

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2  
3 SHRIMP MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

4  
5 Webinar

6  
7 January 24, 2022

8  
9 **VOTING MEMBERS**

10 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi  
11 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama  
12 Billy Broussard.....Louisiana  
13 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC  
14 Jonathan Dugas.....Louisiana  
15 Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas  
16 Bob Gill.....Florida  
17 Chris Schieble (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana  
18 Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi  
19 Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS

20  
21 **NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

22 Susan Boggs.....Alabama  
23 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi  
24 Phil Dyskow.....Florida  
25 Tom Frazer.....Florida  
26 Jessica McCawley.....Florida  
27 Greg Stunz.....Texas  
28 Troy Williamson.....Texas

29  
30 **STAFF**

31 Assane Diagne.....Economist  
32 Matt Freeman.....Economist  
33 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director  
34 Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer  
35 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist  
36 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist  
37 Mary Levy.....NOAA General Counsel  
38 Jessica Matos.....Document Editor & Administrative Assistant  
39 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer  
40 Ryan Rindone.....Lead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison  
41 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager  
42 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director  
43 Carly Somerset.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist

44  
45 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

46 Jennifer Lee.....NOAA  
47 Kerry Marhefka.....SAFMC  
48 Corky Perret.....MS  
49 Clay Porch.....SEFSC

1 Farron Wallace.....NOAA  
2 John Walter.....SEFSC  
3  
4 - - -  
5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1  
2  
3 Table of Contents.....3  
4  
5 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes and Action Guide and  
6 Next Steps.....4  
7  
8 NMFS Evaluation of Draft Approval Specifications for  
9 Reinstituting Historical cELB Program.....5  
10  
11 Updated Framework Action: Modification of the Vessel Position  
12 Data Collection Program for the Gulf of Mexico shrimp Fishery...21  
13  
14 Summary of the December 2021 Shrimp Advisory Panel Meeting.....49  
15  
16 Adjournment.....53

17  
18 - - -  
19  
20

1 The Shrimp Management Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery  
2 Management Council convened on Monday afternoon, January 24,  
3 2022, and was called to order by Chairman Leann Bosarge.

4  
5 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**  
6 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
7 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**  
8

9 **CHAIRMAN LEANN BOSARGE:** I would like to call the Shrimp  
10 Management Committee to order and remind everybody of our  
11 membership. It's myself as Chair, Mr. Chris Schieble is Vice  
12 Chair today, Mr. Anson, Mr. Broussard, Mr. Donaldson, Mr. Dugas,  
13 Mr. Gill, Mr. Riechers and Mr. Geeslin, General Spraggins, and  
14 Mr. Strelcheck.

15  
16 Our agenda can be found, for today's meeting, under Tab D,  
17 Number 1. Were there any modifications or additions that anyone  
18 felt that we needed to make to the agenda today? Staff, if you  
19 see me skipping somebody that has their hand up on the screen,  
20 please jump in and let me know. Sometimes I get excited and get  
21 sidetracked here. All right, and so, seeing no hands up, we  
22 will adopt the agenda as presented in the briefing book.

23  
24 The next item on the agenda is the Approval of the October 2021  
25 Minutes, which are found under Tab D, Number 2. Did anyone have  
26 any revisions that needed to be made to those minutes? All  
27 right. I am not seeing any hands going up, and hearing no one  
28 shout out, and we will adopt the minutes as presented in the  
29 briefing book.

30  
31 Next is Item Number III, our Action Guide and Next Steps, and it  
32 can be found under Tab D, Number 3, and, Dr. Freeman, what I  
33 think I will ask you to do is to introduce each topic as we come  
34 to it on the agenda and go through the action guide for that  
35 topic as each one comes up, and so the next item on our agenda  
36 is Item Number IV, which is going to be the NMFS Evaluation of  
37 Draft Approval Specifications for Reinstating the Historical  
38 cELB Program, and that's found under Tab D, Number 4.

39  
40 I think Dr. Walter is going to present that to us today, and,  
41 before he gets started, I just wanted to thank NMFS. I have  
42 gone through this presentation, and you all really did an  
43 excellent job, and I think you got really down into the details  
44 on how these things would be implemented, if we went down that  
45 path, and I appreciate that, because I am sure that was an  
46 undertaking, and so thank you in advance.

47  
48 As we go through it, for the committee members, because it is a

1 pretty technical presentation, if we come to a slide where you  
2 have a question, I think it would probably be best to go ahead  
3 and ask the question at that point in time, rather than to save  
4 it to the end, and so be sure and raise your hand, or speak up,  
5 if you do have a question, and hopefully that won't be too  
6 troublesome for Dr. Walter. He's a pretty sharp guy, and so I  
7 think he'll be fine. Dr. Walter, are you there with us?  
8

9 **DR. MATT FREEMAN:** Ms. Bosarge, do you want me to read the  
10 action guide for this item first?  
11

12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, Matt. Thank you. Keep me on track. Go  
13 ahead.  
14

15 **NMFS EVALUATION OF DRAFT APPROVAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR**  
16 **REINSTITUTING HISTORICAL CELB PROGRAM**  
17

18 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay. All right. For this agenda item, NMFS  
19 staff will respond to a council request for an evaluation of  
20 draft approval specifications for reinstituting the historical  
21 cELB program. The council requested that specific guidance be  
22 considered in the evaluation, logistics involved in either  
23 bringing a National Environmental Satellite, Data, and  
24 Information Service server online for data transmission or use  
25 of a Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission server, which  
26 office or center of the National Marine Fisheries Service will  
27 house the technical specifications for the Gulf shrimp industry,  
28 who will handle the scientific testing and vetting of vendors  
29 seeking type approval. The committee should consider the  
30 presentation, ask questions, and discuss implications to the  
31 related alternative in the draft framework action. We did  
32 include the request letter, and it's Tab D, Number 4(a), for  
33 reference for the committee members, and so I will hand this  
34 over to Dr. Walter for the presentation.  
35

36 **DR. JOHN WALTER:** Madam Chair, thanks for the opportunity to  
37 address the council and the committee. I think I drew the short  
38 straw to get to present this, but it's not my work alone, and  
39 it's the work of a fairly extensive team across the agency to  
40 evaluate and respond to the request here, and so we think we've  
41 got a pretty comprehensive response.  
42

43 We also really want to thank the chair of the committee for  
44 putting together a comprehensive review of the VMS specs and the  
45 specific items that could be, or might be, considered for  
46 revision, and that was quite a bit of work on her part to do  
47 that, and it really set the stage for us to be able to do this,  
48 and hopefully we can make progress.

1  
2 What I will try to do on this is itemize the things that we  
3 think are largely hardware specifications that can likely stay  
4 the same, versus settings of the hardware that might be able to  
5 be altered, and, by separating that between the hardware and  
6 then the settings, or how the units gets used, we think that  
7 provides sort of a path for how might consider the future of  
8 this program.

9  
10 What we were asked to do, in a letter, was to evaluate a series  
11 of questions that Matt went over in the request to the draft  
12 approval specifications, and, specifically, there were three  
13 things for us to consider, the logistics of data transmission,  
14 which office of NOAA Fisheries would house the technical  
15 specifications, and who will handle scientific testing and  
16 vetting the vendors.

17  
18 The first question is, and, here, we've quoted it verbatim, is,  
19 in terms of logistics involved in either bringing National  
20 Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service server,  
21 or NESDIS server, online for data transmission or use of a Gulf  
22 States, and, here, in this case, it's very likely that NOAA  
23 would have to pay NESDIS, or Gulf States, to set up the cloud  
24 server, and we don't think that it would come at zero cost to  
25 the agency.

26  
27 There would also need to be a requirement to maintain a Federal  
28 Information Security Management Act Agreement, because this is  
29 data is confidential and privileged information, and it's got to  
30 be housed in a secure manner, and then NOAA Fisheries would have  
31 to open up a connection, through a firewall to any cloud assets,  
32 which would typically require a point-to-point VPN, or virtual  
33 private network, and I think that's what that is. Sorry.  
34 That's one of the -- We tried to clean this for any acronyms or  
35 jargon that we didn't spell out, but, every once in a while,  
36 being the government that we are, we slip them in anyway.

37  
38 NOAA Fisheries would maintain an Application Programming  
39 Interface, or API, which accepts, updates, and authenticates the  
40 data. The API would need to be token-based, and each unit would  
41 need to have their own unique token or key, and that's for us to  
42 be able to identify each unit on each vessel. We would have to  
43 ensure the security is up-to-date, and that would be repeated  
44 security updates, as you get on your phone or your computer, and  
45 you would have to be able to push out security updates, because  
46 all of our internet is under constant attack, and we have to be  
47 vigilant to avoid allowing those threats in, and we would have  
48 to establish access for the Office of Law Enforcement.

1  
2 Now, OLE would still be able to access this data at any time,  
3 and that's a key point, one of the big concerns, is that the  
4 current VMS type approval system goes through the Office of the  
5 Chief Information Officer, of which OLE is a direct recipient of  
6 that data. We would still have to allow OLE access to the data,  
7 because, under Magnuson-Stevens, they can get access to any kind  
8 of electronic data, for whatever purposes they deem appropriate.

9  
10 We would have to maintain database links, and then Gulf States  
11 would also require a format change from the current data file  
12 format, and so there would be a number of changes that would  
13 have to occur, and one of the other main -- Really, what we're  
14 getting from the agency is, in terms of considering these costs  
15 to the agency and to the taxpayers, that's one of the main  
16 considerations, is whether it would be a cost neutral or have a  
17 cost increase, in terms of how you might proceed with the  
18 program, with the agency recommendation that things be cost  
19 neutral.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dr. Walter, I don't have questions on every  
22 slide, but I did have a question on this slide. That first  
23 bullet, about NOAA needing to pay NESDIS, which is another arm  
24 of NOAA, right, or Gulf States to set up a cloud server, I was  
25 under the impression that Gulf States was in the process of  
26 going to the cloud right now for a lot of their data that they  
27 have on their system, and so that would be a question for Mr.  
28 Dave Donaldson.

29  
30 Then the NESDIS -- So that's who our server -- Our data used to  
31 go through NESDIS, through the physical server that they had,  
32 and, when I called and talked to folks over there, I was told  
33 that they shut that server down because they were in fact moving  
34 to the cloud-based system, and maybe it's just in the wording  
35 here, but I feel like both of those entities have a cloud-based  
36 system that they are either on now, or they're switching to, and  
37 so I don't -- Maybe NOAA doesn't need to pay to set up a cloud  
38 server, but I think maybe there could be some costs there, given  
39 the volume of the data, and would NOAA need to chip in to, I  
40 don't know, pay some sort of monthly fee for housing the data,  
41 but can maybe you and Dave Donaldson elaborate on that a little  
42 bit and give us some more clarity there?

43  
44 **DR. WALTER:** Go ahead, Dave. I think that was directly to you.

45  
46 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** Thank you, Madam Chair. You are correct  
47 that we are moving toward a cloud server, but we're not at that  
48 point yet, and we're not sure exactly when that's going to be,

1 and so, if we -- There would be some costs for us to move to a  
2 cloud server, at this point in time. Now, down the road, and  
3 I'm assuming that this is not going to happen next month, and so  
4 that might not be the case in the future, but, at this point,  
5 we're not on the cloud yet.

6

7 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Thanks, Dave, and then the NESDIS  
8 piece of it, Dr. Walter?

9

10 **DR. WALTER:** We don't think that it would be cost neutral to  
11 work with NESDIS. Even though it is another arm of NOAA,  
12 they're two different line offices that fund it, and so, because  
13 it's not under their purview, we would likely have to pass funds  
14 to them.

15

16 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. All right, and I'm asking these  
17 questions because I know, for staff to flesh this out, under  
18 Alternative 3, for the document, they will need a little more  
19 detail on what those costs are, and so at least now they know  
20 that Dave maybe can get them a little more information about  
21 costs, currently, versus what may or may not be a cost in the  
22 future, and maybe you can get with NESDIS, since they're on the  
23 cloud already, and find out what that monthly cost would be, if  
24 there is some cost to house the data there for transfer or  
25 storage, essentially, capacity in the cloud.

26

27 Then the other thing I was wondering -- Since both of those  
28 entities are moving to the cloud, especially Gulf States, that  
29 we get data from already, and we get trip tickets and other  
30 things like that, transfers of data from them, I'm assuming some  
31 of these other bulleted items that you have on this page will  
32 have to be set up anyway, for the data that we routinely receive  
33 from Gulf States.

34

35 I am assuming there would have to be a connection through the  
36 firewall, once Gulf States makes their transition to the cloud,  
37 and then this API interface, and it's a possibility, and,  
38 obviously, there is going to have to be a FISMA agreement, and  
39 there may already be one with Gulf States, and you may have to  
40 update it a little bit, I guess, when they move to the cloud for  
41 their assets, and nothing to do with shrimp, and so is that a  
42 fair statement to make, that many of these things are probably  
43 going to have to occur anyway, as these entities move to the  
44 cloud, since we receive data from them already?

45

46 **DR. WALTER:** That's a good question, about whether we would get  
47 economies of scale through other data warehousing that Gulf  
48 States is doing. I don't have a good answer to that, but I

1 would be -- If somebody else has that answer. My guess is that  
2 a lot of the support, like the API for data, electronic effort  
3 data like this, would have to be rather unique, and not able to  
4 simply borrow what's done for other things, but I don't have the  
5 answer to all of that.

6

7 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. All right. Well, that's all my  
8 questions for now. Thank you. Go ahead, Dr. Walter.

9

10 **DR. WALTER:** Thanks. This is a summary of the logistics here,  
11 and we think that it would require significant additional  
12 programming and infrastructure costs to either go through NESDIS  
13 or to route the data through Gulf States, and that's based on a  
14 number of the things that would actually have to happen.

15

16 On the regulatory side, it would require a modified version of  
17 the national VMS tech spec regulations in the local regulations,  
18 and so what would need to be done is a local version, as  
19 specified either through the management plan or through another  
20 tech spec regulation document, similar to what -- Nationally,  
21 this would be an undertaking for the SEDAR regulation writers,  
22 and it would constitute a significant expansion of the Gulf  
23 shrimp fishery regulations and largely be redundant of the  
24 national regulations, and then SERO would be responsible for  
25 maintaining and revising those regulations over time, as the  
26 technology changes, and so there would be regulatory writing and  
27 maintenance costs to that.

28

29 Who will handle the scientific testing and vetting of vendors  
30 seeking type approval? Here, it's good to reiterate the current  
31 process for VMS type approval, where NOAA Fisheries contracts  
32 with a global expert in Denmark, who performs the VMS testing  
33 and provides recommendations. The Southeast Center would  
34 maintain additional requirements for vendors on its program  
35 website, much like it does for SEFHIER, and the Southeast  
36 Science Center would maintain a website with those approved  
37 vendors for the shrimp fishery, and that's under the current  
38 process.

39

40 If a local process is adopted, then the Southeast Center would  
41 have to do the shrimp-specific testing and certification of  
42 vendors and then also house the local requirements and local  
43 vendor options on a local website, and the specifications,  
44 should specific specifications have to be added to the federal  
45 regulations.

46

47 These are answering the same questions, and what we did is we  
48 took it a little bit further, to go into the type approval

1 specifications in general and look at each individual component  
2 that was requested to be amended, altered, or changed, and our  
3 recommendations are as follows.

4  
5 First, we thank the in-depth efforts of the chair of the Shrimp  
6 Committee to dig into these details. Thank you, Leann. Other  
7 than two-way communication and electronic form capability, most  
8 of the differences were minor or ones that could be specified in  
9 the fishery management plan, and so they are open to the council  
10 requesting changes to them, and they don't need to -- We don't  
11 need to revise the national VMS type approval for most of those  
12 changes to be made.

13  
14 The hardware, support, and security should remain unchanged for  
15 the VMS specifications, to provide similar standards and economy  
16 of scale and choice of vendors. In general, most of those  
17 aspects of it are simply to ensure that there is rigorous  
18 hardware and it's supported by the vendor and that there are  
19 multiple vendors that a fisherman could choose to provide the  
20 hardware, and I think that adds some economy, because it means  
21 that there might be some competition for the particular sets of  
22 hardware.

23  
24 Then setting up redundant hardware, one specifically for the  
25 Gulf shrimp, for one fishery, would not be an efficient use of  
26 taxpayer funds, and it would be counter to several national data  
27 strategies, and, again, it would not change the ability of OLE  
28 to access the data, but many of the key points that could be  
29 altered don't require changing national VMS type approval specs,  
30 and the council has flexibility to address these in the fishery  
31 management plan, but the council really can't modify the  
32 national VMS specs, and, unfortunately, neither can the Science  
33 Center, necessarily, or SERO, also modify the national specs,  
34 because they are developed nationally, and they apply to all the  
35 fisheries across the entire nation.

36  
37 We can address local concerns, in terms of how those hardware  
38 units are utilized in the fishery management plan, and so these  
39 include the ping rate, the minimum number of position fixes to  
40 store in local memory, most of which can be very fishery-  
41 specific, and they might rule in or out certain hardware units  
42 that can or can't handle the ping rate or the storage capacity.

43  
44 Then hail-in and hail-out and exemption periods to get the units  
45 powered, power-down exemptions, and additional reporting forms  
46 are all something that's not as -- It's not clearly specified in  
47 the national type approval specs that it couldn't be greater  
48 specified, or specified in more local detail, in the management

1 plan, and so it wouldn't require opening up the national specs,  
2 and it could simply be done on a local basis, as needed.  
3  
4 Many of the elements are almost exactly the same as the national  
5 type approval specs, and these are the latency requirement,  
6 communications security, field and technical service support,  
7 notification type approval, et cetera, et cetera. Many of these  
8 actually were completely unchanged and probably should stay the  
9 same.  
10  
11 The key differences, in this case, it's in the definition, where  
12 the recommendation was to change VMS to cellular electronic  
13 logbook in the fishery management plan or the draft technical  
14 specifications, and, here, it's something that I think requires  
15 a little bit of a definition, but the 3G cELBs are -- Even  
16 though we call them an electronic logbook, they're really  
17 location recording devices and not logbooks, per se.  
18  
19 A logbook would require a fisherman to manually enter the  
20 fishing catch and effort information, as they would write down  
21 into their logbook. What the ELBs are doing is they're  
22 recording independent of the fishermen entering that  
23 information, which is the same thing that the VMS does.  
24  
25 VMS are satellite or cellular-based systems designed to monitor  
26 the location and movement of vessels using onboard VMS to send a  
27 GPS position report, as authorized under the federal  
28 regulations, and, regardless of what they're called, both cELBs  
29 or VMS monitor the location and movement of vessels, and so, by  
30 definition, a cellular electronic logbook is a VMS, and fishery  
31 management plans could specify either one, but they are  
32 synonymous, according to how they function.  
33  
34 Another difference is that the time stamp fix data must be in a  
35 format compatible to NMFS cELB effort analysis programs, and  
36 this is a very astute catch, in the sense that the data should,  
37 in fact, be very similar, and we want it to be similar, so that  
38 it doesn't require major formatting changes, but usually, if  
39 there is a formatting change, it's rather minor, and it might be  
40 a movement of one column to another or a conversion of a file,  
41 like latitude and longitude from decimal degrees to degrees,  
42 minutes, and seconds, something like that, which is really  
43 typically straightforward to do and kind of a very routing thing  
44 for data processing. Really, it wouldn't need to be specified  
45 in type approval specifications, because that would actually be  
46 more detail than would be needed, and we wouldn't need to open  
47 up the national specs.  
48

1 The ten-minute ping rate, as specified in the tech specs,  
2 because the shrimp effort data collection uses a ten-minute ping  
3 rate, this can be done in the FMP regulatory requirements, and  
4 it doesn't, again, require opening up the national tech specs.  
5 It would be something that would be fishery-specific, whether  
6 the actual hardware or software combination can handle what the  
7 fishery needs. In this case, if the ping rate of a ten-minute  
8 ping rate is required, then the hardware, or VMS systems, or  
9 electronic logbook systems, that could handle that would be the  
10 ones that would get approved for that particular fishery  
11 application.

12  
13 Specifying the minimum number of position fixes to be stored in  
14 local memory, because of that ping rate being ten minutes, we're  
15 going to have a very large amount of data that they're going to  
16 have to store until they're back within cellular range to  
17 transmit it, and there are, right now, two cellular VMS systems  
18 that can handle that large amount of data right now, and so that  
19 is something where they are meeting a requirement for the  
20 fishery that is more specific than what the national specs are,  
21 and, because that fishery can be more specific than the national  
22 specs, then it still falls under the type approval system, but  
23 that fishery application is unique to the amount of data that  
24 needs to be held and, again, doesn't require changing the  
25 national specs.

26  
27 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dr. Walter, can you back up one slide, to  
28 Slide 10? I didn't catch you in time to ask you a quick  
29 question. On that slide, you're talking about making sure it  
30 has a ten-minute ping rate, and I can see where you could  
31 specify that.

32  
33 Now, one of the other things that we feel could cause an issue  
34 is the additional pings that are required per the VMS tech  
35 specs, that the device has to send out a ping every time it's  
36 powered up, or powered down, and it has to ping when you cross  
37 certain geographical boundaries or areas, closed areas, and I'm  
38 sure state/fed boundaries. Anyway, those types of things, and  
39 so these additional pings that could possibly cause an issue for  
40 the shrimp algorithm and actually getting to our final result,  
41 which is shrimp effort, and that's what these location pings are  
42 all about, and it's actually effort collection.

43  
44 Can we go in and specify that -- Can we remove things,  
45 essentially, from the VMS tech specs and say, no, the device  
46 shall not ping when you do all these other things, and it will  
47 only ping in the ten-minute interval, so that we don't have  
48 issues when we try and compute effort from this, and is that

1 possible, to remove something like that from the tech specs, so  
2 that we get good scientific data?

3  
4 **DR. WALTER:** What we're trying to do is -- Because we ran up  
5 against the national tech specs, and changing them is going to  
6 be a challenge, but we probably don't need to for the  
7 application here, and that's the main thing, is that I believe  
8 you could probably program the units to do what is needed for  
9 the shrimp fishery, and so the units would meet VMS type  
10 approval, but then how they're programmed to be used would meet  
11 our requirements, which is the difference between going up and  
12 trying to change the VMS tech specs nationally, versus using  
13 them for type approval and then adapting how they are programmed  
14 to ping for our needs.

15  
16 I think it could -- Even if it was an additional ping, like less  
17 than ten minutes, the effort algorithm could probably either  
18 remove it or, because it would be ten minutes or less, it  
19 probably could handle that, and I don't have the details on  
20 that, but I can get back to you on it.

21  
22 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, and I wasn't speaking so much to the  
23 algorithm side, because we do know that the one-hour ping rate -  
24 - The algorithm couldn't handle that, and so there is a  
25 probability that it may very well have an issue with any other  
26 pings outside that ten-minute window, and so the question is  
27 more to -- This boils down to VMS tech specs, and we have to  
28 have good scientific data.

29  
30 Well, those tech specs were designed for law enforcement, and  
31 that's what those other pings are all about, is law enforcement  
32 needs to know when you're crossing these boundary lines, when  
33 you power your machine down, when you power it up, because they  
34 are trying to track you and see where you are, but those very  
35 things that we're going to tell the vendor that we want your  
36 device to do this, if you follow the tech specs for VMS, are  
37 things that may corrupt our data, when we go and try and get the  
38 end result, which is effort, and so can we remove those things  
39 from the VMS tech specs, if we're going to use those for shrimp  
40 devices for effort, to make sure that we get good, usable data?

41  
42 **DR. WALTER:** Well, we're not recommending removing them for the  
43 national tech specs, for the reasons that I have alluded to,  
44 that that's going to be an uphill battle. However, if you know  
45 that the pings were always one minute, and it was only nine  
46 minutes from the previous ten-minute ping, then the effort  
47 calculation would say, well, you have done this much distance  
48 between this much time, and, because it's recording the location

1 and the time of the ping, it should be able to simply be a  
2 process, and that would be, we think, just modifying the  
3 algorithm to ensure that it's not sort of locked in on ten  
4 minutes, and that it's ten minutes or less. I think that's a  
5 rather simple change to the algorithm.

6  
7 In terms of those pings being because of a particular aspect,  
8 like a closed area, as you alluded to, the requirement to be  
9 able to ping when something like that happens is a national one.  
10 Whether that gets used for whatever purpose, and because we're  
11 only using it right now for the effort algorithm, then that  
12 wouldn't come into play what that ping was caused by, and it  
13 would simply be that it knows that it's the usual ten minutes,  
14 and, all of a sudden, there was a one-minute between those, and  
15 it's just the distance divided by the time, and then it  
16 determines whether that is effort or not, but it's not -- We  
17 wouldn't, for the effort calculation, be using that for the  
18 purpose of enforcement, because the process is being used for  
19 scientific evaluation of effort.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, and so, essentially, we have to use the  
22 VMS tech specs as they are, and, although that may create an  
23 efficiency there, it's going to create additional burden  
24 somewhere else, because we're going to have to go back and  
25 rewrite the mathematical algorithm, to make sure it handles it,  
26 and test it and make sure that we get good, accurate data.

27  
28 I am one that likes to do it right on the frontend, rather than  
29 go with that easy route and then have to fix something else on  
30 the backend, but at least we know where we stand on it. All  
31 right. Thank you, sir.

32  
33 **DR. WALTER:** Fair point. Fair point. However, there are units  
34 we know that we can do what we need right now, which is what  
35 we're looking at the hardware is the more challenging thing,  
36 because that is -- How you use it is relatively straightforward,  
37 how to program it, and then an algorithm is just some simple  
38 lines of code, and so that's relatively cheap, compared to  
39 buying many different hardware units, and that is why we're  
40 looking at it from that angle.

41  
42 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, sir. You can go ahead.

43  
44 **DR. WALTER:** Okay. The two-way communication, this was a  
45 request to modify the tech specs to remove two-way  
46 communication. Right now, two-way communication is the basic  
47 standard for most devices and estimation, and how it gets used,  
48 i.e., whether we would be communicating with the unit, would be

1 specified in the fishery management plan, but a device that's a  
2 cellular or satellite modem is capable of two-way communication,  
3 and so are the cellular electronic logbooks we're using today.  
4 The 3G units are capable of this, and it's really just the  
5 standard by which these units are created, that they're able to  
6 both transmit and receive information, such as software updates.

7  
8 It's one of those things that is -- If one were to design a  
9 unit, you would not reverse-engineer it or take out that  
10 capacity, and that's just mostly the basic standard right now  
11 for production of a hardware unit like this, in particular  
12 because software updates -- If you've got a cellphone or a  
13 computer, you know that there is always software updates that  
14 are needed to be pushed out, and so that is a key thing to  
15 ensure its security and protect it from vulnerability.

16  
17 Remove the requirement for electronic forms in separate tech  
18 specs, the forms are fishery-specific, and so they would be  
19 specified in the fishery management plan regulatory requirements  
20 for the fishery, and there aren't national specifications, and  
21 so, in this case, the terminal, or tablet, just needs to be  
22 supported and not necessarily have one connected, which the 3G  
23 ELB units had this capability.

24  
25 Also, while having the capability to attach a terminal, or  
26 tablet, is a requirement, this should be maintained in the tech  
27 specs, to allow for changes in reporting requirements without  
28 the unit onboard -- Without replacing the unit onboard, and this  
29 is in case we need to collect another piece of information, and  
30 if the reporting needs to change in the future, and remember  
31 that we're trying to put together a system that's going to be in  
32 place for a good long number of years, because I, for one, don't  
33 want to have to be back in this same place two years from now,  
34 when we find out that the system we worked really hard to get is  
35 no longer working, or there is an upgrade to it. We want to  
36 have it be as robust to those kinds of updates as possible.

37  
38 I think this gets us back to probably one of the biggest issues,  
39 is whether the data goes through OCIO and the Office of Law  
40 Enforcement or not. To not go through the OCIO, and the current  
41 VMS type approval process, it would create a redundant  
42 infrastructure to receive and store information for one fishery.  
43 Right now, it would be counter to the Office of Management and  
44 Budget federal data strategy emphasizing transparency and  
45 sharing of data platforms and resources, and, since the  
46 Department of Commerce, and NOAA, is a subsidiary of, we have  
47 similar required strategies.

48

1 The Office of Law Enforcement would still have easy access to  
2 these data, whether it's stored at the Southeast Center or  
3 whether it's at the Office of the Chief Information Officer, and  
4 all NMFS data is available for law enforcement, as required by  
5 the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

6  
7 While we could do that, there's a number of reasons that may be  
8 based on government policy to not do that, but, primarily, there  
9 is the potential for additional cost.

10  
11 In summary, most of the recommendations for changes to the  
12 specifications could be addressed through the fishery management  
13 plan, and they wouldn't require opening up the national VMS type  
14 approval. Here, we have listed that many of them are hardware  
15 and support, and we, in reviewing this, recommended either  
16 addressing them through the fishery management plan or keeping  
17 them in the current specs, because there are just very practical  
18 reasons.

19  
20 There is support, and particularly removing the litigation  
21 support, and this one we recommend keeping, because one wants to  
22 ensure that anything they put on their boat and use has some  
23 support from the manufacturer, and then, in terms of data  
24 routing, this is probably the main sticking point, about whether  
25 the data would either be housed through the Gulf States or the  
26 Southeast Center or moved to OCIO and OLE. That's probably --  
27 That line is the major decision point, in terms of where we  
28 would go with it and whether there would be added costs to the  
29 agency and the taxpayers to doing that, versus maintaining the  
30 current system that's in place and using the VMS architecture.

31  
32 With that, I think that is the end of my presentation, and I am  
33 happy to take more questions, and I do have a figure that shows  
34 how the current system works and how an alternative pathway  
35 works, either through Gulf States or some other server, but, in  
36 either case, there is going to have to be access provided to the  
37 Office of Law Enforcement for this type of effort data. Thank  
38 you, and I'm happy to take questions, or I know there is a  
39 number of outstanding questions that I will seek some answers  
40 from colleagues.

41  
42 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Thank you, Dr. Walter. Are there  
43 any questions from the committee? No hands up. All right. So  
44 I did want to go back to one slide, and it would be Slide 5, and  
45 so this is that comparison that, if we go with the VMS type  
46 approval process, how that would work, versus, if we don't run  
47 it through the OLE VMS type approval process, how it would work,  
48 and I really appreciated this slide, because that gave me the

1 information that I have been wondering about, you know who would  
2 do this and how would this transpire.

3  
4 You say there that, you know, OLE has a vendor that they used,  
5 that they contract with, over in Denmark that does the testing  
6 on the VMS, and that testing is mainly for actual transmission,  
7 to make sure that the reports go through in a timely manner and  
8 that the device is somewhat seaworthy.

9  
10 Then, if we don't go through that, then the Science Center would  
11 essentially get a contract with that vendor, or some other  
12 vendor, if they choose, but they would have to get a contract on  
13 file with the vendor, the same way that OLE does, and so you  
14 could contract with that same vendor, and so that sounds like  
15 paperwork.

16  
17 Then, after that, who is going to maintain the requirements, and  
18 so, if you did go with the draft tech specs that I wrote for the  
19 devices that we have on the boats now, which worked well, then  
20 you would put that on your website, and that's where vendors  
21 would go to figure out what they need to build to apply for  
22 approval, instead of it being on OLE's website.

23  
24 Then you would add those specifications to the codified  
25 regulations, and so, to me, that right there was what I was  
26 hoping to see. I mean, personally, I think that's exactly what  
27 needs to transpire, and this is a scientific effort collection  
28 program, and we have to make sure that that is at front of mind  
29 and is tested properly and that we continue to get this very  
30 important, accurate data from the shrimp fleet, which is used in  
31 a multitude of ways.

32  
33 I was glad to see that, and I was glad to see that it is  
34 possible, and I can tell it's probably not the preferred avenue  
35 for the federal government, that you all prefer going through  
36 OLE, but it's good to know that this is possible, and a lot of  
37 it looks like paperwork that has to be done to get it on the  
38 ground and get it running, and so thank you, and I know this was  
39 quite an undertaking and I appreciate it. Are there any other  
40 questions or comments from anybody on the committee? All right.  
41 Dr. Freeman.

42  
43 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** Leann, I have my hand up.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Strelcheck.

46  
47 **MR. STRELCHECK:** You knew I was going to raise my hand at some  
48 point.

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I was waiting.

3  
4 **MR. STRELCHECK:** That's right. John, thanks for the  
5 presentation. Great job to you and the team, and I'm really  
6 impressed with how thoroughly you guys looked at this. I don't  
7 have any questions for John, and I had read through the  
8 presentation beforehand, but I did want to comment, Leann, on  
9 the point you just made.

10  
11 Yes, it's maybe technologically possible to go down the path  
12 that you just noted, but my concern is that it's kind of  
13 evident, throughout the presentation, that that path is more  
14 costly, with increased taxpayer expense, and it does not resolve  
15 the concerns about OLE getting the data, and it's going to be  
16 more administratively burdensome, and, in looking back at some  
17 of the prior VMS action that this council has taken, really, it  
18 would be very inconsistent with previous approaches, where the  
19 council has recommended the hardware and left it up to the  
20 agency with regard to how to implement, obviously, the council's  
21 requirements.

22  
23 Certainly I think the council needs to heavily weigh those  
24 factors and the amendment process, and I like the recommendation  
25 of, obviously, using the existing framework hardware technical  
26 specifications, with some specific modifications that could be  
27 outlined in the FMP, that are suitable, obviously, to the shrimp  
28 industry and make sense, obviously, for the shrimp industry,  
29 because I think that will address many of the things that I just  
30 noted, with regard to cost burden and OLE. Thanks.

31  
32 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thanks, Andy, and I appreciate that, and, you  
33 know, I'm glad that you brought it up, because, if we go to  
34 Slide 14, I can see probably some of these bullet points making  
35 it straight into the amendment, and I really didn't want to get  
36 into it, but, you know, you got me worked up, Andy, and so I  
37 will.

38  
39 This idea that it creates a redundant infrastructure to receive  
40 and store this location information for one fishery, I kind of  
41 disagree with that, especially if you're talking about using  
42 Gulf States as the kind of intermediary to go between the  
43 vessels and the Science Center.

44  
45 Gulf States is in the process of moving to the cloud, and so  
46 it's not like we're asking somebody to go to a cloud-based  
47 server only for the shrimp industry, and you get data, and you  
48 receive and transfer data from Gulf States all the time, and so

1 a lot of the securities and things like that -- Those aren't  
2 going to be redundancies, and you're going to use those anyway,  
3 as Gulf States transfers to the cloud, in order to receive data  
4 from them.

5  
6 This idea that it's not transparent, or the sharing of data  
7 platforms and resources, it's very much that. I am not asking  
8 you to go to a separate entity that doesn't house data for us  
9 already, and I'm asking you to add us to that, and you're  
10 looking at it from the prism of a VMS, and I see this as effort  
11 data. This is our logbook, all right, and it's a very passive  
12 form of logbook, because it operates in the background, and we  
13 don't have to physically input our location, as they do for all  
14 the other fisheries, and they have to tell you what block they  
15 were in, or what area they were in, and ours does it passively  
16 for us, but it's just that, and it is our logbook for scientific  
17 data.

18  
19 If you go look at the precedent for logbooks and who is the one  
20 having to develop them and maintain them and store the  
21 information and receive the information, that is the Science  
22 Center and SERO, and, in fact, you just stood one up for the  
23 for-hire fleet, with their eTRIPS and their logbooks that they  
24 have, and you're still working on those, and so I guess  
25 sometimes it makes me feel like we're the red-headed stepchild,  
26 even though we're the economic powerhouse in the Gulf of Mexico,  
27 when it comes to commercial fisheries.

28  
29 We put the Gulf on the map, and put us in the top five, when you  
30 look at the economics of the U.S. fisheries, every time that  
31 publication comes out, and yet it's okay for SERO and the  
32 Science Center to stand up logbooks for every other commercial  
33 fishery, but, for our logbook, because it's passive, we feel  
34 like that should be passed on to some other entity, which, in  
35 this case, is law enforcement.

36  
37 I think, if you asked any of those other commercial fisheries,  
38 well, I tell you what, we want you to send your data to law  
39 enforcement from now on, and we're not going to worry with it on  
40 the Science Center side, and we just want to receive it -- I  
41 mean, even as you're talking about going to an electronic  
42 logbook for all your other commercial fisheries, that is running  
43 through the Science Center and SERO, and that is not -- You have  
44 hopes to one day, after you stand it all up and create the  
45 documents and make sure it works properly and everything, to ask  
46 the VMS vendors if they will put those forms on their VMS, but  
47 it's going to be stood up by SERO and the Science Center, and I  
48 feel like we're, for some reason, being passed off to somebody

1 else.

2  
3 I know that you all have done this for other fisheries, with  
4 their logbooks, and I feel that the shrimp industry should  
5 benefit the same as others, that we shouldn't be handed off, and  
6 so I just wanted to address some of those points that were made,  
7 so that, when the IPT fleshes this out, we'll have both sides of  
8 the coin in there, and so thanks for listening.

9  
10 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Can I respond?

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, go ahead.

13  
14 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Just two things, and I don't want to get into a  
15 debate here, and I know we have a lot of things to discuss, and,  
16 right now, we're not going to treat the shrimp industry any  
17 differently than we would the for-hire industry or the  
18 commercial reef fish industry.

19  
20 Those VMS data go through our law enforcement program, right,  
21 and so, on March 1 of this year, we stand up the for-hire  
22 program, and those VMS data will go through our enforcement  
23 program and be made available to the Science Center and the  
24 Regional Office, right, and so they're accessible not only to  
25 OLE, but all of NOAA.

26  
27 The other thing is just to kind of put this as an analogy, and I  
28 feel like -- Let's take permits, for example. We have a permits  
29 program that the agency stood up, and we're implementing, and,  
30 even though we're making changes to it, and it's like the shrimp  
31 industry, or another industry, wants to come in and say, you  
32 know, we really don't want to get our permits from the Regional  
33 Office, and so we're going to maybe route it another way, just  
34 to go through and get our permits, and so think about that, in  
35 terms of a cost and administrative burden, and in terms of then  
36 the complexities of having to then line up that data with a  
37 system that already exists, and so that's really the point I'm  
38 trying to make, is we have a system that exists, and it's in  
39 place, and it has approvals, and it's already incurring these  
40 costs and can house this data.

41  
42 To me, that is the logical place that we should move forward,  
43 using the devices and program that's already at our fingertips,  
44 in order to move forward with getting effort data back  
45 operational since the 3G units have expired, and so I've said my  
46 piece, and I will stop there.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck, and I won't even

1 come back to it. Look at that. I'm going to be a good girl  
2 today, and so let's move on to the next agenda item. Well, Dr.  
3 Freeman, if we're done with that one, and you keep me straight  
4 now. Are we finished with that one?

5

6 **DR. FREEMAN:** I believe so. Yes, ma'am.

7

8 **MS. BOSARGE:** Okay. All right. The next agenda item is going  
9 to be the updated draft framework action for the modification of  
10 vessel position data collection program for the Gulf of Mexico  
11 shrimp fishery, and that's found under Tab D, Number 5, and, Dr.  
12 Freeman, if you will take us through the action guide on that  
13 and then through the presentation as well.

14

15 **UPDATED DRAFT FRAMEWORK ACTION: MODIFICATION OF THE VESSEL**  
16 **POSITION DATA COLLECTION PROGRAM FOR THE GULF OF MEXICO SHRIMP**  
17 **FISHERY**

18

19 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay, and so, for the action guide, the committee  
20 will be presented with an updated draft framework action to  
21 transition the Gulf shrimp fishery from the expired 3G cELB to a  
22 new device collecting vessel position data, for the purpose of  
23 maintaining effort estimation. Staff will review draft  
24 alternatives.

25

26 The committee has background information available, which  
27 contains an update from NMFS on testing of cellular VMS on Gulf  
28 shrimp vessels. The committee should ask questions and provide  
29 staff with further direction, specifically on the timing and  
30 next steps for the development of the draft framework action,  
31 based on the information received from NMFS on the evaluation of  
32 the draft approval specifications for reinstating the  
33 historical cELB program.

34

35 Further, the council has recently solicited and decided on  
36 proposals to test the P-Sea WindPlot software program with a  
37 proportion of the shrimp fleet in the Gulf of Mexico, and the  
38 result of these efforts are likely to be completed in early to  
39 mid-2023.

40

41 Madam Chair, I did want to note just a few additional items. As  
42 far as the background information, we do have Farron Wallace  
43 available on the webinar, and so, during this agenda item, if  
44 the committee has any questions, Farron is available, and then,  
45 for the last portion, regarding the proposals, Dr. Simmons is  
46 going to provide a brief updated, before we move to the next  
47 agenda item.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Thank you, Dr. Freeman. Go ahead  
2 and proceed.

3  
4 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay. I will just give admin staff a moment to  
5 bring up the framework. Okay. Not much has changed in the  
6 document itself since the committee saw this in October. We  
7 made a few updates, one being it was a request from a committee  
8 member, and we did update Appendix C, and then the other thing  
9 that I wanted to go to was Action 1, or the action, and just  
10 provide some additional information for the committee and other  
11 council members.

12  
13 With regard to Alternative 1, which is the current method of  
14 data collection, where NMFS is collecting the memory cards, just  
15 to provide an update, I did get information from the Science  
16 Center, earlier this month, on the SD cards, and more have been  
17 ordered and received. They ordered a little over 1,100 of them,  
18 and so they are good for the January 2022 mailing, and they  
19 should be as well for the June/July mailing.

20  
21 One item that I did want to inquire about that was brought up  
22 during the IPT is in regard to Alternative 3, and, Ms. Bosarge,  
23 I know I mentioned it to you prior, but I want to at least  
24 mention it to the other committee members and get feedback  
25 formally from you for the IPT.

26  
27 There was a question, on that second line of the alternative,  
28 where it says, "would be required to install an approved  
29 electronic logbook (ELB)", there was a suggestion to instead  
30 refer to it as "would be required to install an approved  
31 device", since, as Dr. Walter even mentioned, it's not a true  
32 logbook, per se, and so I did want to just bring that up for  
33 discussion and just get feedback from you.

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you. On Alternative 3, personally, I  
36 prefer to keep the electronic logbook in there. To me, that is  
37 what helps to make it clear that what we are collecting is  
38 scientific data. That logbook is collecting effort data, and  
39 it's the data that's used to compute our effort, and it does it  
40 in a passive manner, as I mentioned before, but, however, that's  
41 what it's all about.

42  
43 When you change it to just the plain Jane bland device, I think  
44 that gets lost in translation, and I think it's important to  
45 keep it listed as an electronic logbook, but I am open to hear  
46 feedback from other committee members, if they have an opinion  
47 on this. Andy, is your hand up now, or is that from earlier?  
48

1 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, ma'am.

2

3 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Go ahead.

4

5 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Just to clarify, it does not collect effort  
6 data, and so there is an algorithm that processes the GPS  
7 coordinates to estimate shrimp effort, once that data is  
8 collected, and so, like John indicated in his presentation, and  
9 I have said in numerous council meetings now, there really is no  
10 difference between calling it an electronic logbook and a VMS,  
11 because they are still collecting archival vessel position data,  
12 and so, to me, the Alternative 3 is in some ways misleading,  
13 because I feel like what you are really saying is that you are  
14 wanting to have a unit that falls outside the VMS program, and I  
15 am thinking, if you want to maintain this alternative, that that  
16 might be a better approach, and it certainly is not my preferred  
17 approach.

18

19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Right, and so I think sometimes we need to  
20 step back and look at the history of what's being collected and  
21 how it was collected and how we got to this point, and so we  
22 have collected shrimp effort data for many, many, many decades  
23 in the Gulf of Mexico, and the way that we historically have  
24 done it, way back when, was actually with port agents that went  
25 out and conducted interviews with the fishermen to find out  
26 where they fish, where in the Gulf of Mexico they were trawling  
27 and shrimping, and how many hours, which add up to days, they  
28 were in those various locations.

29

30 Now, as our fisheries have evolved, we have found a more  
31 efficient way of collecting effort data in the shrimp fleet, and  
32 that is with this piece of equipment, but this is still effort  
33 data, and it's not just some device. It's not a VMS device that  
34 is on the boat, and this is our electronic logbook that we have  
35 had on the boats for a decade or so, or a decade-and-a-half,  
36 maybe, in the shrimp fishery in the Gulf of Mexico to collect  
37 scientific effort data, and I think, if we make this more plain  
38 vanilla, and just call it a device, we lose the entire history  
39 and the point of what we're trying to accomplish here, and that  
40 is to get effort data, which goes into our stock assessments,  
41 which goes into our bi-ops and our analysis to do with sea  
42 turtles.

43

44 This is not just location data that you would get off of any VMS  
45 used for law enforcement. This is effort data, and so I think  
46 it's important to keep it as electronic logbook. I don't see  
47 any other hands up, and, Dr. Freeman, if you have some other  
48 questions for us, that we need to clarify for the IPT, I

1 definitely want you to go through those, but I also was hoping  
2 that, since that background material is in the briefing book on  
3 the testing of VMS devices, maybe you could just -- And you said  
4 that Dr. Wallace is on the line, but you could briefly go over  
5 what the game plan there is, because I'm sure that council  
6 members are going to be wondering about that timetable as well.

7  
8 **DR. FREEMAN:** Yes, ma'am, and so that was the primary question  
9 that I had on my list, and certainly I can defer to Farron and  
10 let him discuss what is in the background information. However,  
11 before we leave this agenda item, I would still like some  
12 feedback from the committee, in terms of how to incorporate/what  
13 to incorporate, et cetera, the information from Dr. Walter's  
14 presentation into the current document, but certainly let me  
15 just give admin staff a moment to get Farron so that he can  
16 provide audio, and we'll get the background information pulled  
17 up.

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. That sounds great, and you can bet  
20 that I am going to be giving you more feedback on what I would  
21 like to see in the document, and so don't worry. It won't be  
22 radio silence when we finish with Dr. Wallace.

23  
24 **DR. FARRON WALLACE:** I am online here, and so I can answer any  
25 of the questions you may have on this.

26  
27 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dr. Wallace, could you just, in a nutshell,  
28 kind of tell us what your game plan is on testing those, the  
29 true already type-approved VMS devices, to ensure that they  
30 will, number one, work on the shrimp boats, and, number two,  
31 give us good, reliable scientific data?

32  
33 **DR. WALLACE:** Absolutely. To this point, both of the cellular  
34 providers are onboard with us, and they will provide cellular  
35 VMS units, and we will deploy those on the Caretta. Also on the  
36 Caretta, we're going to deploy the 3G units, and we'll be  
37 matching data to data analysis, following several trips out to  
38 sea, and we're also going to include a couple of other new units  
39 that we're trying to develop that would actually do the  
40 automated effort analysis at-sea, but this will give us a nice,  
41 clean look at the data from the cELBs and then also then also  
42 the VMS.

43  
44 As you know, the VMS will be collected at one-minute, and we'll  
45 be able to go through and filter out just the ten-minute  
46 intervals, and we can also look at one-minute intervals, to get  
47 a really good idea if there is any sort of differences in the  
48 effort calculation, at the end of the day, through the same

1 program that has been used for the last decade or two.

2  
3 I have not had any industry contact me volunteering to have a  
4 cellular unit placed on their vessel, and so I would certainly  
5 appreciate any sort of help that you can help out there, and I  
6 think that would be a really good thing to do, but maybe not  
7 necessarily in terms of -- If we're going to be on a single  
8 vessel, in a single area, it may not cover all of the needs that  
9 the industry may have, for example if people are fishing in, of  
10 course, different areas of the Gulf and if you had questions  
11 about whether or not there would be a difference in the spatial  
12 areas.

13  
14 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Dr. Wallace. Were there any  
15 questions from committee members? Maybe, if we could scroll  
16 forward in that presentation that you have pulled up there, and  
17 I know you have a page that shows, you know, where you're hoping  
18 to get volunteers from, the different areas of the Gulf, and  
19 kind of the timeline that you're hoping to carry out the  
20 trawling, and I don't have that pulled up, but maybe you could  
21 tell staff what slide that is.

22  
23 **DR. WALLACE:** They will have to page through it. I don't have  
24 it in front of me, other than what's on the screen right now,  
25 and so if staff could go ahead and go down through this. Here  
26 is the timeline right here and the potential for industry  
27 volunteers, and all of the deployment days, and it will be out  
28 for about thirty days. The top line shows the R/V Caretta, and  
29 we are still scheduled to get out there in May.

30  
31 We'll be carrying both the Faria and the Woods Hole, and there's  
32 not an X there at this point, so that we can evaluate both of  
33 those side-by-side, and, of course, the cELB. The data logger  
34 is another -- Again, I mentioned the data logger, and hopefully  
35 we'll use this as an advanced technology tool that will automate  
36 the effort analysis at-sea.

37  
38 **MR. BOB GILL:** Madam Chair, my hand is up, but not recognized.

39  
40 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Go ahead, Mr. Gill.

41  
42 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, and the question might be for you, and  
43 this chart is germane, and so, at the last committee meeting,  
44 council meeting, and the AP, the plan laid out was discussed,  
45 and my takeaway was that the industry had significant input in  
46 terms of the where and the how, et cetera, but I also came away  
47 with the impression that industry was also going to step up and  
48 the bottom five, the shrimp vessels, they were going to work

1 together to figure out how to make that happen. That currently  
2 has not happened, and so either my understanding is wrong, or  
3 there is something else going on, and could you clarify why that  
4 portion has not transpired? Thank you.

5  
6 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, and thanks, Mr. Gill. I guess I would  
7 throw it back to Dr. Wallace and ask him who he has reached out  
8 to since that meeting that he thought was going to volunteer  
9 that maybe has backed out.

10  
11 **DR. WALLACE:** Sure, I can do that, Leann. If you recall back to  
12 our last meeting, and that was November, I believe, or whenever  
13 the last meeting was, but I made it pretty clear that we didn't  
14 have staff onboard that could reach out to various shrimp  
15 industries, and I left that up to this committee, to throw out  
16 the fishing line to see who would be able, and who would want,  
17 to volunteer for this program. Again, we have no staff to  
18 coordinate anything like this, and, if I didn't make it clear  
19 enough to members, then I apologize for that.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Gill, does that answer your question?  
22

23 **MR. GILL:** Well, partially. The bottom line is we have not made  
24 any progress on that part of it, and so I guess the follow-up to  
25 that would be, and I see Corky has his hand up, is what's the  
26 game plan for achieving the industry participation in assessing  
27 of the units in a way that we had expressed at our last meeting  
28 in October was needed to fully flesh out how all of this was  
29 going to work on a real shrimp vessel shrimping?

30  
31 **DR. WALLACE:** Well, I can't force vessels to participate in  
32 these things, and, again, this is where help from the industry  
33 is really needed, and, if we want to test on several vessels in  
34 different areas of the Gulf, then I will need volunteers.  
35 Certainly the cellular providers are onboard with sending units  
36 out, and so they are -- The cellular unit providers are also  
37 onboard to do that, and quickly too.

38  
39 **MR. GILL:** Madam Chair, if I could do a follow-up?  
40

41 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, sir. Go ahead, Mr. Gill.  
42

43 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I am in agreement, and I am  
44 thinking that industry testing of the units is highly desirable,  
45 and I don't know if, by the lack of volunteers thus far, implies  
46 that industry does not agree with that, or has a problem, or  
47 something else is going on, but I am thinking that, to really  
48 evaluate this program, that part of it is good, and I think the

1 Coretta information will be interesting and helpful, but I think  
2 the real-world, actual participation by active industry vessels  
3 is important, and so I am -- I guess I'm concerned that -- Do we  
4 have a problem here or not, and how do we make the next step  
5 going forward, if we're in agreement that that is needed?  
6

7 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, and I have some comments too, but  
8 I think I'm going to hold my comments, and I am going to let Mr.  
9 Perret, who has been patiently waiting, speak, if we have him on  
10 the line and ready.  
11

12 **MR. CORKY PERRET:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for  
13 allowing me to address the council and the committee. I am a  
14 little puzzled, and our Shrimp Advisory Panel met in December,  
15 and, when we discussed this issue, one of the members was  
16 disappointed that there were no vessels from Louisiana, and we  
17 had some discussion on that and asked if it would be possible to  
18 get a Louisiana vessel, or vessels, involved, and I guess, Dr.  
19 Wallace, my question to you is -- Obviously, from reading the  
20 update footnote, no volunteers came forward from Louisiana to  
21 participate in this program?  
22

23 **DR. WALLACE:** That's right. I didn't hear back from any  
24 industry out there from any states, and the schedule you're  
25 looking at there on the screen right now doesn't have Louisiana  
26 specifically on there, because this is just a draft, and it's  
27 just to sort of portray the idea that we're looking for vessels  
28 probably from various areas around the Gulf, and certainly any  
29 vessel fishing out of Louisiana would be welcome to participate  
30 in this study.  
31

32 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Go ahead, Mr. Perret.  
33

34 **MR. PERRET:** Thank you, and, like Mr. Gill's comment, I'm a  
35 little disappointed that we have not had more volunteers, but  
36 thank you for your input.  
37

38 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. I have Dr. Walter next.  
39

40 **DR. WALTER:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I think this highlights  
41 the issue that we're facing, is that we need help here to do  
42 this, and this is a request from the council to evaluate these  
43 units, and, unless we get industry support in testing these,  
44 we're going to have to go with the best information we can  
45 gather, which is putting it on the R/V Caretta, and so we'll put  
46 the units on the Caretta, and this will be done in May, and  
47 we'll get the information that we can get, and we'll have to  
48 make our decision process based on that data. Unless we can get

1 industry support to put these units on other vessels in other  
2 states and in other fisheries, the data we've got will come from  
3 the Caretta.

4  
5 I will also note that we definitely have a ticking timeframe  
6 here, because the shrimp bi-op reasonable and prudent measures  
7 says that we're going to monitor effort at the same or greater  
8 level as we have for the last ten years, and I think that our 3G  
9 units are not quite keeping up right now, and we're going to  
10 have to get this process in place, sooner rather than later, to  
11 meet that, and so I am hopeful that we can get some support here  
12 from the industry to test these units to get the answers needed  
13 to make informed decisions. Thanks.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Strelcheck.

16  
17 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Thanks, Leann, and I'm certainly open to your  
18 suggestion here, and my initial thought was certainly we can  
19 reach out, again, to major shrimp organizations, but I'm  
20 thinking that it would actually be better coming from you and  
21 Corky and others that work very closely with the shrimp industry  
22 to garner that buy-in and support.

23  
24 Certainly, if we would need to send a letter or something from  
25 the council, we would certainly encourage that, but I agree with  
26 John that we're going to proceed forward with testing of the  
27 Coretta, and it certainly would be nice, obviously, to have  
28 industry step in and help us test these units, and my concern,  
29 right now, is the longer that we, obviously, wait to get to a  
30 solution with regard to collecting effort data, the worse and  
31 worse the data, unfortunately, is getting since we ended the 3G  
32 program, and so we really need to be urgent, in terms of trying  
33 to come up with a solution to this and get these units tested as  
34 quickly as possible.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. I don't see any other names on  
37 the list, and so I will jump in here. I'm going to have to  
38 defend the industry a little bit here. I think the word that I  
39 didn't like was "again", that you all could reach out to  
40 industry again, and so I asked who had been called, and no one  
41 has been called.

42  
43 This presentation was given at the Shrimp AP meeting. Now,  
44 that's a group of twelve people. Now, there are Mississippi-  
45 Alabama Sea Grant, and there is a Louisiana Sea Grant, and there  
46 is a Texas Shrimp Association, and there is the Southern Shrimp  
47 Alliance, and there is all sorts of people that you can pick up  
48 the phone and say, okay, is there anybody that you think would

1 volunteer?

2  
3 I don't think one presentation at a Shrimp AP means that you  
4 have reached out to the industry and asked for volunteers and  
5 have gotten none, and you made one presentation, and that is  
6 essentially the extent of what you're going to do to carry out  
7 this testing, and this is a scientific data collection program,  
8 and this is not the responsibility of the industry to make sure  
9 that the scientific testing gets carried out.

10  
11 Now, we are hoping that it will get done, and we have gone out  
12 of our way, because we didn't see any steps being taken to pay  
13 for scientific testing for a device that would collect this same  
14 data, and we are willing to help, and I do believe that, but we  
15 shouldn't be calling NMFS and saying, hey, have you gotten any  
16 volunteers yet, and it's NMFS' job to try and find some  
17 volunteers, and a couple of phone calls I don't think is asking  
18 too much.

19  
20 I don't see the blame for this being put on the industry. We  
21 were the ones that at least passed a motion that said, you know,  
22 we should probably test these, and let's work on this. Had we  
23 not passed that motion, I don't think that this testing would be  
24 occurring at all, and so I think industry is very involved in  
25 this, and has been pushing for this, but we do expect a little  
26 bit of legwork on the other side of this equation, and I am  
27 getting testy about it, but I hear all the blame being pointed  
28 at industry.

29  
30 I mean, we have spent our money, and we have done our legwork to  
31 try and test the device, to make sure that we keep getting the  
32 data that we need to proceed as an industry, and so this is a  
33 give-and-take here, and I would suggest that you reach out to  
34 those entities with an email, that I mentioned, and I bet you  
35 will get some volunteers, but not communicating, other than a  
36 Shrimp AP meeting, and expecting people to pop up on your radar  
37 is probably not going to get the job done, and so I'm sorry to  
38 have to put my momma voice on there. Let's see. Do we have  
39 other hands up? John and Andy, are those new hands, or are  
40 those the same hands from before?

41  
42 **DR. WALTER:** A new hand.

43  
44 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** New hands. Okay. I have Dr. Walter first  
45 and then Mr. Strelcheck.

46  
47 **DR. WALTER:** I just want to say that I really didn't want to  
48 make this an industry versus agency issue here, and we are

1 trying to work together here, and we really do thank the  
2 industry for putting up a lot of resources in trying to solve  
3 the problem. I think what we kind of just need are the numbers,  
4 as you have pointed out, and I think we can make the phone  
5 calls.

6  
7 Just, when we do, and it someone from NMFS calling, hopefully  
8 they will understand, and sometimes it helps for the connection  
9 to be made, and maybe Leann or others can help us make that  
10 connection, because not everyone wants to get a phone call from  
11 us, but, if they know the reason and the purpose, it might go  
12 smoother, and we can make those connections happen easier and  
13 get this done, but I don't want it to be an adversarial thing,  
14 and we're trying to seek the same solution. Thanks.

15  
16 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thanks, and so, you know, I am definitely  
17 willing to work with you, but we'll just have to talk about, you  
18 know, the logistics of it. We're actually shrimping in the  
19 Atlantic right now, and I don't know if that will do you any  
20 good, and I don't know if that's too far for people to have to  
21 travel to outfit boats and do what you need to do, and so, you  
22 know, know that we're willing to help, but we will have to work  
23 out those final details and see if our boats will do you any  
24 good at this point. There you go. Let's see. Emily, I think I  
25 have your name next.

26  
27 **MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN:** Well, at Dr. Freeman's suggestion, I  
28 think that I would also just like to offer that, if there's some  
29 sort of intermediary role that we can play, as sort of the  
30 intermediary between the industry, we're happy to use our  
31 Outreach and Education Technical Committee, which is all the Sea  
32 Grant agents across the coast, as well as the state folks, and  
33 then we can also use our communication channels to sort of help  
34 get some participation in this program, if you find that  
35 helpful, Mrs. Chair.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, ma'am. I think that would be very  
38 helpful. Thank you. I like solution-oriented women. Thank  
39 you, ma'am. All right.

40  
41 **DR. FREEMAN:** Ms. Bosarge, do you mind if I jump back in?

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I was about to call your name. Go ahead.

44  
45 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay. I just wanted to ask, and, along those  
46 lines, Farron, if your office has like sort of a generic email,  
47 perhaps, requesting volunteers, that we could pass along, as  
48 Emily just stated, we're more than happy to help with our

1 resources, to that effect.

2

3 **DR. WALLACE:** No problem, Matt. We can get that to you.

4

5 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

6

7 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Strelcheck. I'm sorry, and I forgot to  
8 come back to you. Go ahead.

9

10 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I thought that you were just going to start  
11 ignoring me for the rest of the day. No, but, Leann, I want to  
12 apologize, and I didn't mean to get you fired up, and I don't  
13 like hearing your momma voice, and certainly my intent wasn't  
14 that, and I certainly see this as a collaborative effort, and I  
15 think John said it well.

16

17 We need, obviously, better communication with industry, and I'm  
18 just trying to figure out what the pathway, obviously, is to do  
19 that, and so we have a number of good contacts, and we can start  
20 pursuing those, and certainly we can work with council staff and  
21 yourself and others, obviously, to reach out to more people, if  
22 for some reason we're running into resistance.

23

24 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you. That sounds like a plan, and,  
25 Andy, the other thing we probably need to talk about are just  
26 the protocols and how it's going to transpire, and it really  
27 shouldn't be something that you find a volunteer and then you  
28 just give them the name and number of the vendor and they fly by  
29 the seat of their pants from there, and we need to kind of nail  
30 some things down.

31

32 If anything needs to be collected on paper, let's get it exact  
33 dates of when the trawling occurred, and, that way, we can parse  
34 it out, as these chips come in, and do we ask the shrimper to go  
35 ahead and mail his chip in when he gets done, so we're not  
36 waiting six months to get his chip, or probably more than that,  
37 to actually get the data and compare the ELB data to the vendor  
38 data and make sure that they match up.

39

40 There is some finer details that have to be worked out, and  
41 those are more scientific details that I think are going to have  
42 to come from either SERO or the Science Center, and that's not  
43 something that the shrimper probably needs to be dictating, and  
44 so that's something else to think about. Okay.

45

46 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Leann.

47

48 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, sir.

1  
2 **MR. STRELCHECK:** While we have Farron, or John, I would be  
3 interested if they could comment on that. I mean, I certainly  
4 agree with you, and I would assume that they have worked out  
5 some of the protocols and probably have some ideas already along  
6 those lines, but I would be interested, obviously, in terms of  
7 how they see that intersecting with industry.

8  
9 **DR. WALLACE:** I have been contacting with both Faria and Woods  
10 Hole, the VMS providers, and they told me that they would work  
11 with any vessel operator out there. They would ship their units  
12 out there and then provide technical support to install it at  
13 any time, and so, in terms of the VMS units themselves, it's  
14 fairly straightforward, and apparently they are pretty easy to  
15 install, also.

16  
17 Now, in terms of matching up the data, Leann, you're exactly  
18 right that we will want to make sure that any of the shrimp  
19 vessels that do participate will have to ship in their card, so  
20 we have the data and be able to process that data in near real-  
21 time, if we want to get this analysis done as soon as possible.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. That sounds good, and so there  
24 will, at a minimum, need to be some list of instructions given  
25 to the shrimpers, and, because we're dealing with chips now, and  
26 you don't really have a way to ensure that that electronic  
27 logbook -- That the antenna is transmitting and everything is  
28 good on it, real-time, and you've mentioned that before, it  
29 would probably be good if the volunteer actually gave you a  
30 pencil and paper setout and pickup time, so that, if you don't  
31 have ELB data like you have, this wasn't a complete wasted  
32 effort, and you do have some sort of at least pencil-and-paper  
33 data on what the trawl hours were on each day, and you can  
34 compare that to the data that you're getting out of the  
35 algorithm.

36  
37 I think there's got to be a backup on this too, something to  
38 make sure that we have a baseline, and we don't want to ask the  
39 shrimpers to go through a lot of effort and then end up not  
40 having usable data. Anyway, I think there's some things to talk  
41 about, protocol-wise, and then, also, what is the stick, the  
42 measuring stick, that we're going to use?

43  
44 I assume, and hope, that it's the actual output from the  
45 algorithm, and we need to be able to put that VMS data into the  
46 shrimp algorithm and get an output for that trip and then put  
47 the SD card data into the shrimp -- Which is the ELB, into the  
48 shrimp algorithm and get an output, and those two things should

1 match up, and so hopefully that's our evaluation parameter, at  
2 the end, how closely those two things match up.

3  
4 Anyway, there is some things to talk about, but I think we need  
5 to get those things in writing, before we go too far. No more  
6 hands, and so, Dr. Freeman, do you want to go back to the  
7 document now and try and make a little more progress there on  
8 what the committee would like to see in the next iteration of  
9 this?

10  
11 **DR. FREEMAN:** Yes, ma'am. Just one moment, and I'm switching  
12 slides, and so let me get that back up. I think what might be  
13 helpful, at this point, in addition to having this document up,  
14 is, Bernie, do you mind pulling up Dr. Walter's presentation as  
15 well, and going to Slide 15 or that?

16  
17 Thinking about the action in the current shrimp framework, I am  
18 seeing three items, and hopefully I didn't miss anything, but I  
19 am seeing three, the ten-minute ping rate, specifying the  
20 minimum number of position fixes, and the mandatory at-sea  
21 testing that we would specify in the FMP.

22  
23 I guess my question, for the committee, is would you like for  
24 staff to incorporate that into the updated draft that the  
25 committee sees in April, and so that's my first question, and  
26 I've got some follow-ups, but let me sort of pause there with  
27 that question.

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. I see Mr. Gill's hand up, and then I  
30 will chime in.

31  
32 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and the answer, Dr. Freeman,  
33 is yes.

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Well, that was short and sweet,  
36 Mr. Gill. You're trying to keep me on time. I would like to  
37 actually shift the focus of how we incorporate this into the  
38 amendment, and, to me, the best way to incorporate it is if you  
39 go to Slide 5.

40  
41 Those three bullets at the bottom, to me, are how you implement  
42 Alternative 3, and this goes back to it being an electronic  
43 logbook, and that is, generally speaking, how these other  
44 logbook programs, SEFHIER for example, and they have a VMS  
45 component, but that VMS component is not their logbook  
46 component, and they have eTRIPS, and, in fact, we're going to  
47 get a presentation, I think tomorrow or the next day, where the  
48 Science Center would like to actually move all the other

1 commercial fisheries to an electronic logbook, and that's going  
2 to be housed within the agency, within the Science Center and  
3 SERO, as far as standing that up and putting out the protocols,  
4 to make sure they get the forms right, and that's not going  
5 through the VMS and through OLE.

6  
7 That is going to be stood up by the Science Center and SERO, and  
8 I think that the shrimp industry should follow that same  
9 process. We should have a logbook that is stood up by the  
10 Science Center and SERO, and those bullets spell out how you do  
11 that and who does what, and then, for each one of those bullets,  
12 that would be put into the amendment that we're looking at, you  
13 can flesh out each one of those, with some of these other slides  
14 that you have before it, that talks about what server would you  
15 use, that you have a contractor already that does this that you  
16 contract with, and bring them onboard, and it tells you right  
17 there where you're going to put the requirements, and they will  
18 be housed on the Science Center website, and that the shrimp  
19 specifications will be added to the CFR.

20  
21 Either way, you're going to have to add things to the CFR, and I  
22 want to get it right the first time, and so that would be my  
23 path forward on how you flesh out this document and how you  
24 implement Alternative 3, rather than piecemealing it together  
25 and trying to take Alternative 3 -- If we go with that Slide 15,  
26 we're actually still reverting back to the VMS stuff, and those  
27 specifications, as we just talked about today, really weren't  
28 written to make sure that you get shrimp effort data  
29 appropriately.

30  
31 They were written for a different purpose, and there are things  
32 that need to be added, and, more importantly, there are things  
33 that need to be taken out, and you can't take those things out  
34 if you try and use national VMS standards.

35  
36 This is a logbook program, and it needs to fall -- It needs to  
37 have its own tech specs, and that's the way you go about it, is  
38 that page 5, and that's what I would like to see put into the  
39 document. Any other hands? Okay, Dr. Freeman. What other  
40 questions do you have for us?

41  
42 **DR. FREEMAN:** Ms. Bosarge, Dr. Simmons has her hand up, and I  
43 see Mr. Strelcheck as well.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dr. Simmons, go ahead.

46  
47 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you. I guess it's a little  
48 bit unclear to me -- I mean, I think we could pull these out and

1 talk about them at another council meeting, but I guess it's  
2 unclear to me how our staff would do something that I think the  
3 Science Center is really going to have to develop and prepare,  
4 regarding the contract and whether that has to be competitive  
5 and all those types of things. I think we can certainly talk  
6 about it at a council meeting, but I guess I'm not really clear  
7 how our staff would move forward with this right now in the  
8 amendment, in the framework action.

9  
10 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Carrie, I'm not talking about actually  
11 putting out a proposal to contractors. I am talking about an  
12 amendment that gives detail on what alternative means, what  
13 Alternative 3 means, and how it would be carried out, which is  
14 what that Slide 5 summarizes, right, in those three bullet  
15 points, that there would be shrimp-specific testing and  
16 certification carried out under the auspices of the Science  
17 Center, that there would be specific shrimp specifications for  
18 the hardware, to make sure that we get good effort data, and  
19 that would be housed on the Science Center's website, under the  
20 shrimp program, and that those shrimp specifications would also  
21 need to be added to 50 CFR Part 622, and that is what get  
22 fleshed out.

23  
24 Now, as far as who the Science Center actually contracts as a  
25 vendor, I mean, that's for them to determine at some point in  
26 time, sort of like when we did the for-hire amendment. We put  
27 down how we -- The overview, generally, and some specifics of  
28 what we wanted the program to look like and how it would be  
29 implemented, but we didn't get into specific vendors and things  
30 like that. Does that help a little bit?

31  
32 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** A little, Madam Chair, but a  
33 follow-up. I guess, timing-wise, would it be better until  
34 spring, or whenever we get some of these results from the  
35 testing, and it comes back to the council, and we get maybe a  
36 progress report on the work that we're going to contract with  
37 for P-Sea WindPlot, and the council gets a status report,  
38 perhaps, on when that contractor is decided, on where that  
39 program is, and then some of these details would be fleshed out  
40 a little further? I mean, I feel like some of these stuff has  
41 to be tested, and we need to get some more information, but  
42 perhaps I'm missing something here, before we can really delve  
43 into these bullets.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** No, I don't think you do have to wait on the  
46 testing, for either one, really, as far as fleshing this out,  
47 and I don't think you're going to get those results as soon as  
48 you think either. I mean, there's a lot that's got to -- That's

1 in May, and it's a month-long trip, and then you have to run the  
2 analysis and get the presentation, and I don't see you getting  
3 that until closer to the end of the year, more than likely,  
4 before the council sees anything from that, and that's only on  
5 the Coretta.

6  
7 Your testing for the pink shrimp fishery, that's going to have  
8 to occur this winter. That's a winter fishery, and you have  
9 just about missed it at this point, and so that's going to  
10 occur, the testing for the pink shrimp, which is vital, in my  
11 opinion, and that's going to occur in probably December, or  
12 January of -- December of 2022 and January of 2023, and so those  
13 results you're not going to have until next year on the testing  
14 there.

15  
16 To me, what it is, Carrie, is we have these draft  
17 specifications, right and, as long as we wrote those  
18 appropriately, then that will give us a device that will alter  
19 the historical data that we've collected thus far, and we're  
20 going to make very little alteration to that. The data that we  
21 will get going forward will match that data as it has always  
22 been in the past, and it gives the vendors the specifications to  
23 build and program a device for that purpose, to collect the data  
24 in that way.

25  
26 If you go back and look at the presentation that Dr. Nance gave,  
27 because he's the one that stood up this program the last time,  
28 that was one of the key points he has made every time he has  
29 presented, is that, when they switched from the old system to an  
30 electronic logbook, the first time we actually moved from one  
31 ELB to another, right, because we've had to do this one time  
32 before, one of the key things that they tried to do was not  
33 alter the data, to make sure that, whatever device they went to,  
34 whatever platform they used, collected the data in the same way,  
35 nothing extra, nothing missing, ten-minute pings, and that's it.

36  
37 They made sure that they continued to get good data that was  
38 comparable to the old data, and it's not broken, and so don't  
39 fix it, right, and that's what those tech specs do, and so I  
40 think, as long as you have those tech specs in the document, and  
41 you show that there is an operational path for a vendor to be  
42 approved, where they would find the specs, how they get -- Who  
43 they apply with to get approved and how the data would be  
44 transferred.

45  
46 We gave two server options there. If it doesn't go through the  
47 VMS program, it's going to go through Gulf States' server or a  
48 NESDIS server, and we have all the detail on that to go into the

1 document. As long as you flesh those things out, I think you  
2 have everything in the document that you need. I've got a whole  
3 list of hands here, if Dr. Simmons doesn't have another follow-  
4 up, and it's fine if you do, Carrie.

5

6 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** I'm good. Thank you.

7

8 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. I have Mr. Strelcheck and then Mr.  
9 Gill and then Ms. Levy.

10

11 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Thanks, Leann. I am going to let Bob and Mara  
12 speak, and then please come back to me.

13

14 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Mr. Gill, go ahead.

15

16 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Madam Chair. A few comments relative to  
17 the discussion on the document. We all know that the purpose of  
18 what we're trying to do here is get the data to compute effort,  
19 but we also know that the VMS system was set up as an  
20 enforcement tool, back in the day, and, in the minds of the  
21 stakeholders out here in the real world, that's what it is.

22

23 Part of this back-and-forth about nomenclature I think would be  
24 helped if -- I know it's in the purpose, but if it was explained  
25 in the action what the purpose of that action is relative to  
26 data collection, and so that minimizes, at least in my mind, the  
27 distinction on what you call it.

28

29 The second thought is that, to the Chair's point -- I lost my  
30 train of thought. I am sorry, Madam Chair. I was thinking, and  
31 I can't think of what my next point was, and so my last point  
32 was I think it would help, in the document, because, in all  
33 these discussions, at least I am losing track of the timeline  
34 that we envision for each of the alternatives and what the steps  
35 are that drives that timeline.

36

37 I think that would be helpful in fleshing this out and point  
38 where we're going and when we're going to there, to the point  
39 that the Chair was just talking about, the pink shrimp fishery,  
40 and, at this point, at least in my mind, it's kind of amorphous,  
41 and we're working on the document, and it doesn't have an  
42 endpoint.

43

44 Well, it does, as has been pointed out by Dr. Walter, but I  
45 think, for each alternative, the argument has been made that  
46 there is implications on this and that and the other that has to  
47 be done, et cetera, and so I think laying that out, perhaps in a  
48 graphic fashion, and making that crystal clear would be helpful

1 to the document, and, if I can remember what my other point is,  
2 Madam Chair, I will put my hand back up. Thank you very much.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, sir. We'll come back to you when you  
5 think of it. Ms. Levy.

6  
7 **MS. LEVY:** Thank you. I just wanted to say a few words about  
8 the comparison with the for-hire reporting requirement and to  
9 point out that the council, in that document implementing the  
10 for-hire reporting requirements, which involves two components,  
11 right, of fishing records, which are the logbook, and the  
12 location information, which is used primarily to validate  
13 effort, which is the GPS requirement, were much less specific  
14 than what is on Slide 5, meaning that the alternative for the  
15 logbook section basically said that permit holders are going to  
16 need to submit records for each trip on a NMFS-approved device.

17  
18 It didn't say who was going to house the data, what NMFS office  
19 was going to figure out what those forms were, things like that,  
20 and, for the location data, basically, it said that you need to  
21 use -- Submit NMFS records via NMFS-approved hardware or  
22 software with a GPS capability that, at a minimum, can archive  
23 the vessel position.

24  
25 Again, it didn't say who was going to develop the tech specs for  
26 that, how it was going to be approved, who was going to house  
27 the data, and, ultimately, what NMFS ended up doing to implement  
28 this was to change the VMS regulations, the national  
29 regulations, to allow for cellular units that would meet the  
30 requirements of this for-hire reporting action and go through  
31 route.

32  
33 I just feel like, if we're going to look at what was in the for-  
34 hire amendment, and then what you're talking about adding here,  
35 we should probably be really looking at what was in the for-hire  
36 amendment, which was not this specific. Thank you.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Strelcheck.

39  
40 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Thanks, Madam Chair. Great points, Mara. I  
41 agree, and that's one of the things that I had done, is look at  
42 prior amendments as kind of examples of what the council has  
43 taken action on in the past.

44  
45 The two comments I had, specific to Alternative 3, and giving  
46 guidance to the IPT, would be, obviously, there was a lot of  
47 discussion in John's presentation about costs and that this may  
48 not be budget neutral, and so I think it's going to be really

1 important to distinguish what those added costs would be and  
2 what that looks like from the standpoint of the agency, as well  
3 as the industry.

4  
5 I made the comment earlier that I think we're arguing over  
6 semantics, and I think Bob even referenced that, but, to me,  
7 Alternative 3, the distinction that I feel like you're making,  
8 Leann, is it's a non-VMS program, right, and so there's  
9 Alternative 2, which is VMS, and then there's Alternative 3,  
10 which is non-VMS, but the units themselves are essentially  
11 functioning in the same way, and so the IPT might want to  
12 discuss how that additional clarity maybe could be made with  
13 regard to the wording of the alternatives and bring back  
14 suggestions to us at a future council meeting.

15  
16 Then the last comment is maybe a question, which it's really not  
17 clear to me -- You pointed to what is on the screen and the  
18 shrimp technical specifications being added to 50 CFR, and Mara  
19 just noted that that has been kind of within the agency's  
20 purview, to decide what those specifications are, and so my  
21 question is, are we considering adding the detailed  
22 specifications that have been drafted as part of Alternative 3,  
23 because I think that would help, in terms of clarifying to the  
24 IPT, or is that still going to be under the purview of the  
25 agency, ultimately, which I think it would have to be, and you  
26 would just provide kind of some guidance with regard to what  
27 would go into those technical specifications?

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** To me, the most important piece of that  
30 Alternative, or one of the most important pieces of that  
31 Alternative 3 is that the technical specifications for any  
32 device that we're going to use to collect scientific shrimp  
33 effort data will be specific for that purpose.

34  
35 The tech specs that I drafted, that's what they were specific  
36 to, to make sure that we get good scientific data. Those specs  
37 should be housed by the Science Center, and they, I hope, will  
38 use what I have as a baseline. If you use the right tech specs  
39 from the beginning, then we don't end up in a situation where --  
40 Just what we talked about earlier.

41  
42 You're going to get too much information, in some cases, and  
43 possibly not enough in others, and, because you didn't actually  
44 get a device that fits your purpose, you end up having to go to  
45 the government, and your people will have more work on the  
46 backend, and they're going to have to go back and rewrite a  
47 shrimp algorithm, and that's just the first thing.

48

1 Andy, has anybody contemplated that, if you don't get these tech  
2 specs right, and you get a device that gets you data that is  
3 comparable to your old data, you're also going to end up in a  
4 situation where you very well may have a historical dataset that  
5 doesn't match your current one, and so they'll spend about three  
6 years trying to recalibrate shrimp data, and God only knows  
7 where that will land. That's been such a pleasant process thus  
8 far with other data.

9  
10 To me, that's what we do when we go with Alternative 3. You  
11 write specs that get you a device and data that looks like your  
12 old data, which has functioned very well for you, and all you  
13 need is transmission. That's what is wrong with our program  
14 right now. There's nothing wrong with the data that we collect,  
15 and we need to continue to collect in the same way.

16  
17 Nothing added and nothing lost. That's what Alternative 3 will  
18 get you, and so I would hope that those draft technical  
19 specifications would be utilized, instead of going back to your  
20 VMS specs, which, in some cases, gets you too much, and it's  
21 going to cause you problems, and, in some cases, it gets you too  
22 little, and so, I mean, you just told me couldn't put it -- You  
23 asked if I wanted that in the document with Alternative 3, and  
24 it's in the document as an appendix, and I think you just told  
25 me that I couldn't have it in the document with Alternative 3,  
26 and so I guess it's a rhetorical question. Andy, do you want to  
27 follow-up and ask me a different way?

28  
29 **MR. STRELCHECK:** No, I'm good for now. Thanks.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, and so I want staff to pull  
32 something up. I am going to put this -- I am going to try a  
33 different angle on this, because I think we get lost in the  
34 weeds, and we forget what these two options are and what they  
35 mean to our scientific data, okay, and that's what this is all  
36 about, is getting good effort data and how we're going to move  
37 forward.

38  
39 We're still getting effort data, but it's not transmitted  
40 automatically, and so, staff, I sent you all an email, and it's  
41 got two presentations that the council has already received, and  
42 I just want you to pull up two slides, a slide from each  
43 presentation, side-by-side, and it's the actual effort data, and  
44 it shows you, on a map, what it looks like, and this is the  
45 difference, right now, between Alternative 2 and Alternative 3,  
46 and this council has got to figure out which route they're going  
47 to go, which program they want to use, which means VMS or some  
48 other device that follows a different set of technical

1 specifications and Alternative 3. Can you pull that up for me?  
2  
3 On that one, I want you to go to Slide Number 5, and pull up  
4 Slide 5. On the rock shrimp one, pull up Slide 5, please.  
5 Thank you. Now, if you will go to the LGL presentation and pull  
6 up Slide 10 and see if you can show those two things side-by-  
7 side.  
8  
9 This is what all this amendment boils down to right here. This  
10 is your output, from these devices that only collect location  
11 data, and it's not a logbook, and it's just location data, and  
12 these are the two outputs, and this is the actual effort,  
13 because that's what those devices are doing, is collecting the  
14 raw effort data.  
15  
16 Now, the slide on the right is the device that the council just  
17 funded Dr. Benny Gallaway and LGL, and the industry forked out  
18 about three-hundred-and-something-thousand dollars to do the  
19 actual scientific testing, and so that device got location data,  
20 and Dr. Gallaway is the one that originally created that  
21 algorithm that the Science Center uses, and so he has the  
22 algorithm, and so he put it through the algorithm, and that plot  
23 -- What he was trying to show you there is that the P-Sea  
24 WindPlot device, where they can be other devices that do this  
25 too, once you publish the draft tech specs that we have in the  
26 appendix, but that it created effort data, based on that raw  
27 location data, that mirrored the ELB that was on that boat also  
28 collecting the same data, and so you have good, solid scientific  
29 data.  
30  
31 The effort data from that device, using some technical  
32 specifications like we came up with and drafted in the appendix,  
33 will give you data that is comparable to your old historical  
34 data, and so you hope we won't have to recalibrate anything, and  
35 you can continue on.  
36  
37 Now, the left-hand plot is VMS data that we plugged in and tried  
38 to come up with effort data from it. The first thing you need  
39 to note is this is actual VMS data off of one boat, and that's  
40 why it's plotted -- You see it's like a made-up location, right,  
41 and they put some other continent out there, and I don't even  
42 know it is, and I can't see it. The screen is too small, but so  
43 that it would protect the privacy of the boat.  
44  
45 However, they took VMS data, and they tried to plug it into the  
46 shrimp algorithm, and it wouldn't work. I think it called it  
47 nonsensical results or something like that, but it wouldn't  
48 work. It didn't go into the algorithm and give you effort data,

1 because the algorithm is hard-coded for ten-minute pings, and  
2 that's why I keep harping on this idea of using these VMS tech  
3 specs that have all these additional pings, and that's why I  
4 asked the question of can we take things out of the VMS tech  
5 specs, if we go that route, and, no, we can't remove stuff. We  
6 can add stuff.

7  
8 Well, that's going to cause a problem, more than likely. If it  
9 caused a problem here, then the odds are that it could very well  
10 cause a problem when you have the additional pings.

11  
12 Now, so what was done here is everybody says it's so simple to  
13 calculate effort, and all you have to do is know the time  
14 between points, and the distance between points, and you can get  
15 effort.

16  
17 When this was provided to the Shrimp AP, it seemed very easy,  
18 but it took some shrimpers actually looking at it to say, okay,  
19 well, guess what, that's not accurate data, and we shrimp in the  
20 rock shrimp fishery, and it doesn't matter what map you put that  
21 on, and, if north points north, that's not South Atlantic rock  
22 shrimp data, because you can see those yellow dots, and that's  
23 the trawling. That's what, using a formula, they came up with  
24 for trawling. That is generally going east and west.

25  
26 In the South Atlantic, generally speaking, the stream runs north  
27 and south, and we can't trawl across that stream. We have got  
28 to trawl with it. We've got to trawl north or south when we  
29 rock shrimp, and so we've got to go with the stream or against  
30 the stream, and we can't run cross-current. That is one thing  
31 that tells you that that data is not accurate, it's not giving  
32 you good, accurate effort.

33  
34 The other thing is, if you look at the scale on the bottom, it  
35 says 100 kilometers, and I plugged it in, and I think that was  
36 like sixty-two miles, and that looks like about an inch on that  
37 scale, and so there's some of these trawls where we're trawling  
38 sixty-something miles, and there's one trawl down there where it  
39 looks like we're trawling, Lord, I don't know, somewhere between  
40 150 and 180 miles in one trawl.

41  
42 You would trawl multiple days without ever pulling your nets up  
43 to make that kind of tow, and that doesn't happen. I mean,  
44 generally speaking, we make about a three or four-hour tow. We  
45 don't make a sixty-mile tow. We don't make a 120-mile tow.

46  
47 These are the results, right now, that Alternative 2 is giving  
48 you. Is that the effort data that we want? We talk about these

1 tech specs, and I have harped on them, because that is what  
2 you're getting right now if you go with a VMS, and I, for one,  
3 am not willing to not write the tech specs right the first time  
4 and go try and fix this on the backend, hoping that we can fix  
5 it, and then, even if we do fix it, what implications does that  
6 have going forward? Are we going to have to recalibrate  
7 historical data?

8  
9 No, and do it right the first time, and you don't have to fix  
10 things on the backend, and so, Alternative 3, with those tech  
11 specs, gets you good, usable data, and it's already been tested,  
12 and we just have to work out the transmission piece, and that's  
13 just from one vendor, and there is plenty --

14  
15 I guarantee you that those VMS vendors will create a device that  
16 will collect the data the way we need it collected for shrimp  
17 effort scientific integrity, and they will apply to be approved  
18 under those tech specs, housed through the Science Center, and  
19 this gets done right, and so there's an easy way or a right way,  
20 in my opinion, and, right now, Alternative 3 gives you good  
21 data, which you have got to have, for various stock assessments,  
22 and we don't need stock assessments imploding because we don't  
23 have effort data, or we have effort data that needs to be  
24 recalibrated, or all sorts of things, and we certainly --

25  
26 We certainly don't want to be in hot water with environmental  
27 groups over turtles, when we have a path forward that will give  
28 us good data, and we don't need to take the easy path, but we  
29 need to take the right path. That's what those two alternatives  
30 get you.

31  
32 I hope that kind of makes it clearer for the committee and the  
33 council as we talk about all this lingo of do we want to call it  
34 a device, or do we want to call it an electronic logbook, and  
35 this is what you're getting, and so I will open the floor to  
36 questions. I see you Dr. Walter, and I see your hand up, but,  
37 Mr. Schieble, you've been quiet, and I'm going to let you have a  
38 chance to speak, and then we'll go to Dr. Walter.

39  
40 **MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Well, thank you, Madam Chair. This  
41 is a little add-in of information, as well as I am supportive of  
42 your point, and I see the point you're making here with this,  
43 but I also see some of the other things, and the timeline is my  
44 biggest question.

45  
46 I am looking at our action schedule, and, obviously, it doesn't  
47 go out to next June on this document yet, and so maybe Dr.  
48 Freeman can give me a pointer on that when I'm done here, as to

1 what we're looking at as far as the timing of this document to  
2 get preferreds in here, as well as a public hearing draft, et  
3 cetera.

4  
5 To me, that seems like the side-by-side study would be dependent  
6 upon that time scale as well, if we're going to continue on with  
7 that, and then my final point, on that note, is I just had this  
8 added to the shrimp taskforce meeting in Louisiana, which is  
9 coming up on February 16, and so there's going to be a  
10 solicitation of potential shrimpers to participate in this  
11 program, and probably this PowerPoint will be presented, in some  
12 fashion, to them, so they know more about it, and it's also gone  
13 out to Louisiana Sea Grant, at the same time today, and so just  
14 so you know, and that's all that I have.

15  
16 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dr. Walter.

17  
18 **DR. WALTER:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm not a member of the  
19 committee, and so I appreciate you calling on me, and definitely  
20 call on members of the committee and the council first, and I do  
21 take a little bit of an issue here with you saying that the VMS  
22 data is wrong, because it's not showing what you might expect,  
23 and this is, I believe, a different fishery for shrimp, and I  
24 think probably somebody who might know the fishery better would  
25 probably say -- I believe it's the royal red fishery, and the  
26 reason that it looks like one contiguous trawl is because this  
27 is at one-hour pings, and so that's the reason that --

28  
29 It wouldn't really make sense to have run it through the  
30 algorithm that requires the ten minutes, but it looks like one  
31 contiguous trawl, because the vessel is, that whole time, moving  
32 slowly, and the way we partitioned trawling versus steaming was  
33 simply on the vessel change in position over time, and, if it  
34 didn't change its position much over time, then it was moving  
35 slowly, and we can't tell whether it is one whole entire trawl  
36 or not, but, in terms of the effort algorithm, neither does the  
37 effort algorithm that we're using at ten minutes, other than if  
38 you separate out finer scale, because it has that finer  
39 resolution, but it doesn't know trawling or not trawling, other  
40 than the change in position over time.

41  
42 I think to say that the VMS collects data that is wrong cannot  
43 be inferred from this, and you would need the testing protocols  
44 that have been outlined to be able to demonstrate that the  
45 existing 3G gives the same thing that any of the cellular VMS  
46 units provide, which is what we've outlined, but I don't think  
47 we can say that VMS is wrong, and, in many other fisheries, VMS  
48 is used routinely to collect effort information, and for many

1 scientific purposes, and so we do have pretty good confirmation  
2 that the VMS units do their job to collect effort information  
3 accurately, and so I just wanted to note that, that you cannot  
4 say that the VMS is wrong from this.

5  
6 It doesn't look like rock shrimp fishing, and I think that's  
7 probably true, because it's probably not, and it doesn't look  
8 like any of the other shrimp fishing either, because it's  
9 different, and we did specifically put it in a different  
10 location, to preserve the confidentiality, and that's the  
11 challenge with trying to present this information. Thanks.

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, and I have just been reminded of  
14 our time, that I have to be cognizant of our time, and I  
15 appreciate that, Chairman Diaz, but I will say those comments  
16 that I made -- Those came directly from rock shrimp fishermen on  
17 the Shrimp AP, and so I didn't come up with that on my own, and  
18 those were shrimpers that had fished that fishery, and it says  
19 one test for rock shrimp vessel in a disguised location, and so,  
20 even if you say that, because it's one-hour pings, it throws the  
21 data off, if it truly is rock shrimping, then that east-west  
22 data -- I mean, that's what the shrimpers told us at the Shrimp  
23 AP meeting, and I think that they would know.

24  
25 They have spent their lives doing that, and they have shrimped  
26 in the South Atlantic, in the rock shrimp fishery, and still do,  
27 and so to say that you don't trawl east-west over there in that  
28 rock shrimp fishery, and you generally trawl north-south, and I  
29 can look at that screen and tell you that there's something  
30 wrong, and so I'm going to turn it back over to Dr. Freeman, and  
31 I'm sorry to have to get so fussy about it, Dr. Walter, because  
32 I sure do like you, and so I don't like to do battle with you  
33 like this, but, anyway, sometimes it has to be done, I guess.

34  
35 Dr. Freeman, would you go through the Shrimp AP summary quickly  
36 for us, because I think we've got about five minutes, and we'll  
37 be up against our deadline, and that's about the last thing on  
38 our agenda here, and, Chairman Perret, if you're still on the  
39 line, let us know if you want to chime-in after that summary.

40  
41 **DR. FREEMAN:** Madam Chair, I didn't want to jump ahead just yet,  
42 because there was an outstanding question, I believe, from Mr.  
43 Schieble on the timeline for picking preferreds and public  
44 hearings and so forth.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** You're right.

47  
48 **DR. FREEMAN:** The first was I did want to just comment that, in

1 its current form as a framework action, the document would not  
2 go out for public hearings. However, Emily would still develop  
3 a video and post that online, and so the shrimp industry would  
4 still have an opportunity to provide written comments, as well  
5 as, of course, verbal comments during the council meeting as  
6 well.

7  
8 In terms of progressing with the document, that was part of what  
9 was in the action guide, was requesting input, and I did get a  
10 resounding yes from Mr. Gill, in terms of incorporating some of  
11 the items from Farron's presentation into an updated draft of  
12 the document.

13  
14 However, I do still want to sort of toss back to the committee  
15 that one of the things that we would potentially need to keep in  
16 mind, and staff would need input for, is, when I look at the two  
17 items on the screen right now, on the left and the right, the  
18 items on the left is what Farron was saying would be tested on  
19 the R/V Caretta, and hopefully with volunteers from the Gulf  
20 shrimp industry, and then on the right is what would be tested  
21 and funded through the proposal that Dr. Simmons is going to  
22 give a just brief one-minute update on. She is shaking her  
23 head, and I think she's trying to back out, quickly, and so I  
24 suppose part of it is, tossing it back to the committee, if we  
25 are to wait for results from those different projects or not.

26  
27 Some of what the committee would like to see is going to  
28 determine the timeline and how we proceed with the document, and  
29 so I would just pause there and see if there is any feedback,  
30 real quick, and then Dr. Simmons said that she will talk for  
31 just twenty seconds on an update on the proposals.

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Mr. Schieble, would you like to  
34 give some feedback on what you were hoping for the timeline and  
35 preferreds and things like that, and I tell you what. We will  
36 just reserve the AP report, possibly, for Full Council, if we  
37 don't have time right now, because I do think this is an  
38 important question to get through, and the Shrimp AP report is  
39 important and needs its due time as well, and so we may take  
40 that up in Full Council. Mr. Schieble, did you want to chime in  
41 on preferreds?

42  
43 **MR. SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I will be short, because  
44 I know we're behind on the schedule here, and so I guess my  
45 thought on this is, right now, it looks like we have one vessel  
46 signed up, and so, if we don't get more signed up in this  
47 program, then, to me, it's kind of pointless, and so we would  
48 have to go forward without this, I guess is the answer, because

1 you're not going to get a complete dataset to make the  
2 comparison if we only have one vessel on that list, right, but  
3 let's see what happens.

4  
5 Like I said, I have solicited it to put on the agenda for our  
6 taskforce, and maybe we can get a Louisiana vessel on there, and  
7 that would help, and then look to get the results of that study  
8 to be incorporated into this I guess would be my thought on the  
9 timeline, but, if we don't get that participation, and it's kind  
10 of pointless, I think we could start looking at putting  
11 preferreds here and making a recommendation to go final shortly  
12 after that. That's just my thoughts.

13  
14 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Thank you. I have Mr. Strelcheck  
15 and then Mr. Gill.

16  
17 **MR. STRELCHECK:** My suggestion is that the IPT, or Regional  
18 Office, Science Center, and council staff kind of get together  
19 and talk about a timeline, because, to be honest, I see  
20 Alternative 2, and I know Leann, with her presentation just now,  
21 disagrees, and she thinks that can be a viable path forward, and  
22 I don't see it that way, and I am not convinced that that's the  
23 case, but I can see us moving forward and taking final action,  
24 if we went with Alternative 2, pretty quickly.

25  
26 Now, we could wait until, obviously, after testing, to verify  
27 everything, but that is going to be a faster path, in terms of a  
28 timeline and in terms of implementation, even after the council  
29 takes action as well, and so I think it's not only a path for  
30 the council to get to final action, but also, once the council  
31 takes final action, what is the lift by the agency and the  
32 Science Center, in order to get a program up and running, and  
33 what is that going to look like, in terms of post-council action  
34 to implement the program.

35  
36 Now, timing shouldn't be the only decision, obviously, in terms  
37 of what we're factoring into the process, but I think it's an  
38 important consideration that we should be looking at. Thanks.

39  
40 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Gill.

41  
42 **MR. GILL:** Thank you, Madam Chair. To Dr. Freeman's question, I  
43 think the answer is of course. There is no point in doing the  
44 testing if we're not going to incorporate that as to how we go  
45 forward and what works and what doesn't work, et cetera, and so,  
46 to me, it's a no-brainer, and the testing results are needed as  
47 part of this document. Thank you, Madam Chair.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Thank you. I had hoped that,  
2 with the presentation that we got from NMFS -- Although I have  
3 kind of given them hell today, I really did like their  
4 presentation, and I think they did a great job on it. That  
5 really gave enough detail on how you could implement Alternative  
6 3, and the path forward for that, that I had hoped that we would  
7 pick preferreds today.

8  
9 The Shrimp AP is going to meet again in March, and that's our  
10 normal slated Shrimp AP meeting, and I think it's important that  
11 we had preferreds for them to look at when they meet in March,  
12 so that we could get some feedback in April.

13  
14 If we did choose to go with Alternative 3, then that set of tech  
15 specs and that device, the one device at least, has been tested,  
16 and you have your comparable effort data there, and that's been  
17 done, and, to me, that's the faster avenue. Then you can put  
18 those tech specs out and have multiple vendors apply, and the  
19 only piece that has got to be worked out, which we've already  
20 funded an RFP for, is the transmission piece, and there is more  
21 than one vendor that can work that out.

22  
23 To me, Alternative 3 is the faster path forward, and then you  
24 could pick preferreds today, and hopefully take final action in  
25 April or June, but I will leave it up to staff to go through  
26 that. I see Dr. Simmons with her hand up, and then, Mr.  
27 Chairman, after that, I am going to give it back to you, and  
28 we'll pick up the Shrimp AP report in Full Council.

29  
30 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Madam Chair. Just  
31 really quickly, just to remind everybody where we are with the  
32 request for proposals and testing the P-Sea WindPlot, we did put  
33 a call out again, a revised call, that included more technical  
34 and data specifications, and that was readvertised from December  
35 1 to January 10.

36  
37 We have received proposals, and remember that we need to put  
38 together a review team with leadership and have a Science Center  
39 staff member on there and make a decision, and we have to amend  
40 our scope of activities and have that approved by the Grants  
41 Management Division, because this wasn't in our original scope,  
42 and we had to do that for the gray triggerfish ageing project.  
43 We have to get a signed contract, and so we're hoping to do all  
44 of that by March 1, or sooner, if possible, and so that's an  
45 idea on the timeline for that.

46  
47 I guess, as far as I understand the urgency in wanting to move  
48 this forward, but I also feel like we could get ourselves in

1 more trouble without seeing how these pilot, and also the  
2 council's project that they're funding, is going to go, at least  
3 getting preliminary reports on some of these efforts, and I  
4 really feel like we could be redoing things, if we move this  
5 forward without knowing some of that information. Thank you.

6  
7 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** Ms. Bosarge, we have Ms. Jenny Lee on the line,  
8 from the Office of Protected Resources, and I would like to make  
9 sure and give her an opportunity to relay her information to us,  
10 if you would, and then, also, Mr. Perret has been with us all  
11 day, and I would like to make sure and give him and opportunity  
12 to weigh-in, before we close this committee out. Then, anyway,  
13 we'll get those two folks taken care of, and we'll try to wind  
14 things up. Thank you, Ms. Bosarge.

15  
16 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Chairman Diaz, and I see Dr.  
17 Frazer's hand, and he hasn't spoken either, and so I think it  
18 would be good to let Dr. Frazer speak, before we close out the  
19 committee as well, and so, Ms. Lee, if you're on the line, you  
20 can go ahead.

21  
22 **MS. JENNY LEE:** Good afternoon, everyone. It would have been  
23 fine, and I would have called back in when you discussed the  
24 Shrimp AP, but I was asked just to come onboard to speak on one  
25 of the Shrimp AP motions, which was about an annual report of  
26 sea turtle take and compliance, and I will pause there to ask if  
27 you would like me to just say my couple of sentences here  
28 related to that, or would you like me to call back in when  
29 you're discussing the Shrimp AP?

30  
31 **SUMMARY OF THE DECEMBER 2021 SHRIMP ADVISORY PANEL MEETING**

32  
33 **DR. FREEMAN:** Ms. Bosarge, if it's okay, Jenny was going to  
34 comment in response to the Shrimp AP motion, and so, if you  
35 don't mind, we only had two remaining items, and so if we could  
36 just address those, real quick, and Jenny would be able to  
37 respond at that point, and then Mr. Perret would have the  
38 opportunity to add anything additional.

39  
40 The first is on page 6, to request that the council work with  
41 NMFS to ensure that the agency's evaluation of the draft  
42 approval specifications set forth in Appendices D and E of the  
43 draft shrimp framework action, as requested by the Shrimp Effort  
44 Data Focus Group, is completed in a timely manner and presented  
45 to the council at its January 2022 meeting. The motion carried  
46 unanimously, and, fortunately, the committee can cross that off  
47 their list, and they received that presentation earlier from Dr.  
48 Walter. The second motion is on the top of page 9.

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Matt, are you just going to go to the motion  
3 that is relative to what Jenny Lee has to say to us? I think  
4 that would be the best.

5  
6 **DR. FREEMAN:** There were only two remaining motions. Yes,  
7 ma'am. This one was to request that the council work with the  
8 Office of Protected Resources to provide an annual update to the  
9 Shrimp AP and Gulf Council on sea turtle take and TED  
10 compliance. The motion carried unanimously, and so I  
11 communicated with Jenny Lee, last week, to see if that would be  
12 something reasonable for their office, or if she had any  
13 additional thoughts, and so I think she wanted to provide some  
14 comment there, and so I will let her respond, and then, before  
15 we close out, give Mr. Perret an opportunity to provide any  
16 additional comments.

17  
18 **MS. LEE:** Thank you. I just wanted to point out that both the  
19 Shrimp AP and this committee had a presentation on the new  
20 biological opinion that we completed, and I just wanted to make  
21 sure that folks understood that the take estimates from the new  
22 opinion are based on statistical modeling that is not feasible  
23 to conduct on an annual basis, and that's due to the needs of  
24 the model.

25  
26 The model requires pooling take data, and for some other  
27 reasons, and so I am fine if the AP, or the council, wants to  
28 receive some update on what we know about protected species  
29 relative to the opinion on some type of annual basis, but I just  
30 wanted to make it clear that I would not be able to produce, or  
31 share, take estimates on an annual basis, and we are only doing  
32 those estimates on a five-year basis, with pooled data, and they  
33 also --

34  
35 The Shrimp AP asked for compliance information, and, again, I  
36 just wanted to make it clear that folks understood that we were  
37 doing our task estimates different, such that we are still -- At  
38 Protected Resources, we are still monitoring -- We're generally  
39 looking for signs that something is going wrong, in terms of sea  
40 turtle take potentially increasing, but, again, we're not doing  
41 that method where we were taking boarding data and analyzing it  
42 in terms of quantifying the impacts on sea turtle take, and so  
43 the information available would just be from OLE information on  
44 what they are seeing for boardings relative to TED compliance,  
45 but it's not -- It would not be equated in the way it was under  
46 the last bi-op and so I hope that is helpful. I just didn't  
47 want to see everyone make a motion for something that we can't  
48 really carry out.

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Ms. Lee, and I think you also made  
3 that clear to the AP, and they appreciated that, and they  
4 understood it. I think they were just hoping for any annual  
5 data that you do have, whether it be compliance statistics or  
6 any other data you have, so that they can see, heaven forbid, if  
7 something starts pointing in a negative direction, that we  
8 definitely, as an industry, would want to follow-up on that,  
9 however we can, before we get to the five-year mark.

10  
11 We want to make sure that, from year to year, everything is  
12 still looking good, whatever metrics that you can provide. We  
13 appreciate that. Thank you, Ms. Lee.

14  
15 **MS. LEE:** You're welcome.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Mr. Perret.

18  
19 **MR. PERRET:** Again, Jenny, thank you for that update. Like  
20 Leann said, the AP is interested in that type of information,  
21 and we recognize that it's not available on an annual basis, but  
22 anytime you can give a preliminary report, or an update, we  
23 would be happy to have it. Leann, you guys are behind on time,  
24 and how much talking do you want me to do?

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** For you, anything, Corky. You're going to  
27 have to get with Dale on that. He's the one that is going to  
28 bring you out if you talk too long.

29  
30 **MR. PERRET:** Well, is Matt going to continue to go through the  
31 motions?

32  
33 **DR. FREEMAN:** No, sir. We're done with the AP report, and so  
34 it's completely your show now.

35  
36 **MR. PERRET:** Okay. All I want to say is one thing, I think, of  
37 importance to the entire fishing industry, and certainly the  
38 shrimp industry, is our President signed an Executive Order,  
39 sometime in 2001, setting up a national offshore wind goal, and  
40 that order -- To meet, they want a thirty-gigawatt goal by the  
41 year 2030, and that's what the Executive Order is asking for.

42  
43 An AP member asked just how many turbines would it take to reach  
44 that thirty-gigawatt goal, and the lady with BOEM responded that  
45 fifty-eight produced one gigawatt, and so the number is 1,740,  
46 and that's Gulf, Pacific, and Atlantic, and so roughly they're  
47 looking at around 600, at this point, I guess, for the Gulf.

48

1 Transmission lines and dredging and so on and so forth, and so  
2 the AP was extremely concerned about all that offshore activity.  
3 One thing is, I guess, fortunately, in a way, is fishermen and  
4 people in the Gulf, that have worked in the Gulf, are aware of  
5 all the offshore oil and gas activity, and one of the programs  
6 that oil and gas has set up is an underwater obstruction fund,  
7 so that, if gear gets damaged due to mineral activity, the  
8 fisherman gets compensated.

9  
10 The AP would like to see something similar with offshore wind  
11 turbines, and, also -- Gosh, I'm like Bob Gill, and I lost my  
12 train of thought on the other thing, but please keep this  
13 offshore wind thing on the front-burner.

14  
15 The lady did mention that there is one member of NMFS, of NOAA,  
16 excuse me, on the Gulf taskforce, and I am quoting now, and that  
17 member may represent council interests, and so I think it's  
18 important that the council would have someone involved, and  
19 hopefully be able to serve on a taskforce.

20  
21 I think the AP requested that shrimp industry members be  
22 appointed to a taskforce, and whether or not that will happen  
23 certainly is questionable, and not only shrimp, but  
24 representatives of other fishing interests should be involved,  
25 and the other thing is the AP was very well satisfied with the  
26 transparency that went into the offshore aquaculture atlas, and  
27 they would hope that the agency and BOEM would use that kind of  
28 process when they develop zones for this offshore wind industry,  
29 utilizing the data that you've been talking about, the shrimp  
30 effort data, where the fishing activities for shrimp and other  
31 species takes place.

32  
33 It appeared, when we had our meeting, that the area of most  
34 interest was west Texas. However, in the last two days, of  
35 reading newspapers in Louisiana and Mississippi, it looked like  
36 they are now looking at an area off of southwest Louisiana as an  
37 area that may be a location for some of these turbines, and, of  
38 course, that's an important fishing area, also. I think that's  
39 it, Madam Chair, and I don't want to keep you guys too much  
40 longer.

41  
42 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Mr. Perret, and now we have Dr.  
43 Frazer.

44  
45 **DR. TOM FRAZER:** That's okay, Leann. I think what I will do is  
46 I've got some suggested language that I think might help, with  
47 regard to the alternatives, but, in the interest of time, I will  
48 bring them up in Full Council.

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** That sounds great. Thank you, Dr. Frazer.  
3 Thank you for trying to be productive and help us forward there.  
4 We will do that, and then, during Full Council, there are a  
5 couple of things that didn't have motions from the AP report,  
6 but that are still vital just to mention to the council, and so  
7 we'll briefly do that as a well. Mr. Diaz, thank you for the  
8 extra time, and I will turn it back over to you.

9  
10 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on January 24, 2022.)

11  
12 - - -  
13