

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

Hyatt Centric New Orleans, Louisiana

January 29, 2024

**VOTING MEMBERS**

- 10 Susan Boggs.....Alabama
- 11 Kesley Banks.....Texas
- 12 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 13 Jonathan Dugas.....Louisiana
- 14 Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
- 15 Bob Gill.....Florida
- 16 Michael McDermott.....Mississippi
- 17 Chris Schieble (designee for Ryan Montegut).....Louisiana
- 18 Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi
- 19 Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS
- 20 C.J. Sweetman (designee for Jessica McCawley).....Florida
- 21 Ed Walker.....Florida
- 22 Troy Williamson.....Texas

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

- 25 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
- 26 Billy Broussard.....Louisiana
- 27 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- 28 Tom Frazer.....Florida
- 29 Anthony Overton.....Alabama

**STAFF**

- 32 Assane Diagne.....Economist
- 33 Matt Freeman.....Economist
- 34 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
- 35 Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
- 36 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
- 37 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 38 Natasha Mendez-Ferrer.....Fishery Biologist
- 39 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
- 40 Ryan Rindone.....Lead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
- 41 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 42 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director
- 43 Camilla Shireman.....Administrative & Communications Assistant
- 44 Carly Somerset.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist

**OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

- 47 Jim Green.....FL
- 48 Kerry Marhefka.....SEFSC
- 49 Clay Porch.....SEFSC

1 Jessica Stephen.....NMFS  
2 John Walter.....SEFSC  
3  
4 - - -  
5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1  
2  
3 Table of Contents.....3  
4  
5 Table of Motions.....4  
6  
7 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes and Action Guide and  
8 Next Steps.....5  
9  
10 Discussion on For-Hire Data Collection Program.....5  
11     Ad Hoc Charter-for-Hire Data Collection AP Report.....6  
12     Presentation: Summary from SEFHIER.....21  
13     Recommendations and Next Steps.....34  
14  
15 Update on the Status of the Timeline on the Implementation of  
16 the Commercial Electronic Logbooks.....62  
17  
18 Adjournment.....63  
19  
20                   - - -  
21

TABLE OF MOTIONS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

PAGE 44: Motion to direct staff to include Motions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 11 from the January 2024 Ad Hoc Charter-for-Hire Data Collection Advisory Panel into the charter-for-hire electronic data collection document. The motion carried on page 46.

- - -

1 The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery  
2 Management Council convened at The Embassy Suites in Panama City  
3 Beach, Florida on Monday morning, October 23, 2023, and was  
4 called to order by Chairman Susan Boggs.

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

10 **CHAIRMAN SUSAN BOGGS:** I would like to call the Data Collection  
11 Committee to order. The first thing on the agenda is the  
12 Adoption of the Agenda. Is there any changes or additions?  
13 Seeing none, the agenda is adopted is written. The second item  
14 is we need a motion to approve the October 2023 minutes.

15  
16 **MR. BOB GILL:** So moved, Madam Chair.

17  
18 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** I apologize, and I should have asked if anyone  
19 has any changes, or corrections, and I have one, actually. On  
20 page 42, line 18, I must have misspoke, and I said we bought our  
21 headboat in 2021, and it's actually 2002, and so I wanted to get  
22 that corrected, because the math doesn't add up, if you read  
23 everything that goes behind it, and so we have a motion and a  
24 second. Are you okay with those changes?

25  
26 **MR. GILL:** Yes, ma'am.

27  
28 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Is there any opposition to the motion? Seeing  
29 none, the motion passes. The next item on our agenda is the  
30 Action Guide and Next Steps. I'm going to turn it over to Dr.  
31 Hollensead to walk us through that.

32  
33 **DISCUSSION ON FOR-HIRE DATA COLLECTION PROGRAM**  
34

35 **DR. LISA HOLLENSHAD:** Thank you, Madam Chair. The first agenda  
36 item is to discuss for-hire data collection in the Gulf. The  
37 council had put together an Ad Hoc Charter-for-Hire Data  
38 Collection AP, and they met January 10 and 11, and so a little  
39 earlier this month, to discuss some initial steps for creating a  
40 new data collection program to replace the Southeast For-Hire  
41 Integrated Electronic Reporting, or SEFHIER, program.

42  
43 A meeting summary is available. During that meeting, Captain  
44 Jim Green was appointed as the AP chair. He is in the room with  
45 us, and he will help provide a presentation on the summary. As  
46 well, Madam Chair, there was a presentation done by SERO staff,  
47 and Dr. Masse provided a presentation. She, similarly, had a  
48 presentation to give to this committee, and so she is feeling

1 under the weather, and so Dr. Jessica Stephen will be providing  
2 that presentation. She's all the way in Hawaii, and so she'll  
3 be yelling as loud as she can to give that presentation.

4  
5 The presentation will address several questions that the council  
6 asked at its October 2023 meeting, and so, broadly, that  
7 presentation is going to include information on the number of  
8 targeted trips, species-specific catch numbers, spatial movement  
9 behavior of the fleet, and regional compliance estimates, and so  
10 the committee should direct staff on any considerations, or  
11 recommendations, from the AP that they would like to see moving  
12 forward in a document that the council requested be initiated  
13 back at the April 2023 council meeting. Madam Chair.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. At this time, we're going to delve into  
16 this, if Captain Jim Green would come to the hotseat, please,  
17 and we've asked Jim if he would kind of go through the motions.  
18 We've asked Jim to go through the motions that were made and  
19 passed at the ad hoc meeting, and to provide a little background  
20 on that, and then, when we hear Dr. Stephen's presentation, we  
21 will kind of backtrack and go through those motions individually  
22 and discuss them here at the council table and see where we want  
23 to land on each one, and so, Captain Green.

24  
25 **AD HOC CHARTER-FOR-HIRE DATA COLLECTION ADVISORY PANEL REPORT**  
26 **AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

27  
28 **MR. JIM GREEN:** Thank you, all. Thank you very much. I first  
29 want to say thank you for convening the AP. The population of  
30 it was very diverse. There were a lot of different opinions.  
31 The ones that were able to show up came wholeheartedly and were,  
32 I thought, very thoughtful in expressing their views on  
33 different topics through our AP, and I think we all kind of came  
34 together.

35  
36 You noticed that all these motions passed unanimously. I think  
37 that's a testament to the fact that our industry is ready for  
38 it, and that we're willing to -- That we've come together and  
39 found some good things that everybody is willing to see fleshed  
40 out, and so thank you very much. Do you want me to read all  
41 this?

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** If you will go motion-by-motion, and read the  
44 motion, and then give us just a few sentences of rationale, as  
45 to how you concluded or came to that conclusion. Thank you.

46  
47 **MR. GREEN:** Good, because I would need a chair if I was going to  
48 read all that. The first motion was to adopt the following

1 objectives for a new charter-for-hire data collection program:  
2 increase the timeliness of catch estimates for in-season  
3 monitoring; increase the temporal or spatial precision of catch  
4 estimates for monitoring; reducing bias associated with  
5 collection of catch and effort; and increase stakeholder trust  
6 and buy-in associated with data collection. These were taken  
7 off of the original SEFHIER, and these were taken -- Go ahead,  
8 Ms. Lisa.

9

10 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** It was a technical memo.

11

12 **MR. GREEN:** We gave the opportunity -- When we were asked to do  
13 this, we kind of started a list, and it turned out to be  
14 components and objectives, and so we kind of used that as a  
15 list, a checkoff list, as we went through our motions, to kind  
16 of capture that. We were kind of getting in the weeds a little  
17 bit, and staff reached up and said, hey, this is what was from  
18 the last, and do you all agree with this, and we all agreed, and  
19 we moved on, and we actually used our list to check things off  
20 as we went through motions, and so that motion carried with no  
21 opposition.

22

23 The next motion was to recommend the council not require twenty-  
24 four-hour tracking. We had a discussion on this, and some  
25 weren't clear with what the ruling that came down was about, and  
26 it was about twenty-four-seven tracking and not tracking, and,  
27 as we discussed effort monitoring and stuff like that, we found  
28 that tracking may have to be a part of it, and so we all came  
29 together and decided that twenty-four-hour tracking -- That we  
30 would not like that to be required, and that passed unanimously.

31

32 The next motion was to recommend to the council that trip  
33 declarations include the following components: the vessel's  
34 registration number/name; captain's name; departure date and  
35 time; estimated return date and time; location; and type of  
36 trip. This is very much exactly how SEFHIER's trip declarations  
37 were, and that passed unanimously, knowing that that was the  
38 minimal amount of information that we needed, and staff agreed  
39 to that, that that was what was needed for a declaration. Do I  
40 need to stop?

41

42 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Yes, and I'm sorry. I am looking and making  
43 notes. Andy.

44

45 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** I should know the answer to this, Jim, and  
46 I think you just stated it, and so those are the same variables  
47 that we were previously collecting, and you did not reduce that  
48 list at all, and so it's consistent with the SEFHIER program as

1 it existed previously?  
2

3 **MR. GREEN:** That's correct, and there's a little bit of  
4 difference, because I'm a headboat operator, and so there's a  
5 slight variation between the headboat survey and what VESL did,  
6 or any of the other ones did, for the actual charter part  
7 portion, but it was all relative that. Yes, sir.  
8

9 All right. The next motion was to recommend to the council that  
10 trip declarations only be required for for-hire fishing trips  
11 before departure. That motion carried with no opposition, and  
12 that addressed what we were actually in the process of  
13 addressing when the ruling came down, which was the multiple  
14 hail-outs, the burden on the agency to collect it, the burden on  
15 the operator to have to continually hail-out three or four or  
16 five times a day sometimes, and so this motion was speaking to  
17 that.  
18

19 The next motion was to recommend to the council that one  
20 mechanism be used to report all fishing activity across sectors  
21 and regions. One thing that we heard a lot was that those that  
22 were dual-permitted, commercial and charter, in the Gulf, and  
23 also dual-permitted with South Atlantic with charter, and the  
24 Gulf, that they were -- Some people were doing like three or  
25 four different reporting on different platforms.  
26

27 Jessica, I believe, was the staffer who brought it up, that the  
28 agency was actually working on developing some software where we  
29 could have all of that go to one place and then disseminate to -  
30 - Once you collected it, disseminate to where it needs to go,  
31 and we were very -- Everybody was very happy to hear that. The  
32 streamlining the process, and making it easier, was definitely  
33 fully supported.  
34

35 The next was to recommend to the council that a trip report  
36 include the following components, and, as you can see, the first  
37 six items matches your trip declaration, and so it would be pre-  
38 populated on the field. If you already did that, it would just  
39 continue. It would be angler count; passenger count; crew  
40 count; average depth fished; general area in a GPS format; the  
41 individual species kept and discarded; fishing occurred, yes or  
42 no; primary gear used; and primary target species. This was  
43 also very much like SEFHIER, except that it removed the economic  
44 component, the trip costs, which was, as you all know, a very  
45 contentious thing in our industry, but this went with no  
46 opposition.  
47

48 It cut down some, and like the average depth fished was put in



1 there, and, like on the headboat thing, we're still doing  
2 minimum and maximum of primary, and so, you know, that's how it  
3 was when we did SEFHIER, and this kind of narrows it down to  
4 where you just give your average depth, and so that cuts down a  
5 couple of fields, along with cutting down, cutting out, the  
6 economic data, which was two more fields, I believe, and so we  
7 reduced the amount of metrics being collected, or recommended to  
8 reduce the amount of metrics being collected.

9

10 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Dugas.

11

12 **MR. J.D. DUGAS:** Thank you, Captain Green. Just a question. Is  
13 there a reason why two of the bullet points are not colored?

14

15 **MR. GREEN:** Yes, sir, and they're actually sub-bullet points,  
16 and so, when we do that, we actually select the species that  
17 we're putting data in on, and then we have a kept and discarded.  
18 Under headboats, because it continued to develop after SEFHIER  
19 was struck down, they've even gone in, this year, and had a sub-  
20 menu below discards and asked if you vented or descended, and  
21 those were optional, but they were added in there, and so the  
22 two-bullet points that are not shaded-in are actually sub-bullet  
23 points of the individual species data.

24

25 All right, Ms. Bernie, and we'll go to the next one. All right.  
26 That was the end of the day the first day, and this was our  
27 second day of the meeting, and it was -- Our first motion was to  
28 recommend to the council to add an additional depredation data  
29 section to the data reporting to include a selection list of  
30 predatory species and marine mammals.

31

32 I was one of the ones that -- I was the one that brought this in  
33 as a motion. I have been standing at this podium, I figured  
34 out, somewhere around seventeen years that I've been coming and  
35 giving testimony. My first testimony at a Gulf Council meeting  
36 was that dolphins were a problem. That was in 2005.

37

38 This is the first chance -- After all of this, this is our first  
39 chance of being able to make a motion to add -- To get some kind  
40 of data rolling. I mean, nothing happens fast, and we all know  
41 it's very glacially slow, but it was to recommend that we get  
42 some data being collected.

43

44 Are we seeing this 30, 40, 50, 80 percent of the time we're  
45 fishing? We have to start somewhere, and so that was the  
46 premise, and it was met with -- At first, I wanted to make it a  
47 requirement, and some people were a little concerned about what  
48 all that is, and they wanted to flesh out what it was, and so,

1 in the end, we all came to the conclusion that to make it  
2 optional was a more palatable way for everybody to move forward  
3 with understanding what that would be, and so a little bit of  
4 contention there, but, like I said, we worked together to find a  
5 solution.

6

7 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Dr. Sweetman.

8

9 **DR. C.J. SWEETMAN:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Thanks, Jim, for  
10 talking us through this. Just on the depredation component, I'm  
11 curious how you all talked about this. Was this from a  
12 perspective of the fisheries that are being consumed, or is this  
13 relative to shark management in and of itself?

14

15 **MR. GREEN:** To me, it was both. Like I think they're hand-in-  
16 hand. Like that was my part of the discussion, was not only  
17 would this prove -- Not only would this be a way of showing that  
18 the sharks are more aggressive, and we're seeing more of them,  
19 but, also, when we talk about discard mortality, or, you know --  
20 I think that it would be a start for us to be able to have that  
21 information to start addressing all those issues, and so I don't  
22 think there was one thing. I think it was just a way of getting  
23 the foot in the door and trying to start collecting this data.

24

25 I wanted to go depredation, did you see it occur, yes, and how  
26 many spots did you fish, how many spots did you see depredation,  
27 and then what -- Shark, dolphin, goliath grouper, or what was it  
28 was that creating the depredation, and so I wanted to go a  
29 little further with it, but it was kind of new to everybody, and  
30 so we all kind of agreed that making it optional, for right now,  
31 would be a good way of exploring what that is before  
32 recommending something to you.

33

34 The next one was to recommend the council to remove the economic  
35 information from the daily reporting requirements and explore  
36 other methods for collecting economic data in the for-hire  
37 industry. This -- As you know, you've heard plenty about it.

38

39 There's a lot of difference between trip costs and trip value.  
40 The way I viewed it, and this is probably a more simplistic way,  
41 but, you know, the operator of the boat isn't always the owner,  
42 and he doesn't always have purview to what the boat is making,  
43 and I think it should be on the burden of the permit holder, and  
44 I first came there -- My idea, and this was just mine, and this  
45 is not reflective of the motion, but that it should be tied to  
46 permit renewal, or an annual thing, where, when you renew your  
47 permits, you turn it in, or another thing that staff brought up  
48 was, quarterly, randomly sample 30 percent of the fishing fleet,

1 and hand out these surveys, and have them send them back, and so  
2 there was a little discussion about how it would be done, and we  
3 left it vague, because, to be honest with you, that's more of  
4 the agency, and the council's, purview of which way we go with  
5 it, but removing it from the reporting was the main thing.

6  
7 They weren't against giving the data, but, in the manner in  
8 which it was being collected, it was burdensome, and they were  
9 concerned about it, and I think that the permit owner, or the  
10 vessel owner, should be the one responsible for economic  
11 surveys, and not the captain, or the operator, if they are  
12 different, if that makes sense.

13  
14 The next one was to ask NOAA Fisheries and the council to  
15 explore some options to address permit renewal issues that  
16 maintains the integrity of the for-hire data collection program  
17 and provides some flexibility for program participants.

18  
19 This motion was brought up because there was people, in the  
20 beginning of the implementation, that -- As you know, we had  
21 some that were not participating, and there was a lawsuit  
22 involved, and people were dragging their feet, and they were  
23 coming to find out that, when they went to renew their permits,  
24 they weren't able to renew, because they did not have these  
25 reports turned in, their no-fishing reports or fishing reports  
26 or what have you.

27  
28 The intent of this motion was more or less to kind of soften the  
29 permit renewal process and to allow some time for it to be --  
30 For those who weren't heavily involved in the process, to allow  
31 some time to keep it up, but not at the expense of the integrity  
32 of the program. It was a vague discussion, and it's a vague  
33 motion. I don't think it has -- That it doesn't have merit, but  
34 I think public comment would probably speak to that, to the  
35 people who made the motion, which are here, and I've seen them.

36  
37 I think the big thing is they just wanted to be able to have  
38 some of the people in the fleet not feel like they were trying -  
39 - Some of them felt like it was very authoritative, which it  
40 should be to maintain the integrity, but I think some of them  
41 would have liked maybe a little bit better bedside manner on  
42 that, if you would. I know that was a vague explanation, but it  
43 was vaguely spoken about.

44  
45 The next motion was to recommend the council to use industry  
46 outreach and be part of the development and implementation plan,  
47 such as the port ambassador program. Some of these things, like  
48 the multiple hail-outs, the equipment failure protocol, and the

1 things that we were actually working on to create -- To fix  
2 issues we had with SEFHIER, and we feel that like, if the  
3 industry was more involved in the development end, at the agency  
4 level, then we could help some of these issues that we had with  
5 SEFHIER before they even get started.

6  
7 If somebody would have been sitting in that planning meeting and  
8 they said, okay, every time the boat moves, you have to hail-  
9 out, and a guy from south Florida could have said, hey, that's  
10 like five times a day for me, and we would have had that already  
11 addressed before the implementation would have happened, and, as  
12 you know, I was one of the port ambassadors, and we did work  
13 hard on the implementation plan, but we realized, pretty  
14 quickly, if we would have been more involved in the development,  
15 and not just the implementation, then things would have rolled  
16 out a lot smoother, or they wouldn't have come out until we had  
17 them ironed out.

18  
19 The next motion was to recommend to the council to maintain the  
20 component of the SEFHIER program that allowed for safe dockage  
21 before submitting a report and offloading fish. If you  
22 remember, in the beginning, everybody talked about thirty  
23 minutes before landing.

24  
25 Folks in smaller boats, rough weather, stuff like that, were  
26 talking about how they wished they could just get to the dock  
27 before they do anything, and, in SEFHIER, that's what we did.  
28 We made it to where you couldn't offload your fish before you  
29 submitted -- Until you submitted your report. The AP was just  
30 pushing at the fact that they liked that part of the SEFHIER  
31 component, and that's what they were trying to display here.

32  
33 The next motion was to recommend the council explore the  
34 following validation efforts to ensure that our data can be used  
35 to reduce scientific uncertainty, and management uncertainty,  
36 and be used in a stock assessment passing peer review, with the  
37 following tools: 1)hail-out (trip declaration); 2)logbook;  
38 3)dockside intercepts; 4)explore trip validation options, such  
39 as effort validation button, which would capture GPS coordinates  
40 of the device, and this would be required to be hit by the  
41 captain after the trip declaration is made, and before the trip  
42 report was put in, while still seaward of the demarcation lines  
43 or a geofence option; 5)no fish reports required, only weekly,  
44 like currently in the Southeast Regional Headboat Survey,  
45 meaning, if you did not fish at all in the week, you would have  
46 to do a no-fish report, and, if you fished one day during the  
47 week, you wouldn't be required a no-fish report. That motion  
48 passed unanimously, with no opposition.

1  
2 Going to Item Number 4 on this list, there was some discussion,  
3 and we discussed deeply, with the staff and the AP members,  
4 about what the tradeoff was going to be. Since VMS was no  
5 longer going to be part of this, what could we do to fill that  
6 void, and maintain that effort, that effort monitoring, and so  
7 things came up.

8  
9 We spoke with some of the people from -- Like VESL was at the  
10 meeting, and we spoke with them beforehand, and we talked about  
11 like a validation button, and you show up for a trip, and you  
12 declare your trip, and say it's a six-hour, and it leaves at six  
13 o'clock, and the app could then have a validation button on it,  
14 and so you go to sea, and, you know, we're trying to prove this  
15 trip happened, and everybody is worried about the random  
16 pinging, and the fishing spots and all that stuff.

17  
18 By having a validation button, the operator of the vessel would  
19 have the ability to decide where the validation occurs. It  
20 would allow the operator to have the ability to validate the  
21 trip when they wanted to, and, you know, with the pinging, and  
22 the worrying about fishing spots, it would be really easy for  
23 someone to leave their fishing spot, and, while they're  
24 traveling to their next one, hit their validate button, and  
25 their proprietary information is not out on -- You know, not  
26 being released.

27  
28 That was one option, and another was geofences, to basically  
29 draw a line along the coastline, and, once the app releases that  
30 you're outside it, it timestamps that geofence when you go  
31 through it, and it timestamps it when it comes back, and none of  
32 your GPS information is given out. The agency would only get a  
33 report of when the geofence was broke, and that would allow the  
34 effort validation to happen, along with the harvest report, and  
35 maybe it's both of them. Maybe it's geofence and a validate  
36 button.

37  
38 One of the concerns was, with a validation button, the captain  
39 forgetting to hit it. I spoke with some of the app -- With the  
40 app maker, and they said they could definitely make it where it  
41 would pop-up, like, hey, you have one hour to validate, you  
42 know, to give them enough time, but, if they forget to, the app  
43 would validate anyway, but they would be notified that it would  
44 be happening, and so these are things that we worked on, and  
45 came together on, and could find common ground on, to fill the  
46 void of what the VMS did for us in SEFHIER.

47  
48 The next motion was to recommend the council to move forward

1 with reimplementing the SEFHIER program as soon as possible with  
2 current available options, excluding vessel tracking and  
3 economic data requirements, while continuing to explore the AP  
4 recommendations to improve data integrity and usability. This  
5 motion was passed unanimously.

6  
7 I think what really is here is that this is just our industry  
8 showing that we're really ready to get back into a data  
9 collection program. There was discussion on whether that data  
10 without the -- Without the validation would be usable, but I  
11 think it just demonstrates that we want to work on something,  
12 especially in light of all the news and the data field that  
13 we've been dealing with here recently.

14  
15 The next one was to recommend the council not to move forward  
16 with a for-hire IFQ program, and I want to push back on this,  
17 and I don't know if you all were listening to it or not, but I  
18 kind of pushed back on this a little bit, and the reason why was  
19 because we -- You know, a few years ago, when we went through  
20 the 41 and 42 process, when we started that process, we were at  
21 a nine-day fishing season, okay, and we were whittled down to  
22 nothing, and we really wanted to have the opportunity to do  
23 something with the little bit of fish that we had, and it wasn't  
24 just the nine-day season, but it was a nine-day season with the  
25 next year projected at a three-day season, because we had a lot  
26 of things going on in the red snapper fishery.

27  
28 I just want to say that this program is not being set up for an  
29 IFQ fishery. Whether we even knew what an IFQ or not was, we  
30 believed that our industry should be stewards of this resource  
31 that we're getting to use, and that this data collection program  
32 makes us better at that. It's not being used for an IFQ system,  
33 and it's not intended for an IFQ system, and it's not on our  
34 radar, and unless -- In my opinion, unless I get whittled down  
35 to like a week of a season, on any species, I'm not going to  
36 bring up wanting to find different ways of being managed, but,  
37 when you're whittled down to nothing, that's what led to us  
38 talking about IFQs in the for-hire industry.

39  
40 That's not what this is intended for, and, to be honest with  
41 you, we get a data collection system running, and we get buy-in  
42 from this industry, and we become part of something, and we  
43 manage these fish better, we should never get whittled down to  
44 that little amount ever again, you know, and so I just wanted to  
45 be clear about that.

46  
47 All right, and that was it. That's how we led our meeting, and  
48 so it was a very -- Everybody that was at that meeting worked

1 really hard to come up with ideas, and I prefaced it really well  
2 that we can come up with stuff that we want to see explored for  
3 our industry, but that doesn't necessarily mean that you support  
4 it, and so I explained to the participants that this is all  
5 about the ideas we want to see worked on for our data collection  
6 system, and I think that kind of put everybody at-ease that this  
7 isn't going to be contentious, and this is what do you want to  
8 see, and what do you want this data collection to look like, and  
9 I think everybody did a real good job of ensuring that they put  
10 their differences aside and tried to find -- To be helpful and  
11 be sincere in what the future of our data will look like, and so  
12 I appreciate the opportunity, and thank you for the AP and  
13 allowing us to work on this.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. I've got a couple of people in the  
16 queue, but I'm going to backtrack a minute, because I did not  
17 identify who was on this committee, and so, if I may, Mr. Chair,  
18 and so the committee is myself, Susan Boggs, as chair, Captain  
19 Ed Walker as vice chair, Dr. Kesley Banks, Chris Schieble, Dave  
20 Donaldson, J.D. Dugas, Bob Gill, Dr. C.J. Sweetman, Michael  
21 McDermott, Dakus Geeslin, General Joe Spraggins, Andy  
22 Strelcheck, and Troy Williamson. Jim, hang out for a little  
23 bit, and I think we've got a couple of questions. The first one  
24 is Dr. Banks.

25  
26 **DR. KESLEY BANKS:** Hi, Jim. Thanks for giving us that update.  
27 With the discussions at the AP, looking at these validation  
28 efforts, was there one in particular that the AP seemed to lean  
29 more towards? You have a list of about five, or is there a  
30 couple of them?

31  
32 **MR. GREEN:** So, in SEFHIER, we had dockside intercepts, the  
33 hail-out, and the logbooks already, and so those three are kind  
34 of naturally components that we want to see in there. As far as  
35 -- Number 4 is really the one with the multiple options, in my  
36 mind.

37  
38 I don't think that we picked one that we were more advantageous  
39 to go with, because we didn't know quite what that is, and I  
40 tried to get everybody to be real -- Like don't pinpoint down in  
41 something, and we're asking this to be explored, and geofences  
42 came up during SEFHIER, when we were trying to figure out the  
43 hail-in, the multiple trip declarations, before it was struck  
44 down, and so reducing that burden, and having it to where it's  
45 only when fishing trips are -- You know, all those kind of  
46 played into it, and I think the biggest thing was that we wanted  
47 something that was certifiable.

48

1 You know, like a lot of those guys got in there, and they're  
2 like I never want anything to track me, and then, once they  
3 started getting a little bit more educated on what exactly the  
4 agency needed, they realized that this is a component they have  
5 to have, and so, to us, those were the most least burdensome,  
6 passing over a geofence or hitting a button once a fishing trip,  
7 and I think that everybody was onboard with both of those ideas,  
8 and that's why they really made it into 4.

9  
10 It's a little long-winded in that motion, but we wanted to make  
11 sure -- At the end of the day, some of these motions were a  
12 little big, but we wanted to make sure to convey exactly what we  
13 were thinking in them.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Geeslin.

16  
17 **MR. DAKUS GEESLIN:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Captain Green, I  
18 appreciate you leading up this ad hoc committee. I especially  
19 like the depredation question, and I think we could really gauge  
20 some valuable information, and I know that we hear, from our  
21 anglers in Texas, that the marine mammals, the dolphins, are  
22 just becoming more and more problematic, both inshore and  
23 offshore.

24  
25 Jim, if I'm doing the math, and this is just an observation,  
26 you're batting -- You're batting a thousand with these motions  
27 carrying with no opposition. You're fourteen-for-fourteen.  
28 That leads me to believe that you should probably chair other  
29 committees, but, in all seriousness, that's not necessarily  
30 reflective of what we've heard over the last couple of years in  
31 public testimony from our charter-for-hire representatives, and  
32 what do you make of this? What's going on? Are you that great  
33 of a committee chair, or has the sentiment changed within the  
34 community, or what's going on?

35  
36 **MR. GREEN:** First off, I want to say that -- Like I appreciate  
37 the accolade, but it was everybody in the meeting. Like, you  
38 know, everybody showed up with a sincerity, hat in hand and  
39 wanting to figure out and be more educated, and I think -- I  
40 think you can understand, and anybody at this table can  
41 understand, that, when you sit at this table, and you're  
42 presented with facts, and then you go in and try to craft  
43 motions, all the noise, all the boogeyman stories, all the other  
44 stuff kind of fades away, and you're faced with facts, and the  
45 agency being -- You're educated on what the agency can do, and  
46 what they need, and your preconceived notion of what you want,  
47 and I think everybody just did a real good job of coming  
48 together to -- Like I said, I prefaced this that this is -- If



1 you vote for one of these motions, it doesn't mean that you  
2 support that being -- Like we're not solving all the problems of  
3 the world today.

4  
5 This is just things we want to see fleshed out, and I think it  
6 kind of lightened the tone with everybody, and then everybody  
7 was a little bit more open to hear what the agency needed, or  
8 what their limitations were, and I think we kind of came  
9 together, and we didn't get bogged down in what -- You know,  
10 what one person wants or not, because I told them we're just not  
11 there yet, and they can save that for the second and third  
12 meeting.

13  
14 The second and third meeting will probably be a little tougher,  
15 once you iron out some of these, when staff comes up and tells  
16 us exactly what that means, you know, and so I don't think I'm a  
17 wizard of any sort, and I just think that the people you put on  
18 that AP that showed up were really willing to do something good,  
19 and they realized that SEFHIER was good, but they wanted to  
20 correct the heartburn that they had, which was tracking and the  
21 economic data.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Captain Walker.

24  
25 **MR. ED WALKER:** So, Mr. Geeslin, to your question somewhat, I  
26 think that the unanimous vote in favor of shark and dolphin  
27 depredation reporting is somewhat misleading to what actually  
28 happened at the meeting.

29  
30 The idea was brought forth, and it's mandatory add to the list  
31 that we're trying to make shorter, and not longer, and there was  
32 significant opposition, among the group, to this concept, from  
33 multiple states in the region, and so the idea was then changed  
34 to not making it a mandatory idea, and making it voluntary,  
35 which essentially eliminated opposition in the room, and so I  
36 just wanted to clarify that -- Don't be misled by a unanimous  
37 vote in favor of shark and dolphin reporting by this unanimous  
38 vote, because that was only voted unanimous as a voluntary, do-  
39 it-if-you-want-to-or-don't vote, because it would have been a  
40 failed vote, by my read in the room at the time, if it had gone  
41 through as mandatory.

42  
43 **MR. GREEN:** If I may, and I didn't mean to mislead, or  
44 misrepresent what it was, and it said "optional", and that's why  
45 I said there was some contention, and I wanted to make it, but  
46 that was never the intent, to mislead, and the "optional" part  
47 is the reason why it passed, because, again, we did have  
48 multiple discussions, and there were some very opposed, some

1 very concerned, and some that were okay with it, to back up what  
2 Captain Walker is saying.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. I need to get Andy a red flag down  
5 there, because, obviously, I cannot see him. Mr. Strelcheck.

6  
7 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I have really long arms that I will try to  
8 extend them a little farther. A couple of comments. With  
9 regard to Dakus' comment, I think my read of the situation is  
10 also, one, the group came prepared to work with one another, but  
11 we have a lot of lessons learned, right, from the SEFHIER  
12 program, and so hindsight is twenty-twenty, and so the ability  
13 to have gone into the discussion, with the experience of  
14 operating under a program that now no longer exists, and knowing  
15 what you want to change about it, really helps incentivize  
16 people to think through the program.

17  
18 Jim, I really appreciate your leadership in chairing that, and I  
19 did have a couple of questions about the motions. One, the trip  
20 declaration motion specifically states only for for-hire trips,  
21 and I know, when we were working through trip declarations  
22 through this council, a year or two ago, I think we landed on  
23 any fishing trip, both charter or non-charter, as well as non-  
24 charter -- Non-fishing trips, right, and so can you talk me  
25 through, in terms of it kind of being just only for charter  
26 fishing trips?

27  
28 **MR. GREEN:** Well, I think a lot of people wanted to streamline  
29 it, and make it really easy, and, you know, to them, even when  
30 we were trying to fix the multiple hail-out issues that we had  
31 with SEFHIER when it was implemented, I think that they just --  
32 Like there's no reason to -- Their idea was that there's no  
33 reason to turn it in if I'm not fishing.

34  
35 Some people think that, if there's commerce being conducted, we  
36 should capture that, because it has to do with the economic  
37 impact, and I think that's really up to you, and the reason why  
38 it said that was because that was the will of us, and we feel  
39 like that you shouldn't have to turn in a declaration if you  
40 were not going fishing under for-hire, and I think that, you  
41 know, we did that to express what we wanted.

42  
43 Now, what you want and what you get are two different things,  
44 and it might end up being if it's fishing, and, you know, that's  
45 up to the will of this council, and what direction you give us  
46 to begin to input again, but, to me, that was it, and we're  
47 trying to show that we wanted this to be less intrusive, and  
48 about the fish, which is why depredation and some other things

1 we were talking about -- Like, under the discards were  
2 considered, and the economic data and stuff like that was pulled  
3 out of it, because it needs to be about the fish.

4

5 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Andy, is it to that point?

6

7 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and so I have one more question, but kind  
8 of a follow-up to that, and I made this comment during the  
9 advisory panel meeting, right, and I think we, as an agency,  
10 working with the council, need to do a better job of explaining  
11 why we're collecting data, but I also appreciate the AP  
12 whittling down the list of data variables that is being  
13 collected, and so I think one of those question-marks, I will  
14 say, is with the trip declaration and the why would it be  
15 important to collect something more than just for-hire fishing  
16 trips, or not, right, and so a conversation to come.

17 s

18 The other question I had, and I don't recall if you talked about  
19 it or not, and you mentioned, obviously, with the economic data,  
20 the burden on the kind of permit holder, and not the captain,  
21 who may not know that information, and was there any discussion  
22 about the new requirements for disaster determinations, and now  
23 being able to include the for-hire industry in that, and the  
24 benefits of collecting economic data for disaster  
25 determinations?

26

27 **MR. GREEN:** There was. There was talk about disasters, and  
28 there was talk about, you know, hurricanes and things like that  
29 that we talked about, and Assane was so gracious to educate us  
30 exactly what that economic does in the Section 3 of most of our  
31 fishery management plans, the economic impact, and I think  
32 people understood it, but I think, especially nowadays, in this  
33 world of people -- You know, with technology and everything  
34 being so intrusive -- I mean, we talked about a Brazilian  
35 steakhouse at lunch, and, when I sat down, I got an email about  
36 Brazilian steakhouses.

37

38 I think the fact that there is so much intrusion -- I think some  
39 people just don't feel it's any of your business, you know what  
40 I mean, and I think you have some like that, some that don't  
41 want to give it up, and some that are okay with it, and I think  
42 that's -- It doesn't have to do with one place or another, and I  
43 think that's just the sentiment of being an American in the  
44 south, and so we did talk about it some, but I think some people  
45 just stood on their principle with that.

46

47 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Dr. Sweetman.

48

1 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Andy touched on one of my questions there too  
2 about fishery disaster, and I think it's a balance, and I think  
3 for-hire was not previously eligible for fishery disaster, and  
4 so I think that is something that you all should probably  
5 consider. Getting past the intrusiveness part of it, I think  
6 that there is some purpose to that that can actually be  
7 beneficial to the overall for-hire sector, and I just wanted to  
8 throw that out there.

9  
10 Also, the other point I wanted to make is, as you guys are  
11 navigating this, and so the South Atlantic is having some  
12 significant challenges with their SEFHIER program, and I think  
13 their compliance rate is around 40 percent, and it's basically  
14 not even useful for management purposes, and so, as you guys are  
15 kind of trying to balance what should and shouldn't be in there,  
16 keep that in the back of your mind, that utility of the data is  
17 going to be incredibly important there for us too, and so I just  
18 kind of wanted to throw that out there.

19  
20 **MR. GREEN:** To that, real quick, I think everybody -- I think  
21 everybody understands now how important -- That it's important.  
22 I think it's the way you collect it. Some of our discussions at  
23 dinner, after the meeting and stuff like that, were, you know,  
24 like would you be onboard if the survey like had ranges, and  
25 like, instead of me writing down that I made \$222,000, have it  
26 in ranges, where it's a little bit vague, but it allows -- It  
27 takes off that they have to write down specifically what might  
28 be held against them on a tax return, or something like that,  
29 where I made between -- Did you make between \$200,000 and  
30 \$225,000, or \$200,000 and \$250,000, or \$250,000 to \$300,000, and  
31 create some ranges, and don't make them give you exact numbers,  
32 and just take an economic survey and collect, you know, whatever  
33 is applicable ranges to be able to still get that information  
34 and make it useful.

35  
36 Then the other thing, to your comment, was that everybody at  
37 that table was very much in agreeance that they don't want to be  
38 doing anything that's not going to be used, and so it is very --  
39 The economic thing is a little weighty, but everybody is very  
40 much squared-up that, if we're going to do this, it needs to be  
41 worth something.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Ms. Geeslin.

44  
45 **MR. GEESLIN:** This may be just a -- I appreciate it, Madam  
46 Chair, and a point of clarification to Dr. Sweetman's comment,  
47 and this may be just a question, but I recall, when we process  
48 CARES Act disaster relief funds, that charter-for-hire were

1 specifically eligible for those, and I believe there's been some  
2 other fishery disaster relief funding that was available to  
3 charter-for-hire, and is that -- Am I off here?

4  
5 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Dr. Sweetman.

6  
7 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I can't speak to the specific disasters that  
8 you're referring to, and I just know that law has recently  
9 changed, this last year, that allows for for-hire to be included  
10 into the federal fishery disaster process, and is that correct,  
11 Andy?

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** That was my understanding as well, and I think  
14 there's been some one-offs along the way, but now we're up there  
15 with the commercial sector. Any more questions for Captain  
16 Green?

17  
18 He's not leaving, and don't leave the room, but we'll let Dr.  
19 Stephen, if there's no more questions, go ahead and give her  
20 presentation, and so I don't know what time it is over there,  
21 but we'll let her kind of move on, and then what I would like to  
22 do is come back and go, one-by-one, through these motions and  
23 determine if there is -- I have talked to Dr. Hollensead, and  
24 we'll look at some that are -- Some we could probably move  
25 pretty quickly with, and go ahead and get into the document, and  
26 some that we may have to request -- To have some discussion,  
27 maybe getting some white papers and more information on, but to  
28 try to get this ball rolling, as they say, and so, Dr. Stephen.

29  
30 **PRESENTATION: SUMMARY FROM SEFHIER**

31  
32 **DR. JESSICA STEPHEN:** Thank you. At the last council meeting,  
33 there were a number of questions for some data and analysis.  
34 Before I go over those results of the requested analysis, I  
35 wanted to just start off with some analysis about the SEFHIER  
36 data.

37  
38 Some of our data caveats are the analysis that we are using is  
39 raw SEFHIER data, and so it's not accounting for any missed or  
40 non-reported trips. The SEFHIER data has not been calibrated or  
41 validated against the MRIP data. The SEFHIER data only includes  
42 federal data, whereas MRIP includes all the for-hire data, which  
43 includes state-only permitted charter trips. Then the following  
44 SEFHIER effort data is provided in units of vessel trips,  
45 whereas MRIP effort is given in units of angler trips, and what  
46 this means is these analyses are not directly comparable to  
47 MRIP.

1 The next few slides are addressing questions that came from the  
2 October council meeting, and the question was sort of along the  
3 lines of can you tell us how many vessels were participating in  
4 each of the fisheries, and so, in order to answer that question,  
5 what we did is perform a series of analysis, and, on this slide,  
6 we're looking at an approximation, or what we consider kind of a  
7 relative for-hire fishing effort for the 2022 data.

8  
9 Now, keep in mind this is relative effort, using the raw SEFHIER  
10 data, and so, again, it cannot be directly compared to MRIP, but  
11 we can use this to get a qualitative sense of where we are with  
12 any depletion issues that would be occurring in any of the  
13 fisheries.

14  
15 On this figure, what we're showing is the total number of trips  
16 where the captains said that they are going out to target a  
17 species and then looking at did they actually catch that species  
18 that they said they were targeting, and so, on this graph, the  
19 trips here really are logbooks, as each logbook represents a  
20 trip, and the number of logbooks is shown along the X-axis.

21  
22 Keep in mind this does not show all the trips that may have  
23 caught the species, and, again, these are just the trips that  
24 said they were targeting the species. The bars in this figure,  
25 which are color-coded by the different species, show the number  
26 caught of that species, and then the vertical black lines that  
27 are beside each bar are the number of logbooks reporting that  
28 they intended to catch those species.

29  
30 When you're looking at this, when you divide those two numbers,  
31 the total logbooks that actually caught the species versus the  
32 total number of logbooks that said they intended to catch the  
33 species, you get a ratio, and that ratio is shown there beside  
34 the bar.

35  
36 If you take that ratio by a hundred times, you can see, for  
37 example, in red grouper, that 91 percent of the trips that said  
38 they intended to catch red grouper actually caught red grouper,  
39 and so, just to let you know, we picked these species -- They're  
40 not fully comprehensive, and we just looked at the top-caught  
41 species, based on the ACLs, and we took some insights from both  
42 SERO and council staff, in order to pick the species here, and I  
43 recognize there's a lot on this graph, and we can revisit it  
44 later, if you want, and we just wanted to give a feel for where  
45 we were within the different fisheries.

46  
47 What we did do is realize that we had to have a red snapper on a  
48 separate graph, and so the same graph as you saw before, but

1 this is just for red snapper, and this is due to the magnitude  
2 of the number of logbooks for red snapper. It's significantly  
3 larger than any of the other species, and so we didn't want the  
4 other species to kind of be narrowed down within the graph, and  
5 hidden behind all the red snapper, and so we did decide to show  
6 it differently.

7  
8 On these new few slides, we're taking the information that we  
9 showed you before and breaking it down to smaller chunks. In  
10 this case, we're kind of looking at where they are by the  
11 different quarters within the species, and so the same concept  
12 as before, and the X-axis is still showing the number of  
13 targeted trips, but here we've broken it down by quarter, so  
14 that you can get a feel for different seasonality as we're  
15 moving through these fisheries and during the year.

16  
17 The top figure is showing January, February, and March in that  
18 first quarter of 2022, and then the second figure shows the next  
19 quarter, April, May, and June, and so on and so forth.

20  
21 Just, again, to give an example, if we're looking at red grouper  
22 in that first quarter, in the top figure, you can see there were  
23 750 trips that said they intended to go out and target red  
24 grouper, and you see that, as you go, it picks up a bit, to  
25 almost 1,200 trips when you're in the second quarter, and keep  
26 in mind that, if you sum up all the quarters from here, you will  
27 get the total sum that you saw in the previous slides.

28  
29 Again, there's a lot of different species here, and information  
30 being shown, and so feel free to kind of digest this, and we can  
31 revisit these graphs later, if needed.

32  
33 Once again, we had to separate red snapper out here, and you  
34 can, again, see where red snapper is most prevalent, in the  
35 second and third quarters, as you're moving forward, and what we  
36 saw is that, in the first and fourth quarters, the fishery is  
37 mostly closed, and then it really picks up in the second  
38 quarter. We have around 6,500 trips, and then about 7,500 trips  
39 get shown in the third quarter.

40  
41 Again, this is a similar graph as the ones before, but, this  
42 time, what we're not doing is looking at the number of trips,  
43 and we're actually looking at the number of vessels, and so how  
44 many different vessels were targeting each of these species, and  
45 so a similar layout as before within our quarters. We have the  
46 different quarters, and the different species, but the bars, in  
47 this case, represent the number of vessels.

48

1 Again, I will use red grouper, and you can see, for red grouper  
2 in that first quarter, we had around 116 vessels that went out.  
3 Overall, they took the 759 trips that we saw two slides ago, and  
4 that's how you can combine the information between these two  
5 slides, to get a feel for where effort is within the fishery.

6  
7 Likewise, again, we'll see here, for red snapper, we can see the  
8 second and third quarters each had about 500 vessels that were  
9 out fishing for it, and those were the ones that were making  
10 around the 6,500 and 7,500 trips within those two quarters.

11  
12 The information we have in this slide is presented a little bit  
13 differently, and so I want to take some time to walk you through  
14 it. Here, what we're seeing is the number of retained, along  
15 the Y-axis, and, along the X-axis, you have the different  
16 months, and, once again, you have these for each of the  
17 fisheries. Keep in mind that the gray boxes that are visible  
18 there are when the fishery is closed for those different time  
19 periods, and so you need to keep that in mind when looking at  
20 these graphs.

21  
22 In order to interpret this information, for example, we'll take  
23 black grouper, up in the top-left-side of this figure, and you  
24 can see that the fishery is closed in the first part of 2022,  
25 and then it opens up in May, and the retained catch bar jumps up  
26 there quite a bit, and you can see that the peak retained catch  
27 is occurring around June of 2022, and so, once again, a lot of  
28 information shown here, and, if you feel the need to come back  
29 to it, we're happy to try and answer some questions about these.

30  
31 Once again, we did keep red snapper separate, because, again,  
32 the magnitude of scale within that. As you can see, the fishery  
33 was closed at the beginning and the end of the year, and, when  
34 the fishery was open in June, we see that retained catch jumps  
35 all the way up, close to around 80,000 red snapper being  
36 retained that month, and, if you remember correctly, that was  
37 also equivalent to those amount of vessels that were fishing  
38 within that quarter.

39  
40 I'm going to switch gears here a little bit, and so, for this  
41 question, the council -- At the last council meeting, the  
42 question had been asked of what can you tell us about areas of  
43 non-compliance within the Gulf, and so, in order to answer this  
44 question, we looked at compliance state-by-state, and, within  
45 each state, it's assigned -- We looked at the for-hire vessels  
46 using the vessels homeport that is listed within their permit  
47 application.

48



1 Also, in each figure, each label is showing the state  
2 abbreviation, and then under that is the number of non-compliant  
3 vessels out of the total permitted vessels within that state.  
4 When you divide those two numbers, you get the ratio that is  
5 shown there, and, again, multiply that ratio by 100 percent to  
6 get it at a percentage point.

7  
8 What we also hope to do is color-code the map, and so the legend  
9 at the bottom does show the difference in scale, where the  
10 darkest color represents the state with the lowest non-  
11 compliance ratio, and the lightest color represents states with  
12 higher non-compliance.

13  
14 Taking a look at the map, you can see that Alabama, for example,  
15 has the highest percentage of non-compliance, at 26 percent,  
16 but, when we look at it, Florida and Louisiana are close behind  
17 that, and Texas and Mississippi are just a little bit lower,  
18 having 15 to 11 percent of the vessels being non-compliant.

19  
20 Another question that we received at the last council meeting  
21 was asking for information on vessel movement, and,  
22 specifically, the questions were centered around can you tell us  
23 how many vessels moved from state-to-state to fish and how many  
24 vessels fish in both the Gulf and the South Atlantic throughout  
25 the year, and so there's a number of different ways that we  
26 could think about answering this question.

27  
28 What we ended up doing was using the vessel's homeport to  
29 evaluate the vessel movement. With that, I do have to say there  
30 is some caveats to consider within this analysis. By using the  
31 vessel's homeport -- We captured that from the permit  
32 application with the data, and, when we pulled the analysis, we  
33 pulled the permit information from January, which might have  
34 meant that there was some movement between when we pulled the  
35 permit data and when they actually took the trip earlier in  
36 2022, and so just keep that in mind, that there could be some  
37 biases within this output.

38  
39 Also, not all the homeports that we have listed in our permit  
40 applications are actually within coastal counties, and so we had  
41 to make some assumptions from that, as we were looking at the  
42 analysis for movement. In Florida, we did consider the  
43 homeports as being Gulf homeports, and then, the inland counties  
44 that were closer to the Gulf, we also considered Gulf homeports,  
45 but then any of those in Florida that were closer to the South  
46 Atlantic, or on the South Atlantic coast, we then considered  
47 South Atlantic homeports for those analysis.

48

1 Finally, the question was really about how many vessels are  
2 doing this, and so, here, the analysis is by vessel. It is not  
3 necessarily by trip, and so, if one vessel is being counted  
4 within these -- If they have only one trip outside that homeport  
5 region.

6  
7 Looking at this, we developed this into having three distinct  
8 questions within this bullet point to work through, and so the  
9 first question was how many vessels have a different homeport  
10 county than the end-port county, and so we were looking there by  
11 quarter, and we could see that there was a slight change over  
12 quarter. We had higher values in Quarter 2 and Quarter 3, where  
13 they differed from their homeport county to the end-port, which  
14 is where they were landing.

15  
16 The higher values in the second and third quarter do need a  
17 little bit more analysis, but one of the things we can think  
18 about is there might be an increase in either participation in  
19 the for-hire fishery within those peak months, being more of a  
20 tourist season, or there might be an increase in vessel  
21 relocating to areas that have more tourist hotspots.

22  
23 The next question we looked at is how many vessels have a  
24 different homeport state than their end-port state, and so  
25 taking that concept earlier, but moving it larger to the state  
26 category, and, once again, we see a similar trend, where we have  
27 more movement of vessels in Quarter 2 and Quarter 3. In  
28 general, most of these differences were between adjacent states,  
29 and so there wasn't any very large geographical differences.  
30 The few larger geographical differences that we saw were most  
31 likely attributed, again, to pulling the permit data in January  
32 of 2024 and looking at where vessels were homeported, or using  
33 the SEFHIER application in 2022.

34  
35 Then the last question was home many vessels have a different  
36 homeport region, that being the Gulf versus a different end-port  
37 region, and so we're really looking at comparing the Gulf to the  
38 South Atlantic, and, in here, we saw that, in 2022, we  
39 definitely had three vessels that had a different homeport  
40 region than their end-port region. The final analysis in this  
41 is that we excluded Monroe County, which Monroe County can be  
42 both the South Atlantic and the Gulf, when doing the analysis.

43  
44 All right, and then, finally, to answer kind of the question of  
45 how many vessels are fishing in both the Gulf and the South  
46 Atlantic, what we did is did a count of the Gulf for-hire  
47 permitted vessels and if they made at least one trip in the  
48 Gulf, versus at least one trip in the South Atlantic, for the

1 analysis between those two.

2  
3 As you can see here, we quantified the trip location using the  
4 reported area, which is a required field within our SEFHIER  
5 application, and it is just supplied once for each trip, and so  
6 this is at the trip level, and it's using the lat and longitude  
7 coordinates.

8  
9 To answer this question of how many vessels fish in both the  
10 Gulf and South Atlantic, you can see that, on average, we have  
11 about fourteen vessels taking trips that end in both the Gulf  
12 and the South Atlantic, and those occurred in four different  
13 quarters, as we were looking through. Now, when we mapped out  
14 these latitude and longitudes of all the trips, they typically  
15 occurred off the Florida coast, and most of them are actually  
16 centered around the Keys, which tends to make a lot of sense as  
17 we're thinking about where the dual South Atlantic and Gulf for-  
18 hire-permitted vessels are. I think that's all for that one.

19  
20 Again, I would just like to really thank the SEFHIER team that's  
21 working with this. I particularly want to thank Michelle Masi,  
22 who couldn't be here to give this conversation and talk to you,  
23 as well as Jenny, Anna, Dominique, and Dave Records from our  
24 SERO center. Again, all of our Gulf for-hire electronic  
25 reporting IPT members, and, once again, our SEFHIER constituents  
26 who helped provide this information to us. At this moment, I'm  
27 going to try and answer any questions you have.

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Gill.

30  
31 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, Jessica, for that  
32 presentation. If we go back to Slide 9, my question is,  
33 utilizing red grouper as the primary example, is it fair to  
34 interpret that as we have a substantial amount of illegal  
35 activity in February and March, and maybe a little bit in the  
36 September through December timeframe, or is there some other  
37 rationale?

38  
39 **DR. STEPHEN:** I think, in this -- Keep in mind that what this is  
40 showing is retained catch, and so there could be errors in the  
41 data, where they meant to have it discarded, versus retained,  
42 and so we haven't gone through the SEFHIER logbooks to kind of  
43 determine the accuracy of the kept versus discarded portion, and  
44 so that could play a factor into it. It could also play into  
45 the fact that there were people who were not fishing  
46 appropriately. We would need to dig more in, to give you a  
47 better, more definitive answer.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Gill.  
2  
3 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and so the second question  
4 is, on Slide 11, and I'm not looking for an analysis here, but,  
5 if you did one, did you try to correlate the non-compliance by  
6 species? For example, without any knowledge, since red snapper  
7 is a species of interest, my suspicion would be that the bulk of  
8 the non-compliance was red snapper. Did you look at that at  
9 all, and, if so, could you share the results?  
10  
11 **DR. STEPHEN:** I will say that we did not look at it by what  
12 species were also within those non-compliant reports. I will  
13 also say that the compliance, again, was looking at a broader  
14 scheme, and so, if you did turn in a logbook, whether it was on-  
15 time or late, we did count it towards compliance.  
16  
17 We could certainly investigate using those vessels who are  
18 compliant or not and looking into the logbooks by the catch, to  
19 determine some species-specific relationships. We can even,  
20 most likely, do this by quarter, as we did in the other graphs.  
21  
22 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** A follow-up on that. On that Slide 11, because  
23 I was going to ask about this, and these are people that  
24 reported, that the report wasn't complete, incomplete, or is  
25 this people that just didn't report?  
26  
27 **DR. STEPHEN:** These are people that did not report, and so it  
28 could be that we had a declaration with no logbook towards it,  
29 or we were -- Again, apologies that I don't know all the details  
30 of how Michelle did this analysis, but, if they reported late,  
31 we did consider it then compliant within this slide.  
32  
33 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay, and so, to that point, and correct me if  
34 I'm wrong, and I was trying to find the actual number in Dr.  
35 Masi's presentation in October, where I thought the charter-for-  
36 hire have like an 83 percent compliance, but, if I do the math  
37 here, it looks like it's a 20 percent compliance, and am I  
38 misunderstanding something?  
39  
40 **DR. STEPHEN:** So this is of the noncompliant vessels, and so I  
41 think, if you would take all these numbers -- Sorry. This is  
42 looking at the number of vessels, and Michelle's presentation  
43 before I think was looking at the number of trips, and so, when  
44 we're looking at vessels, that's combining all their trips  
45 together, and if they were compliant or noncompliant in its  
46 entirety, and so keep that mind when comparing the two different  
47 graphs. Typically, I suggest that compliance within the  
48 logbooks is the better metric.

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** I've confused myself completely on that  
3 question, and so, for that, I do apologize. Mr. Geeslin, get me  
4 out of this.  
5

6 **MR. GEESLIN:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I was going to ask a  
7 similar-natured question, and it prompted an additional  
8 question, in my mind. Jessica, when we think about these  
9 violations, and the report or non-report, it sounds like it's  
10 all binned into one category, and I guess I was thinking this  
11 may be characterized as minor, moderate, or severe violations,  
12 and that doesn't appear to be the case, but are these -- Is this  
13 something that is easily correctable, through some education, or  
14 how do we get -- How do we work towards achieving, you know, 100  
15 percent compliance, and is that something that, you know, we, as  
16 a council, should be embracing and supporting?  
17

18 **DR. STEPHEN:** That's a really good question. When we're looking  
19 at how to achieve better compliance, the number-one goal for us,  
20 normally, is outreach and education, and so there are times when  
21 someone may not comply because they're not aware of the  
22 regulation, or they're not aware of some nuance within the  
23 regulation, and so what we've been trying to do, throughout the  
24 SEFHIER program, is give calls to those people, do that  
25 education and outreach, right, and we don't want to fine a  
26 fisherman for not complying immediately, when it could be,  
27 really, just they were unaware, and, as soon as they are aware,  
28 they came into compliance.  
29

30 That said, we've had quite a few, a number, conversations, and  
31 phone calls, with some fishermen that just did not want to be  
32 compliant, and those are a little bit harder, but education and  
33 outreach is not going to solve that as we move forward. What we  
34 see, here in the Gulf as well, is that we did have the kind of  
35 requirement attached to your permit renewal to come into  
36 compliance at least before your permit is renewed, and that did  
37 seem to be a measure that really worked well, because of the  
38 limited-access nature of the permits and the fact that, if you  
39 could renew your permit, you would not be allowed to go out  
40 fishing.  
41

42 I will say that, in general, one of the things, as we move  
43 forward with the program, might be to look at different levels  
44 of violation, and so coming into compliance before your permit  
45 renewal does not necessarily mean that the data will be usable  
46 for management. Michelle showed, I think in her last  
47 presentation at the council meeting, the number of late  
48 logbooks, and so what we also want to do is try to decrease that

1 margin of late logbooks, because, after a certain amount of  
2 time, there's a bias in that reporting, and it's not usable for  
3 management.

4

5 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Geeslin.

6

7 **MR. GEESLIN:** Thank you, Jessica, for the response and  
8 clarification. I have gathered that there is a trend of some  
9 repeat offenders here, and is there -- This may be a question  
10 for NOAA OLE, but is there a scalable offense where you have  
11 increased penalties for multiple violations?

12

13 **DR. STEPHEN:** I will start to answer this, and, if there's  
14 anyone from OLE to help out. In general, OLE does have  
15 different offenses throughout time, applied to most fishery  
16 regulations.

17

18 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** I don't think OLE is here, and so okay. Thank  
19 you. Captain Walker.

20

21 **MR. WALKER:** I am not positive about this, but I think maybe,  
22 when the permit renewal is based on compliance, most people I  
23 know that were holdouts, because I do know several guys that  
24 just plain said I'm never putting that stuff on my boat, and I'm  
25 not doing it, and I think maybe, this particular year, they  
26 still hadn't been dragged into compliance by that permit  
27 requirement, and I'm not sure. You would have to look at the  
28 timing, but that definitely tightened it up.

29

30 If the program was still going on, I'm fairly certain that you  
31 would have much higher compliance than this, and I also know  
32 that that's what is going on in the South Atlantic down there as  
33 well, and there is no -- There is no penalty down there. If  
34 they take your permit away in the South Atlantic, you can get  
35 another one the next year for twenty-bucks, and there's no  
36 moratorium on those permits down there.

37

38 I think maybe the 20 percent noncompliance here is related to  
39 they hadn't been forced into it by their permit renewals, and  
40 they come up on your birthday month, and there might have been a  
41 period in this year when they hadn't been forced in yet, and I'm  
42 not sure, and that's my guess.

43

44 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Anson.

45

46 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** I'm not on your committee, and thank you.  
47 Alabama seems a little high, not only in the nonreporting, but  
48 also the number of permits that have been identified. We are

1 operating with requiring charter boats, federally-permitted  
2 charter boats, to report, and we were comparing that to the NMFS  
3 permits, and there was quite a few that we reached out and  
4 contacted, and they just told us that they were not in the  
5 charter business at all, and so I was just curious whether or  
6 not, Dr. Stephen -- I know you said you've not done the  
7 analysis, but did you all look at any of that information?

8  
9 You know, there's the for-hire survey data that the commission  
10 does, that identifies charter vessels, as well as they have a  
11 directory there, where they kind of keep track of contacts with  
12 permit holders, as to the status of their vessel, and did you  
13 all look into that?

14  
15 **DR. STEPHEN:** With the limited time we had to put this together,  
16 we were simply looking at the federal permit application data,  
17 and one thing I will say though is sometimes, if they were in a  
18 certain state, and they've moved, they don't always necessarily  
19 update the homeport county, and that's something that we've  
20 found in general, looking at the analysis, and are working on  
21 outreach, to ensure that they are updating their permit  
22 application each year, particularly if they have moved  
23 somewhere.

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Anson.

26  
27 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you. Just a couple more, or one comment and a  
28 question, or two questions. Going to Mr. Gill's point about the  
29 number of fish that were reported retained out-of-season, and  
30 seeing that these -- Several of these species, you know, have  
31 ACLs, and they have a chance of meeting that ACL fairly quickly,  
32 did you all, as the agency, talk about putting a check in the  
33 app, whereby, if a species is reported as retained, that it will  
34 send an error message, or a message back to the captain,  
35 confirming that that is fact their selection? I know that can  
36 bring in some questions about whether or not that changes a  
37 person's mind to report that fish, but -- If it's actually a  
38 retained fish, it needs to be reported, but it's going to be, I  
39 think, overly burdensome for staff to try to eek out when  
40 reports are accurately reported or not, or the information is  
41 accurately reported or not, in-season, and so I'm just wondering  
42 if you all have discussed that.

43  
44 **DR. STEPHEN:** I will say there's a couple of different kind of  
45 answers to this, or caveats to point to, and so, when we're  
46 looking at information, one of the ideas is when you -- You want  
47 to limit how many errors pop up to a fisherman when they're  
48 entering information, in the sense that you want to make it

1 overly burdensome or lengthen the time it takes to enter that.

2  
3 That said, we're in collaboration with our Greater Atlantic  
4 Fisheries Regional Office, in looking at how they apply some of  
5 these validation checks to it, and what we're hoping for is to  
6 be able to build in some different critical criteria going  
7 through. With the way that technology works, is it waits until  
8 submission, and then, once it hits our database, it immediately  
9 pops in, within seconds, some warnings, or errors, about the  
10 different fields within it, and so anything that would be a  
11 required field, that wouldn't be filled out, there would be an  
12 error that would stop submission, but it would also be able to  
13 send back different errors that are in relation to different  
14 kinds of criteria that just could be a typo, or some other type  
15 of information, within that.

16  
17 That's all still a little bit of a work in progress, and it's  
18 information that we would probably like to prototype with  
19 different fishermen, to see how it works and what is the best  
20 appeal in moving forward with it.

21  
22 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Anson.

23  
24 **MR. ANSON:** I appreciate it. Thank you for that answer. Then,  
25 if you were redo any of the graphics, I would just suggest maybe  
26 looking at waves, and reporting in waves, because it would be a  
27 little bit more consistent to the data that we're looking at  
28 currently, and then, also, in that same light, why weren't the  
29 number of angler trips calculated? They do report the number of  
30 anglers on each trip, and it would be interesting just to see  
31 the number of anglers, or angler trips, that are being reported.

32  
33 **DR. STEPHEN:** So I don't have a precise answer for you on that.  
34 I know we began investigation into how to look at it, and we  
35 were limited really here, with time between the two council  
36 meetings and getting this data together, in order to move  
37 through things, and one of the things we are looking at is how  
38 to kind of understand and put this in terms where it would be a  
39 little bit more comparable to MRIP, but keep in mind that we're  
40 collecting different catch per unit efforts within these,  
41 looking at the vessels, versus the way that MRIP calculates  
42 things, but these are all avenues we're still searching to  
43 explore. We're a little limited in some of the expertise, and  
44 we're reaching out to gain some more expertise in how to do some  
45 of these analyses.

46  
47 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** All right. Seeing no other questions, and I'm  
48 just going to make a comment, and I don't know, and I'm not



1 asking you to do the analysis, Jessica, because I don't think it  
2 would be prudent, depending, I guess, on where we go with this,  
3 but, you know, there could be some non-compliance due to some of  
4 the technical issues that were being had at the beginning,  
5 especially the VMS, and is that maybe a true statement?  
6

7 **DR. STEPHEN:** That's one of the reasons we were concentrating on  
8 the 2022 time series and not going back to the 2021.  
9

10 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Thank you. Any more questions for Dr. Stephen?  
11 Mr. Strelcheck.  
12

13 **MR. STRELCHECK:** No question for Dr. Stephen, although certainly  
14 she can weigh-in if I'm incorrect, and so, first, I know there  
15 was concerns raised by Mr. Gill about those red grouper landings  
16 in February and March, and keep in mind that we do allow harvest  
17 in February and March, but it's just prohibited outside of  
18 twenty fathoms, and so those can be retained. There were small  
19 landings that were occurring outside of the season later in the  
20 year, and so I just wanted to note that.  
21

22 You know, in terms of this issue of compliance, you know, like I  
23 said earlier, there's a lot of lessons learned with implementing  
24 a program like this, and so we're gaining a lot of knowledge  
25 with regard to how we can improve the program.  
26

27 I know Jessica, and her team, have spent a tremendous amount of  
28 time, for both the Gulf and South Atlantic, in terms of  
29 improving compliance, but it is a daily effort, in terms of  
30 outreach and education and working with fishermen, and  
31 ultimately bringing OLE into the process, obviously, if people  
32 are not wanting to participate.  
33

34 With that said, I think the -- What I also want to convey is  
35 this is a snapshot in time, and 2022 is the only full year of  
36 data we really had, to me, for good data for the program, and  
37 compliance was improving throughout that entire timeframe, from  
38 what I recall, right, and so it wasn't like we had reached an  
39 asymptote, and kind of that was all we were going to get out of  
40 the fishery, and we were actually building momentum, in terms of  
41 improvements in the program and compliance.  
42

43 Obviously, we didn't get to 100 percent, but I think, if we had  
44 been able to run the program for another year or two, we would  
45 have seen these numbers change, and so just kind of keep that in  
46 mind as we move forward with evaluation of the program and what  
47 we can and can't implement.  
48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** So, Mr. Chair, we're past our breaktime, but  
2 this would probably be a good time to break, before we dive back  
3 into reviewing these motions.

4  
5 **MR. ANSON:** Sounds good to me. We'll take a short break. Let's  
6 try to do a ten-minute break.

7  
8 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)  
9

10 **RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEXT STEPS FOR THE FOR-HIRE ELECTRONIC**  
11 **REPORTING**  
12

13 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Here we go, and so I think the easiest way to  
14 do this, for the committee, is I will read the motion, and then  
15 I think we should have the discussion, albeit, and we've only  
16 got about an hour left, and see if we can give some guidance to  
17 staff, and then, of course, we'll have to discuss it at Full  
18 Council, but, Lisa, I'm assuming that, if I read the first  
19 motion, and everybody is onboard, we make a motion to accept  
20 that, or how would we -- Do we need -- How is the proper way to  
21 kind of go through this?

22  
23 **DR. HOLLENSHAD:** Madam Chair, if you want to go -- You know, if  
24 you want to go motion-by-motion, I've sort of organized the  
25 motions and things that I think could be addressed rather  
26 quickly in, you know, an initial draft of the document, and I  
27 say, generally, I think this is, you know, staff's assessment of  
28 that, and is there any recommendations to not do that, or  
29 discussion for that, and that's what we would plan. I think  
30 kind of go through that way, motion-by-motion.

31  
32 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay, and so I have Lisa's cheat sheet on these  
33 motions, and so I think we'll start with those motions, and so  
34 they won't be exactly in order, but I will -- You all I think  
35 can follow along. Bernie, do you mind bouncing around a little  
36 bit? Okay.

37  
38 Like I said, I've talked to Dr. Hollenshad about this, and, as  
39 she stated, she's kind of laid out those things that -- As I  
40 refer to as low-hanging fruit, and so we're going to start with  
41 those, and so the first one is the first motion, which is to  
42 adopt the following objectives for a new a charter-for-hire data  
43 collection program, increasing the timeliness of catch estimates  
44 for in-season monitoring, increasing the temporal and/or spatial  
45 precision of catch estimates for monitoring, reducing biases  
46 associated with collection of catch effort, and increasing  
47 stakeholder trust and buy-in associated with data collection.  
48 Does anyone have any questions or comments? Dr. Hollenshad.

1  
2 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Madam Chair, just to provide a little context  
3 for any discussion that may happen, I would sort of interpret  
4 this motion as this potentially being what would be in the  
5 background of the document, as well as perhaps informing some of  
6 the purpose and needs during the IPT deliberations, that sort of  
7 thing, and so that's how I would imagine this motion could be  
8 directly input to another draft document.

9  
10 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. Thank you. Anybody have any questions,  
11 or comments? Captain Walker.

12  
13 **MR. WALKER:** I support the motion, as it's written.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. Dr. Hollensead.

16  
17 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Okay, and I think that Dr. Froeschke just  
18 mentioned too that if the committee -- If there was anything  
19 they felt strongly against, that's something that we could then  
20 remove. If everybody was comfortable not only with the motion,  
21 but sort of staff's, you know, recommended moving forward of it,  
22 and so, for example, I would envision this motion being  
23 incorporated into the background and, again, forming the purpose  
24 and need of a draft document that you all would see, and so  
25 that's how this motion would be applied to sort of a future  
26 progression down this path of getting this through, and so,  
27 unless somebody felt something very strongly, like don't put  
28 that in there, or I don't want you to pursue that, or there's  
29 something that I've noticed that is really missing, that needs  
30 to be -- Then that's where we could take some comment.

31  
32 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay, and I know this is kind of an unusual  
33 approach to this, but there's so much information here, and I  
34 just want to try to be -- To use our time as wisely, and  
35 effectively, as possible, and, to that, about the purpose and  
36 need, it's my understanding that the IPT will be bringing  
37 something back to us, unless this committee wants to take a stab  
38 at drafting the new purpose and need, and is that correct? Dr.  
39 Hollensead.

40  
41 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Right now, the IPT has been working off of the  
42 purpose and need that went into the first document, and so I  
43 imagine there's certainly one word that will not be in there,  
44 and there will be other modifications, probably, to that, and I  
45 would probably advise the IPT to take a look at these  
46 objectives, as they were sort of blessed by the AP and the  
47 committee, when you think about modifying what you want to do,  
48 and we could then bring that to the committee, and then they

1 would have an opportunity to comment on it.

2  
3 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay, and I'm just trying to be kind of  
4 forthcoming with everything, because this is kind of a different  
5 approach to how we normally do things. Okay, and so, if there's  
6 no strong disagreement, or recommendations to that, the next  
7 motion that I had marked that's kind of -- That can move forward  
8 is to recommend the council not require twenty-four-hour  
9 tracking. I know there's a lot of conversation about that, and  
10 does anybody have any comments, or discussion, for that motion  
11 that the AP made? Does the agency have anything to say to that  
12 one? Dr. Hollensead.

13  
14 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** I was just going to, again, provide a little  
15 context, and so where I see this motion working is that, again,  
16 it would go to inform the background of the document, and so it  
17 would sort of lay out a history of data collection in the Gulf,  
18 and we would probably, you know, bring up the SEFHIER program,  
19 the court ruling, those sorts of things, as rationale why it's  
20 not being considered as one of the alternatives, something like  
21 that, and so it would be used to create the record as we build-  
22 out the document, and so that's how that motion would be folded  
23 into that.

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay, and so -- Mr. Strelcheck.

26  
27 **MR. STRELCHECK:** So does this mean that twenty-two-hour tracking  
28 is okay?

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** It sounds good to me.

31  
32 **MR. STRELCHECK:** In all seriousness, I, obviously, understand  
33 where this is coming from, in terms of the lawsuit, and I guess  
34 my only comment, reaction, from an agency standpoint, is a lot  
35 of money, and resources, went into purchasing VMS, right, and I  
36 understand the requirement not to use it for twenty-four-hour  
37 tracking, but I think it would be worth being open-minded, and  
38 is there other options that we could still utilize VMS without  
39 the twenty-four-hour tracking component.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** To that point, is that something that we could  
42 have discussions with the agency about, and, obviously, talk to  
43 the fishermen, but, also, would we need to have discussions with  
44 the vendors, to see what they have available for use, and I was  
45 thinking about the idea, and I'm jumping ahead a little bit, of  
46 the geofencing and things like that, if that's something that  
47 the VMS units could be used for, because I do understand what  
48 Andy is saying.

1  
2 There was a lot of outlay, and, if there's a way that we can use  
3 those units -- Of course, it's like any computer, and they go  
4 out-of-date, and so, depending on how long this takes, is it  
5 something that we can continue to use, but I do understand,  
6 Andy, and we will certainly see if we can't put them to use in  
7 some form or fashion.

8  
9 All right, and the next motion is to recommend to the council  
10 that trip declarations include the following components: vessel  
11 registration number, captain's name, departure date and time,  
12 estimated return date and time, location, trip type. Dr.  
13 Hollensead.

14  
15 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Again, I believe, as Captain Green had let the  
16 committee know, these were things that were out of the SEFHIER  
17 program that the AP said that, okay, we can retain those  
18 elements, and so I would imagine we would pull -- You know, pull  
19 some language straight out from the old SEFHIER program, and  
20 implement some of this, either as -- Probably an action, in that  
21 case, with alternatives for those, is how I believe I would  
22 envision that, and so that's how this motion would then be  
23 incorporated into a draft document.

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Any comments, or questions, and I keep looking  
26 down, Andy, at you, because I feel like the agency may have some  
27 -- I'm getting a thumbs-up. Okay. Captain Walker.

28  
29 **MR. WALKER:** So this is essentially a trimmed-down list that  
30 went through the AP, and what can we eliminate, what do we  
31 really don't like, and what can we legally not keep anymore,  
32 and, you know, what's the minimum that we can get the data that  
33 we need, and this is what they came up with, but there is  
34 certainly room for input here on keeping these, or modifying the  
35 list, and it's not set in stone. This was just a scaled-down --  
36 A first-level scaling-down of the system, in my view.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Dr. Hollensead.

39  
40 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** What I might envision, and what Captain Walker  
41 has just said, is, you know, this would be something that would  
42 be reported to the IPT, not only these things, but then it's  
43 open to IPT discussion, if they thought that something needs to  
44 be modified as well, and then, again, those deliberations would  
45 be reflected in a document that would come back to the committee  
46 to comment on.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** This is just to try to get us heading in a

1 direction of a data collection program. Mr. Anson.

2  
3 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you, and, to that point, to Dr. Hollensead's  
4 point, you know, I know this is an attempt to try to strip it  
5 down, but, if you go to the next motion, there's a lot of other  
6 information that will be required of the trip, and so, if this  
7 is able to be populated into that next screen that they get, and  
8 that was actually looking at adding more items, like number of  
9 anglers and the crew size and that type of stuff, into this  
10 initial -- Anyway, it can be eked through the IPT or later on.

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Dr. Hollensead.

13  
14 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** I would envision that there would be sections  
15 with the trip declaration data fields, as well as the logbook,  
16 and so maybe look at that way, to organize exactly what data and  
17 why, and, ideally, as Mr. Strelcheck has pointed out, providing  
18 some rationale within the document of why this is being  
19 requested, and, ideally, how it will be used, you know, some of  
20 those things that we talk about, the lessons learned from  
21 SEFHIER, that we get a nice balance, and that everybody is sort  
22 of on the same wavelength of an understanding of what's going in  
23 and how -- What's going to come out. That would be something to  
24 consider when looking through all those at an IPT level.

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Ms. Levy.

27  
28 **MS. LEVY:** Thank you. So I understand that we're very early in  
29 this process, but I guess I just want to caution the idea that  
30 the document is going to specify every field for everything,  
31 meaning, for the declaration, for the trip report, like we're  
32 going to put -- Because what's going to happen is it's going to  
33 get implemented, and we're going to be like, oh, this really  
34 isn't exactly what we needed, and we want to tweak it, and then,  
35 to tweak it, we're going to have to go through this whole  
36 process, and remember, when we tried to change things when the  
37 other program was in place, there was a lot of discussion about  
38 why is it taking so long, and why does it all have to go through  
39 the council process, and so, the more specific you're going to  
40 get in the document about all of these little things, it means  
41 that, if you decide later, or, when it's in practice, if  
42 something needs to be tweaked, it's going to be a much longer  
43 process to get that done.

44  
45 I will note that, in the other for-hire document that you did,  
46 it did not specify all of these things in the declaration. It  
47 says you have to do a trip declaration, and you need to hail-  
48 out, and it must include expected return time and landing

1 location, but, in order to actually figure out who it applies  
2 to, then the agency was like, well, we need a vessel  
3 registration number, right, and we need -- So it wasn't that  
4 specific.

5  
6 I guess, as we move through this process, just think about the  
7 specificity that you're trying to incorporate in there, and  
8 then, not to say that you can't discuss the types of things that  
9 are going to be collected, and of course we want to discuss  
10 that, but do we want to articulate every single field that you  
11 think you need now, when I think we can pretty much guarantee  
12 that there's going to be something that comes up later where  
13 we're like, oops, or it's not working so great.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** So, to that point, I think -- I've talked to  
16 several captains about this, and what I feel like is happening  
17 here, to some extent, and I understand your comments, Mara, is  
18 they don't want to get into another SEFHIER, where it came out  
19 of council as this, and then the agency made the administrative  
20 changes, and then something different came back that was  
21 implemented, and so I feel like, based on some of the  
22 discussions I've had, they do want -- They do want to be fairly  
23 specific, and they are taking this out of a page from SEFHIER,  
24 what worked and what didn't work type of thing, but I do  
25 understand your comments, and I hear what you're saying. Dr.  
26 Froeschke.

27  
28 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Pretty much the same comment, and, I mean, one  
29 example is the idea of when we had to declare every time the  
30 vessel was moved, and that was never part of the discussion in  
31 the original SEFHIER, and so I think what -- When we're writing  
32 the document, I would hope that, any of those pitfalls, we could  
33 be specific, and I do agree, and, I mean, we don't want to be  
34 overly specific, every time a minor thing comes, but I would  
35 hope we could avoid the big-ticket things that really affected  
36 how the program operated, and that seemed to be where we got  
37 from a lot of support to an awful lot of pushback.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Strelcheck.

40  
41 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I mean, I guess I look at this differently than  
42 kind of what John just described, which was more of a -- How  
43 does the agency have to interpret something that was put forward  
44 by the council, and ultimately implemented by the agency through  
45 rulemaking, right, and so there was maybe differences in either  
46 interpretation, or it was never a discussion, or envisioned by  
47 the council to begin with, right, and so the agency is  
48 essentially filling in the gaps.

1  
2 In this instance, like with the next motion, which we'll talk  
3 about, when you have to do a trip declaration, you know, I see  
4 that as, obviously, the action in this document, but there could  
5 be discussion of the fields, and the information, that would be  
6 included as part of that trip declaration, and kind of sharing  
7 the intent of the AP, and the council, in terms of what's  
8 included, without having to actually have actions, and  
9 alternatives, around each and every variable that would be  
10 collected for the program.

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Understood. Okay. Any more discussion on that  
13 particular motion? Seeing none, the next one is the motion to  
14 recommend to the council that trip declarations are only  
15 required for for-hire fishing trips before departure. Dr.  
16 Hollensead.

17  
18 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** I would sort of echo what Mr. Strelcheck had  
19 mentioned. You know, potentially, that could be an action. You  
20 know, looking at lessons learned from the -- Let me back up.  
21 Lessons learned from SEFHIER, just what was mentioned here, that  
22 there was, you know, some questions, and people, I think, had  
23 some interpretations of what a trip entailed, and so that caused  
24 a little bit of confusion.

25  
26 My understanding is, potentially, we could, as a group, you  
27 know, make the determination, a definition, of what a for-hire  
28 trip is, what a trip is, what a fishing trip is, and there's a  
29 lot of ways to cut it, or potentially have it as some sort of  
30 action, with alternatives, of when you are required to declare,  
31 you know, what action it is that you are taking, and that's my  
32 understanding of it, so that it can more narrow down what is the  
33 intention of the program, and so that might take a little bit of  
34 thinking, right, and so what are your --

35  
36 Then that goes back to your objectives, perhaps, and your  
37 purpose and need, and so have that handy when you start thinking  
38 about what those -- Consider what those alternatives would be,  
39 what you might get out of, one, the pros and cons of selecting  
40 one over the other, and that sort of thing, and so that is  
41 probably something that the IPT could sit down and discuss as  
42 well, but if there's any, you know, recommendation from this  
43 committee forward about some objective that you would really  
44 like to have, that might help tailor some of those discussions.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Well, and I think too one of the things we  
47 could do, in relation to this, and, Andy, I would like to get  
48 your feedback, is look at the last modification, I believe, that



1 we passed, that ultimately did not move forward, because of the  
2 lawsuit, about hailing-out, and I apologize that I don't  
3 remember exactly, but I think it was basically, if you're  
4 generating income from a trip, is how we finally defined it, or  
5 how we defined it as a fishing trip, but maybe we could take  
6 from something that this council has already effectively passed,  
7 even though it didn't much go further than that, and at least  
8 look at that as a way to start this conversation within the new  
9 document. Mr. Strelcheck.

10  
11 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I was thinking the same way, and so, when we  
12 were looking at trip declarations previously, you know, was it  
13 charter fishing, was it any fishing, including recreational  
14 fishing trips that a boat might be going offshore for, or was it  
15 charter activities that were non-fishing, and so I think all of  
16 those are at least a reasonable range of alternatives to  
17 consider, and I use the example that there's -- You know,  
18 there's moving parts here, right, and so I think part of this  
19 will depend on that validation component of how we determine if  
20 a trip has been taken.

21  
22 It was mentioned, for example, the geofence, and, well, if  
23 someone trips the geofence, right, and they're going offshore,  
24 and we don't know if that's a fishing trip or not a fishing trip  
25 without some other mechanism to tell us it is, right, and so  
26 then we're looking for is there going to be a corresponding  
27 logbook when that boat returns to shore, and so I feel like, at  
28 least as we build the actions, and the alternatives, we just  
29 need to keep that in mind, and then we'll see how all these  
30 pieces fit together to determine how stringent, or how flexible,  
31 we can be with, obviously, the options.

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. All right. Captain Walker.

34  
35 **MR. WALKER:** I agree, but I would like to point out that this  
36 was kind of a major problem, and it was argued back and forth at  
37 the council for a long time beforehand, and, you know, this is  
38 where a lot of us had problems with the multiple hail-out issues  
39 and all that, and this is a key place, in my view here, to make  
40 some improvements to this new improved SEFHIER system, is to  
41 simply, greatly simplify, trip declarations.

42  
43 I think it can be done, with some of the ideas that we have on  
44 the table right now, and I will tell you that, at the meeting,  
45 the AP meeting, we debated, or discussed, using different terms,  
46 such as a trip that provided commerce, quote, for-profit, and  
47 the definition of what constitutes a charter trip, and there was  
48 some discussion on the terminology, but there was pretty much

1 full support, among the AP, on making it much easier than it was  
2 before.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Well, and, to your comments, Captain Walker,  
5 and that's kind of the last document that this council passed  
6 before SEFHIER was struck down, in that you don't have to hail-  
7 out, because you're going from your slip to the fuel dock, or  
8 from your slip to purchase ice, and that is, ultimately, how I  
9 ended up defining it, I think, when we were having the  
10 discussion, is, basically, if you're making money, you need to  
11 report that, that trip.

12  
13 As Andy stated, especially if you go into geofencing, and now,  
14 if you're looking at ways that you may trip the geofence, and  
15 you haven't reported, then that constitutes a whole other set of  
16 problems that we have to deal with, and so all of these are good  
17 ideas, but I did want to be clear that this would not -- The  
18 trip declarations, as the council saw it at the last version, so  
19 to speak, or modification, was to remove any of those trip  
20 declarations that really had nothing to do with a charter trip,  
21 if you will, as far as commerce.

22  
23 Now to the next motion that I think we could maybe move forward  
24 with, and it's the long one, Bernie. To recommend to the  
25 council that a trip report include the following components:  
26 vessel registration number; captain's name; departure date and  
27 time; actual return date and time; location; trip type; angler  
28 count; passenger count; crew count; average depth fished;  
29 general area fished (GPS format); individual species data, kept  
30 and discarded; fishing occurred, yes or no; primary gear used;  
31 and primary target species. I think, Mr. Anson, that gets to  
32 some of your concerns, because this does include angler count  
33 and passenger count. Dr. Hollensead.

34  
35 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Madam Chair, again, thinking that this is  
36 something that we would bring to the IPT, about how potentially  
37 how the program would be structured, certainly taking into  
38 account, you know, how prescriptive do we want to be, and so  
39 then it would probably come back to those IPT recommendations,  
40 but I largely see something, at least addressing this, being as  
41 an action in the document.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Any comments? Mr. Dugas.

44  
45 **MR. DUGAS:** I have a question, Ms. Chair, and did we skip one  
46 motion before this one?

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Well, we did, but we're -- What I'm trying to

1 do, right now, is address those motions that maybe we can kind  
2 of get through, and start working on, versus those that are  
3 maybe a little more challenging, and so the next one, Bernie, is  
4 going to be -- Sorry, Andy.

5  
6 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Just a comment. At the December South Atlantic  
7 Council meeting, the South Atlantic Council passed a motion to  
8 start looking at improvements to their program, and so, with the  
9 recommendations here, you know, what I'm immediately getting  
10 growingly concerned about is alignment with the two programs,  
11 right, and so I definitely want to make sure that we're also  
12 collaborating, and coordinating, with the South Atlantic, in  
13 terms of any sort of redesign simplification of the logbook  
14 system.

15  
16 I am generally in agreement with, obviously, boiling down the  
17 list of variables here, and I think we'll have to talk, in terms  
18 of the IPT, how they integrate this information into the  
19 document.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Okay. The next  
22 one, Bernie, is going to be toward the bottom, and it's the  
23 motion to recommend the council maintain the component of the  
24 SEFHIER program that allows safe dockage before submitting  
25 reports and offloading fish. Dr. Hollensead.

26  
27 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and so it's my  
28 understanding that some of this language has already been  
29 crafted for the SEFHIER program, and so the new document would  
30 then also sort of retain that language for the safety-at-sea.

31  
32 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Right, and, as I recall -- I mean, this was a  
33 part of the SEFHIER, and you could report up to docking your  
34 vessel, as long as you didn't offload the fish, and I would  
35 think that this is just something that they're saying we like,  
36 and we would like to continue to bring it forward, and so are  
37 there any more comments, or questions, for this motion from the  
38 AP?

39  
40 Okay. Seeing none, those are the motions that the AP made that  
41 Dr. Hollensead and I kind of discussed would be some of the  
42 things that we could move forward with that aren't so  
43 controversial, and so, if everyone is kind of good with that,  
44 we'll now dive into the others. Do you need a motion, or  
45 anything, to move forward with these motions, Dr. Simmons?

46  
47 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I think  
48 that would be a good idea, if you could just say to direct staff

1 to include the following list of items from the Ad Hoc Charter-  
2 for-Hire AP, and just list them.

3

4 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** I have to read all that back into a motion?

5

6 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Do you have a different idea?

7

8 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Well, I have the numbered motions, as they  
9 appeared in the summary, and so they were Numbers 1, 2, 3, 6,  
10 11, and 4, or 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 11, if you want to do it that  
11 way.

12

13 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Well, they're not numbered in --

14

15 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** They're not numbered there, but, in the order  
16 that they came through, unless that's not clear enough for other  
17 staff.

18

19 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** I will be happy to read it all, if you all --  
20 Mr. Dugas.

21

22 **MR. DUGAS:** Thank you, Ms. Chair, and so what is the plan, or  
23 the direction, for the motions that we skipped over?

24

25 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** So we're getting ready to come back to those,  
26 but those are the ones that I feel like we're going to have  
27 request staff to bring us more information back on, and, if we  
28 see fit that we can move forward with it, then we can just make  
29 an individual motion that we accept that AP's motion, for those  
30 motions that we skipped, Dr. Simmons, and is that okay? Mr.  
31 Gill, I'll get to you in just one moment.

32

33 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** I think so, Madam Chair.

34

35 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Gill.

36

37 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I guess we need to wait and  
38 see what comes up on the board, but I'm prepared to make such a  
39 motion, once we get it fleshed out. I think Dr. Hollensead's  
40 suggestion of by numbers will be a good way to go, rather than  
41 have a five-page motion document, and, in that case, the list is  
42 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 11, as I understand it.

43

44 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** That is correct. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 11. Is  
45 that your motion, Bob?

46

47 **MR. GILL:** Yes, Madam Chair.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Is there a second to the motion? Dr. Sweetman.  
2 Okay. I will read the motion into the record. It's to direct  
3 staff to include the list of items from the Ad Hoc Charter-for-  
4 Hire Data Collection Advisory Panel, (Numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and  
5 11). Does this not need to say "ad hoc"? I'm sorry. Okay. I  
6 apologize. Maybe I didn't read it. To direct staff to include  
7 the list of items from the Ad Hoc Charter-for-Hire Data  
8 Collection Advisory Panel, (Numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 11). Mr.  
9 Donaldson.

10  
11 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** Just so it reads a little easier, can we  
12 just say to direct staff to include Motions Number 1, 2, 3, 4,  
13 6, and 11 from the Ad Hoc Advisory Panel, and take away the  
14 parentheses?

15  
16 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Is the motioner and the seconder okay with  
17 that? Okay. I've got a thumbs-up.

18  
19 **MR. GILL:** Yes, Madam Chair. Thank you, Dave.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Strelcheck.

22  
23 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I guess -- I don't know if we need to capture  
24 it, or if it's understood, but we, obviously, made some  
25 additional suggestions beyond those motions, and does that need  
26 to be noted in this, or is that just direction to staff for our  
27 discussion?

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Dr. Hollensead.

30  
31 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** I've made those notes for the summary, for the  
32 summary report, and so I can include those in, and then have the  
33 motion underneath, Mr. Strelcheck, if you're amenable to that.

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay, and so to direct staff to include Motions  
36 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 11 from the Ad Hoc Charter-for-Hire Data  
37 Collection Advisory Panel. Is there any opposition to this  
38 motion? Ms. Levy.

39  
40 **MS. LEVY:** I'm sure this is understood, but do you want to say  
41 to include in what, and I assume we're talking about the  
42 development of a new program, or document, right?

43  
44 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Dr. Simmons.

45  
46 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Into the  
47 for-hire data collection program amendment, and it was from  
48 2023, April.

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Geeslin.  
3  
4 **MR. GEESLIN:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Just as a point of  
5 keeping this straight in my head, I would make a suggestion  
6 that, whether it's Captain Green or council staff, that we go  
7 back and number these within the meeting summary, and we've got  
8 fourteen of these, but just to keep track within the record.  
9  
10 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Understood, and that kind of was the discussion  
11 we were having, as opposed to a four-page motion, and we don't  
12 want to copy Andy on his long motions over there, and so all  
13 right. **To direct staff to include Motions 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 11**  
14 **from the January 2024 Ad Hoc Charter-for-Hire Data Collection**  
15 **Advisory Panel into the charter-for-hire electronic data**  
16 **collection document.** Are my motioner and seconder all good?  
17  
18 **MR. GILL:** Yes, Madam Chair.  
19  
20 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. **Is there any opposition to this motion?**  
21 Dr. Hollensead, can we amend the AP's summary to number these  
22 motions? Okay.  
23  
24 The first motion up for discussion is to recommend to the  
25 council that one mechanism be used to report all fishing  
26 activity across sectors and regions. I asked if there was any  
27 opposition. Was there any opposition to that motion? We're  
28 running out of time, Carrie.  
29  
30 Okay, and so the first motion that we did not address with this  
31 would be the fifth one, and the pages aren't numbered, and so  
32 I'm sorry that I can't refer, but the motion reads to recommend  
33 to the council that one mechanism be used to report all fishing  
34 activity across sectors and regions. Dr. Hollensead.  
35  
36 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** So I understand that this is a desirable  
37 mechanism moving forward, the idea of sort of this one-stop  
38 reporting for vessels that are multi-permitted, and it involved  
39 a lot of data collection programs. Certainly that is a bit of a  
40 tall order, depending on all the programs that are out there in  
41 the various regions and that sort of thing, and so I certainly  
42 appreciate the AP putting this motion forward.  
43  
44 As I understand, it's a work in progress, and it's something  
45 that would have to be continued on. If you're looking for  
46 something for April, you know, we may not be able to do that,  
47 but that this would certainly be taken forward, and perhaps some  
48 discussions with other data collection programs.

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. Captain Walker.

3  
4 **MR. WALKER:** Just this would be fantastic, and it sounded like  
5 it was a really big ask, but then Dr. Stephen mentioned, during  
6 the AP meeting, that they're actually working on a, quote,  
7 unquote, one-stop reporting system to iron-out a lot of these  
8 cross-region issues and stuff like that, which was very  
9 encouraging to hear, that there might actually be hope to a one-  
10 stop -- And there's some effort going on to produce that, and so  
11 that would be excellent, and this might not sound like such a  
12 far-fetched idea after all, hearing that.

13  
14 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Gill.

15  
16 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and so I agree that this is  
17 an ideal that we should be searching for, but it's not part of a  
18 starter program, and it affects all the others, and, therefore,  
19 it should not part of the document that we are considering, and  
20 so I would recommend not addressing it within the charter  
21 document.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** I do understand what you're saying, Mr. Gill,  
24 and I do know this is something that the fishermen have been  
25 asking for, because, if you're dually-permitted with the South  
26 Atlantic, there's a lot of reporting that goes on here now. I  
27 guess my question, to Dr. Hollensead and/or the agency, and I  
28 guess kind of to Mara's point, is, to move forward with this  
29 document, and, at the time this becomes available, I guess  
30 there's really nothing you have to do, and it just becomes  
31 available, and, I mean, I get that --

32  
33 I know why the fishermen want it, and I'm not dismissing that,  
34 but, if it stalls this document, and maybe we can get some  
35 feedback tomorrow at public comment, but, if something like this  
36 shuts us down from moving forward, is it worth it, or is it  
37 better to move forward without this, and, when this becomes  
38 available, hopefully sooner than later, and I don't think it  
39 would require any action from this council, because it's just  
40 something that you would -- It's just a new mechanism for  
41 reporting. I don't -- I'm asking, and so I'm looking at the  
42 agency, as well as you, Dr. Hollensead.

43  
44 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Madam Chair, my limited understanding is that  
45 one-stop reporting -- There would be the potential that you sort  
46 of have this sort of least common denominator, in terms of what  
47 needs are across the program, and so it could change a way a  
48 program that you had been working on, you know, had been

1 reporting to -- It may change some of those reporting elements.  
2 Sometimes it's what you have to report, and sometimes it's just  
3 what you see, and then you don't have to fill in those, knowing  
4 which program you're in, and so I would imagine, functionally,  
5 it could get a little convoluted, but -- So I don't think that  
6 it's necessarily just a plug-and-play.

7  
8 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Strelcheck.

9  
10 **MR. STRELCHECK:** So I think certainly, from an agency  
11 standpoint, this is what we would aspire to, right, in terms of  
12 limiting the pieces of equipment you have to use for reporting  
13 or the actual submission of data itself through a single portal,  
14 right, but I agree with the previous comments, right, and it's  
15 aspirational right now, and I think this is a heavy lift to try  
16 to take on just for the SEFHIER program, knowing that it also  
17 has implications for other programs, but I think the guidance to  
18 staff would be really to kind of keep SEFHIER lean and mean, so  
19 to speak, in terms of trying to keep it simple, with as much of  
20 it contained with single reporting mechanisms as possible, and  
21 aligning with other programs.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** So, Andy, and maybe I didn't understand, but,  
24 to slow down a new document -- I mean, say we get to the end,  
25 and this is the only item that we're still looking at, and, I  
26 mean, there would be no reason for the council not to go ahead  
27 and pass a document and bring this on later, or does that create  
28 more complications?

29  
30 I'm just trying to ask -- Kind of what to Mara said, and, if we  
31 go through something, and we say, oh, we should have, we could  
32 have, but we didn't, and I just -- I don't know the answer, and  
33 I'm just trying to find out, or trying to determine, if this is  
34 something that, if the new data collection document is stood up,  
35 and all of this is resolved, is there any reason why this  
36 council wouldn't move forward and then deal with this coming  
37 online at a later time, without too much difficulty? That may  
38 be a question that no one can answer. Ms. Levy.

39  
40 **MS. LEVY:** Well, I mean, I see that -- I mean, the council is  
41 going to develop the program, what you want the requirements to  
42 be, right, and like when do you want people to report  
43 electronically, trip level, declarations, like what we're going  
44 to use for validation, and this, to me, goes to the platform,  
45 and how it's going to interact with other data reporting  
46 requirements, and I don't think the council -- I mean, I think  
47 the agency is already thinking about that, right, and so, as  
48 long as the requirement that we put in place through the council



1 process, and the regulations, are adhered to, then how that  
2 integrates with the other data collection programs -- That's  
3 something the agency is going to have to work on behind the  
4 scenes, right?

5

6 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Thank you for that. Captain Walker.

7

8 **MR. WALKER:** I think the spirit of this motion from the AP was  
9 more of a goal than a requirement. There was nobody there, that  
10 I spoke with, that would want to hang anything up based on this,  
11 but, you know, I think they just wanted to get it down, in  
12 writing, that someday this would be nice to have, and I don't  
13 think it was being put forward as we need this to get the  
14 current system up and running, and that was not my read on this.

15

16 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Why I'm asking is, I mean, a lot of people --  
17 They may -- There is a lot of interpretations of things that are  
18 said, and how they're said, and you don't want someone to come  
19 along and say, well, you all passed this motion, and why isn't  
20 it part of this, and so I'm probably being too careful to make  
21 sure we understand where some of these issues may lie, as far as  
22 being a part of the document or coming in behind-the-scenes type  
23 of thing. Any more discussion on this motion?

24

25 Dr. Hollensead, do you have -- I mean, there's really nothing  
26 that we can do, other than know that it's out there, and  
27 something that's being looked at by the agency, and so okay.

28

29 The next motion, which would be Number 7, I believe, is to  
30 recommend the council add an optional depredation data section  
31 to the data reporting to include a selection list of predatory  
32 species and marine mammals. Dr. Hollensead.

33

34 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Initially, based on the discussions from the  
35 AP, and then the discussions we've had today, it seems like this  
36 would need a little bit more discussion, and exploration, and  
37 I'm not really sure how to go about that just yet, but if -- You  
38 know, potentially thinking of April, something sort of ironed  
39 out that we could present, and I don't think anybody on the IPT  
40 is ready to do that just yet.

41

42 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Strelcheck.

43

44 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I will go back to my comments earlier, Ed, and  
45 it really boils down to what is the intent, and the purpose, of  
46 collecting this data, and we all know that depredation is a  
47 problem. If it's optional to collect this data, then we're only  
48 going to potentially get a subset of information, and then are

1 we -- How are we going to use it as an agency, as a council? Is  
2 it to inform where hotspots might exist, or is it to help us  
3 improve our discard mortality estimates?  
4

5 I have lots of questions, and I understand why maybe the  
6 fishermen are interested in us collecting it, but I think we  
7 just need to be thoughtful, in terms of, if we're going to  
8 include this in the action, or the amendment, why we would  
9 include it.

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** My understanding too was that HMS was at this  
12 meeting, and they didn't really know, if the data was collected,  
13 what they could do with it, and so more discussion to be had on  
14 that, and does anyone here have any questions, or comments?  
15 Captain Walker.

16  
17 **MR. WALKER:** I think it's important to point out that nobody is  
18 actually asking for this information, in the agency or anywhere,  
19 and there are certainly predation issues, but I don't see that  
20 there's a lot to gain, in the charter industry, by offering up  
21 this data, and the woman from HMS, and I forget her name right  
22 now, and I apologize, but she was on the line, and she seemed a  
23 little bit caught off-guard when questioned about what if we  
24 just gave you this predation, shark predation, data, and what  
25 could you do with it, and she kind of said, well, I mean, I  
26 suppose we could use it for identifying areas of heavy shark  
27 predation, which, to this charter boat captain over here, it  
28 meant we could use it to kick you out of your favorite fishing  
29 spot, you know, and, if you're fishing there, and you report a  
30 bunch of shark interactions -- So I don't see any upside to a  
31 charter fisherman for supporting this idea at all.

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** That comes back to sometimes the unintended  
34 consequences, when you think you're doing something good, and it  
35 bites you in the tail, and so I understand exactly what you're  
36 saying, Captain Walker, and you're right, and I hadn't thought  
37 about it on that level, and it makes perfectly good sense, but,  
38 in my mind, of hearing all the comments about the previous  
39 SEFHIER program, it was adding more questions, and that's just  
40 adding more questions, and so, honestly --

41  
42 I mean, yes, there are some questions that may be needed, but  
43 this is one -- I understand the intent, but I think it's one  
44 that probably doesn't need to be added at this time, and so I  
45 don't know -- Dr. Hollensead, do you need any direction? Does  
46 this council want to have them to look at it? Do we want to  
47 disregard it? I mean, if it's still in this -- I mean, we need  
48 to take some action on this, do we not? Okay, then we'll just -

1 - Okay. Mr. Donaldson.

2  
3 **MR. DONALDSON:** Based on the comments, I would say we just leave  
4 it alone at this time.

5  
6 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Agreed. I just wanted to make sure, and, like  
7 I said, this is kind of a different animal than we've skinned in  
8 the past. Okay. The next one is, if there's no more question  
9 on that, or discussion, to recommend the council remove the  
10 economic information data from the daily reporting requirements  
11 and explore other methods for collecting economic data in the  
12 for-hire industry. Dr. Hollensead.

13  
14 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Yes, and so I think this is going to take a  
15 little bit of exploration with some of the economists and  
16 council staff, and probably at the Science Center, and likely  
17 the Regional Office as well, you know, to develop something else  
18 that could be within the regional alternatives, to get what they  
19 need that may be more feasible for the industry, and so that's  
20 going to be a continued discussion, I would imagine.

21  
22 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Well, Captain Green made the comment that, as I  
23 understood, that the AP is not necessarily against collecting  
24 this information, but who is responsible for providing that  
25 information, and I can understand that. If you're a hired  
26 captain on the vessel, that owner may not want you to know how  
27 much he's getting paid for a charter, and I feel like most  
28 people know that anyway, but I can understand, and, if they're  
29 not paying the bill, they may not know what the price of fuel  
30 is, but, as I've stated in the past, I think most captains know  
31 what they're paying for fuel, so they can run their trips  
32 economically.

33  
34 It sounds like maybe this is not as big of a hurdle as we once  
35 thought, of just not wanting it at all, and I would like for us  
36 to explore some different options of how this might be  
37 collected. I know, during the Gulf Headboat Collaborative, at  
38 the end of the year, the captains, or the owners, received an  
39 economic questionnaire, and it was ten or fifteen pages, it  
40 seems like, and it was lengthy, and I know -- My understanding  
41 is, the commercial fishery, they have a portion that, every  
42 year, those commercial fishermen, or permits, that have to  
43 report, and so I think there's some ways that maybe we can  
44 explore this and collect that information. Dr. Sweetman.

45  
46 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I obviously think  
47 socioeconomic information is an important part of how we try to  
48 manage our fisheries here, and I don't think that process is

1 necessarily well laid out for how some of this information --  
2 Maybe even for the folks on the AP, but how this information  
3 would actually be utilized for the management process.

4  
5 When I was speaking to Captain Green earlier, I was talking  
6 about just the fisheries disaster, and how that could be  
7 utilized from that, but that's not really the intent of what  
8 we're trying to accomplish here, you know, and it's not for the  
9 fisheries disaster information, and that's just a subset of what  
10 you can get from that, and so I think, as we're developing this,  
11 Lisa, maybe even some coordination -- I mean, we just had a long  
12 discussion about the Standing SSC, and how we're going to be  
13 incorporating more socioeconomists and anthropologists onto  
14 that, and guidance, perhaps, as to how this would be utilized  
15 from a management perspective, coordination with the AP along  
16 those lines, to maybe dispel some of these reservations, and I  
17 understand the reservations, quite frankly.

18  
19 I agree with some of them, but I do think that there is utility  
20 for this that could be used on the management side of things,  
21 but I feel like it just needs to be spelled out for how we would  
22 do that. Does that make sense?

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Any other comments or questions? Mr.  
25 Strelcheck.

26  
27 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Well, I guess I just want to be clear, in terms  
28 of we're going to ask staff to continue to explore options here  
29 for looking at different ways to collect economic data, so that  
30 we would eventually potentially include something in the  
31 amendment, and I would still -- I think it's reasonable to have,  
32 as part of that action and alternative range, a requirement to  
33 submit economic data through the logbook. I recognize the AP is  
34 opposed to that, but I think that is part of the range of  
35 alternatives that we would want to consider here.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. Andy, can you make a motion to that  
38 effect, please?

39  
40 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Do I need to make a motion? I thought these  
41 were all just part of the discussion that Lisa was capturing. I  
42 mean, if people disagree, I will make a motion, but I feel like  
43 we're so early in the process that it's worth discussing this.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Dr. Simmons.

46  
47 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and so I  
48 guess my thing is due to the lawsuit findings, and kind of some

1 of the previous motion, which was spelling out what you wanted  
2 us to put in the next draft. With even the AP being kind of  
3 split on this, I think -- Maybe not right now, but at least by  
4 Full Council, we should have the direction on what you're asking  
5 us to do, whether it's a separate thing we look at, where we  
6 look at what the commercial industry is providing, and what the  
7 headboat industry is providing, and better explain how that data  
8 is being used, and then the council could consider integrating  
9 it into the amendment, but I do think we need some clear  
10 direction by Full Council on this, because it was very much a  
11 sticking point.

12

13 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Strelcheck.

14

15 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I don't think we're going to accomplish all of  
16 the reasons that have been discussed to that, in terms of how we  
17 use the data, between now and Full Council, but, in terms of  
18 your comment about the lawsuit, we lost on an Administrative  
19 Procedure Act violation, and essentially -- It was, to me, a  
20 nuanced legal argument that we had stated that we were going to  
21 collect socioeconomic questions, and we never outlined those,  
22 specifically, until the final rulemaking, or the proposed  
23 rulemaking, and then all of them ended up being economic  
24 questions, right, and so Mara may disagree, but I think we have  
25 every right, as a council, if we build a record, as to why we  
26 could include those. Now, I'm not saying that that's the  
27 preferred alternative at this point, but I think it's certainly  
28 reasonable to consider that as an option.

29

30 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Dr. Hollensead.

31

32 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** I am spit-balling a little bit, but perhaps --  
33 Just thinking of the next IPT meeting, and sometimes it's  
34 helpful for our IPT agendas, as we populate those, to have some  
35 motions that kind of go with them, and it helps direct the  
36 discussion a little bit, and, if it's the will of the committee,  
37 or the council, at Full Council -- If you would like to see some  
38 sort of placeholder action in there, that we're directed as  
39 such, and if, instead, you would like to see development of say  
40 a white paper, that we would then use to inform an action -- You  
41 know, just those little nuances help at the IPT level.

42

43 Sometimes, you know, IPTs have to interpret things a little bit  
44 differently, and it may not be what you're looking for in April,  
45 and I understand that you want to get this launched as quickly  
46 as possible.

47

48 Going back to what Dr. Sweetman said, you know, the idea of

1 things coming back very deliberately, and, if there was a white  
2 paper investigation, such that even somebody like myself, who is  
3 also working on the IPT, has a better understanding and can help  
4 us as we write those sections, and review those sections, and  
5 then put it in there, and so something along those lines would  
6 be helpful, but, again, maybe not now, and maybe take some time  
7 to think about it at Full Council, but at some point.

8

9 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Ms. Levy.

10

11 **MS. LEVY:** Well, and just to also think about the South Atlantic  
12 reporting program, and what it's asking, which includes economic  
13 questions, and the fact that you have dually-permitted vessels,  
14 and remember, when these programs went into place, the South  
15 Atlantic regulations basically said that, if there was a more  
16 stringent requirement in place, that you wouldn't have to report  
17 to the South Atlantic, and you could just report to that, and  
18 that includes the questions.

19

20 I think you have to be very deliberate about especially this  
21 piece, because, if the Gulf says no economic, and the South  
22 Atlantic has economic, and the dually-permitted vessels are  
23 reporting to both then, because they're not the same, and so  
24 there's a lot that goes into this, and I will agree with Andy.

25

26 The lawsuit did not prohibit the council from asking, or  
27 collecting, economic information. It was a rulemaking issue,  
28 and about notice to the public before the final rule was  
29 published, and that is easily remedied by being more specific in  
30 the proposed rule.

31

32 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Captain Walker, did you have your hand up?

33

34 **MR. WALKER:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I think some of us, while  
35 we are opposed to economic reporting, recognize that there's  
36 probably going to be some economic reporting required here, and  
37 so I would suggest, if we must, to work with the industry to  
38 find like some middle ground, where there is minimum acceptable  
39 information, number of questions if you will, to satisfy  
40 economic needs of the industry, versus -- You know, from NMFS,  
41 versus what the industry really wants to give.

42

43 I think the open-ended, seemingly open-ended, part last time was  
44 kind of where we got in trouble, and some of us felt like we  
45 never really talked about these issues, or these questions, when  
46 we were designing the program, and we felt like it just turned  
47 into an open-ended ask us all the questions you want, or require  
48 all these questions, and so perhaps, you know, if there's going

1 to be economic reporting, we could work together to just keep it  
2 as minimal as possible, while satisfying the needs of the  
3 economic people.

4

5 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Geeslin.

6

7 **MR. GEESLIN:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Hearing all this, I keep  
8 going back to the unanimous passing of this motion, and sensing  
9 a fairly deep opposition to folks turning over their economic  
10 information, and, going back to what Dr. Sweetman said, in  
11 reviewing some of the CARES Act disaster relief, and I realize  
12 these are two different purposes, but, when we reviewed those as  
13 a state, as those funds came through the Gulf States, it was  
14 ultimately the responsibility of the captains, and those license  
15 holders, to provide that financial information, in whatever form  
16 that took.

17

18 Some provided receipts, and some provided tax returns, where  
19 they were able to demonstrate that measurable loss, and it  
20 qualified them for the funds, and I just want to tread lightly  
21 here, because I do sense that strong opposition, and,  
22 personally, if this was me, as a charter-for-hire, I would not  
23 be supportive of this, and I would have to, you know, put some  
24 level of faith in our AP here.

25

26 I think maybe the white paper, and maybe getting to Mara's  
27 point, and really fleshing out what that economic data looks  
28 like, and what the end goal of the purpose of that economic data  
29 can be used for may be a path forward, but, as of right now, if  
30 we were to vote this up or down, I would be in support of a  
31 motion as it stands.

32

33 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. Dr. Frazer.

34

35 **DR. TOM FRAZER:** Thank you. I'm not on the committee, and I'm  
36 just listening to the discussion here, but I think C.J. did make  
37 a few really important points, right, and I think I would like  
38 to reiterate some of those. I mean, so, earlier in the meeting  
39 this morning, we talked about the composition of the SSC, right,  
40 and we recognized that the majority of what do on this council,  
41 and what that body does in particular, is deal with biological  
42 data to help us manage fisheries, you know, and we're  
43 aspirational, in the sense that we would like to incorporate  
44 that socioeconomic data to make those decisions, but those --  
45 That science, in my mind, is still not quite mature in that  
46 regard.

47

48 I think part of the issue here is that the socioeconomic

1 scientific community is having a hard time articulating, in a  
2 clear way to this council, and to the stakeholders, why that  
3 important and, specifically, how it would help us make a  
4 management decision.

5  
6 I'm not opposed, like C.J., to collecting socioeconomic data,  
7 but what I hear, from all the people that are involved in  
8 managing fisheries, whether it's the Regional Office or the  
9 Science Center, is everybody is burdened, right, and so are the  
10 fishermen, and so I don't want to burden them with something  
11 that we can clearly tell them why it's in their best interest,  
12 and we may, or may not, use that information.

13  
14 I'm not saying that we shouldn't have it, right, and, in an  
15 ideal world, we would, but this is all about now, in my mind,  
16 streamlining and getting to acquire the best data that we can,  
17 right, without burdening people, and so there's a lot of good  
18 comments around the table, and I appreciated those, and this is  
19 a difficult thing, because, again, I think a lot of people  
20 recognize that, if we were mature, with regard to the  
21 information needs, right, and that socioeconomic science, we  
22 would use it, but the fact of the matter is we're not using it  
23 right now, and, until somebody can tell us how we are going to  
24 use it, we probably should not burden anyone.

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. Dr. Diagne.

27  
28 **DR. DIAGNE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Just, perhaps, a few  
29 remarks when it comes to economic data within the confine of  
30 this program, meaning for the for-hire sector. I totally  
31 understand that folks may have opposition when it comes to  
32 providing what they consider to be, quote, unquote, personal  
33 information, but, at the end of the day, I mean, the for-hire  
34 sector sells one product, and that product is called a fishing  
35 trip.

36  
37 If you want to say anything about that market, you need, at the  
38 very least, to know the price of the product that is being sold,  
39 and, in this particular case, then the charter fee needs to be  
40 collected, and how many folks were on that trip needs to be  
41 known, so that you can get essentially a sense of an angler  
42 trip, how much was paid per angler trip, and what it is that we  
43 look at in the amendments, the regulatory actions, would be  
44 really the value extracted from that angler trip, meaning, you  
45 know, the value above and beyond the cost of providing the trip.

46  
47 You need two things. You need the revenue side of it. I mean,  
48 in the simplest way, total revenue is the price times the number



1 of units, and you need the variable cost, and the variable cost,  
2 in the simplest way here, would be fuel costs and labor. If you  
3 are looking at the big picture, at the end of the year, you need  
4 some sense of the fixed costs. Then you would bring in  
5 insurance, depreciation, and all of that, but, in the simplest  
6 form, we need a sense of the value extracted from those trips.

7  
8 For the longest time here, the value that we are using is a  
9 value from 2012, or, actually, the last comprehensive study that  
10 was completed was completed, and issued actually, by the Ag  
11 Center, but Rex Caffey and one of his former students, Dr.  
12 Savolainen.

13  
14 What we've been doing, in recent history, was to take that value  
15 and essentially adjust it based on inflation rates, and so it is  
16 obvious that, between 2012 and now, the industry has evolved.  
17 We have a pretty good handle on the commercial side of things,  
18 because they report. We have a pretty good handle on the  
19 private angling side, because the Science Center conducts  
20 studies. For example, Doctors Carter and Liese have a series of  
21 choice experiments, and they provide consumer surplus value,  
22 meaning, you know, the satisfaction attached to, for example,  
23 harvesting an extra red snapper or red grouper and so forth.

24  
25 We do not have recent values, when it comes to the charter-for-  
26 hire, and so how it is we are going to use this information, in  
27 a practical sense, two examples are, in short order, we are  
28 going to have to review the allocation of red snapper between  
29 the for-hire and the private angler sector separation. At that  
30 time, everybody would wish that we had an updated value for the  
31 charter-for-hire. Everybody would then ask us how come nobody  
32 told us that we needed this before we got here.

33  
34 There is also, I guess, thought of, in the future, considering  
35 sector separation for additional species, and I think greater  
36 amberjack was discussed around this table, and others. When  
37 that time comes, folks are also going to ask for the value,  
38 excess value, or producer surplus, attached to a target trip for  
39 a single species, and so, from an economic standpoint, we are  
40 extremely clear about why we need this data and what we would do  
41 with it. I mean, what is a puzzle, to me, really, is how come  
42 we have such a strong opposition to it, while everybody would  
43 benefit from having that information.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. Is it to that point, Dr. Frazer?

46  
47 **DR. FRAZER:** Yes, and I just wanted to say thank you to Dr.  
48 Diagne for his comments, right, because I think that's exactly

1 what we need, is a fairly simple articulation of the most basic  
2 socioeconomic data that we can use to help us make a decision.  
3 In this particular case, decisions as they relate to allocation.  
4 We can make decisions based on biology, and we have a hard time  
5 making value judgements, in the absence of data, and so, to the  
6 extent that you can articulate, right, to the council, and to  
7 stakeholders, what those basic information needs are, we're all  
8 going to benefit, and it will help guide these types of motions,  
9 and so thank you for that.

10

11 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. Mr. Strelcheck, to that point.

12

13 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Well, and, by extension, and this is why I was  
14 making the comment I did earlier, right, and I'm not necessarily  
15 supportive of including them, but I don't want to exclude them  
16 at this point in the process, and I think what we need then is  
17 the economists, and others, to come in and tell us the benefits  
18 and tradeoffs of collecting data in different ways, right, and,  
19 if this is the gold standard, to collect it directly from the  
20 logbook program, and, if we back off of that, and we lose some  
21 of the data, and level of detail, if we collect it another way,  
22 but we feel like that's still adequate for our purposes, right,  
23 then we could choose that path, but, without understanding the  
24 benefits and tradeoffs, I just don't want to dismiss this as a  
25 consideration at this stage.

26

27 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Captain Walker. Mr. Dugas. I guess everybody  
28 is pointing at everybody. Dr. Froeschke.

29

30 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Well, following-on Andy's comment, I mean, that  
31 seems like the white paper we need right there, is summarizing  
32 the -- The biologists on the IPT don't have that information,  
33 and so, for us to come up here and make the case about why we do  
34 it, if it really is critical -- Like we, as biologists, can't  
35 make that, and so it falls into space, and it needs the experts  
36 and those people to come and tell us.

37

38 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Well, the next meeting, we'll put Assane up  
39 here. How's that? Okay. Mr. Chair, I'm cognizant of the time,  
40 and we've got three more motions left in this document, and what  
41 would you like me to do?

42

43 **MR. ANSON:** I guess if you can quickly wrap up those, and I  
44 think you have one other -- Don't you have one other item in the  
45 agenda too or -- I mean, let's go ahead and try to wrap-up at  
46 least this agenda item.

47

48 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** I think the last one should be very quick, I

1 would think. Okay. The motion is to ask NOAA Fisheries and the  
2 council to explore some options to address permit renewal issues  
3 that maintains the integrity of the for-hire data collection  
4 program and provides some flexibility for program participants.  
5 Dr. Hollensead.

6  
7 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Again, I think that  
8 this would be something that the agency could work with. I know  
9 sort of the spirit of the discussion around the AP at this time  
10 was sort of looking at the potential of losing your permit,  
11 which is limited access here in the Gulf, and it represents tens  
12 of thousands of dollars, for not putting in a logbook or  
13 something, that's just been skipped -- The idea is that this is  
14 not something that's nefarious, and that this may just be sort  
15 of accidental, and so is there some mechanism with which  
16 stakeholders could work through the agency, or the Permit  
17 Office, to remedy some of these things.

18  
19 I think that would take some further exploration, because,  
20 truly, accounting it -- You know, linking some of these things  
21 with the permit, as Captain Walker just brought up, and  
22 compliance, which is good, so that you can begin using the data  
23 in a meaningful way, right, and so how to balance sort of that  
24 out, and that's the sort of the concern that the stakeholders  
25 had, is there's a mistake that they didn't mean to make, and  
26 that it can be remedied, as well as, you know, making sure that  
27 there is something ongoing for compliance.

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** So I can speak from experience on this one. We  
30 went to renew our permits, and I guess it was last year, and we  
31 had one logbook that was missing, and I got an email from NOAA,  
32 or from NMFS Permits Office, that said you're noncompliant, and  
33 this is what you need to do, and I think I was given twenty-one,  
34 thirty, or maybe even forty-five days, to become compliant, and  
35 so I am not opposed to this, because this puts teeth in the  
36 program.

37  
38 If you don't have something to hold these captains' feet to the  
39 fire, if you will, then what are we doing? I mean, we want to  
40 stand up a program that is good, that gets us the information  
41 that we need, and, to me, this is one way to do that, and, as I  
42 stated, it wasn't you're missing a logbook, and we're not  
43 issuing your permits.

44  
45 It was, hey, you're missing a logbook, and, if you don't have it  
46 completed by this date, then you -- But you were given time, and  
47 so I don't know if that's what this is about, but I would think  
48 that, for someone to think they could get their permits renewed

1 without completing this, without completing a logbook -- There's  
2 got to be some teeth in the program, and I think this is a good  
3 place to get that, and those are my comments to that. Are there  
4 any other comments, or questions? Captain Walker.

5  
6 **MR. WALKER:** Just a quick one here, and I think that this motion  
7 was put forward by a couple of individuals who had some kind of  
8 extenuating circumstances, and they were kind of threatened with  
9 permit renewal, and I think it was -- I don't remember exactly,  
10 but I think it was a little bit more than you are missing a  
11 logbook or something, but I forget, but it was like an act of  
12 nature, or something like that, and they had been negatively  
13 impacted, and they wanted to put this out there to seek a little  
14 more forgiveness under special circumstances, I think is where  
15 this came from, if I'm not mistaken.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** To that point, not really knowing the  
18 circumstances, and I think we've had this discussion before at  
19 this table with various things, that sometimes you have to look  
20 at the one-offs, and that may be something that this council  
21 can't do anything about, and it would be with the agency, or the  
22 NMFS Permits Office, and I will say that, if you treat them  
23 nice, they treat you nice too, and I've seen that happen before  
24 too, and so -- All right. Any more discussion on that issue?  
25 Okay.

26  
27 Seeing none, the next one is to recommend -- The motion is to  
28 recommend the council use industry outreach and be part of the  
29 development and implementation plan, such as the port ambassador  
30 program. Dr. Hollensead.

31  
32 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** I think that that would work, and that would  
33 certainly be something important, and outreach and education is  
34 an important element of any rollout that happens, but that  
35 wouldn't necessarily have to be directed into the document, but  
36 that would be something that is working, you know, sort of as  
37 the document evolves, and thoughts about how to do the rollout  
38 would continue as well, and sort of simultaneously, but not  
39 necessarily within the document.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Any discussion on that issue? I think that's  
42 pretty easy to flesh out. Mr. Strelcheck.

43  
44 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I'm all for working with industry, in terms of  
45 rolling out the program, and I guess the questions I have more  
46 come down to kind of the intention here, and, if we're asking  
47 industry to perform a certain function, like conveying on behalf  
48 of the council program information, or on behalf of the agency,

1 I think that's a slippery slope that we need to avoid, and we're  
2 not certainly talking about paying industry to do this either,  
3 and it's more of, I think, the relationship and working with  
4 industry, in terms of the outreach and education on the program,  
5 and maybe it's more of like joint training and opportunities,  
6 and we can work with our advisory panels and others, or at least  
7 that's the way I'm interpreting it.

8  
9 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. The next motion was to recommend to the  
10 council that we explore -- Excuse me. To recommend to the  
11 council that we explore the following validation efforts to  
12 ensure that our data can be used to reduce scientific  
13 uncertainty, and management uncertainty, and be used in a stock  
14 assessment passing peer review with the following tools: 1)hail  
15 out (trip declaration); 2)logbook; 3)dockside intercepts;  
16 4)explore trip validation options, such as effort validation  
17 button, which would capture GPS coordinates of the device  
18 (phone), and this would be required to be hit by captain after  
19 declaration, before trip report, while seaward of demarcation  
20 line or geofences options; 5)no-fish reports required, only  
21 weekly, like currently required in the Southeast Regional  
22 Headboat Survey, meaning, if you do not fish at all in a week,  
23 you'd have to do a no-fish report, and, if you fish one day  
24 during that week, you wouldn't be a required a no-fish report.  
25 Dr. Hollensead.

26  
27 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Again, I think, as the IPT begins thinking  
28 about, you know, sort of how to build-out this document, and  
29 going back to what Mr. Strelcheck had mentioned, this idea of  
30 collecting the data, but then also having some tool of  
31 validation and what those linkages would look like, depending on  
32 how that's built out, and, you know, you would have an  
33 associated validation, to make sure that, you know, that was  
34 actually occurring.

35  
36 Then, of course, the feasibility of it. You know, maybe having  
37 to do some exploratory investigations with vendors, you know,  
38 and how easy is it to have a georeference, and how is it to  
39 have, you know, a reminder to do this, so that somebody knows  
40 that, hey, you're offshore, and you need to enable this right  
41 now.

42  
43 Those sorts of things will take a little bit of time, you know,  
44 and so I think that those discussions would come out, as you had  
45 mentioned, when we were looking at some of the data fields and  
46 talking about validation, that it could be looked into that, and  
47 they're sort of inherently linked, and, the way the document  
48 would be -- I would have to think about how that would be

1 organized a little bit, but that's how I would envision that  
2 happening.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Are there comments, or questions, or  
5 discussion? I'm guessing this is another white paper type of  
6 thing, to explore these options, or --

7  
8 **DR. HOLLENSSEAD:** Well, I think it's -- The value I see in this  
9 motion is you've got some taste of what industry says is, hey,  
10 this is what we could live with, what we understand of what  
11 you're going through, and so that was a good starting place of,  
12 hey, we're going to put out some validation, as we start to  
13 think about some potential options moving forward, and so I  
14 think that, if I was on the IPT for this, I would have this list  
15 as sort of a check in my notes to go through about, hey, we  
16 could use this element perhaps to validate some data field that  
17 we want to collect. We've got some feedback from the AP that  
18 this would be something that's feasible.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. The next motion I think we've pretty  
21 well discussed, and it's to recommend the council move forward  
22 with reimplementing the SEFHIER program as soon as possible with  
23 current available options, excluding vessel tracking and  
24 economic data requirements, while continuing to explore AP  
25 recommendations to improve data integrity and usability. Any  
26 comments or questions or discussion?

27  
28 Then the last one -- Did you want to comment, Dr. Hollensead?  
29 Okay. Then the last one is to recommend the council not move  
30 forward with a for-hire IFQ program. Mr. Gill.

31  
32 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Madam Chairman, and so my view on this one  
33 is that, number one, there is no for-hire IFQ program on the  
34 table, or in the document in the future, and, secondly, it's not  
35 in the charge of the AP, and so, at this point, we should not  
36 concern ourselves with it.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** I think that can just be understood, since  
39 we're not discussing it, but your comments are captured on the  
40 record. Any more discussion with regard to the ad hoc AP's  
41 report? Dr. Hollensead, would you like to take us through Item  
42 VI?

43  
44 **UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF THE TIMELINE ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF**  
45 **THE COMMERCIAL ELECTRONIC LOGBOOKS**

46  
47 **DR. HOLLENSSEAD:** Yes, ma'am. I can quickly do that. Agenda  
48 Item V we spoke about at the Sustainable Fisheries meeting.

1 Just a quick verbal update, and, as you all recall, we took  
2 final action in October to approve an amendment, and it's a  
3 joint amendment with the South Atlantic to integrate the  
4 commercial coastal logbook to an electronic logbook, and they  
5 had been filling out paper documents, and now this would allow  
6 for electronic reporting.

7  
8 The IPT then went through and did sort of the final checks, and  
9 General Counsel looked through the document. As you can  
10 imagine, it's a joint effort, and so there was a lot of people  
11 looking it over, and so that takes a little bit of time. It's  
12 my understanding, from speaking with South Atlantic Council  
13 staff, that the final revised version of that has gone to their  
14 chair for review, and is in the process of being reviewed, and  
15 it should be transmitted at some point before their March  
16 meeting.

17  
18 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Seeing no other business, I am in the hole  
19 twenty-two minutes.

20

21 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on January 29, 2024.)

22

23

- - -