

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

The Battle House Renaissance Mobile, Alabama

June 5, 2023

**VOTING MEMBERS**

- Susan Boggs.....Alabama
- Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- Jonathan Dugas.....Louisiana
- Bob Gill.....Florida
- Jessica McCawley.....Florida
- Michael McDermott.....Mississippi
- Chris Schieble (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana
- Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS
- Troy Williamson.....Texas

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

- Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
- Billy Broussard.....Louisiana
- Phil Dyskow.....Florida
- Tom Frazer.....Florida
- Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi
- Greg Stunz.....Texas

**STAFF**

- Assane Diagne.....Economist
- Matt Freeman.....Economist
- John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
- Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
- Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
- Mary Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- Natasha Mendez-Ferrer.....Fishery Biologist
- Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
- Ryan Rindone.....Lead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
- Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director
- Carly Somerset.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist

**OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

- Chester Brewer.....SAFMC
- Clay Porch.....SEFSC
- Jessica Stephen.....NMFS

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1  
2  
3 Table of Contents.....2  
4  
5 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes and Action Guide and  
6 Next Steps.....3  
7  
8 SEFHIER Program Update and Next Steps Presentation.....4  
9  
10 Status Update on Plan with GSMFC and NMFS on the Private Angler  
11 Permit.....12  
12  
13 Other Business.....25  
14  
15 Adjournment.....25  
16  
17 - - -  
18

1 The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery  
2 Management Council convened at The Battle House Renaissance,  
3 Mobile, Alabama on Monday morning, June 5, 2023, and was called  
4 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 members of the committee are myself,  
12 Susan Boggs, and Vice Chair is Dale Diaz, Chris Schieble, Dave  
13 Donaldson, J.D. Dugas, Bob Gill, Jessica McCawley, Michael  
14 McDermott, Mr. Geeslin, Andy Strelcheck, and Troy Williamson.

15  
16 The next item on the agenda is the Adoption of the Agenda. Does  
17 anyone have anything to add? Seeing no changes, is anyone  
18 opposed? Seeing none, the agenda is adopted. The next item on  
19 the list is Approval of the April 2023 Minutes. Is there any  
20 opposition or any changes? Seeing none, the minutes are  
21 approved. The next item is the Action Guide and Next Steps, and  
22 I will turn it over to Dr. Hollensead.

23  
24 **DR. LISA HOLLENSHAD:** Thank you, Madam Chair. The first agenda  
25 item for the committee is a SEFHIER program update, as well as  
26 discussing some next steps, and so, if you all recall, the  
27 SEFHIER program has been removed, and so, during the April 2023  
28 meeting, the council passed a motion that directed staff to  
29 initiate steps towards establishing a data collection program  
30 for the for-hire sector.

31  
32 SERO staff -- We've got Dr. Stephen on the line, as well as Dr.  
33 Masi, and Dr. Stephen is going to provide us a presentation  
34 outlining sort of where we're at now, and so what data  
35 collection is currently being done for the for-hire industry.  
36 Bringing up the past document, we'll look at the preferreds in  
37 that document, reminding the committee of what the goals and  
38 objectives were there, and then speaking a little bit to next  
39 steps, and they also have the expertise to speak to the South  
40 Atlantic's program, should anybody have any questions about  
41 what's being done in the South Atlantic.

42  
43 Then, Ms. Levy, perhaps, if you wanted to provide just a brief  
44 update on the appeals process and that sort of thing, and, the  
45 last time we left off, we heard there was the potential to take  
46 things to the Supreme Court, but we'll just a get a formalized,  
47 on-the-record update as to that, and so the committee should  
48 listen to the presentation, ask any questions of staff, and

1 provide guidance on the developing management objectives for the  
2 future of the Gulf for-hire data collection program.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** All right, and so I guess next we will have --  
5 Dr. Stephen, are you ready for your presentation?

6  
7 **DR. JESSICA STEPHEN:** I am ready. Can you hear me?

8  
9 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Yes, ma'am, and we're ready when you are. We  
10 have the slide show up.

11  
12 **SEFHIER PROGRAM UPDATE AND NEXT STEPS PRESENTATION**

13  
14 **DR. STEPHEN:** Okay. Great. We just wanted to give you a little  
15 update on where we are with the SEFHIER program and some of the  
16 next steps. I wanted to reiterate what the original goals of  
17 the SEFHIER program were, and so, when we were building this  
18 program, we wanted to be able to produce reliable estimates of  
19 both catch and effort for the federally-permitted for-hire  
20 vessels.

21  
22 While we knew that it might take some time in order to use that  
23 data in management, we did feel like there were some immediate  
24 data uses, where we could validate both the minimum catch and  
25 effort estimates coming out of MRIP and other data collection  
26 programs.

27  
28 In the future, we hope to have calibration and benchmarking, so  
29 that we could use the SEFHIER directly within management. Some  
30 of the original anticipated benefits of the program was improved  
31 for-hire data management, which would be through increased  
32 accuracy and timeliness of data being reported to the agency, a  
33 census-based style reporting, and reductions in recall bias.  
34 Overall, we hoped to improve both the monitoring and compliance  
35 within the sector.

36  
37 Where are we without SEFHIER at this point in time? What we've  
38 done is revert it back to the data streams that we were using  
39 prior to SEFHIER, and so, for catch and effort estimates within  
40 the Gulf, we have the MRIP program, with the for-hire survey  
41 effort as well as the APAIS sampling, and we still have LA Creel  
42 sampling, Texas' Parks and Wildlife sampling, as well as the  
43 Southeast Region Headboat Survey.

44  
45 What I want to do is remind everyone what was in the original  
46 for-hire reporting amendment, and we had four actions within  
47 that amendment. The first one was modifying the frequency and  
48 the mechanism of reporting the data, and the preferred

1 alternative was to have the owner or operators of the charter  
2 and headboat vessels, with both reef fish and a CMP permit, to  
3 submit their records via electronic reporting prior to  
4 offloading of the fish, and, during the SEFHIER program, we had  
5 approved two softwares in order to submit that, as well as some  
6 VMS forms at the time.

7  
8 For Action 2, that was modifying the reporting frequency and  
9 mechanisms for the headboats, and so the headboat survey program  
10 was on a slightly different frequency and wave reporting, and so  
11 we did modify that so that the headboat survey data was in line  
12 with the SEFHIER program at that time.

13  
14 Action 3 was trip notification and reporting requirements, with  
15 the preferred alternative of having a hail-out prior to  
16 departing for a trip, and, in that hail-out, they would provide  
17 information that would be similar to what you would see in a  
18 pre-landing notification, which included the expected return  
19 time and the landing location for that, and that was selected  
20 both for the charter vessels and for the headboat survey  
21 vessels.

22  
23 For Action 4, we looked at what the hardware and software  
24 requirements would be for reporting, and this was used where we  
25 wanted to have GPS capability software, and, at the time, the  
26 preferred alternative was for a minimum of archival vessel  
27 positions send to the agency, and so this allowed us to create  
28 the cellular VMS devices and have people report them -- Kind of  
29 a stored form, and they would store it while at-sea, and it  
30 would forward it once they were in cellular range. It also  
31 allowed us to do the traditional satellite VMS software.

32  
33 Where are we currently, and what should be our next steps for  
34 moving forward with the program? I do want to inform you that  
35 no petition for further review has been filed, and the 5<sup>th</sup>  
36 Circuit's decision is now final. We would like to have the  
37 council review SEFHIER's original program goals and objectives  
38 and determine if anything needs to be changed when putting a  
39 program back into place.

40  
41 SERO staff also is working through evaluating the data that  
42 we've obtained for the SEFHIER program to-date, and we hope that  
43 that might be able to identify some goals and objectives as  
44 well. Currently, we're planning to have some preliminary data  
45 available at the October meeting.

46  
47 The next step would be, kind of based on some of the analysis  
48 and the information received in the October meeting, the council

1 could determine what components of the SEFHIER program should be  
2 revised and what components you might want to keep from the  
3 original program, and then, finally, the council could review an  
4 options paper, and we're anticipating around January of 2024 for  
5 that, in order to start a new SEFHIER amendment.

6  
7 I think that is my last slide, and I'm happy to take any  
8 questions you have about where we're going forward with the  
9 SEFHIER program.

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Do you have the goals and objectives that were  
12 initially part of the SEFHIER program, so that the council can  
13 be refreshed on that?

14  
15 **DR. STEPHEN:** I believe there was the original document added as  
16 background material, and could someone bring that up? If you go  
17 to page 4, that should have the purpose and need. In the  
18 amendment, we didn't quite call them goals and objectives, but  
19 we framed it in the terms of purpose and need, and so that could  
20 be adjusted to the goals and objectives, and so you can see here  
21 that the purpose was to improve the accuracy and timeliness of  
22 both landings, discards, effort, as well as social and economic  
23 data. The need for this was to improve management and  
24 monitoring within the fisheries.

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Thank you, Dr. Stephen. Any questions for Dr.  
27 Stephen? If not, I would ask Mara to -- Kevin.

28  
29 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** I'm not on your committee, and thank you. Dr.  
30 Stephen, I have a couple of questions, or at least questions  
31 about a couple of the bullets that are on Slide 2 of your  
32 presentation. In the second bullet, immediate data uses,  
33 validate minimum catch and effort estimates, can you describe  
34 that, or explain that?

35  
36 **DR. STEPHEN:** When we started the program, before it gets  
37 through calibration and benchmarking, what could be possible is  
38 that we could look at the catch and effort estimates coming out  
39 of the SEFHIER and compare it to other data sources, to see if  
40 we can validate where they're at, and so the point where we were  
41 in the SEFHIER program, due to kind of limited costs, we had  
42 mostly concentrated on using our contractors for customer  
43 service, and we had only recently switched over to using them to  
44 look at the data, and so that would be the idea, is that the  
45 MRIP and other data sources would still be the ones used in  
46 management, but we would be using the SEFHIER program data to  
47 validate that, to see if they match and line up, before we got  
48 to the area of calibrating and benchmarking the data for use

1 directly.

2

3 **MR. ANSON:** All right. Thank you, and one other question. The  
4 anticipated benefits of SEFHIER improve monitoring and  
5 compliance, and, specifically, I'm curious about the compliance  
6 part of that bullet, and can you explain that?

7

8 **DR. STEPHEN:** What we were hoping to do with the SEFHIER program  
9 is that you would have more monitoring of the fishery, through  
10 the declarations, the logbooks, and kind of understanding where  
11 everyone was taking a trip, and, with the compliance, that would  
12 be turning the information in in a timely manner, and so, prior  
13 to the SEFHIER program, there was voluntary reporting to the  
14 MRIP program, and this would be moving us more towards mandatory  
15 reporting and getting better information, and I think, as  
16 everyone is aware, in the first few years of the SEFHIER  
17 program, we did struggle with compliance, and we were working  
18 typically towards compliance assistance, having fishermen  
19 understand the regulations and make sure that they would  
20 complying within time.

21

22 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you.

23

24 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Thank you, Dr. Stephen. Ms. Levy, do you want  
25 to give us an update?

26

27 **MS. MARA LEVY:** I mean, I think it was in there, right, and so  
28 the decision is final, and there is no further review.

29

30 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Schieble.

31

32 **MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE:** I have a question, I guess for maybe Dr.  
33 Hollensead or Dr. Simmons, and so what are the next steps here?  
34 Do we work with the existing document, and work as a council to  
35 modify that, or do we have to start from scratch, with a whole  
36 new amendment, here?

37

38 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** I am just talking a little bit with staff here,  
39 and it may be best to start with a whole new document.  
40 Certainly some of the aspects that you would have here could be  
41 translated over, some of those goals and objectives of  
42 timeliness and data collection and that sort of thing.

43

44 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Troy.

45

46 **MR. TROY WILLIAMSON:** Mara, can you refresh our memory of what  
47 the objections of the lawsuit were to this program and basically  
48 what the court settled in on as the reasoning for their

1 decision?

2  
3 **MS. LEVY:** Well, I have not thought about it in quite a while,  
4 since it was done, and, I mean, essentially, there was the VMS  
5 component, right, which was the main objection, and whether the  
6 agency had the authority to require the twenty-four-hour, seven-  
7 days-a-week gathering of location information. On the record  
8 before the court, the court said no.

9  
10 There was a 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment issue raised, and the court did not  
11 directly rule on the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment claim, and there was no direct  
12 holding. They indicated that they had concerns about the  
13 requirement under the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment, as applied in this  
14 particular circumstance, but they did not hold -- They did not  
15 hold that it was a violation of the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment.

16  
17 Then there were the claims about the collection of the social  
18 and economic data, and, essentially, that we required something  
19 in the final rule, the five questions, that it was not clear  
20 that we were going to require in the proposed rule, and so,  
21 essentially, a violation of the Administrative Procedure Act and  
22 sufficient notice of those five economic questions. I think  
23 that was it.

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** I had -- I do have a question about what you  
26 just said, about the economic questions. I mean, the fact that  
27 it was not proper notice, and so my question is, and I know  
28 there is going to be a lot of feedback that we don't need that,  
29 and we don't want that, and that set aside, if it were to get  
30 back into the document, we would have to do a different way of  
31 notifying the angler, or the fisher -- Excuse me. I am getting  
32 my sectors confused, but the charter fleet, the federally-  
33 permitted folks, that, hey, this is coming, and then they would  
34 be able to provide feedback, and is that what we missed in the  
35 notification? I am trying to figure out what we would have to  
36 do differently if the council wanted to include that again.

37  
38 **MS. LEVY:** I don't think the council would necessarily have to  
39 do anything differently. The agency, in doing the proposed  
40 rule, would need to be more explicit that this is social and  
41 economic data, and we used the term "socioeconomic", which the  
42 court said did not provide sufficient notice that we were going  
43 to request social and economic data, and so we would need to be  
44 more explicit about what we were requesting, and then the final  
45 rule would need to be consistent with what we said we were  
46 proposing.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Thank you for that. Mr. Diaz.



1  
2 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** Thank you, Ms. Boggs. I am seeing, in your  
3 presentation, that SEFHIER staff evaluate SEFHIER data with  
4 respect to identified goals and objectives, and you all are  
5 going to do some work and come back to us in October, and I  
6 guess we're going to start a new document in October, and is  
7 that correct?

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

10  
11 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** In response to Dale's question, I mean, I  
12 think that's up to the council. This is what the agency is  
13 suggesting, given the lawsuit, and we felt like it was important  
14 that we go back and take a look at the data and information that  
15 was collected on the program, first and foremost, and then be  
16 very kind of strategic and methodical with regard to any  
17 improvements, changes, modifications, that we would make to the  
18 program, and so the October presentation would provide you, I  
19 think, the basis to then move forward with an options paper in  
20 January, and then we would develop the document throughout 2024,  
21 with hopeful implementation then by 2025, but I am interested,  
22 certainly, in hearing from the council with regard to timing of  
23 this.

24  
25 We heard a lot of charter captains who were disappointed in the  
26 legal decision, as well as those that were supportive of that  
27 legal decision, and, ultimately, at the end of the day, I think  
28 a lot were caught by surprise that the entire program was set  
29 aside, and there is certainly a lot of interest to try to stand  
30 that program up quickly, and so, at this point, based on what  
31 we're suggesting, we're probably not looking at a revised,  
32 updated program in place until Calendar Year 2025, at this  
33 stage.

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Diaz.

36  
37 **MR. DIAZ:** Thank you, Ms. Chair. As you all are having some of  
38 those discussions, and, Andy, I'm just one person, just one vote  
39 on this council, but I would like to see us try to simplify the  
40 document, and then I would like to see us put up some guardrails  
41 in the document about what can be asked once the document leaves  
42 us and goes to SERO and NOAA, and I want us to focus on needs  
43 and not wants.

44  
45 I mean, the thing -- There was a lot of stuff being asked of  
46 fishermen, and we had some public comment, at the last meeting,  
47 that suggested that we simplify it, and I would just like us to  
48 try to focus the document and try to stick with needs, with a

1 goal of having as few things for charter fishermen to fill out  
2 as we can get away with, and, if we're going to have a lot of  
3 economic and social information, I would like for us to have  
4 some discussions about whether they're needed before we put all  
5 of that in there.

6  
7 I just want it more simplified, and we went last time, and I  
8 think the example was the Cadillac and the Buick, and I lean  
9 more towards us going towards getting a Buick for this program,  
10 and focus on needs and less burden as possible on time of people  
11 to fill out stuff, and so thank you.

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay, and so I have a lot of comments. The  
14 simplification, I just pulled it up on my phone, the app that we  
15 have to use for the Southeast Headboat Survey, and it's fourteen  
16 questions, which is not a whole lot different than the charter  
17 fleet themselves, and, I mean, it's a little different, but it's  
18 not. It's fourteen questions, and it's very simple.

19  
20 Again, the headboats have been doing it for twenty-plus years,  
21 and it's just in their blood, and I don't see what quite the  
22 angst is, and I do understand that a lot of people didn't like  
23 the VMS at first, and I know the fleet where we are in Orange  
24 Beach, and they came to me when it was set aside, and they  
25 wanted to continue reporting, and the question was -- Some of  
26 them that were opposed to it when the amendment passed didn't  
27 like it, but now they see the value in it.

28  
29 As far as the VMS, there has to be some type of validation, and,  
30 if it's boots on the ground, that's fine, but I do understand  
31 the agency's point that we need to validate, because it's easy  
32 to build the -- I am trying to remember how my husband says it,  
33 and it's easy to build your future when you know what it's going  
34 to be, and so, if you know that nobody is watching you, and you  
35 start reporting all these fish, then there is no validation, to  
36 say, well, he caught ten fish and not fifteen fish.

37  
38 I think it's important, whether it's VMS or boots on the ground,  
39 and there has to be some type of validation, and what form that  
40 comes in I don't know. I mean, they already have MRIP and the  
41 intercepts there, but I think that it needs to be more, because  
42 you have to know what's coming to those docks.

43  
44 I will say this, that I have made an observance, since the  
45 change, that we have not seen, and I know it's a separate  
46 program, and it's not really a question for you, Andy, but it  
47 seems like we have not seen the validation on the headboat side  
48 as much as we were when the program was -- Because you don't

1 have to hail-out, because you don't have to report until the end  
2 of the week, and so they don't know when you're coming and  
3 going.

4  
5 That was the point of validation, and so I think there's some  
6 things that we have to have there to be able to validate what is  
7 coming to the dock, and I certainly would like to see something  
8 on the water in 2024, and it's not going to happen, and I get  
9 that, but I would certainly hope, at this meeting, that we can  
10 maybe get a motion out there to start a document, so that we're  
11 not waiting until the last minute scrambling and we could go  
12 ahead and be having discussions.

13  
14 It's going to be a hard discussion, and we're already having  
15 those discussions about what needs to be in there and what  
16 doesn't, and then, in October, we can look at the data and see  
17 what it was doing for us, and tweak it from there, but I don't  
18 think we need to wait until October to try to move forward with  
19 a document. Any other questions or comments? Dr. Simmons.

20  
21 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** Thank you, Madam Chair.  
22 Just to remind the committee that you did direct us, in April,  
23 to initiate a document that establishes a charter/for-hire data  
24 collection program to replace the SEFHIER program, and so you  
25 did direct us to do that already, and what we were trying to do  
26 here, with this presentation, is just give an update on what the  
27 agency had decided and what they thought the next steps were,  
28 looking at what the South Atlantic Council is doing now and what  
29 the needs were, as far as compliance and validation that you  
30 brought up.

31  
32 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** You're right, Dr. Simmons, and so when might we  
33 see that document that's being -- I mean, are you going to wait  
34 until October, until we get the presentation on the SEFHIER, or  
35 is this something that we would see in August, so that we could  
36 go ahead and be tweaking the purpose and the need and things  
37 like that, or do we need to have -- I will let you answer. I'm  
38 sorry.

39  
40 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I will  
41 start, and then maybe I will have Andy help me out here, but I  
42 think we could start a document, but I think the idea was to get  
43 some of that information analyzed from the previous program, and  
44 also from the efforts in the South Atlantic Council, to see what  
45 we needed, as far as the basics go, and then build from there.

46  
47 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I don't think the October presentation  
48 precludes us from proceeding with development of a document

1 sooner than that, but it will certainly help inform further  
2 drafting of that document.

3  
4 A couple of comments, while I have the mic. One is I think the  
5 previous amendment that implemented SEFHIER still has a lot of  
6 really good constructs and components that we would want to  
7 consider, and so that could still be the building block of that  
8 new options paper that we would be considering, and then, to  
9 Dale's comment, I certainly agree, and I think, in terms of  
10 appreciating that we need to evaluate the need, the burden, on  
11 the industry, and part of what will be helpful is learning from  
12 what we've been collecting in terms of data previously, but,  
13 also, being able to explain why some of those data elements are  
14 being collected and really sharing the need for those data  
15 elements, so that there's a discussion with regard to burden  
16 versus actually the value, or benefit, of collecting that  
17 information.

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Any other questions on this topic? All right.  
20 Seeing none, Dr. Hollensead.

21  
22 **STATUS UPDATE ON PLAN WITH GSMFC AND NMFS ON THE PRIVATE ANGLER**  
23 **PERMIT**

24  
25 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Yes, ma'am. The next agenda item, the  
26 committee is going to get a status update on the plan with the  
27 Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, as well as NMFS, on the  
28 private angler permit. As you may recall, the council has  
29 recently discussed exploring some novel approaches to managing  
30 federal private recreational anglers, and defining the universe  
31 of those anglers has been identified as an initial step.

32  
33 The council requested that the Gulf States Marine Fisheries  
34 Commission, in collaboration with NMFS, engage state agency  
35 partners to help provide insight on this initiative, and Mr.  
36 Dave Donaldson is going to give us a verbal update, as to how  
37 that has been going on, as well as identification of the  
38 committee that's sort of been initially tasked with this, and so  
39 the committee here should listen to the status update and ask  
40 any questions of staff.

41  
42 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** Are you ready?

43  
44 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Sorry. I had to get a drink. Go ahead.

45  
46 **MR. DONALDSON:** Thanks, Madam Chair. As Dr. Hollensead  
47 mentioned, at the last meeting, the council passed a motion for  
48 us to start looking at the private angling permit, and so we had

1 some internal discussions and thought that the best group to  
2 address this would be the research track development team.

3  
4 That group consists of Beverly Sauls from Florida, Kevin Anson  
5 from Alabama, Trevor Moncrief from Mississippi, Harry Blanchet  
6 from Louisiana, Tiffany Hopper from Texas, Richard Cody from  
7 NOAA Fisheries S&T, John Foster from S&T, Tom Frazer, and Gregg  
8 Bray.

9  
10 The group met about a month or so ago, and one of the things  
11 they talked about was needing more information on the intended  
12 purpose of the permit, to help generate some essential questions  
13 from the state partner perspective.

14  
15 There was a fair amount of discussion, and the group ultimately  
16 decided to forward the discussion to the commission's Technical  
17 Coordinating Committee, TCC, would be the best option. This  
18 group consists of state and federal scientific experts, and it  
19 would be best suited to have a productive discussion, and so the  
20 research track team is developing a short presentation that will  
21 be provided to the TCC to help focus their discussion, and a  
22 presentation will have specific questions that the group needs  
23 to consider, including who needs the permit, cost  
24 considerations, possibly obstacles to implementation,  
25 standardization across the states, how would a new permit be  
26 included in the National Saltwater Registry, would a research  
27 project help explore this topic, and how disruptive could this  
28 process be.

29  
30 Our TCC is scheduled to meet in October of this year, as part of  
31 our fall commission meeting, and I will note that, while the  
32 committee has representation from the states and federal  
33 partners, it does not have Gulf Council staff representation,  
34 and so we would have invite someone from the council staff to  
35 participate in this discussion, and it's envisioned, once those  
36 discussions happen, that we would provide a presentation, or an  
37 update, at a future council meeting, possibly the October  
38 meeting, council meeting, because we're meeting the week before  
39 the October council meeting, and so that's kind of where we're  
40 at, and I will answer any questions.

41  
42 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Dyskow.

43  
44 **MR. PHIL DYSKOW:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Dave, I have a  
45 fundamental concern that, just like the data collection system  
46 for charter boats and headboats, we're going to make this way  
47 more complicated than it needs to be. With all these people  
48 involved and all these wants, this thing is going to get out of

1 control.

2  
3 What we want to do is to instill accountability in the  
4 recreational fishing community, and that's what we hear over and  
5 over and over from everybody that comes to the podium, and the  
6 same kinds of concerns that are raised before this council, and  
7 there are just a few simple buckets that we want to accomplish.  
8 We want data on recreational fishing effort in federal waters,  
9 we want catch information in federal waters, and we want discard  
10 information.

11  
12 If we get those three things, we've accomplished the majority of  
13 what we need, and, incidentally, as you well know, the states  
14 are already collecting most, if not all, of this information,  
15 and so I don't think that we need to reinvent something and make  
16 this so complicated that it takes a long time to implement, and  
17 it frustrates people along the way, because we make it more far-  
18 reaching than it really needs to be.

19  
20 I would recommend that we start with those fundamental goals,  
21 those three things that we want, effort, catch, and discards,  
22 which is easier to implement, perhaps, and, if we need to  
23 complicate this and ask for all sorts of other things, let's do  
24 that down the road, and let's address the fundamental need that  
25 we have before the council today and not try to make this a  
26 mind-blowing, far-reaching project that is not going to go  
27 anywhere fast. Thank you.

28  
29 **MR. DONALDSON:** I couldn't agree with you more, and I think the  
30 keeping it simple and not complicating it is the best approach,  
31 and your comments will certainly be conveyed to the TCC, when  
32 it's presented in October, and so thanks.

33  
34 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Dugas and then Mr. Diaz.

35  
36 **MR. J.D. DUGAS:** Thank you, Ms. Chair. Dave, has there been any  
37 discussion on the funding of any sort of program like this,  
38 where is the funds going to come from?

39  
40 **MR. DONALDSON:** Not initially, and I wasn't in the discussions  
41 for the research track group, but I think that was one of the  
42 things that they were concerned about, and that's one of the  
43 items that is going to be presented to the TCC, is this needs to  
44 be considered, because it potentially is not going to be a cheap  
45 endeavor, and so, yes, that's one of the things we need to talk  
46 about.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Diaz.

1  
2 **MR. DIAZ:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and so I'm trying to -- I  
3 think me and Mr. Dyskow agree, but I'm thinking more simpler  
4 than what he's talking about, and I think this is purely about  
5 identifying the universe, and that's it. We can get weights, or  
6 we can get all that other information from our dockside  
7 surveyors, and we're already collecting that already, and we  
8 identified a universe, and I would like for any discussion  
9 that's had at the Gulf States TCC to make sure and bring up that  
10 we need guarantees that this information is going to be used.

11  
12 At the end of the day, if we go through all this trouble, and we  
13 do all this, and we don't replace FES, at least interface with  
14 FES, and try to use this universe that we collected to better  
15 refine everything, then we've done nothing, and so, at every  
16 discussion, I would appreciate if there's a discussion on how  
17 it's going to be used and when it's going to be used, and that  
18 should be reported to the council, because, if there's not a  
19 commitment to use it, we need to decide here whether we want to  
20 do it or not and put all the states through all this effort. I  
21 mean, this is tremendous lift, and that, to me, is the number-  
22 two thing to consider, and so thank you very much.

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Diaz, you bring up a pretty good point, and  
25 I don't know that I have actually considered it, and, I mean,  
26 we've been asking to identify this universe, and, other than  
27 maybe helping the Science Center, what benefit does that give  
28 us?

29  
30 **MR. DIAZ:** I think Clay would be better able to answer that,  
31 but, right now, we get some numbers in, and we extrapolate it  
32 across this big, giant universe that we've got, that we have  
33 right now, and so, if we identify this universe, and we more  
34 tightly bring it down to what it is, then I don't think -- I  
35 think we can make our estimates a lot better, and I think Clay  
36 could do a whole lot better job explaining that, but that, to  
37 me, is what we want to do with this, and so, Dr. Porch, why  
38 don't you take a better stab at that than what I just did?

39  
40 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Go ahead, Dr. Porch.

41  
42 **DR. CLAY PORCH:** Certainly refining the universe could help us  
43 in our estimation, to get more precise and, in principle, more  
44 accurate estimates of the total effort, which will improve the  
45 statistics across-the-board, right, and the problem is there's a  
46 lot of nuances on how the different states classify that effort,  
47 and what the exceptions are, and so I think you do need a broad  
48 team, with participants from all the states talking about it,

1 what's the best way to implement this, how do you account for  
2 those who have exceptions, you know, for whatever reason, under  
3 sixteen or retired, and, you know, do you require them to  
4 actually get the license, and there's a lot of subtleties there.

5  
6 Also, a vessel license works more effectively than individual  
7 licenses, when you're trying to sample the offshore universe,  
8 and so there's a lot of subtleties in there that are worth  
9 talking about, and you need the states to be of a similar mind  
10 when they're implementing it, but, I mean, it's obviously not  
11 just a benefit to the Science Center, and it's a benefit to  
12 everyone, if we can get better estimates of recreational fishing  
13 effort.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** So a question, Dr. Porch, and I know the  
16 conversation has been back and forth, is do you do it  
17 individually or vessel, and I have concerns about doing vessel,  
18 but, if you can give me a brief explanation as to why that's  
19 better, and I will explain to you why that concerns me, is  
20 because you can have a center console, a thirty-six-foot  
21 Freeman, going out, but they're going to have fifteen people on  
22 that boat, but then the next boat -- I look at what comes to our  
23 dock to purchase fuel and the number of people on the vessel,  
24 and I know they're going out fishing, because they have all  
25 their stuff out, or they're telling you about the trip that they  
26 just came in on, but then you have boats that come in and they  
27 have three people on it, and so are we still identifying that  
28 universe of anglers?

29  
30 **DR. PORCH:** I mean, it's easier in the sense that you can't go  
31 offshore fishing without a vessel. Yes, maybe there's a few  
32 people that go out in kayak, but it's pretty small, and so  
33 that's the simplest unit of effort, and, with individual  
34 anglers, you've got all the issues with out-of-state and keeping  
35 track of whether they're fishing inshore or offshore, and, I  
36 mean, there's issues with that with the vessels as well, but  
37 it's a simpler unit of effort to keep track of, and then you can  
38 do the same interviews as well, and we do how many anglers were  
39 on the vessel, et cetera, but I think the main issue is it's a  
40 simpler unit of effort, and, if you're really going after  
41 offshore, no one is going out there without a boat.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Thank you. Any other questions? Dr. Frazer.

44  
45 **DR. TOM FRAZER:** I participated in this group, and I think the  
46 reason that they moved it over to the Gulf States Marine  
47 Fisheries Commission and their technical committee is that each  
48 of the state representatives recognized the complexity of



1 modifying their individual licensing programs to a universal  
2 kind of angler permit, or something of that nature, and I didn't  
3 want people to walk away, from this discussion anyway, thinking  
4 that that's the path that ultimately we're going to go down.

5  
6 I think Dale and Clay pointed out, rightfully, that the goal is  
7 to be able to identify, in the best possible way, what that  
8 angler universe is, so we can refine our sampling efforts,  
9 right, to get accurate and precise measures of harvest and  
10 discards, and so I think it's the appropriate group to discuss  
11 what the limitations and the constraints, or the costs, might be  
12 with modifying those programs, but they are also charged, I  
13 think, with providing alternatives, right, to how we might get  
14 that information, and so I think there's going to be a bit of a  
15 process involved here, and so I look forward to what that group  
16 actually comes up with.

17  
18 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** I appreciate those comments, Tom, and the way  
19 Dale kind of posed the question earlier made me think why, and  
20 these are questions I think that will ultimately come back from  
21 that technical committee that we are going to have to address  
22 and determine do we want angler or vessel, and so I'm just  
23 trying to get a little feedback now, so we can all be thinking  
24 about it. Mr. Strelcheck.

25  
26 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I will just add that I think that I think that  
27 it will be important for the Gulf Council to follow what the  
28 South Atlantic Council process is also working on, and it's  
29 different, and there is justifiable reasons for it being  
30 different, but kind of the same line of thinking, in terms of  
31 they're exploring the idea of a federal permit to really improve  
32 and enhance the effort portion of data collection estimates,  
33 right, and so they refined the purpose and need at their last  
34 meeting.

35  
36 They've had a technical working group that's providing guidance  
37 and advice with regard to how to institute such a permit, if  
38 they, you know, decide to implement something like this.

39  
40 The difference is the Gulf already has reef fish surveys and  
41 programs, and there's a lot of data collection that is already  
42 happening, right, and so, you know, is there a need for a  
43 federal permit, relative to, you know, standardizing and making  
44 the state permits kind of more consistent with one another, and  
45 I appreciate the comments that were made, and, you know, there  
46 is downstream implications of this, because, if that's our  
47 driver in what we're trying to accomplish, that it ultimately  
48 will feed that effort estimation, the states have to be onboard

1 with that and recognize, obviously, that there would be changes  
2 that need to be made in order to accomplish that, but I think  
3 both what you're proposing, and what the South Atlantic is  
4 doing, are very much in alignment with one another, and they're  
5 just taking a little bit different tack to get there.

6  
7 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Any other questions or comments? Mr.  
8 Donaldson.

9  
10 **MR. DONALDSON:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate you kind  
11 of spurring this discussion, because I think these discussions  
12 will help the discussions in October with our TCC, and so any  
13 additional information we can provide to them would be useful,  
14 and so I appreciate you trying to get folks to provide some  
15 input ahead of time, and it is going to be helpful. Thanks.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Dyskow.

18  
19 **MR. DYSKOW:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Dave, since you opened  
20 that box of wanting more feedback, I think one of the biggest  
21 challenges to angler participation is their concerns as to how  
22 this permit is being used.

23  
24 You know, traditionally, recreational fishermen have a license,  
25 and not a permit, and the definitions of those two are somewhat  
26 different, and I think the concern is that this will go the way  
27 of other permits, whereby you have annual lotteries and draws as  
28 to who gets a license to hunt this animal, versus not, and I  
29 think we need to make it clear that our goals and objectives  
30 with this permit, as we continually call it, is data collection  
31 and not regulation.

32  
33 We have regulatory processes in place to manage recreational  
34 fishing, and I don't want this permit to be considered a  
35 limiting entity, where there is going to be a limited number of  
36 permits available, and that will affect participation, and this  
37 is a data collection process, and we need to make that clear  
38 from the get-go, of how this is going to be used, and, if we  
39 don't do that, it's going to make implementation, at the  
40 grassroots level with anglers, more difficult, if we're going to  
41 do boat ownership in particular, and I would much prefer that we  
42 used individual anglers, but, if we're going to go down that  
43 boat path, we need to be clear how this is going to be used, in  
44 my opinion. Thank you.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Thank you, Mr. Dyskow. Any other questions or  
47 comments? Dr. Stunz.

48

1 **DR. GREG STUNZ:** Susan, I have a quick comment. Dave, I don't  
2 recall now the language that Phil is referring to, license  
3 versus permit, and, obviously, permit is what we are seeing  
4 commonly here in the agenda and other places, and do you recall  
5 how that came to be, or that's just -- I mean, Phil is pointing  
6 out a really important -- It may be a nuance, but it has big,  
7 wide implications, potentially, for support of something like  
8 this, and so that's why I'm asking.

9  
10 **MR. DONALDSON:** I am not sure, and I think it was just part of  
11 the way the motion was worded at the last meeting, and I think  
12 the term "permit" was used.

13  
14 **DR. STUNZ:** Yes, that's what I'm wondering, and, maybe at Full  
15 Council, we could pull up that motion, just to see what that --  
16 I don't recall what that was, and the other thing that I wanted  
17 to say, regarding this, is, obviously, two states are missing  
18 here today, because of travel issues, and they won't be in until  
19 this afternoon, and so, obviously, they probably would have a  
20 lot to say about this, and so I will reserve some time during  
21 Full Council, as this comes back around, if they want to chime-  
22 in on this discussion.

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Dyskow.

25  
26 **MR. DYSKOW:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and I'm sorry to keep  
27 coming up with questions and concerns, and this is addressed to  
28 the Chair. In Full Council, we might consider a motion to  
29 change this wording to define this as a license, as opposed to a  
30 permit, and I know that different people have different  
31 opinions, but this is a big deal to the people that we're trying  
32 to gather this information from, and, if we want to get better  
33 information, and better dialogue with recreational anglers,  
34 maybe we need to use language that is more compatible with what  
35 they're thinking, and so we may consider a motion, before Full  
36 Council, to define this as a license, as opposed to a permit.

37  
38 That also goes down the path of do we want this to be directed  
39 at individual anglers or vessels, and I know there are reasons  
40 why NMFS wants it to be permits, a smaller population and easier  
41 to manage, and I get all that, but we need to be thinking about  
42 those two issues.

43  
44 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** All right. Mr. Strelcheck, and then I have Mr.  
45 Dugas, and Mr. Diaz.

46  
47 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Well, I just want to be very clear, and, I  
48 mean, he's calling out NMFS, saying this is what we want to do,

1 and this is a fishery management council request, and NMFS can't  
2 dictate this. I have proposed a recreational fisheries  
3 initiative that we're all going to be a part of. I'm going to  
4 be meeting with leadership in the recreational community this  
5 week, and, ultimately, whatever comes of that will be a council  
6 effort and not just NMFS-driven, and so I just want to be very  
7 clear.

8  
9 I think your point is well taken, Phil, that we need to have  
10 trust in the process, and we need to build trust in the process,  
11 and where I think that can come with this effort is if we're  
12 very clear in terms of what the purpose and need of it is,  
13 whether it's a permit or a license or whatever the case might  
14 be.

15  
16 In terms of things that fall out of that afterward, in terms of  
17 management actions, that is, to me, two or three or ten steps  
18 down the process, and so I just want to be very clear that  
19 nothing is on the table being proposed in terms of how to use  
20 these permits, or licenses, at this point, beyond what we're  
21 talking about around the council table.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Dugas.

24  
25 **MR. DUGAS:** Thank you, Ms. Chair. I hear that the South  
26 Atlantic is working on something similar to this, and it seems  
27 like they're further along, and my question is has funding been  
28 captured for their program?

29  
30 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I'm not sure how much further along they  
31 actually are. Funding is always a question with regard to any  
32 sort of permitting like this, because the federal government, if  
33 it is a federal permit, doesn't collect fees that then directly  
34 go to say the National Marine Fisheries Service's budget to  
35 implement, and it goes to the General Treasury, right, and so  
36 the amendment that they're working on to develop a permit would  
37 take into consideration the cost burden to both anglers as well  
38 as costs to the federal government in order to implement such a  
39 program, if they go as far as making that decision.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** All right. I am going to go to Mr. Brewer, to  
42 that point.

43  
44 **MR. CHESTER BREWER:** Thank you, Ms. Boggs. I am not on this  
45 committee, and I'm not even on this council, and we are all  
46 together on this issue. We had a joint workshop for the South  
47 Atlantic Council and the Gulf Council, and we ended up talking  
48 about just these issues.

1  
2 I don't know if the minutes of what went on at that workshop  
3 would be useful, but maybe so, and the outcome really was to go  
4 ahead and develop a program that would build off of what some of  
5 the states have been doing in the Gulf, and not necessarily in  
6 the Atlantic, and, to a very great degree, the South Atlantic  
7 Council states -- Some of them are very much behind it, in that  
8 they are stymied, because, to start any kind of program like  
9 this, they would need to spend money, and they would have to  
10 get, essentially, approval from their legislature.

11  
12 Getting money from their legislatures is like pulling teeth,  
13 because people think it's a tax, and that's one of the big  
14 problems, but what did come out of that is we need to pursue,  
15 both councils, a program so that the, quote -- This was a  
16 favorite term, but the universe can be identified.

17  
18 Now, whether that would be funded by, and administered by, the  
19 federal, or NMFS, or the states, it finally came down that these  
20 are federal waters, and the federal folks should be in charge of  
21 federal waters. Now, I think there's going to be -- When we get  
22 into Full Council on this, and we are -- I'm pretty sure it's an  
23 agenda item in the upcoming meeting, but there's going to be a  
24 lot of pushback from people who want it administered and run by  
25 the states, just because the Gulf Council has had such success  
26 with some of these state-administered programs, and I wish that  
27 we had them, and that's it, but I just wanted -- What I wanted  
28 to emphasize is we are all in this together, in both the South  
29 Atlantic Council and the Gulf Council. Thank you.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Diaz.

32  
33 **MR. DIAZ:** I want to weigh back in on this permit and license  
34 thing, and I appreciate Mr. Dyskow bringing it up, and I do  
35 agree that it's a nuance that we need to talk about, but I think  
36 it's premature for us to try to decide any of that terminology,  
37 and the reason I say that is -- So Gulf States Marine Fisheries  
38 Commission's TCC is going to take this up in October, and they  
39 have very good representation on that TCC from each state, and,  
40 during Dave's commission business meeting, there is decision-  
41 makers that are pretty much on that business part of the meeting  
42 that can look at this and make some decisions.

43  
44 Like, for instance, right now, Louisiana has an offshore landing  
45 permit, and that permit might already suffice for what's needed  
46 for Louisiana's sake, and so, I mean, it's already called a  
47 permit, and it's in place.

48

1 When you get to the state level, and this is something they  
2 could talk about at Gulf States, there might be a big difference  
3 between a state trying to implement a license or a permit, and I  
4 would imagine that a lot of licensing stuff is going to have to  
5 go through the legislature, and that could be very complicating,  
6 where most of the states are managed by commissions, and  
7 commissions might be able to handle permits, and so it might be  
8 a lot less burdensome.

9  
10 Anyway, I just think it's too early to try to settle whether  
11 it's a license or a permit, and, in my opinion, after the  
12 October meeting, where the Gulf States Marine Fisheries  
13 Commission can have some discussions, and maybe we can tackle  
14 that, but I do understand your concern, and I know it's your  
15 last meeting, and you would probably like to have some closure  
16 on that, and you are going to be missed, by the way, but,  
17 anyway, I think it's way too early to try to decide that,  
18 without more input from the group. Thank you.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. I have a list, and so just be patient.  
21 Dr. Simmons first.

22  
23 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair.  
24 Bernie, could we please put up the motion? The motion actually  
25 does say "fishing license", and I believe, in the letter, and I  
26 think, Chair, we missed this too, but it said "license/permit",  
27 and so I think two reasons that staff did that, and so I will  
28 apologize.

29  
30 The first one is because I think "permit" was used by the South  
31 Atlantic Council, and so we have, in our letter  
32 "permit/license", and the second reason was because we didn't  
33 want to defray, or confuse, the public with what the states are  
34 currently doing, and so perhaps the discussion should be more on  
35 a federal license, or what terminology we would want to use  
36 moving forward, as to not defray, or take away, from what the  
37 states already have in place.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Okay. Ms. Levy, I am going to go to you first,  
40 in case it's to these comments.

41  
42 **MS. LEVY:** Well, I mean, from my perspective, it's what you're  
43 requiring or asking of people and not what you're calling it,  
44 right, and so the states might use a particularly terminology,  
45 and people might associate things with a particular terminology,  
46 but it's what it means that matters, and so, if you have a  
47 license that you determine is only available via lottery, and is  
48 limited access and all that stuff, and you have a permit that is

1 open access, and anyone can get, then you call things different  
2 things, and the implications are different.

3  
4 I guess I don't -- I guess I would just suggest not getting hung  
5 up on what it's called, but focusing on what you want it to do  
6 and what you want the requirements to be to be associated with  
7 it, and we work out what we call it later, but, if we are  
8 talking federal, I think the Magnuson Act uses the word  
9 "permit", but I will double-check on that, but, again, what it  
10 does, versus what it's called, is probably the most important  
11 thing.

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mr. Schieble.

14  
15 **MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Bernie, can you go  
16 to the page 10 on the motions report, and it's the Other  
17 Business section, and so that motion that we first looked at was  
18 tabled, I believe, and then we brought back the motion at the  
19 end, and there was actually two of them, and I think, because  
20 there is two of them, that's what is conflating the issue here  
21 for us.

22  
23 One discusses developing the express purpose of a universal  
24 state-managed recreational fishing license program, and the  
25 other is the motion that I put up that talks about having the  
26 express purpose of developing a universal state-managed  
27 recreational saltwater angling landing permit program. They're  
28 two different things, and that might be part of what's causing  
29 the confusion here as we talk about this.

30  
31 A license, we already have the saltwater license registry, and  
32 so I don't really see the need for the first motion, and it  
33 seems redundant. The second motion was discussing a separate  
34 permit, with the whole purpose of having a landing permit  
35 separate from the license frame, to better define the user group  
36 of anglers that are saltwater fishing in federal waters, and you  
37 could add certain species to that, if you really wanted to.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** So, to Mara's comments, and I'm not saying that  
40 it's the TCC's job to do this, but I think your charge is to  
41 bring back ideas of how this can work and how we can manage it,  
42 and then, as Mara says, we need to determine what all that  
43 means, and then we can name it, but so I think we're getting  
44 hung up on license and permit, and, as Mara said, it's a little  
45 premature now, and I hear what she is saying, and so -- But I  
46 don't know that we'll be consistent in conversations moving  
47 forward with what we call it, until we actually have a plan in  
48 place, and so I hate to get too hung up that. Mr. Dyskow, did

1 you have any final comments on this topic?

2  
3 **MR. DYSKOW:** Just to a point of clarification, and I appreciate  
4 you calling on me. As a recreational representative on this  
5 council, obviously, the recreational stakeholder organizations  
6 communicate with me, just like the shrimp fishermen communicate  
7 with the people that represent them on the council, and,  
8 universally, I hear support for a license/permit, to get better  
9 data on recreational fishing in federal waters.

10  
11 If I get any pushback at all, it's over this whole concern about  
12 what a permit is defined as and what a license is defined as,  
13 and so I'm not making this up, and it's not a personal vendetta  
14 of mine, and I can just communicate that this is a big concern  
15 to a recreational fishing stakeholders' group, and, if we can  
16 define this more succinctly, going forward, we can probably  
17 eliminate some of that concern, and I don't want that concern to  
18 morph into opposition. We want support for this, as we have it  
19 now, and so let's be careful that we don't go down a path that  
20 would cause some greater concern and reduce the level of support  
21 that we have, and that's all I have to say, and I've said too  
22 much on this subject already. Thank you.

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Mara, can you let us know, at Full Council,  
25 what the terminology in the MSA is, and maybe that's what we  
26 need to use in discussions going forward, or does it matter?  
27 Mara.

28  
29 **MS. LEVY:** Well, I mean, so, in terms of the parts of the act  
30 that talk about fishery management plans the council develops,  
31 it uses that there's a discretionary provision that allows the  
32 councils to require permits, but, again, we have open access  
33 permits, and we have limited access permits, and we have all  
34 sorts of permits. If we're talking about with the states, and  
35 like it's not really clear to me where this is going yet, and  
36 like is it going to be all the states, and that's what you're  
37 doing, or you're developing a federal permit, and I don't know,  
38 but, I mean, the language that talks about the recreational  
39 fisheries registry, right, that got developed says -- It uses  
40 all the terms.

41  
42 The Secretary shall exempt from registration under the program  
43 recreational fishermen and charter fishing vessels licensed,  
44 permitted, or registered under the laws of the states, right,  
45 and so, again, it's not the name, but it's what is associated  
46 with the name, and I think you just have to be clear, moving  
47 forward, and I agree that you have to be clear about what that  
48 means and what you're going to be asking of people, regardless



1 of what you call it.

2

3

**OTHER BUSINESS**

4

5 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Of course, we can't answer that, because we're  
6 waiting on the TCC, and so, in the meantime, we'll just call it  
7 whatever and hope for the best. Any other questions or  
8 comments? All right. That brings us, I believe, to Other  
9 Business

10

11 I do have one question on Other Business. At the last meeting,  
12 and this is in reference to the commercial logbooks, there was a  
13 conversation about sending out mailers and then scheduling  
14 webinars in maybe June or July, and is that -- Did we get all  
15 that done, and are we on track with moving forward with that?

16

17 **DR. HOLLENSHAD:** Yes, and Emily and I are discussing that in the  
18 background.

19

20 **CHAIRMAN BOGGS:** Any other business to come before this  
21 committee? Seeing none, we are adjourned.

22

23 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 5, 2023.)

24

25

- - -