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The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council convened at the Sandestin Golf and Beach Resort, Miramar Beach, Florida, Monday morning, June 3, 2019, and was called to order by Chairman Greg Stunz.

ADOPITION OF AGENDA
APPROVAL OF MINUTES
ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS

CHAIRMAN GREG STUNZ: We will call the Data Collection Committee to order. If you’re following along, that’s on Tab F. For the record, our members are -- I am the Chair, and Mr. Anson is the Vice Chair. We have Mr. Banks, Ms. Boggs, Dr. Crabtree, or Sue Gerhart is I guess here for him today, and Mr. Donaldson, Ms. Guyas, Mr. Sanchez, Mr. Spraggins, and Mr. Swindell. We have a full membership here.

The first item of business is Approval of the Minutes from our April 2019 meeting. Is there any comments or recommendations or changes to the minutes? Seeing none, is there a motion to approve those minutes?

MS. MARTHA GUYAS: Motion to approve the minutes.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Martha made the motion, and it’s seconded by Mr. Donaldson. Any opposition to the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes are approved. I guess I skipped out of order. The first was Adoption of the Agenda. We might want to do that before we go into it. Is there any edits or comments to the agenda? Mr. Donaldson.

MR. DAVE DONALDSON: I just have one minor thing, and it’s actually under Item V, and it’s “GSMFC” and not “GSFMC”.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. We’ll make that correction. All right. Any other changes to the agenda? Seeing none, would someone like to make a motion to approve the agenda, please? Motion by Martha, and Mr. Sanchez seconds. Any opposition to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. Obviously, we just went through the minutes. Dr. Hollensead, would you like to talk us through the Action Guide and Next Steps for today’s meeting?

DR. LISA HOLLENSEAD: Thank you, Dr. Stunz. On the agenda today, we have newly assigned members to the Data Collection Advisory Panel, and those terms run from 2019 to 2021, and so, in association with that, staff has drafted a Data Collection AP charge. At this time, the committee can review and provide any input on that charge, which will be sort of a purpose statement
and directive for that group as they meet in the future.

Next on the agenda, we will be continuing our discussion of commercial fishing unique trip identifiers, and Dave Donaldson from the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission will be giving us a little update as to what his group and associated agency partners have done so far along that body of work.

Then, lastly, we’ll be continuing our discussion from last time, if you will recall, for the Southeast For-Hire Implementation Electronic Reporting Program, and several committee members asked for some clarification, and we also had a similar report from stakeholders in the public and what we have identified as sort of some sticking points that we ask for a little more clarification for, and so SERO staff will be giving a presentation on those things that were brought up at the last meeting, and, unless there’s any questions, Dr. Stunz, that concludes my review of the action guide.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED DATA COLLECTION AP CHARGE

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Thank you, Lisa. Any questions for Lisa? One other item, if we have some time today, when we finish that Item Number VI regarding the presentation, I think Emily has a -- If there is some time, she would like to click through an example of what this data entry might look like on an actual trip, and so that will give us a feel for what it really entails, and so I think that may be a good idea, and it will give us an idea of what to expect.

With that, we’ll go ahead and get into the agenda, and the first one is on Tab F, Number 4, and that is review of that AP charge, if you recall our discussions last time about populating that AP, and, of course, we just did that in the closed session, and, obviously, the next step is to develop this charge, and so I will wait a second here, so we can bring it up on the screen, and that’s Tab F, Number 4. I will give everyone a second to read that.

Is there any comments or suggestions, or would anyone like to make edits to this charge? Mr. Swindell.

MR. ED SWINDELL: I guess I’m a little concerned about the AP having enough knowledge about the cost of data collection. Are they going to review how the costs are done or where they’re coming from or that kind of thing?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Maybe some others can comment more than me, Mr.
Swindell. I was sort of -- I guess it depends on how you interpret the cost. From the users, there is a cost for these programs, a forty or fifty-dollar, or I guess it maybe even could be different, more or less, and so they have costs of their own that I guess they could contribute to, but, then again, there is costs of the actual program, that I guess Sue, or whoever is giving the presentation, would comment on, and so I don’t know -- You’re right that I don’t know how much they would get into that, but I do know there is some issues with the users about the daily or monthly fee that they are charged for using that, and so I’m not sure how that would really play out. Sue, do you have any insight on that?

MS. SUSAN GERHART: I guess I’m just a little unclear as to their charge. Is it to do with the program that the council has already approved and is going forward, or are we talking about new programs coming forward?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Well, this is currently the one that’s imminent on implementation here, and my understanding was the cost that most were concerned with, and what we’ve heard in public comment, was their monthly or annual fees that they pay to be able to do that. John, did you have a comment on that?

DR. JOHN FROESCHKE: Just to be clear, this AP is not targeted for any specific program. This is ongoing issues and things, and so, if you have something that comes up related to data collection, that’s the purpose of this. It’s not like an ad hoc that is specifically designed to address one issue.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Right, and thanks, John. That’s a good point. Including me, I’m getting a little -- With the SEFHIER imminent, that this is -- But, at the same time, this would be much broader than that too, obviously. Dr. Simmons.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to add to what Dr. Froeschke said. Just to remind the council, we don’t typically have standing advisory panel charges, but, because of the technical nature that has come up many times with data collection, we decided that it would be ideal to go ahead and draft a charge for the council to consider, and we have a new body, and to try to use them a little bit more regularly was the intent of this.

Regarding the costs in the proposed charge, that was really the cost to the user, the cost of any devices or electronic monitoring or reporting that would be applicable that the council may want to put before them that they would basically
have to build into their business plan in the future, and so any
other actions the council would be working on, and so for the
user is where we were trying to go with this draft charge when
we were first laying it out.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Good. That’s what I suspected, and,
obviously, this charge is pretty broad, and I think that’s a
good thing, and I personally don’t have any issues with that.
Dr. Simmons, I assume too that, as things change and data
collection programs evolve, this charge could evolve as well
then. Any other comments? Not seeing any other hands around
the table, if everyone on the committee feels like this is
appropriate, would someone be willing to make a motion to move
forward with this charge?

MR. DONALDSON: So moved.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. The motion is seconded by Mr. Spraggins.
Any discussion? I will wait and get the motion on the board.
The motion on the board is to approve the Data Collection AP
charge. Kevin, I think you had your hand up?

MR. KEVIN ANSON: I did. Thank you. I think there ought to be
some clarification to the costs and have “user” or “end user
costs”, just to have it specific to that and not necessarily the
total costs for the program. I would let other people comment
on it, if they feel that it should be spelled out, rather than
going back and looking at the minutes to get clarification, or
the AP, if they need it.

Just to pick up on a point that Sue had asked, or brought up,
earlier, is that it’s not necessarily for a review of the
SEFHIER as it’s going through the process at this point in time,
but the charge says to review and evaluate data collection and
monitoring management programs, and so I suspect that, after it
is rolled out and they begin meeting, that they could be
reviewing the SEFHIER, as it relates to implementation and the
efficiency and all those types of things, and get into some of
those more technical aspects of the program, is what I envision,
and I think others had envisioned, when we last discussed this.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Well, there is two things there. First, I
guess, Mr. Donaldson, as the maker of the motion, are you okay –
- Kevin, you’re saying we substitute a word in there or
something before “costs”, like “user” or something, or what is
your recommendation for that?

MR. ANSON: “End-user costs”.
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CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Then, actually, in the charge, before the word
"costs" at the end of the sentence there, and, Mr. Donaldson,
are you okay with that change?

MR. DONALDSON: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Any other comments? Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: If we’re going to make that change, then -- I
guess I am sitting here thinking about costs and wondering
whether or not it’s the right thing to ask an advisory panel to
review the total costs of the MRIP program, for instance, and
whether or not this works better than the cost of another
program. Do we want an advisory panel to look at these kinds of
things, or are we just interested in the feasibility of whether
the data collection programs that we are recommending are good
programs for them to use and what is the cost to the fishermen
at the time? I don’t know.

I am just -- I would like, somewhere along the line, to really
look at what is the total cost to doing all of this stuff, and I
don’t know that this advisory panel is the right people to
really look at all that broad spectrum of cost, but it’s
something that I do think that we should look at, as time goes
by. I am willing for it to go the way it is now proposed.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I am sorry, Mr. Swindell, but could you say
that one more time? I was pushing the button.

MR. SWINDELL: I am willing to go forward with the motion the
way it’s now proposed.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, and I think, also, all of us are very
interested, or at least will be in-tune, with what is the
overall costs and the bang for the buck, in terms of whether
it’s MRIP or this, and whatever programs we end up with, and
we’re sensitive to that. Certainly, I think, the way we
populated this committee, or this AP, earlier today, they are
certainly going to be interested in the end-user costs, and
we’ve captured that here in this motion.

If there is not any other comments or edits to this motion, we
can vote on this motion. Any other comments? All right. Is
there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion
carries.

Moving on to our next item of business, if you recall, I guess
Leann, at some point, brought up this unique trip identifier and all the complexities that that caused and a whole chain of handling, I guess, of fish, from catching and landing and so on, and there was a lot of requests for having a unique trip identifier, which, on the surface, sounds perfectly reasonable, but then, obviously, once we got down into the details, we discovered maybe not, and so Mr. Donaldson had some ideas with the Gulf States, that they may be able to help us out on that, and so, Dave, I think you wanted to bring us up to speed on that.

**DISCUSSION OF COMMERCIAL FISHING UNIQUE TRIP IDENTIFIERS**

**MR. DONALDSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. After our discussions, we convened one of our workgroups and had representation from all the five states, as well as some additional federal partners. The main issue that we talked about was identifying a minimum set of elements that we need for vessel information.

After the call, Mike Travis developed a minimum set, and we distributed it out to the states, to get an idea of what’s the feasibility of collecting this information so we could create this unique identifier.

We have heard back from a couple of states, and not all states, and we have had varying degrees of their ability to collect the information. No state has said that they would be able to collect all the elements, but some states can collect some of it. The issue, as you may recall from the discussion we had at the council meeting, is not a new one, and we’ve been discussing this through GulfFIN for a number of years and have addressed this specific issue a number of times.

We are coming across the same issues that we have in the past, that, for a lot of the agencies, the licensing information is collected through a different agency within the state, and getting timely access to that information is difficult. With Alabama, they can get vessel information, but, the way the information is collected, you can’t uniquely identify if it’s a commercial or recreational vessel, and that has caused some issues, and so we haven’t made a whole lot of progress.

We will continue to move forward and work with the states, to see what the possibility of collecting this information is, but we’re coming across some of the issues that we’ve had, and some of the old issues are still issues that we have to deal with, and just the intricacies of working with different agencies within the state has caused some issues, and so, with that, I
will try and answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Any questions for Mr. Donaldson? Leann.

MS. LEANN BOSARGE: Thanks. Dave, do you think maybe one way to make it a little more palatable -- This originally came from the IFQ AP, and so this is our finfish guys that were requesting this, and so federal finfish guys, to have a unique trip identifier that follows the trip from start to finish and is able to piece all of those little pieces of data together to give a big picture to the scientists, and that’s what this was for.

It seems like it has kind of blossomed and grown, and we’re looking at shrimp, and we’re looking at all sorts of things, and I don’t see where the -- Shrimp is not under a quota, and it’s not something where -- I don’t know how useful that data would really be for shrimp.

Maybe in the future we could find a use for it, but, for the time being, if we just honed-in on the people that actually requested it, which would be your federal finfish guys, if you went to the states requesting something like that, where it’s a much narrower piece of the puzzle -- The shrimp fleet is the biggest commercial fleet in the Gulf of Mexico. When you start asking for data on all of those boats and everything else, I could see where that’s a little overwhelming, but, if we honed-it-in to just the finfish guys, would that possibly make it a little easier for the states to pull the information that you would need to make this happen?

MR. DONALDSON: Well, the issue with the unique trip identifier for finfish is not something that GulffIN has dealt with. I mean, that’s -- I don’t have enough knowledge about what’s collected through the finfish IFQ, but I would think that it would be fairly simple to create a unique trip identifier. This has to do with uniquely identifying vessels, commercial vessels, within each of the fisheries, and so, in my mind, those are two separate things.

The federal unique trip identifier is not something that GulffIN would really have any involvement in. It would be just trying to create that from existing, and maybe adding a few elements, so you can uniquely identify those trips, and, like you said, it has kind of morphed into this, and Mike Travis has been working with us in trying to get uniquely -- To identify the number of vessels that uniquely fish in each fishery, and so I don’t see how we would be involved in the unique trip ID issue.
CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Leann.

MS. BOSARGE: I’m glad we’re having this conversation, because I think you’re right, and I see where Mike is coming from. He needs, for a lot of his work, he does need vessel information, especially for the economic analysis for shrimp, and so I completely get that, but I think you’re right. I think the vessel thing is, unless I’m missing something here, is a different question and a different data request altogether.

What the commercial finfish guys were asking for was a unique trip identifier, something that would link together their hail-out and their hail-in and their landings, the whole shebang, so you could see the picture of the entire trip. Right now, you can have landings data, but you’re not really sure of -- Okay, well, how long were they out for and things like that that, when you put it all together, it gives you a much better picture of what’s happening in the fishery.

That is what they were asking for, and so, Mr. Chairman, I will leave it up to you to maybe stir the right pots and see if maybe we asked this of the wrong people. Maybe this is something that NMFS can do in-house, and I don’t know.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Dave, to that point, because I understood it the way that Leann just described it and not a unique vessel identifier. I just assumed that was already happening, maybe wrongly so, but I’m not real clear on what is the next step. If the finfish -- Do we just go down the finfish, or do we -- Who are we even -- I am trying to figure out how to move the ball here.

MR. DONALDSON: Well, I mean, the two questions are very different questions. The unique vessel ID, or vessel identifier, is something that GulfFIN has been working on. We haven’t been working on a unique trip ID, and I don’t know if Sue can address this, if that’s something that NMFS can create through the finfish IFQ program, and I don’t know, but that would not be something that GulfFIN would be involved in. If that was the original charge, then maybe -- I don’t know how we got off down -- We took a right turn when we should have taken a left, and so I’m not sure.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Dr. Frazer.

DR. TOM FRAZER: Thanks, Greg. I mean, the issue of the unique trip identifier came up at the Council Coordinating Committee
meeting a couple of weeks ago, and so it’s a national issue, right, and it’s not just an issue that we’re trying to deal with here in the Gulf, and so I guess it’s the ACCSP, and they’re working on it at this point, and I would imagine, at some point, there will be an effort to kind of involve or engage the Gulf group in there, and so they are two very different things, but I do think the intent originally was to deal with the trip identifier, and so, as Leann said, you could kind of track things from beginning to end.

**CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Tom, and, Sue, if you want to jump in here too, if you have something you want to add that you might know that the committee does not, but, since I guess you and Carrie were at that committee, is that something that needs to come out of this committee at this point, or do we need to wait and see what the CCC comes to some type of -- I just want to figure out where we need to go as a committee. Dr. Simmons.

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The way I understood it at the Council Coordinating Committee meeting, as regarding the Gulf, is I think we’re the closest to having a unique trip identifier in our program when the electronic for-hire reporting document is implemented, and I believe that ACCSP has been working with the Gulf states on some of that, and, obviously, the Regional Office. When that program comes to fruition, then that would probably be the closest, and that would implement that unique trip identifier, is the way I understand it.

Right now, we don’t have that in the Gulf, and so I believe the Mid-Atlantic Council has done this, and that we should look at what they have done and work with ACCSP and the Gulf States Commission to see what we can do to try to get our other fisheries there and try to move forward in that way.

**CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay, and so what you’re referring to would just be the for-hire that we’re talking about here, right, but, Leann, when you say the finfish group, you’re talking about just commercial, but for-hire too, or -- I guess, if we’re doing unique identifiers, we might as well -- Why do one? I am not real clear what is the universe of the group that you’re talking about.

**MS. BOSARGE:** When this began, I was talking about the commercial IPQ guys. That was my universe. Now, I guess it’s going to happen for the for-hire guys, because they are just implementing their program, and so I guess they’re building this in on the front-end, and so then my question would be, all
right, well, how do we take that and learn from it and see if we
can build that in on the commercial IFQ side, as they requested?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Sue, did you have something?

MS. GERHART: I do not. This is not my area, but Jessica is
here, and she does run our IFQ program at the office, and so I
think she can maybe address this a little bit.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Sure.

DR. JESSICA STEPHEN: If you guys remember, I think back in
March, you guys had a presentation from Mike Travis and Dave
Gloeckner about the unique trip identifiers, and it talked about
shrimp, but we also talked about the IFQ and the other reef fish
ones, and we listed some of the difficulties that we had in
potentially moving forward with that.

Some of it is just the different varieties of ways in which the
information has a different starting point, depending on what
you're collecting and where it's from. We were working towards
trying to identify at least ways to connect that information
after the fact, in which case then it's good for scientific
analysis, but a lot of the possible solutions that we had were
areas where we have potential points of failure.

The possible solutions, back in that meeting, were to report the
trip ticket number on the logbook, mandatory reporting of the
trip ticket number in the IFQ landing collection form, report
the logbook number on the trip tickets, kind of flopping it
around, as well as on the IFQ landing form, and then to make
sure that the trip ticket and logbook numbers are given to port
samplers and observers.

Most of these solutions rely on the fishermen or dealer being
able to pass that information on to each other, and that tends
to end up being a point of failure, in practice, and that's what
we're looking at currently, and the Science Center is looking
into trying to find ways to have a solution.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Is the will of this committee here -- Do we
want to let them work on those solutions, and then we have the
CCC activities going on, especially with the for-hire, or do we
want -- I guess I'm trying to see what is the will of the
committee to move forward with this at this point. Any
comments? Leann.

MS. BOSARGE: Well, I'm not on your committee, and that's why I
didn’t really raise my hand.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Well, you brought it up, and so --

MS. BOSARGE: Okay. Yes, I think that would be good. Maybe if we could -- I don’t know if we need to write a letter to NMFS and say, hey, this is still a priority, and we really want to see what you come up with on ways to mitigate these points of failure and how we can implement this, and I don’t want to put a time certain on it, but I want to make sure that we’re still -- That NMFS is still keeping this on their radar and their priority list and that we get a presentation back at some point at this council and how they think they can fix it.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Unless others feel strongly, I think a letter is appropriate, Carrie. Obviously we can do that relatively easy, but it will also just officially keep it on the front-burner for us and updates and things of what’s going on with this, unless some other committee member has a better suggestion. All right. Seeing none, then, Carrie, if that’s okay with you and your staff, to prepare the letter, and we can move forward with that. Is there any other discussion or questions or anything regarding this unique trip identifier?

Seeing none, we’re moving on to Agenda Item VI now. This is Tab F, Number 5. This is the heavier component of this meeting today, and we have a presentation to go through. If you recall from our last meeting, as we were talking about what this program would look like, in terms of the for-hire data reporting, there were a lot of -- I think it was termed “sticking points” or something like that.

There were some issues that a lot of folks have had, particularly those that were entering this information, and we asked that those be addressed and how we would meet those concerns of those having to enter the data, and I think that’s a big focus of this presentation today. Sue, are you giving that? Okay. Whenever you’re ready, go ahead.

SEFHIER IMPLEMENTATION PLAN PRESENTATION

MS. GERHART: Thank you. As you mentioned, there were several things requested in the letter from the council to us that I tried to incorporate into this presentation, and there are five basic sections, and I will go through a little background, to remind you of how we got to where we are, and I will talk about the data elements that we have determined to request from the fishermen and the reason for those. Then a little bit about the
equipment, which there are a lot of questions about, particularly the tracking devices, and we’ll address some sticking points and then talk a little bit about the timeline.

Both the South Atlantic and Gulf Councils have approved amendments, and both of those amendments have been approved by the Secretary of Commerce. Right now, we’re in the rulemaking process for both of them. The proposed rules have gone out, and we have taken comments, and we are addressing those comments and looking to publish those final rules.

These two programs are a little bit different, but, combined, the fleet is 3,500 permitted vessels that are going to be covered by this, and so it’s a fairly massive program. In the IFQ program, we have nine-hundred-and-some vessels, not even that many, and so this is quite a bit larger of a production than even putting together the IFQ program.

Also, it doesn’t just involve the Gulf and South Atlantic. Because the South Atlantic manages some species all the way up the east coast to Maine, particularly dolphin and wahoo, there are fishermen throughout that whole range that will be using this system, and so what that means is we have to have some sort of integration with those other regions as well as just looking at our own system.

Only about 130 of these 3,500 vessels actually have existing logbook requirements, specifically because they are dually-permitted with commercial permits, but the reason the council put this in place was because of the expected benefits, that this would be a census-based reporting instead of a survey, and it would increase the accuracy of the data, because of that, and it would be more timely than the current data collection system is, and, because of the specific requirement to report before offloading, there would be a reduction in recall bias that is found sometimes with these surveys perhaps weeks after the trip has occurred.

Here are the reporting requirements that the Gulf put into place. They require a hail-out prior to leaving any trip. In this hail-out, they will tell when and where they are going to be returning from the trip, and they must use an approved landing location. Those people that are familiar with the IFQ program know about approved landing locations, and then they can also -- If, on that hail-out, they are not going to be taking a for-hire trip, they can declare out of fishery, and that will be the indication that they’re not going on a for-hire trip, and we won’t be expecting a logbook report after their return.
The logbooks themselves are trip level and have to be submitted before offloading the fish. If no fish are landed, then within thirty minutes of landing, but, other than that, there is not a restriction on the time to get that report in, but just before offloading the fish.

The other requirement is for a location device that’s permanently affixed to the vessel and on twenty-four hours a day. This device has a one-hour ping rate, is what we’ll be requiring, and that’s the same as what the commercial fleet is required to have. The location devices can be either something like a VMS, that’s real-time satellite, or they can be an archivable GPS unit, what we also call store-and-forward type of units that may work on cellular, but it’s stored and then transmitted when they’re within cell range.

Two different permits are affected by this. It’s not just reef fish, but also the coastal migratory pelagics, which are the mackerels and cobia.

SEFHIER, everybody wants to know what SEFHIER is, and it stands for Southeast For-Hire Integrated Electronic Reporting. This is a team that was put together to do this implementation process, and, as you know, it’s been a very long-term implementation, but it was one team that we formed for both the Gulf and the South Atlantic, because we have a number of fishermen that are permitted in both areas, and we want to try to keep this as consistent as possible, both for our data collection and our data analysis, but also for the fishermen, to reduce confusion and duplication and things like that.

We started out with over fifty people on this team, and that included NMFS staff, council staff, and staff from the commissions and the various FINs that are involved here as well, and we had six core sub-topics, and I’ve talked about these at previous updates, and so I won’t go into them in detail here, and we had a number of invited speakers during these meetings, including people from the states, the various Gulf states, and South Atlantic states, that came and talked about their data collection programs and gave us some insights to help develop the program that we were putting together.

Another thing we did was got a grant to contract a strategic planner, and this gentleman has been helping us develop the various processes that are necessary, as well as documenting what we’re doing and, most particularly, writing this development plan.
MR. JOHN SANCHEZ: Please tell me that picture is not our logo.

MS. GERHART: No. It’s meant to be a joke. SEPHIER. Do you want a logo? All right. So, to get into the four topics that we were requested by the council. First, the data elements. The first set of elements -- You may recognize some of this presentation. Emily and the outreach team let me use some stuff that they presented to the fishermen, and so this is very similar to what the fishermen were shown during those meetings.

The first set of data elements are trip information, and these are basic information about the vessel captain and the trip itself, when and where the trip will start and end. Obviously, this identifies what trip we’re talking about, and, when we get to that unique trip identifier, this comes into play there too, to establishing what is a unique trip.

The next set of data is about effort and landings, and so it includes the number of anglers and the hours fished within the trip and then, of course, the meat of the whole thing is what fish were caught, individual species, how many were kept, as well as how many were released. Obviously, we use estimates of efforts and landings in a lot of our analyses, and so this is very critical stuff.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Go ahead, Phil.

MR. PHIL DYSKOW: Thank you. In this section, where we talk about species caught, you have two sub-sectors, species kept and species released. Under the topic of species released, can we add to that the question of whether either descending devices or venting tools were used in those releases, at least the deepwater releases?

MS. GERHART: That’s not something we considered. It does add an additional question, and we were trying to keep the questions as reduced as possible, and I just don’t think we’ve talked about that, and so we can certainly discuss it.

MR. DYSKOW: The reason I’m bringing that up is I chaired the Outreach and Education Committee, and it’s our intention to encourage the use of venting tools and descending devices in the recreational fishing community, which these charter and for-hire vessels are part, and so I think the timing is right to do this, looking at where we’re going in the future and the direction of encouraging proper catch-and-release techniques.
MS. GERHART: Yes. Thank you for that.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Sue, regarding that, would you be able to let us know at the next meeting how difficult it would be to add something, or I guess I’m wondering what would be the next steps if we wanted to incorporate it, because, obviously, that’s something that the committee and council have been very interested in, and having an idea on that would be good, and it maybe could be a simple question related to these, so it’s not real burdensome or something like that.

DR. STEPHEN: One thing to think about is we’re collecting the number of species released, but not the release mortality, which is something that tends to go more with the venting tools and things like that, and the committee, when we were doing the amendment and deciding the appropriateness of what to collect, had moved away from collecting release mortality, because of various issues with that type of data, and so I guess my question is do you think the venting tool question is still useful without knowing release mortality?

MR. DYSKOW: Yes, because we’re trying to encourage best practices in the recreational fishing community, and so mortality is a different question. We’re asking about usage.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Diaz.

MR. DALE DIAZ: I’m not on your committee, but I think I understand the sides of this, and so it’s a balancing act. On one hand, you don’t want to ask any more questions than you have to. You want to get the critical data that you need, but, on the other hand, I think that Mr. Dyskow raises a good point, and it would be valuable information to have that.

Wouldn’t there be an opportunity to have an optional section of this report? They’ve got a required section, and I’m just kicking out something that people could think about. There’s a required section that you have to fill out, and then there might be an optional section, where people could fill out if they wanted to, and I just wanted to throw that out as an idea. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: By the way, Dale, some states, including ours in Texas with iSnapper, are doing just that, where you have the critical elements that you have to have, and then there are some people that do want to provide additional information, and then they can go -- They can either make it clean and quick and get the report in, or, if they’re happy to provide more information,
they have that option, and so there is others doing that. Sue, go ahead.

**MS. GERHART:** Just a couple of things relative to that. We have been working on creating the forms, through ACCSP, and so I’m not sure, at this point, how much changing we can do, but that doesn’t mean that there can’t be changes in the future as well, and we can look into that optional idea as well.

The next set of questions are about how fish are targeted, and so we’ll ask for the target species, what gear was used, the primary areas fished and the depth, and we also like to get a range of depth. This, obviously, gets to that idea of discard mortality as well, because, obviously, that’s depth related, and so that’s the next set.

Then the last set is about socioeconomic information, and we’ll be talking about this a little bit more in the sticking points section, but this includes five different elements: the fee, the estimated amount of fuel used, the price of the fuel, and the number of passengers and crew.

Obviously, we use this kind of economic information when we do the economic effects sections in our amendments, and this is what a lot of the council management decisions are based on, that analysis, and, again, I will talk about that in more detail a little later.

Now a little about the reporting equipment. First of all, for the hail-out, the reporting equipment, the report must be made before leaving the dock. There is no timeframe for a certain number of hours or anything, but, before the vessel leaves the dock, the hail-out has to be done, and they can be done in a number of different ways.

There will be an option to do it through the internet, and someone could have a tablet onboard the vessel, or their PC back at the office, however they want to enter that, and we’re also developing a phone app, a mobile phone app, that will be able to be downloaded to the phone. Then, for those people who have VMS, there is the option to do the hail-out through the VMS.

What you see on the right there is an example of what the VMS screen might look like. This is not a final, but this is based on what we used for the VMS hail-outs for the commercial sector, and so you can see that we have the vessel ID, which, for the most part, may auto-fill, depending on the program being used, the trip type, which will depend on whether we then expect the
rest of the information through the logbook, and you can see that some examples are the charter, or that should be for-hire, trip, a commercial trip, a recreational trip, or a non-fishing trip, and, again, the non-fishing could be anything from going to get fuel or taking a sunset dinner cruise or dolphin cruise or whatever, and so anything that’s a non-fishing trip can be reported as such, and then, again, the rest of the information won’t be expected from that trip.

**Mr. Anson:** Sue, how much quality control work is going to go on for stuff like this on this page, as well as others, when they enter data, specific to trip date, start date, and end date? Do you have something built in there where they can enter in the appropriate date, I guess, making sure that, for instance, a trip start date is going to start today, and the trip end date - - They might accidentally enter in tomorrow, but a different year, and is there any of that going in, to make sure that it’s within acceptable bounds, and, if it isn’t, that it would report back and say an invalid entry or something like that?

There are some issues, apparently, with some of the units that are being used via CLS right now, in that date information doesn’t quite match up with reality, and it’s because the captains can manually enter that information in.

**Ms. Gerhart:** I will try to address, and, if I don’t get it right, Jessica will cover for me here. Part of that depends on the vendor, but there will be some QA/QC going on with this. Obviously, our intention is to match this with the logbooks.

A lot of this is estimated stuff in this hail-out, because your trip may end at a different time than you expected it to, for example, and so that actually data will come in through the logbooks. When they get back, they will enter that. The main purpose of the hail-out is so that we know a vessel is leaving the dock, and so that both port agents and enforcement agents have the ability to come and meet the boat and do the validation and know where and approximately when they will be there, but let me see if Jessica wants to add anything to that.

**Dr. Stephen:** Sure. The other thing we can do is, when we’re writing the tech specs for the different vendors, which are the requirements that they have to meet, one of the things that I envision in those, other than just this field and this format, is some bit of QA/QC that you can’t enter a date prior to today, and so you don’t want someone back-dating that, but some of the things we want to explore just a little bit more, to make sure we’re not locking off a situation, particularly more in the
logbook than the hail-out, where you might actually need to
back-date it without going through NOAA in order to kind of
change your record.

The other thing to mention is that most of these vendors -- This
is kind of a database system behind it, and what they have is
automatic time stamps when people enter data, and so that’s
another way that we use that to quality check that, and it’s
something we use in IFQ, is not just the date the fishermen
enter, but also when it came through to the different parts of
the system.

MR. ANSON: Just to follow-up on that, I mentioned specifically
this report because you were on this part of the presentation,
but it also applies to, obviously, the logbook reports and such,
and so those types of things would be very helpful in trying to
do the final analysis and such and making sure a lot of that
stuff is cleaned up, rather than trying to call a captain back
and clarify it or try to change some dates or other information
that might appear to be incorrect. Thank you.

MS. GERHART: Just a couple of other things to point out on
this. depending on what route the fisherman decides to go in
terms of their equipment, this can be the same device that is
used to submit the logbook, and it can also be, if we’re talking
about VMS, the same device that does the location tracking, and
so it’s really -- The council wanted flexibility for the
fishermen, and so it will be their choice if they prefer
multiple devices that may have a lower cost or if they want to
consolidate and have a single one.

The other thing is to note that the landing location here must
be an approved landing location. Now, we do this in the IFQ
program too, and this is so enforcement knows where to go to
meet them.

In terms of the commercial, there is a lot more approval process
involved than we’re going to have to do here, and so the
commercial requires an OLE approval process, where they actually
go out and inspect the site and make sure there aren’t any gates
and dogs and things like that that prevent them from going
there. That will not be the approval process on this. This
will be an approval process that will be simply making sure the
location exists and that we can find it.

Having said that, all of the previously approved IFQ or
commercial landing locations will be available to the for-hire
guys. They won’t need to be re-approved, because they’ve gone
through a more rigorous approval process, but we can add ones to
those as well that will be just for the for-hire.

The logbooks, again, they must be submitted before the fish are
offloaded, and, again, we have the same options to submit these
as before. They can go through the internet, meaning either
using a tablet that’s on the vessel or a PC that might be back
at the office, and they can go through a mobile phone app, or,
if they have a VMS, it can be done -- Depending on the unit, it
can be done through that VMS unit.

The vendors of these devices will have to be approved
specifically for this program, and so, although we have a number
of VMS devices approved for the commercial program, there is
some different requirements for this program, and so they will
have to go through an approval process again. As such, we
expect that all the vendors are expected to have forms for both
hail-outs and logbooks, and so there should be the opportunity
for one device for both of those requirements.

Of course, everyone is interested in the location devices, what
we call the location or location tracking devices, GPS devices,
whatever we want to call them, and the council, in the
amendment, said that they must, at a minimum, archive the
location for later transmission, but that VMS devices could also
be used, because some of the dually-permitted fishermen, as well
as some people who have been in some pilot programs, already
have VMS units onboard and would like to be able to use them.

Again, as I said, they must be approved by NMFS, and we are
exploring the VMS program that is under the Office of Law
Enforcement, which does the approvals for the commercial VMS,
doing this approval. We are still in the process of working
that out, and it may involve some additional rulemaking.

There are these different types of units, and I mentioned this
before. There are cellular-based ones that are store-and-
forward that archive the information and these one-hour pings of
different locations and then forward them when within cellular
range. There is satellite-based, which is your traditional VMS,
and that would be real time and just continuously uploading to
the satellite, and there are actually hybrid versions that we
were made aware of that will do whichever in either type of way,
and so that can save a little bit of money over a VMS.

Again, most of these we expect to be able to be used for both
the hail-out and the logbook, or not most of them, but some of
them can be used for both the hail-out and logbook, and so, for
example, a VMS will be able to do all three things. However, some of the other devices will not be able to do a hail-out and logbook. It will be simply a pinging device, and that will be all that will be to it.

Here is some of the cellular-type units that have been tested. The Science Center has been testing some of these units, and these are the ones that would store forward, and you see the different brands of units that are being looked at and some of the information that we’ve got about it, and so you can see some of them can include the logbook information, the way they are designed now, and others cannot, and then there is the cost, two costs, associated with purchasing the unit itself and then the monthly cost of the transmission fee, and so this is just the little bit of information that we’ve gathered so far on these six different units.

In addition, here is a list of some of the current VMS units that are approved for the commercial sector, and, again, some of the information that has been requested of us. For example, using a drop-down menu to make it easier to enter while at-sea, auto-populating, so that you don’t have to type in the whole thing, creating a favorites list, which makes it a little bit quicker to put down locations, species, things like that, and then a few of the concerns that have been expressed about these different units.

Recall that we do have a VMS reimbursement program that reimburses the purchase cost, and I believe installation costs for the VMS, and I’m not sure about that one, and so these would be eligible for that. If we have the non-VMS units approved through the VMS program, they would also be eligible for this reimbursement program, and I also have a link down there at the bottom to the CLS program, which has done a pilot program and has been giving out quite a number of tablet-style VMS units throughout the Gulf, and, if anyone is interested in that -- I’m not sure how much they’re still doing that right now.

The sticking points, these are things that came up during the outreach sessions that Emily summarized at the last meeting, particular issues that came up again and again from the fishermen. The first one was about the economic information and why do we need this economic information and is it necessary to have to collect that.

Now, the first thing I’m going to tell you right now is that there are no economists in this room right now, including myself. Unfortunately, we tried to have someone from our
office, and I think I have some people standing by on chat with me if you have questions, but understand that I am not an economist, and I will try to express this as best as I can.

These slides were created by one of our economists, David Records, who worked on this amendment when we were doing it, and we will have Dr. Mike Jepson here later today. He is driving right now, and so he hasn’t made it here yet, and he is the head of our Socioeconomic Branch at the Southeast Regional Office, and so, if you have questions that I can’t answer, or that Jessica can’t answer, then we’ll try to get those questions answered later by those people.

Again, some of the potential uses, and we’ve talked about this a little bit earlier, but getting those five elements of economic information can help us estimate the revenues, the value, and the economic impacts that a sector has. We are required to do regular reports on the economics of this sector, and this will be used in that as well as amendments.

The regulatory costs and benefits will allow us to have more effective management, and this will be more detailed information than we have right now. The marginal value per fish is an important thing, if we’re doing something like changing a trip limit, and the economic analysis needs to know what’s the value of allowing someone to take an extra fish or not take another fish, and so we use it for that.

Quota allocation decisions, obviously, we have talked about, when you make allocation decisions, the allocation policy says that economic issues need to be considered as well, and so this will help with that. We also use this information in disaster recovery assessments and in determining disaster awards as well.

Some things that it will not be used for is it will not be made available to the public, except in some sort of aggregated form that protects protected business information, and it will not be provided to the IRS, which was something that came up multiple times in the outreach sessions, is will the IRS get ahold of this and then use that to do something to us, and so just to make it clear that that is not going to happen without a court order, and so that was a sticking point.

Now, just to really kind of reiterate all these uses, potential uses, we’ve had criticism in the past about inadequate economic analysis in some of our amendments, and so we have used it, based on the best information we have available, but this allows us to get better information that’s available, and so that’s one
of the reasons that we want this information.

Another thing to point out is that the commercial sector has been reporting these same elements through their logbooks for a very long time, and so this has been -- It’s not something we haven’t asked of a sector before, and it’s just new here.

A lot of people have also talked about why can’t you just use a survey or, for fuel, go look and see what the average fuel price is, and the problem with things like that is you’re not capturing the variability. I mean, look at our for-hire fleet. You have six-pack vessels that run little day trips, and you have headboats that can carry 150 passengers and go on multiday trips. Some go farther offshore, and some are near-shore.

Taking these averages doesn’t capture all of that variability, and it doesn’t really show you what’s really going on in the fishery, particularly if we want to break things down say between the charter and the headboat fleet, to see where some of the differences are there. Although we can do things, for example, through surveys and through averaging and looking at websites, it’s just not really going to give us the level of information that’s practical and needed for this particular sector.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I just want to stop you right there, because this isn’t related to necessarily this economic information, but just these data elements in general, but certainly to economics as well. How fixed are these data elements, in terms of set in stone, because you made a comment earlier about the process that you have to go through, and the reason I’m asking that is, obviously, I think this committee and council wanted that flexibility, because we may uncover things that we don’t realize now or things we want to fix or things we want to add or things we want to delete and so on.

I think we were all under the impression that we would have this adaptable program that we could modify as we saw fit, but kind of what I’m hearing you say is this might be more fixed, and so I hope that’s not the case, but what I’m wondering is what’s the procedure, whether it’s like what Mr. Dyskow brought up in discard mortality, or who knows what might come up in the future, but I just want to get a feeling for what’s that process to make changes as necessary.

MS. GERHART: I wouldn’t say things are fixed forever. When I said that, what I meant was we’re trying to stand up this program, hopefully by the beginning of next year, certainly, and
so, working through that, any changes we go back and make to
some of the programming, such that we’ve done already, to create
these forms and set up databases with ACCSP and such will add
some time to that.

Certainly we see this as, as time goes by, we’re going to adapt
this program, as we use it for a while and see what works and
what doesn’t work and make those kind of things, and certainly
it can be adaptable, but it’s just there’s a consequence of
making changes right now for the initial implementation of it,
and that’s really what I was trying to say, more than anything,
for that.

As far as the process, the council did not include data elements
in the amendment, and NMFS is charged with implementing this
amendment, and so it’s kind of on us to do that as we can. The
council can always make recommendations and make motions and
such. If the council wants to require things or not require
things, I would guess that that’s something that has to go
through the regular council process.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, and the reason I was asking that is that
I understand -- I agree that you want to get something running,
and that’s fine, but we just want to have the ability to change
that down the line, and then, anyway, we can talk through those
other questions later. Go ahead, Mr. Banks.

MR. PATRICK BANKS: Sue, I have a couple of questions, one about
the phone app. One of the things we heard, not necessarily in a
public meeting, unfortunately, but just from our captains in
Louisiana, is they really would prefer to use their own
smartphone, and so it looks like you guys developed that.

I think, early on, we weren’t thinking that we were going to be
able to do that, and we were going with just the logbook, and so
I’m happy to see that we’re going to be able to have those guys
use a smartphone. They will have to download an app, or they
will have to sign up for a service with a company and then
download an app, and they can do it that way, and is that -- I
just want to confirm, so that we can get the right information.

DR. STEPHEN: Currently, the vendor we have who is providing
that kind of cellphone app is ACCSP, with their mobile eTRIPS,
and so, if you go to their site, they will have instructions on
how to get a mobile eTRIPS, and you need to sign up for an
account with them, so it recognizes who you are. I think,
currently, that’s the only vendor we have that discussion with,
and I don’t anticipate that being the case in the future, as
more people get into seeing what they can offer and what the
fishermen may want.

MR. BANKS: One other quick question. The term “aggregate”,
available to the public except in aggregate form, and is that
federal law demands that you keep it confidential, and then what
is the standard of aggregate?

DR. STEPHEN: Yes, federal law demands that we keep it, and it’s
three or more individuals, and you need to look at a variety of
levels, to make sure they’re not throughout, and I see Emily has
her hand up back there.

MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN: I just wanted to provide some
clarification on Mr. Banks’ question, because, while there are
some cellphone apps that are being developed, and it sounds like
for the hail-out as well as for the electronic reporting
portion, those vessels are still going to have a device on their
vessel that is permanently affixed, and there is a monthly
service associated with that, and so, even though there is an
app being developed for the one piece of it, I just wanted to
make it clear that that doesn’t free them from the other piece.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Yes. Good point, Emily. Mr. Anson, did you
have your hand up?

MR. ANSON: To further carry on with what Patrick started
regarding the aggregate, what is your current goal for
publicizing that information? You mentioned the commercial data
has it by species and state and the value and the pounds and
that type of thing, and are you going to be able to have it
available so that you can drill down to a species, or it is just
at a state level this is the value of the charter, or is it by
water body or area? What do you envision right now that the
public will be able to drill down that data to?

MS. GERHART: At this time, I think we’re doing this in steps,
and, at this point, we are concerned with getting the
information that we can use in our analysis, which, as you’re
aware, is very aggregated, and it will depend what the action
is, in terms of do we break it down by state or by species and
that sort of thing. Certainly we hope to be able to do it that
way.

As far as making that available to the public, that’s probably a
little ways off, because that involves a lot of programming that
we will have to do, and that will take some time to get
together, and that’s a nice goal to have, is to be able to have
maybe a website, where somebody can go on and just go by species
and by state and all those sorts of things, but I would not
anticipate that being for a little while still.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Ms. Bosarge.

MS. BOSARGE: Thank you, sir. I’m not on your committee. Kind
of following-up on those questions and the confidentiality,
certain pieces of this are, I guess, shared with the state
partners, like your hail-out and your hail-in, because they need
that for enforcement, right, but the logbook piece itself, where
they are putting in how many fish they caught and all the other
questions, does that just go straight to the scientists and the
Science Center, or is that also shared with the state partners?

MS. GERHART: We are exploring the sharing with our state
partners. We have a -- We’ve had memorandums of understanding
with them, and some of them, at least, have signed
confidentiality agreements with us, and so those are things that
-- Non-disclosure kind of agreements, and those are things that
we would have to have in place with them to do that, but we’re
still working through the legalities of that.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Ms. Bosarge.

MS. BOSARGE: Well, that’s what I was wondering, and so that
kind of brings up another discussion. You know, these are
charter and headboats out there that are bringing recreational
fishermen out to fish, and there is a multitude of regulations
that they’re complying with, bag limits and seasons and all this
kind of stuff, and this program is to improve the data that we
get on what they’re catching.

For the charter boats, we used to use MRIP, where we sample a
very small portion of all charter boat trips and then assume all
the rest of them are like that, and this is going to be a lot
better system, where they’re going to, to the best of their
ability, while they’re fishing and while they’re trying to deal
with customers and everything else, they’re going to try and
keep up with how many fish they’re catching, and they’re going
to report that in a logbook, and I am just thinking through this
process.

Now, when they hit that “send” button, if that is shared with
the states for their scientific purposes, that’s one thing, but,
if that is also shared directly to law enforcement that is
intersecting that boat, then are we going to end up in a
situation where they’re watching that offload, and their logbook
was off by two or three fish, compared to what they offloaded, and now they’re going to get fined and get a violation for that from law enforcement that’s watching the offload?

I just want to be careful that we don’t start doing that. This is a data collection program, and the same thing with MRIP on the recreational side. You have biological people there, and they don’t write tickets for things when they are doing that sampling, and I want to make sure that we keep the data separate from the citation side of the house and the enforcement.

If you’ve got an undersized fish, that’s a different story. That’s not a data collection issue. That’s a violation, and you shouldn’t have kept that fish. If you’ve got something that’s a closed season, that’s a violation, but, if the logbook doesn’t match exactly what they see a law enforcement sees going across the dock, I think that that’s a sticky situation that we don’t need to start writing citations for.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mara.

MS. MARA LEVY: Thank you. Well, I mean, just to respond briefly to that, we have a program where we’re requiring folks in the regulations to report all these things before they offload, and that’s a regulatory requirement. It’s enforceable.

To the extent they misreport, it’s a technical violation. Whether somebody is actually going to get a violation for that—We have all these situations where we have violations of the regs, and there’s enforcement discretion that goes along with enforcing them.

I don’t think we can say that reporting is separate from enforcement. Reporting is a requirement that may be enforced, and it may be enforced through the states, through their JEAs and the fact that they have people there that are enforcing the federal regulations, but, again, there’s a lot of discretion that goes into those enforcement decisions.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: To that point, Ms. Bosarge?

MS. BOSARGE: Well, I think that is a slippery slope that we’ve got to watch out for. We have a group of fishermen that came to us and said that we want a better data collection program and we want to make sure that our numbers are really, truly representing a better picture of what we’re doing out there on the water.
Now, if they would have stuck with MRIP, they wouldn’t be fined, and they would have a lot poorer data collection program, but they wouldn’t have these -- Because these fines are not small for them. They’re federal, and so that’s going to be -- A minimum for a written warning is going to be a $2,000 fine, and so I want to make sure that we’re not punishing people for improving their data collection system, right?

We want to encourage that and not punish them for it, but it certainly will be better than MRIP, where you have a small sample of a huge population and then you extrapolate it to all the other boats, and this is going to be much better, and I don’t want to punish them for that.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. In the spirit of moving on, I know Ms. Guyas and Mr. Anson had their hands up, and you all go ahead and ask your questions. I know Sue has quite a few more slides, and so maybe, Sue, with the idea that there is probably going to be a lot more questions at the end if we can get through that, after these two ask their questions, so we can move the meeting along here, but go ahead, Martha.

MS. GUYAS: Well, mine wasn’t really a question. I hear what Leann is saying, and I was just going to say that MRIP is a little different situation. If somebody comes up to you and they want to interview you for MRIP, you can just walk away. You can refuse the interview, and that’s that, and so it is sort of a little bit different situation, I guess.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Kevin.

MR. ANSON: To Mara’s point, and she explained it, that there’s a reporting requirement, and there is the accuracy that goes along with it that’s required to be done as well, and so whether or not -- Comparing this to the commercial side, with the red snapper for IFQ, if that’s what your intent was, to try to make that correlation, I don’t quite see them being quite the same, because we’re talking about numbers of fish for the charter guys, and so they’re held to that standard, as far as the numbers of fish, and, if they miscounted, they miscounted, and that enforcement might use their hail-out report to determine where they’re going to go that day, as far as what marina, or what boats to sample, but that’s still, I think, a little easier for them to manage within their bag limit, based on per fish, and so, if they’re not counting the fish correctly, then it’s just a hail-out report that just kind of guided the enforcement officer to that particular dock on that day, because they knew there were trips out, and that’s all.
CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Sue, I know I started this line and opened the door for questions here, but if you can go ahead and move through, because I know you have several slides left, and there will probably be a lot more information, but we just want to make sure that we reserve some time at the end to get everybody’s comments in.

MS. GERHART: Okay. The next slides are about each of these specific data elements, and so I will go through them very quickly, and you can just use this information on your own time, but, again, the trip fee, obviously, is the most important thing, and that gets to what the revenues are for the business, when we’re trying to do data analysis.

One of the things we want to point out is that we have had surveys that we’ve done in the past, but the last one we did was in 2009, and it’s obviously out-of-date. These things get out-of-date very quickly, quite honestly, and I talked earlier about the simple averages and the problem with that.

Also, using websites, again, we’re talking a number of vessels, a lot of vessels, and so we, obviously, couldn’t sit and look up every website for every vessel, to find out what they charge for fees, and, generally, on the website, they’re not saying here is the fee. It’s a range or something like that. Headboats are a little different. It’s per person, and so that’s usually pretty stable, and so we can do that with them, but not for the charter vessels so much.

Fuel used, this is an estimate, and we don’t expect somebody to be exact about how much fuel they used. If they know the vessel holds X number of gallons, and they used half of the tank, then that’s what it is, but, again, this is getting at the cost. Some people have said you can figure that out by looking at the GPS track and figuring out -- But you don’t know what kind of vessel, and you have to know what kind of vessel it is and what they were doing and all of that kind of thing, and so it just doesn’t work all that way.

Fuel price, again, this is going to vary a lot amongst regions, but, also, it depends on what grade you put in the vessel and that sort of thing as well, and so there’s a lot of variation there, and then number of passengers.

This is the number of paying passengers. Now, note that we are also asking for the number of anglers, but the number of paying passengers talks, again, to what the revenues are. We already
collect this for headboats, and so this is something that
headboats are already providing, and we would just require that
for charter boats as well. Then the number of crew, and the
same thing. This is already collected for headboats, and so
we’re just also requiring it for the charter boats as well.

Sticking Point Number 2 is equipment failure, and so a lot of
questions about what happens if your equipment fails, and most
of this is on the location devices, but, to speak to the logbook
or the hail-out, there is multiple options, as I showed you
before, and there is tablet, PC, cellphone. Phone home. If
you’re at the dock, and your tablet is not working, call back at
the office and tell them, and they can sit at the computer and
enter the information, and so there’s a lot of back-ups for this
equipment, and we don’t really see that as being a big problem,
and it’s also easy to have those back-ups.

For the location tracking devices, a little bit about VMS in the
commercial sector. Failure rate is about 1 percent, and Leslie
is here in the audience, and he’s with our Office of Law
Enforcement, and he has worked very much on the VMS program. He
is going to talk to you, and I got this information from him,
and he’s going to have some units that he’s got, and he will
have them kind of out in the hall later, if you all want to take
a look. If we have time now, I can have him show you as well,
but I know we’re trying to save some time right now.

The units last about five to ten years, depending on the brand,
and they’re getting better all the time. They are getting
smaller all the time and more reliable all the time, and so
that’s just from the commercial sector.

For the commercial sector, we have developed a troubleshooting
guide that helps people a lot, and, if you get to the dock, get
ready to leave the dock, and it’s not working, here’s what you
do to try to track and see what’s wrong with it, and so we’re
considering doing the same thing for any of the units that we’re
going to have here.

We’re working towards a solution that balances the validation
needs and the compliance needs, which is the whole purpose of
having these tracking devices, against the ability to earn
income. We realize that it’s a little bit different with the
for-hire versus commercial.

Commercial guys can say, well, I can’t take the trip today, but
I can go out tomorrow. If you’re on a for-hire trip, you’ve got
customers on your boat, and you’re ready to go out, and they’re
not going to get off and come back tomorrow, and so we’re working on a solution, but we have to look at the legality of it and all, but be aware that we are trying to figure that out.

We don’t currently have funding for a call service, which would be a solution, but maybe, in the future, we can get some funding for that, and we hope to work with our state partners to find some solutions. I met, at the last meeting, with Dr. Mickle, and his people said, well, you know, we’re at the dock all time, and so they have a very small area to cover and a very few vessels, but that is something that we’re going to be exploring in the future, about how to take care of that.

Number 3 is about modifications to landing locations, or notifications, and the regulations require an estimate of the landing time, and we don’t have a window, like in the IFQ program, where you have to do it three hours before your landing, or this many hours, and so that’s not going to be an issue with these guys, in terms of making any changes, or coming in a little after you said you were or before you said you were.

Those people with VMS will have an option to do a new hail-out if they’re changing their location or the time that they’re expected to be back, and this is similar to what we do with the IFQ program.

We are working on the procedure for the cellular units and how to do that. Obviously, if you’re out at-sea, your cellular unit isn’t going to have transmission, and so you can’t just call in and say I’m going to change my landing location or I’m going to be late, and so we’re working on how we can maybe do something about that, but understand that we’re still working on this implementation process, and so we don’t have all of these procedures quite figured out.

Remember that, any time there is an emergency, we want people to be safe, and that’s the most important thing, and so, if you have to come in, and you can’t -- Let the law enforcement know if you can, but, if not, just get people in and get them safe.

Number 4 is about inactive permits, and so people were talking about, well, what if I’m not using my permit, and do I still have to submit logbooks, and do I still have to have the equipment onboard.

For the logbooks, if you’ve got all the equipment already onboard, and you’re not going out fishing, then we’ll know that you’re not going out fishing, because the tracking device will
tell us that, and so we aren’t going to be expecting any logbooks. Likewise, if you’re on non-fishing activities, and you hailed-out as non-fishing, we’re not going to be expecting a logbook, and so, if you’re not using your permit to go fishing, we have ways that you don’t have to submit those logbooks.

The other part of that question was, well, if I’m not using my boat at all to go fishing, do I still need to have this location device onboard, and that’s what our regulations are. That’s what the council put in the amendment, is that we need to have this if you’re a federally-permitted vessel. Now, if you know you’re not going to be using your vessel for a certain amount of time, you can apply for a power-down exemption, and we have this, again, in the commercial sector as well.

That is submitted to our -- Right now, the commercial is submitted to our Office of Law Enforcement, and it allows you to turn off the units and not have them running, so that you don’t have to be using battery or whatever, but you can’t leave the dock. A power-down is for when you’re not using your vessel at all.

One of the things that we’re still looking at, and, again, there are legal issues as well as what the council put in the amendment, but are there ways for us to have long-term exemptions for vessels that aren’t going to be operating at all, so that they maybe don’t even have to have the equipment onboard or that sort of that thing, but, again, there is legal issues involved with that that we’re still trying to work through.

Loss of GPS or satellite signal, some people were talking about storing a boat in covered storage, like a high-and-dry, and what happens if the signal can’t get through, and so, if it’s a cellular-based unit, they can work anywhere a cell phone can, and our cellphones work in here, and it’s obviously covered and many stories above us, and so, if it’s a cellular-based unit, it should be able to work in that covered storage area.

A lot of people said, well, why can’t I just turn it off, and the whole point of this is that we’re validating when you leave and you don’t leave. If you can just turn it off whenever you want, then how do we know if you’ve left the dock or not, if you’ve just turned it off, and so that was the reason the council put it in place, and so it does have to be turned on and functional at all times.

The battery drainage issue is basically a non-issue. The commercial fishermen have small vessels, and some of them have
very small vessels that go out and fish, and they have VMS
units, and they don’t drain down their batteries. In the past,
when this first was required, that was a problem, but that was
twelve or fifteen years ago, and the units are much better now,
and we don’t have that drainage of batteries.

In fact, I just wanted to let you know that there are solar
options on some of these, that they can be solar charged.
Obviously, if you’re under cover, that doesn’t work, but, for
other people who are storing their vessels outside, they can
store power for up to two weeks on the solar units.

The last sticking point, and I think this is the last one, is
which species and which trip types are subject to reporting, and
I think these were maybe two different sticking points when
Emily presented them, but they have the same response, or a very
similar response, and so we put them together here.

The fact is that, if you’re holding a federal permit, you have
to comply with the reporting requirements, regardless of where
you’re fishing, and so, if you’re fishing in state waters, you
still have a federal permit, and you still have to report where
you fish. This is true, again, of the commercial vessels. They
have to report, regardless of where they’re fishing.

In addition, we’re working on ways to share the data with the
state agencies, specifically to reduce duplication of reporting,
and so, if we have non-disclosure agreements with those state
agencies, then we want to be giving them information about
fishing that’s done in state waters, and so telling people they
don’t have to report if they’re in state waters is a bit
counterproductive, in that case.

We realize that there’s a lot of species of fish and other
things out that people catch, and the ACCSP list was thousands
and thousands of species long. If you’re on a PC and you can do
a drop-down list and pick, or you can start typing and it fills
in automatically your species, that’s fine, but someone on a VMS
unit isn’t going to scroll down through this long page of
thousands of fish to find the one that they want, and so we’re
looking to refine that list and to make sure that it includes
all federally and state-managed species, not just for our
region, but for all the regions up the east coast that are
potentially going to be involved in this and then to kind of
group those other species.

There may be some porgies, like red porgy, that we’re interested
in, even if it’s not managed by states or regions, but the
council has talked in the past about adding it back into the
FMP, and we’ll still include those, anything that appears to
have a significant fishery for it, but other things, like all
the other porgies, we could group together. The grunts, we
might pull out some of those to specifically ask for, but then
have a group that is just other grunts, and so something like
that will make it a little bit easier, so there’s not quite
so many in that list to go through.

Similarly, the same thing with gears. We’re trying to look at
gears the same way, just to make it a little bit easier. As I
said previously, the device may allow for shortcut things, like
drop-down lists and favorites and auto-fill, but that’s going to
be up to the vendors, and it’s up to the fishermen which vendor
they choose, and so, if that’s important to them, they should
consider that when deciding on a vendor.

One of the things came about of, well, what if I’m just catching
baitfish and I’ve got thousands of them there, and do I have to
count every single one, and, no, you don’t have to count every
single one, and an estimate of something like that is
acceptable, but within reason.

Then, again, if you’re not doing fishing activities, then you
don’t have to do a logbook, but keep in mind that fishing
activities isn’t just throwing a hook-and-line over. If you’re
going out and you’re digging clams or collecting scallops or
something like that off of a fishing vessel, that’s still
fishing, and so that still does need to be reported.

Finally, we get to the timeline. This is a little bit about
where we went after the council approval. We had a comment
period on the amendment, and that was in July and August, and
that was on the amendment itself, and the Secretary of Commerce,
after reviewing those comments, approved the amendment in
September of last year.

We then put out a proposed rule in October, and we took a
comment period on that, and the comment period actually was
extended, because of effects from Hurricane Michael to the
people, particularly in Panhandle, and they had requested that,
and so we extended the comment period even longer than it had
been on the proposed rule.

Now we’re working on addressing those comments. As you might
guess, there were a number of comments, and there were a number
different types of comments, and I think we identified maybe
thirty-five different comments to address, and not thirty-five
commenters. We had well over a hundred comments, but we take
similar ones and put them together and address them. We’re in
that process now, and then we’ll develop a final rule and
publish that when we have all the pieces together for that.

Implementation, the last time we talked, we talked about October
15 as being a target date. We’re not sure that’s still doable
now. There are, as you might guess with something of this size,
things that continue to crop up that we have to address before
we’re ready to fully implement.

We had also, at one time, talked about phased implementation,
doing the logbooks and/or hail-out first and then doing the
location tracking device later, and that may be an option again
now, to do that as well, because some of the hold-ups are with
the equipment for the tracking and some of that approval process
and such, and so we’re still working on that, and we cannot give
you an exact date now, but our goal is to get something going
towards the first of the year for 2020.

Why is it taking us so long? Here’s some of the challenges
we’ve had. We haven’t had any dedicated funding or staff for
this implementation or any of the validation and things that
come afterwards, and so the people who write your amendments are
the same people who are working on trying to set up this
program, and I have at least one person on the Gulf staff that
spends 50 percent of his time working on trying to implement
SEFHIER, in addition to doing amendment work.

We have tried to cover this with some grants, and these are only
short-term grants, and so they can’t be long term for setting up
and continuing to run this program, but we have, as I mentioned
before, a strategic planner to help us get some of these
processes in place, and we are also looking to get some people
to do some QA/QC as well as people to deal with the VMS data and
that kind of data coming through.

Understand that the current staff are not subject matter experts
in many of these areas that we need, and that’s one of the
reasons that we’re looking at the OLE VMS program in
Headquarters, is we don’t know enough about these devices to
know how to approve them, because we don’t have that kind of
experience, and so we’re looking for that.

A lot of people have said, since you don’t have the experience,
maybe you should get the states to help you out. Well, outside
participation is restricted by FACA, and we all know how FACA
works, and it involves noticing of meetings and things like
that, and so here are some of the things that FACA says, and one
of the things is we have to have a charter, and you have to have
notice in the Federal Register every time the group is going to
meet.

These sort of things delayed implementation even farther, and so
we’ve certainly taken advice from our state partners, but we
can’t have them on the implementation team without running into
issues with FACA.

Some other challenges are the data storage and transmission and
data sharing. We have security requirements to keep this data
secure, and so ACCSP, although they are going to be our data
warehouse, have to be approved through a NMFS process, to make
sure that they have the right security measures in place to
protect the data. The same thing will be true for other
vendors. We’re going through the approval process, just to make
sure that they keep the data secure before it’s sent to ACCSP.

We have to protect the PII and BII, personal identifiable
information and business identifiable information, and so we
have to develop these algorithms and encryption to keep all of
that straight, and that just really takes a long time, and it
involves a lot to get that done. We also have multiple data
streams to combine, and we talked about unique trip identifiers.

We have to be able to put together the hail-out and the logbook
and the location devices at three different times, in three
different places, and, for each of those, we have different
types of devices. For example, if we have VMS devices versus
the store-and-forward, those are two different data streams, and
so we have many, many data streams coming in that we’ve got to
integrate to make this all come together right, and then we have
the different regional and state systems that we want to work
with, so we avoid the duplication that everyone has concerns
about.

I talked a little bit also about the approval process, both the
logbooks and location devices, and we had to get together
technical specifications to send out to vendors, and we had to
figure out who was responsible for doing this approval, which I
talked about already, and then codifying the process, which
involves another set of proposed and final rules.

There is a lot of processes to develop. For example, we have to
be able to take the hail-out and notify law enforcement when and
where someone is going to be, so that, if they choose to meet
the vessel, that they can do that.
There is exemptions that people have requested for various things that we talked about in the sticking points, and those have to be figured out. We have to get with the states and talk about data sharing and whether our MOUs are still valid and if we need additional non-disclosure agreements.

We’re trying to coordinate with the South Atlantic. We have a lot of overlap between the two regions, and we, again, don’t want duplication. The South Atlantic had said, if you have both, you can report just to the Gulf system, but we want the data elements to be consistent, so that the South Atlantic is getting what they need and what they require from their program from our program.

A final thing is the Paperwork Reduction Act requirements. Everything we do that requires someone to fill out a form has to go through an approval process as well, and so, any forms that are going to be on any of these for hail-out for the logbooks, those all have to go through a separate approval process, and they have to go through a rulemaking process as well, and so that, again, takes quite a bit of time, and so now I’m done, and I will take the rest of the questions.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Sue. I’m sure there will be a lot of questions, and, just to inform the committee, we have about twenty-five minutes left here, and I definitely have some questions for you, Sue, but a couple of things, just to remind the committee.

Emily wanted to talk through what this example might look like on a day-to-day basis, and then also, Sue, you mentioned you had someone here that had actual -- You’re talking about a demo of the actual physical unit?

MS. GERHART: Yes, he has three different units that he has brought along, or at least parts of units, and you can see what they look like and what the actual size is and all.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: That would be nice to see, and then maybe Emily could give her quick demo, but I want to make sure that the council and committee here has plenty of opportunity for questions, and so is there other questions for Sue? Go ahead, Lieutenant Zanowicz.

LT. ZANOWICZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While listening to this presentation, I was just trying to think of how it was going to look for the Coast Guard when we were doing at-sea boardings,
and one of the questions that I thought of was what mechanism is in place to verify that the vessel actually hailed-out?

For example, in the commercial sector, a vessel is going to have VMS onboard, and so, if it gets underway without hailing-out, you will be able to see its position on VMS, and, if their VMS isn’t operating properly, they will get a violation, if they get boarded, but, for this, they don’t -- The vessels don’t necessarily need to have real-time location data, and so I was just wondering how that was going to work.

**MS. GERHART:** Even for the non-real-time, our expectation is that it will be pinging when they’re at the dock, and, as they leave the dock, we know that they are leaving the dock. We will lose that signal at some time, in terms of real time, and it will be recorded, and so we should still know that they’re leaving the dock.

**DR. STEPHEN:** I will just add to that. One of the long-term goals is to create an application, or an app, that’s available that combines the VMS data that law enforcement has access to, to see it with the hail-outs coming in through an alternative mechanism, but, of course, we’re trying to get the program up and running first, is our priority.

**CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Mr. Anson and then Ms. Boggs.

**MR. ANSON:** To follow-up on the question that I had asked earlier that was brought up regarding the review, the legal review, internal legal review, for the data sharing between the states, when do you anticipate that you should come to a decision on that? Then I have one more question.

**MS. GERHART:** I will probably have to get back to you on that. We’re trying to research those MOUs and see what we actually have in place right now versus what is not, and we might be reaching out to you to talk about what you have on your end as well, but sorry.

**MR. ANSON:** Then the next question is, as it relates to the data sharing, is that -- The states certainly would prefer to have that data sent to them, and is that going to be done from the vendor, is that going to be done from the ACCSP, as far as the pushout?

**MS. GERHART:** It would have to go through ACCSP first.

**CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Ms. Boggs.
MS. BOGGS: I just have a comment. I participated in the SEFHIER meeting last July, and one of the main things that I stressed was messaging to the charter/for-hire fleet, and I have been asked multiple times -- Captains have come up to me concerned that they’re not already reporting and should they be, and so we need to get out a message that we’re not ready yet, because a lot of them are concerned that they are not complying and asking me what do they need to do, and I’m like, well, not do anything and so it would -- Just message it, please.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Ms. Guyas.

MS. GUYAS: I have a question about I guess how this is going to like look and feel for the fishermen, and maybe even like ticket agents or whatever, booking agents, really, and so do you anticipate that -- Let’s say the booking agent is going to do the hail-out, and they also may know like the fuel costs and that kind of thing, and could they like -- I understand the hail-out is different from the actual logbook, but could they start a logbook that the vessel actually finishes? Do you know what I’m saying? Like they fill in part of the information and then the boat fills in the rest and, together, it makes one big thing? I’m just trying to think about how to make this easy for people.

MS. GERHART: I think it would depend on the vendor, whether that would be possible or not. It seems like something we should be able to work out, and maybe we can communicate that as a desirable thing. We are anticipating that stuff like the fuel use, you’re right that it’s probably somebody back at the office that knows, and maybe there’s just a quick phone call when they get back and they’re filling out the logbook, to say, hey, how much was the fuel.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Regarding Ms. Boggs’ messaging comment, Carrie, and maybe that’s something Emily -- I’m sure you all already do this anyway, but just through your different channels, Emily, is just sort of update where we are with that and what needs to be happening at this point, the latest timelines and all that stuff, and I think would be a good idea.

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Through those outreach meetings that we were able to do, I have about a third of the charter fleet’s direct email addresses, and so, the last we heard, October 1 was the implementation timeline, and I did notify them of that. I do plan to follow this meeting with another email out to that group that just says that it sounds like we’re pushing it back to the
first of the year, and so don’t worry.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: That would be a good opportunity to get that word out. Mr. Dyskow.

MR. DYSKOW: Thank you, Greg. I understand the complexity of this issue and the tremendous amount of work that’s gone into it so far. I would just like to make another plea to include the question about whether the appropriate release mortality mitigation tool is being used or not, and the reason I’m stressing this isn’t just to be stubborn.

The 800-pound gorilla in the room with recreational angling is release mortality, and so, if we don’t even know the simple basics of whether these tools, descending devices and venting tools, are being used or not, we’re never going to make any progress, and so I think it is important, and we can’t ignore the issue of release mortality, and I want to take some very tentative first steps to see where we are, and so I would ask that that not be moved to Considered but Rejected, but actually get included in the survey. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: To Mr. Dyskow’s question or plea, and maybe this is inappropriate, and I apologize if it is, but do any of the states require that on their surveys?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Martha.

MS. GUYAS: We have a voluntary app that people can use, and that’s a question. That’s a question that we ask dockside when we interview people as well.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: At least with the electronic reporting in Texas through iSnapper, that’s part of the voluntary component unit of the basic catch data, and then we actually get into even more questions than what Mr. Dyskow is referring to regarding discard mortality, such as use of the device and then how many did you discard and so on. Ms. Boggs.

MS. BOGGS: Well, and I only ask because we talk about the burden on the charter/for-hire fleet, and I just feel like, if it’s going to be something requested of the charter/for-hire fleet, then we need to look at it for the private recreational anglers as well, and that’s why I was asking.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Go ahead.
MR. DYSKOW: That’s certainly a fair question, and the Education and Outreach Committee, at this point, is looking at starting down a path where we could even ask that question. Right now, this council has a recommendation regarding the use of these tools, but it doesn’t have a regulation regarding the use of these tools, and so the steps that we can take on the Education and Outreach Committee today are to make sure that there is broad exposure to these devices and training materials on how to use these devices and significant outreach, hands on how to use these devices.

At some point, that’s an appropriate step to look at mandating their use in the deepwater fisheries, and so I don’t think we’re trying to exclude private anglers. We’re trying to look at the entire recreational community together, to say that we’ve got to address this issue, and it truly is the 800-pound gorilla in the room.

I remember, at the last meeting, where your husband gave a presentation with some anglers from somewhere in the Midwest, and they mentioned floating fish being a problem, fish they had to release because the season was closed floating away, and, well, that’s something we all feel bad about and we all want to address, and so I don’t think it’s something we want to just utilize to punish charter and for-hire vessels. I think this is an instance where the entire recreational community needs to embrace these tools. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I am not seeing other questions, but I do -- Dr. Simmons, go ahead.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to get some clarity regarding notifying federal permit holders. I think we need to work with NMFS with our new timeline and send a letter out not just to the folks that attended the workshops, but to all of the federal permits that we have on record, so they know what’s going on, and we can work with them to do that, because we plan to send the larger packets out too before the implementation plan, but I think we need a little bit more coordination with NMFS and make sure that everybody gets an opportunity to receive that letter.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Yes, and that’s a great point, Carrie, because that’s probably, I’m guessing, where some of the confusion is coming in. Some of them aren’t quite as engaged with the council process, and they are probably the ones not getting the message, and so that would definitely help. We’ve got some more
questions. Mr. Swindell.

MS. BECKWITH: Just to comment, just to let you guys know that the South Atlantic Council is moving towards final action on Amendment 29 under our snapper grouper, where we are looking to make descending devices and/or venting tools mandatory on the vessels.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Thank you, Anna. Ed, were you just pointing out Anna, or did you have a comment, too?

MR. SWINDELL: I have a comment, and that’s regarding the economic data that you’re collecting. We’re only collecting economic data on fuel use and crew labor, and what about other economic data that goes along with operation of a charter/for-hire vessel? How do you get that information? Where do you get it from? How are you putting it all together?

MS. GERHART: Well, I’m not an economist, and so I would say we were doing that balancing act of how much do we want to ask on every trip that is reported versus getting from some other sources, and these were the elements that our economists determined were the most critical to have on a per-trip basis.

Some of the other things, they do get that information, but it doesn’t need to be on a per trip basis, and so, their sources, I’m afraid I can’t tell you, but I can certainly have someone get back to you and let you know.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Mr. Swindell.

MR. SWINDELL: I understand for the per-trip basis that these are the critical cost items, I would think, but where are we getting the other information on the total costs of vessel maintenance and so forth, like insurance and accounting, et cetera? Do we have some system where it is putting all that into the picture or what these people are really having to spend to get this done?

MS. GERHART: I’m sure it’s surveys and other general information that is collected by various organizations and such. I honestly will have to get back to you with that answer, if you don’t mind.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Sue, along those same lines of the economics, we’re obviously asking a pretty heavy recording load, and I don’t know what percentage of the questions are economics versus the actual catch statistics that we want, but one of the
questions that I had related to that was about the validation of
the economics component, and so are we validating that, or how
is that working?

MS. GERHART: The validation of it, in some part, will be spot-
checking through things like websites and such, and so they
reported that they charged this much for a trip, but their
website says something different, and we’ll look for outliers
and that sort of QA/QC, if it’s an outlier, way lower or way
higher than what they reported previously, or afterwards, or
what other people in their area are reporting and that sort of
ing a difficult thing to validate, and so that’s -- It will be
basically the same type of validation we currently do.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Right, and I realize it’s a different thing,
but, also, obviously, it needs to be validated as well, at least
to some extent, and one other question, and I’m not seeing any
other questions, and then we’ll move on to the demos, if there’s
not any others.

You mentioned, in one of your slides, about a 1 percent failure
rate, and I think it was with the VMS, and, sorry, and I don’t
really remember, but what does that mean? Is that 1 percent of
the trips? 1 percent of what is failing, is what I’m not real
clear, and, if you don’t have it right now, it’s okay. Maybe
later you can tell us. That can be a big number or a little
number, depending on 1 percent of what.

MS. GERHART: Maybe Jesse can really quickly answer that. He
supplied that to me. Thank you. This is Jesse Leslie, and he’s
in our Office of Law Enforcement in the Southeast Regional
Office, and he was the main VMS guy at our office, and so he’s
our VMS expert.

MR. JESSE LESLIE: I’m Jesse Leslie, a VMS technician. That 1
percent, we actually have two different types of failures. We
have the unit itself could just stop for any number of reasons.
A wire could disconnect, or there could be power issues, and so
that’s like a temporary failure that can be fixed at the dock.

The other type is a permit failure, that the unit gets hit by
lightning or just the end of its shelf life, and so we tend to
see the one-offs, like they have some kind of issue, like rough
seas and a wire gets disconnected, and they stop reporting at-
sea. We notify them when they get back to the dock, and they
resolve the issue, and they’re ready for the next trip. The
units actually failing, that happens much, much less.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay, and so what I am interpreting that is
that 1 percent of the trips are not being recorded or whatever
because of some type of failure.

MR. LESLIE: Correct, and those are probably partial trips.
They might go out and make a seven-day trip, and we might see
them for the first five or six days, and then the unit kicks
off, and then we see them and they start reporting again at the
dock, and so we usually reach out and let them know that there
was an issue and that they have to get it corrected, and most of
the people have like a marine technician or someone kind of
standing by for these issues when they come up.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Good. Thank you. I am not seeing other
questions -- Tom.

DR. FRAZER: Thanks, Greg. I’m just trying to wrap my head
around something, and this is for Sue. I’m trying to understand
the relationship between SERO and the ACCSP, as far as how data
flows.

DR. STEPHEN: I will take that one instead, and so we’re using
ACCSP as our data warehouse and first receiver of the data, and
that enabled us to actually start implementing this program or
bringing the process much sooner than if we had to build from
scratch within NOAA’s systems. They have an infrastructure and
a database system that integrates with a lot of the different
states that are reporting, and we’re working within that
structure.

Most of that is fairly easy for us, because they’re already
doing for-hire reporting and collecting it for the Northeast and
some of the states, and so we were able to use the benefit of
that, and that’s kind of where our relationship is.

When we have a change that we need to the system, we’ll talk to
them about instituting it, and they will do the structural
change, and then they have the vendor, the eTRIPS and eTRIPS
mobile, that creates the forms, and they work with that, and so
there’s always a guaranteed form, or a way to submit the
collection of data.

With the other vendors, we’re working with them to create the
technical specifications for other vendors to report, and so
that means that, when another vendor reports, the data is going
to go to ACCSP from that vendor, and it has to meet all the
requirements, and a lot of those are QA/QC requirements as well
as data field requirements. Then NOAA, again, will pick up the
compiled data as a whole out of the ACCSP for our analysis.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Okay. Thank you. Emily, how long do you think
it will take to go through your demo?

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Not long.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Maybe if we just have a brief -- Susan, do you
have someone here that would like to show us -- I mean, we have
about like eight minutes or so, and so we don’t have a lot of
time, but just a brief demo of the units and let Emily -- Emily,
do you want to see those real quick and then you can talk us
through how to actually look on the screen or something?

MS. GERHART: Okay, and so that’s Jess, again, and he’s got, I
believe, three different things. He has got one complete unit,
including all the parts of it, to show you kind of the size of
it. If you could just bring those up, Jess, that would be
great.

MR. LESLIE: We have a couple of different types of units. This
one is going to be our Nautic Alert unit, and it was just type
approved, and a lot of people have the conception that VMS units
are really big and bulky. This is the entire unit right here.
You would have -- This one is actually set up to be plugged into
the wall, but you would switch it over to DC for vessels, and
that’s the entire thing.

You would have that probably mounted on your helm somewhere, and
then this little ice cream scoop is your antenna, and so any
little center console or anything -- I mean, that’s really tiny,
and we’ve come a long way. Our old units, you would have the
giant -- It looked like a radar dome, and so that’s good.

Depending on what size you get, they have different functions.
I know their new unit we have is the iFleet 1 unit, and that
actually runs on a tablet, and so this is what you’re going to
interact with, but the junction box, if you will, is probably
something on the order of that, and the dome that sits on the
roof is quite large, and so it all depends on what kind of
functions you want, and that also factors into the monthly cost.

Then, also, the unit you guys have probably heard a lot about,
the CLS unit, here is their tablet, and their unit is actually
fairly small. It’s a small junction box. The dome that would
be on the roof is fairly small, and so the iFleet 1 unit is
actually web-based, and so the unit itself has two different
components, one that runs all the VMS forms, and so it’s locked,
and the other is open, and so you can use it just like the
internet.

You are using satellite data, and so it’s kind of expensive, but
you could go on just like your cellphone or whatever and hit
whatever you want to look at, Google or you want to look at the
weather or whatever, and so it is really good, especially for
the boats that go offshore for long periods of time.

If you guys want, I can send these tablets around, for anyone
who wants to check them out. Right now, it has the, for our
commercial boats, the IFQ pre-landing form, just so you can get
an idea of what the form looks like, and it’s pretty user-
friendly. I will take any questions you guys have.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: That would be great, to pass those around, so
we can get a -- I think it’s important that we have an idea of
what it’s like. While that’s happening, are there any
questions? Emily, while you’re getting set up, if you want to
take us through what it actually looks like on a screen, as
they’re entering these things, but, before you do that, Sue,
also, just in her presentation, if you recall, there is a price
table or something of all these units, so you can kind of get an
idea of what’s what.

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Okay. Great. Thank you for this opportunity.
When we went out to the initial round of outreach meetings that
we did for the captains, we actually displayed eTRIPS mobile,
which is the reporting app that’s associated directly with
ACCSP, and so, just to show a different vendor, because I know
that we’re going to have multiple vendors with multiple apps,
today we’re actually going to look at the VESL app.

VESL is created by Bluefin Data, and I was thinking that, since
the CEO of Bluefin Data is in the audience, and Andrew Peterson
is here, I’m going to drive, and I’m just going to let him
explain it to you, because it makes more sense, because he made
it, and so, Andrew, if you’re in the audience, will you come on
up to the podium, and you can drive us through.

Just a little background is this app -- The VESL app is actually
used for the Beaufort Headboat Survey already, and so they are a
vendor that’s pretty familiar with the process, and so this is
Andrew.

MR. ANDREW PETERSON: Hi, guys. Also, in addition, we’ve been
working with Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission on the
commercial dealer reporting side of things since early 2000, and
so Gulf States kind of got us into commercial reporting, and
then Ken Brennan with NOAA Fisheries got us into the headboat
recreational world, and so, because of these two parties,

especially, the system can be modified to meet the requirements
for the for-hire sector. Emily, if you could, click on “create
trip”.

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: I think our internet is not amazingly fast.
There we go.

MR. PETERSON: What you will see on the screen here is what
we’ve worked with, or at least what we have understood to be the
coming requirements for the data elements that SERO has given
us, as far as what the final elements will be, and so, at the
top section, you will see there is a hail-out portion, and these
are a lot of the basic questions that they’ll have to fill out
just to say, hey, I’m going on a fishing trip.

There’s what type of trip is it, is it for-hire or not, and then
trip start and trip end. You all talked about validation a good
bit, and we typically try and have drop-down menus, instead of
having free-form text, so we don’t have to deal with validation,
or at least the data that they’re entering is valid. If you
have start port and end port, we actually get this data, or plan
on getting this data, from ACCSP. This is all testing, and so
there aren’t actually items in the list for some of them. If
you go ahead and enter an actual trip end down in the trip
details section.

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Sorry. The internet is slow. Okay.

MR. PETERSON: Then you can just kind of scroll down. A lot of
these fields aren’t currently required, and a lot of these
fields are similar to what is in the headboat survey, and so you

have like number of anglers, number of paying passengers, number
of crew, your economic questions, trip fee, fuel used, price of
the fuel.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: If you looked at total data entry time, from
the time you start and then the time you’re actually done
submitting a trip, what, on average, would that be?

MR. PETERSON: It depends. Just this form specifically?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Not this form, but I meant like from the time
you start a trip. I mean, obviously, you go fish, and then you
come back, and you close it out, and is it like five minutes or two minutes or ten minutes?

MR. PETERSON: From other forms that we’ve looked at, it’s been around two minutes, two-and-a-half minutes. The actual entering in each species, which is where most of your records come -- As Emily will show you, it’s just two or three fields, and we actually have a grid that pops down, to where you can actually enter in multiple species at once, to make it easier to enter in a number of species.

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: It looks like I have to add some things before it lets me.

MR. PETERSON: Okay. Yes, I think the only things that are required are trip start date and a vessel.

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Can I do today?

MR. PETERSON: Yes, today should work.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Chairman Frazer, we’re just about approaching our time here. Do you want to pick this up in another meeting or something? I will leave that up to you. We still have Other Business and just to wrap up, but that’s really about it.

DR. FRAZER: I think we can find a more convenient time to wrap it up.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: I am just figuring sitting here right before lunch, and I don’t want to hold -- Will that work, Emily? I’m sure there will be a few minutes.

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: I’m sorry, but I didn’t hear you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: We were just saying that, since the internet is running so slow, we can just pick this up during a time when there may be another committee meeting cut short or something like that, since we’re right ahead of lunch here.

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Okay. Or we’re right here, and so let’s add one species, and then I think we’re good. Is that all right?

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: Tom, is that good?

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: If go to add species, and so this is what it looks like, and you will have a drop-down menu, and this drop-down menu will populate sort of based on what you typically
land, and I think there might be a function where you can choose
a favorite and have some favorites, but you choose a species,
choose the number that you kept, choose the number that you have
released, and you add it, and then it will start to sort of just
generate a report, and you can do that for every species that
you harvest on your vessel. Once you’ve done that, all you have
to do is submit your report when you hit the dock, and you’re
good. Does that pretty much sum it up?

MR. PETERSON: That’s it.

MS. MUEHLSTEIN: Okay. Then it’s also my understanding that
Andrew has some of the devices that you can see, and maybe if
you can have those outside available on the way, for people
going out to lunch or whatever, the VMS as well as those GPS
archiving units, so you guys can see those. I am going to
submit my trip, and then we’re good. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Thank you, Emily. That brings us
to Other Business. Is there any other business that needs to
come before this committee? Dr. Hollensead, have we met
everything that you wanted to look at the action list here?

DR. HOLLENSAED: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN STUNZ: All right. Then that will conclude the
meeting, and I will turn it back over to you, Tom.

DR. FRAZER: Excellent. Right on time. We will adjourn for
lunch, and we’ll meet back here at one o’clock, and we’ll deal
with the Sustainable Fisheries Committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on June 3, 2019.)
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