY: So just this section is about council committees, and so it's talking about like your Reef Fish Committee, and it's talking about your council committees, like the Data Collection Committee that we're in right now, and this is not related to advisory panels, and so, if you look at the sections of the SOPPs -- This is under council committees, and it's not under the advisory panels, and so I don't think that the Chair can just populate an advisory panel, like this is implying.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Okay, and so, Dr. Simmons, and I know we need to kind of wrap this up, and we can pick it back up at Full Council, but, Dr. Simmons, you said maybe the Data Collection and CMP APs, but, if you're going to do that, then I would say to do the Reef Fish AP, because, I mean, everybody has kind of got a hand in this, which is fine, and I understand, and we want to make sure we're inclusive, but now my concern is, if we go down this road, and we get to another subject, and we don't feel like that AP is properly populated, are we going to be having this conversation -- I am just -- I am thinking forward. Ms. Banks.

 DR. BANKS: Thank you. I appreciate the desire to push forward, and I do feel that as well, but this program was controversial, and it's already been shut down in court, and we shouldn't try to force it through as quickly as we are. We should have representation, and we should take our time and make sure it's right. Otherwise, we're going to end up in another lawsuit, and it's going to end up shut down again, and we're going to be delayed, and so one-and-done may take a little while longer, but I think one-and-done logically makes sense to me. Maybe that's me being new to the process, but that's my thought. Thank you.

 CHAIRMAN BOGGS: I understand your comments, Ms. Banks, but I think delaying having these conversations is going to push it back, and, again, I am also thinking ahead. If we do it for this AP, what are we looking at in the future, because we didn't have so-and-so on this AP, and now we need to get people here on this AP, and maybe we need to look at APs and repopulate them every year, and I don't know.

That's a question for another time, and I understand your concern, and I agree with you to get it right, and that's why I

want to go ahead and start this conversation and not wait, because this council changes, as you understand, and you're new, and, I mean -- I'm not being critical of that, but you get momentum, and, if we keep pushing, pushing, pushing, we're going to be next year and new council members, and we're going to have to start this process over again, and so I'm not trying to push it and not get it right, but I'm just trying to get this conversation started, because we've got to, or we're going to be 2030 before this people have any kind of data collection going for them, and I think it's very, very important.

4 5

There is plans out there, and we've got the charter/for-hire plan from CFA that we need to be looking at, and there's things that we can go ahead and look at and be incorporating in having these discussions. Dr. Sweetman.

DR. C.J. SWEETMAN: Thank you, Ms. Chair, and so, listening to all the points on this, I understand the need for Louisiana representation, but, at the same time, the Data Collection AP is charged with more than just looking at SEFHIER 2.0 or whatever we're going to call it. It's a broader charge than just looking at one specific topic here, and I will also point out that, while I'm not opposed to maybe an ad hoc AP, or something along those lines, to look specifically at this issue, I am concerned about the timing of it, because we have heard from a large suite charter community specifically about the need the implement something as quickly as we possibly can here replace that, because we recognize the need for data collection within that particular sector, in order to effectively manage our fisheries here.

 The points of why it was shot down are very specific, as it relates to noticing and VMS and things along those lines too, and so I do think that there are avenues we can work on. I mean, the South Atlantic has a SEFHIER program that's working okay right now, I mean, and so maybe there's something that we can learn to maybe potentially fast-track this along those lines there, but the moral of the story is I'm not opposed to an ad hoc AP, to get some Louisiana representation on there, to look at this specific issue, something along those lines, but, from my perspective, timing is kind of the essence, and so I agree with you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Any more discussion on this issue? Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Madam Chair, and so, hearing all of the discussion, it seems, to me, that the path forward is to go in parallel, and we continue work on the document, which, as Dr.

Simmons pointed out, is going to take some time, and we're very early in the process, and the October presentation will help provide some basis for that, but there's no reason, in my mind, that, in order to accommodate the Louisiana representation that we don't have, that we go ahead and create an ad hoc charter/for-hire data collection AP that is populated and created and set up while this document goes forward, and that accommodates, in my mind, the need both in the timing and in the substance.

With that in mind, I move that we create a charter/for-hire data collection AP, ad hoc, an ad hoc charter/for-hire data collection AP for the purpose of addressing precisely the items that we're talking about today.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Is there a second? J.D. Okay. I have a question about this motion. Do we need to be specific in the motion about how the ad hoc is populated, because, if you get applicants, and someone, again, from Alabama is not chosen for that ad hoc, are we going to be having this same discussion, and I don't know how specific we can be in the motion. Mr. Gill.

MR. GILL: Thank you, Madam Chair, and so I think the answer is, no, we don't need to do that, because we're going to revisit this when the applications are in, and we will make the choices then as to who populates this AP. We've had this discussion, and all at the table will be present, assuming they're at the meeting, for that discussion when we populate the AP, and that will be part of the discussion at that time, and that will be a closed session, and we can address those issues within that closed session to populate this AP, and so I don't think it needs to be here.

I think what we really need to do here is start the process, take that first step, and get going on that, so that whatever that process is to get that AP, in terms of a timeline, it's as soon as possible, so that it can slide into the program that will be discussed in October.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Any other discussion? Dr. Simmons.

 think this works, but, by Full Council, if we could have like a charge, and staff can help with that, for discussion at Full Council for this ad hoc group, and I think that would help people understand what they're applying for as well, and we can put all that out on social media and send it to states and promote it that way.

4 5

That being said, we could also try to expedite this if the state law enforcement and federal law enforcement officers and applicants are willing to go ahead and have us do a background check prior to the council making the appointments, and that's a big if, and so they would have to note that on the application, and the states would have to turn that around for us, and the federal staff would have to turn that around for us, for OLE, and so that is a possibility, if we get those things to line up, that you could make your final selection in October.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: So, if, when, we approve this motion, how long are we required to advertise it for?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Emily, we've typically advertised for three weeks, and is that right, and then, if we don't get many applicants, we'll do another push out for more recruits, and we had a really good -- We had high numbers of applicants for the Coastal Migratory Pelagics AP, and we had record numbers of applicants for the Coastal Migratory Pelagics AP, because the states promoted it through their social media and their press release avenues. We had almost ninety applicants for that AP, and so that helped a lot.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Ms. Muehlstein.

MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN: I was just going to say that I think, logistically, we could probably get the advertisements out next week and start pushing for it then.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: So, if we did that, and did it for three weeks, then we would have that available to us in October.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Yes, and so what we would try to do, if it's the council's desire to have all of this information ready, including the background checks, for October, in a closed session, we would tell the folks that apply that they're going to have a fishing violation background check done on them, and they do that anyway, but have that ready, and we would have to get the applicants, send the applicants to the states and the feds, have them do the check, and then hopefully have that all together by October, and I think we could do that, if we move fairly quickly on it, but I do think we need to have a mission statement by Full Council, so that people understand what this group is supposed to do, because I also think that other people on the APs might be disappointed that we're not using them as well.

 CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Understood. Mr. Diaz.

MR. DALE DIAZ: Thank you, Ms. Boggs. I don't think the motion was seconded, and so I wanted to second the motion, and, whenever it's appropriate, I wanted to comment on it.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: You can go ahead and make your comments now.

 MR. DIAZ: I just -- I agree with Andy that we need to try to get buy-in, and I don't think Louisiana was the only area that didn't have good buy-in, and so I think, by moving this motion forward, we could try to see if we could get some of those folks involved and be part of the process and have better buy-in.

I also think that it was stated earlier that we could have the Data Collection Committee potentially meet with the ad hoc committee, if we needed to, and so that might address some of the concerns that folks have, but that's all I had. Thank you, Ms. Boggs.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Thank you, Mr. Diaz. Any more comments? All right. The motion on the board is to create an ad hoc charter/for-hire data collection AP. This is a committee motion. Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion passes. Dr. Hollensead, if you would quickly take us through the update on the commercial logbooks, please.

OTHER BUSINESS UPDATE ON COMMERCIAL LOGBOOK PROGRAM

 DR. HOLLENSEAD: Yes, ma'am. Just to give the committee an update, if you recall, we were going to do virtual public hearings for this document, which included sending out a mailer to permit holders. That letter has been mailed to those permit holders, and we've already gotten a little bit of feedback.

 Just to let you know, we've also selected dates and times for those public hearings, and so one will be held at -- These are all Eastern Time, but will be held at noon on August 23, 6:00 p.m. on August 29, and 10:00 a.m. on August 30. Those are the times those will be conducted. Science Center staff will also be available to provide a presentation and a demonstration of the eTRIPS application, as well as answer any technical questions.

The South Atlantic has already done their virtual public hearings, and I listened in to all three of those, and, just to give you a guick summary of that, a couple of folks had some

technical questions, and so it was nice to have the Science Center there to directly answer those, so that everybody was available to speak, and so that went really well. I believe they had about four individuals provide comment, and all of them were supportive of the transition to the electronic reporting.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: If there is no other business to come before this committee, we are adjourned.

DR. FRAZER: Thank you, Susan, and so I am just making sure that I have in my head kind of the series of events, and I want to capture the discussion, because I know it's going to come up again in Full Council, right, and so, I mean, I understand clearly that there's some urgency here, right, and the need to continue to move this forward, and we have some momentum in that regard, and I appreciate some of the comments that were made by folks around the table, particularly C.J., right, with regard to the fact that the AP that we have in place for data collection had a much broader charge, and we're trying to focus the discussion, and then to Kesley's points and others, and, you know, we need to be able to capture the representation.

If we can come together again in Full Council and make sure that we have a plan, and I'm just making sure that we're good here, right, and so the things that have to fall into place, right, as Emily pointed out, are, next week, try to get an advertisement out, right, pretty quickly, have a three-week kind of turnaround time, or thereabout, and so those applications would come back in by the first -- End of the first or the second week of September.

Then we have to engage our state and federal law enforcement officials, right, and we'll be talking with them before all of this, right, but the turnaround time for them is relatively quick too to have the background checks completed, and so we have all of that information by the October council meeting, and I can't remember when it is. Is it the second week of October?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: The third week.

DR. FRAZER: The third week? Okay. I think we can do all of that, right, and my question is, failing to do so, what is the Plan B? Carrie says that we don't need a Plan B.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: So do you want to end this by 11:45, or do you 46 want me to answer?

DR. FRAZER: 11:45 would be fine. I just want to make sure we

have some clarity here, right, because it's a big ask, right, and there's a lot of moving pieces, and I just -- Again, I feel as strongly about making sure that we have representation, appropriate representation, on any committee that we form, so that we have buy-in from this council and everybody is all on the same page that this in fact the way to go, and so that's all I'm saying.

4 5

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: My suggestion for a Plan B is that we go ahead and convene the Data Collection AP, knowing that we're working on this ad hoc, because I think they're going to see it at some point anyway, and so you could allow them to go ahead and look at it while we continue populating the ad hoc AP, and is that —I mean, is that kind of backwards, or does it really even matter?

DR. FRAZER: Okay, and so we've got a floating Plan B. Again, I'm okay with that, but I want to level the expectations around the table.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: So, just quickly, with this ad hoc AP, can we — I know we need to come up with a charge, and I don't know if it would be part of the charge or how you advertise it, and I understand what you said, Mr. Gill, about we'll have the conversation at this table, but, to make sure we have qualified applicants, can we be very specific that you have to have either a reef fish or a CMP federal fishery permit, because that would make you a charter vessel, and can we ask them to identify if you are a six-passenger, a multi-passenger, or dually-permitted, and I think that's important when we get into these conversations, so that we, again, have a proper representation of who we put on this ad hoc AP.

DR. FRAZER: All right, and so, prior to Full Council -- Again, those are all good considerations, to the extent that we can kind of refine that charge and make it as directed as possible, and I think we'll all be in better shape as a consequence. Kevin.

 MR. ANSON: Just procedurally, I'm just curious, and do the enforcement agencies -- Do they get the entire list of applicants, or is it just for the residents -- Do they list the state of residence and just those people go to that particular state?

DR. FRAZER: Dr. Simmons.

48 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I

think Les left the room, but we do the whole list for all the states now, and that change was made a couple of years ago, and so the list could be quite large.

DR. FRAZER: Yes, and all the more reason to make sure that the charge is, you know, as specific as it can be. Peter.

MR. HOOD: I am just trying to think about our enforcement folks, and, you know, if they get a hundred applicants, which I know that's a really high end of it, but we just need to make sure that we cue them in early that this sort of thing is going to happen, because they're going to -- That's a lot of work for them to do, and so I think that we just really need to make sure that we engage them early, so they're aware that something is coming. Thanks.

DR. FRAZER: Point well taken, Peter, and we'll certainly engage folks as soon as we possibly can. Okay. I asked Susan if she could break us a little bit early, and she did a fine job, because we need to set up for the lunch, in anticipation of the discussion with Dr. Howell, and so I think you're still -- There was no other business, right?

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Well, no, and we kind of wrapped all of that up, but I would like to make a request of staff that, at the October meeting, that we have plenty of time allotted to this conversation, after we hear the presentation from the agency, and, if there's no other business to come before this committee, I would entertain a motion to adjourn. Bob, would you like to make a motion to -- J.D. made a motion to adjourn. Is there a second?

MR. GILL: A point of order, Madam Chair. There is other business on the agenda that we have not discussed.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Dr. Hollensead did go through that. Would you like to have her repeat it?

39 MR. GILL: Apparently I'm not paying attention. No.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Is there a second to adjourn?

MR. GILL: Sure.

CHAIRMAN BOGGS: Thank you. That concludes the Data Collection 46 Committee.

 1 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on August 14, 2023.) 2 ---