

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2  
3 SHRIMP COMMITTEE

4  
5 Webinar

6  
7 SEPTEMBER 28, 2020

8  
9 **VOTING MEMBERS**

10 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi  
11 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama  
12 Roy Crabtree.....NMFS  
13 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi  
14 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC  
15 Jonathan Dugas.....Louisiana  
16 Robin Riechers.....Texas  
17 John Sanchez.....Florida  
18 Chris Schieble (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana

19  
20 **NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

21 Susan Boggs.....Alabama  
22 Phil Dyskow.....Florida  
23 Tom Frazer.....Florida  
24 Lt. Nicholas Giancola.....USCG  
25 Martha Guyas (designee for Jessica McCawley).....Florida  
26 Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi  
27 Greg Stunz.....Texas  
28 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana  
29 Troy Williamson.....Texas

30  
31 **STAFF**

32 Matt Freeman.....Economist  
33 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director  
34 Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer  
35 Karen Hoak.....Administrative & Financial Assistant  
36 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist  
37 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist  
38 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel  
39 Jessica Matos.....Document Editor & Administrative Assistant  
40 Natasha Mendez-Ferrer.....Fishery Biologist  
41 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer  
42 Kathy Pereira.....Meeting Planner & Travel Coordinator  
43 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist & SEDAR Liaison  
44 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager  
45 Charlotte Schiaffo.....Administrative & Human Resources Assistant  
46 Camilla Shireman.....Administrative & Communications Assistant  
47 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director  
48 Carly Somerset.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

**OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

Anna Beckwith.....SAFMC  
David Gloeckner.....SEFSC  
Peter Hood.....NMFS  
Paul Mickle.....MS  
Clay Porch.....SEFSC

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1  
2  
3 Table of Contents.....3  
4  
5 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes.....4  
6  
7 Action Guide and Next Steps.....4  
8  
9 Gulf Fishery Analytical Requirements, Program Updates, and  
10 Reporting Options.....5  
11  
12 Adjournment.....22  
13  
14 - - -  
15  
16

1 The Shrimp Management Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery  
2 Management Council convened via webinar on Monday morning,  
3 September 28, 2020, and was called to order by Chairman Leann  
4 Bosarge.

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

10 **CHAIRMAN LEANN BOSARGE:** I will call the Shrimp Management  
11 Committee to order. The members are myself, Mr. Banks, Mr.  
12 Anson, Dr. Crabtree, Mr. Diaz, Mr. Donaldson, Mr. Dugas, Mr.  
13 Riechers, and Mr. Sanchez.

14  
15 The first thing on our agenda is the Adoption of the Agenda.  
16 Were there any edits or items to add to the agenda? Seeing  
17 none, the agenda is adopted as stated. The next item would be  
18 the Approval of the April 2019 Committee Minutes, which that's  
19 when we had our last Shrimp Committee, and that's found under  
20 Tab D, Number 2. Did anybody have any edits to those minutes?  
21 I am not hearing anything, and so, seeing no edits, the minutes  
22 are approved as written.

23  
24 Next is our Action Guide and Next Steps, and that can be found  
25 under Tab D, Number 3. We have a pretty short agenda today.  
26 Dr. Freeman, would you like to take us through the Action Guide,  
27 or would you like me to run through that, real quick?

28  
29 **DR. MATT FREEMAN:** Certainly, and I can do that. The Science  
30 Center will present on analytical requirements, program updates,  
31 and reporting options for the Gulf shrimp fishery. Current  
32 vessel reporting will be impacted, as cellular reporting through  
33 the 3G network is being phased out. The Science Center has also  
34 provided background information in Tab D, Number 4(b) to the  
35 committee, further outlining analytical requirements and  
36 reporting options.

37  
38 The committee should consider the presentation, review the  
39 background information, ask questions of Science Center staff,  
40 and then provide feedback to the Science Center on how these  
41 changes will affect shrimp industry participants in the Gulf.  
42 The committee may then consider development of an amendment, if  
43 necessary, to address the options presented by the Science  
44 Center.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Dr. Freeman. Do we have Dr.  
47 Gloeckner, Dave Gloeckner, on the line?  
48

1 **DR. DAVID GLOECKNER:** Can you hear me?

2  
3 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, sir. I can hear you. Are you ready to  
4 take us through your presentation?

5  
6 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Sure.

7  
8 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. You have the floor, sir.

9  
10 **GULF FISHERY ANALYTICAL REQUIREMENTS, PROGRAM UPDATES, AND**  
11 **REPORTING OPTIONS**

12  
13 **DR. GLOECKNER:** All right. I'm Dave Gloeckner, as Leann said,  
14 and I am the Division Director for Fisheries Statistics at the  
15 Center in Miami, and I'm actually a little bit new to the shrimp  
16 reporting for the vessels, and so bear with me if I stumble  
17 through this a little bit. I just gave this presentation last  
18 week to the Gulf Commission Data Management Committee, and so  
19 hopefully we can move through this quickly and you can guys can  
20 take a look at the information that we sent you.

21  
22 There is four types of shrimp data that are required to complete  
23 the very wide array of Southeast Center and SERO outputs,  
24 including the regulatory requirements and annual council and  
25 industry requests and additional national reporting requirements  
26 that we have at the Center, and so that's effort data, bycatch  
27 rates, landings data, and then there's additional data for  
28 economic and regulatory analyses, and this should be included in  
29 the background information we sent you.

30  
31 The current data collection, we have bycatch rates that we  
32 acquire through one observer program, and this is a  
33 representative estimate of the average catch per tow of sea  
34 turtles, red snapper, and other species. With our current  
35 funding level, that covers only around 2 percent, and so that  
36 leads to imprecise estimates for most of those species.

37  
38 The current data collection on landings, economics, and  
39 regulatory data, they are collected through dealer-reported trip  
40 tickets, and annual gear, landings, and economic surveys as  
41 well. The gear, landings, and economics survey are paper-based,  
42 and they are mailed annually to permit holders, and so that's  
43 not the most efficient use of resources.

44  
45 The shrimp landings are currently required to be submitted  
46 monthly on state trip tickets, as opposed to the species  
47 included in the Gulf and South Atlantic permit, which get  
48 submitted weekly.

1  
2 For effort data, currently, we have tow-by-tow effort that's  
3 derived from time-stamped GPS coordinates, using the 3G cellular  
4 electronic logbook system, what we call cELBs, and the coverage  
5 is less than 40 percent of the Gulf shrimp fleet, and, since 3G  
6 technology is being discontinued, beginning January 1 of 2021,  
7 new shrimp effort data collection methods and reporting  
8 requirements are warranted.

9  
10 A little bit of background on dealer permitting, and a Gulf  
11 shrimp dealer is a person who purchases shrimp from a vessel or  
12 person that fishes in the Gulf of Mexico EEZ or in adjoining  
13 waters and that lands shrimp in the adjoining states.  
14 Currently, shrimp dealers are required by states to report  
15 monthly, but they're not required to do that electronically.

16  
17 Requiring federal shrimp dealers to have a GSAD and adhere to  
18 those weekly electronic reports would ensure that NMFS receives  
19 timely and accurate shrimp data, and so, right now, we get blank  
20 market size category fields that have been increasing, and so  
21 they're not quite what we need, and so then SERO could enforce  
22 dealer reporting requirements, if we had this federal permit.

23  
24 The current vessel reporting, the unit of shrimp effort is days  
25 fished and is derived by an algorithm developed by LGL  
26 Ecological Associates. The cELB GPS data is transmitted  
27 electronically via a 3G signal to NMFS, establishing a trip  
28 start and stop that can be matched, theoretically, to a state  
29 trip ticket, using a twenty-four-hour match window. Match  
30 efficiency using this algorithm ranges from 50 to 80 percent,  
31 depending on the year.

32  
33 Time-stamped GPS data recorded at ten-minute intervals by the  
34 cELB units are used in the algorithm to estimate vessel speed,  
35 which is then used to infer time spent fishing, and so effort in  
36 units of days fished. Unmatched trips do not get used in the  
37 effort estimation, and cELBs are mostly on offshore vessels, and  
38 so this may bias the estimates.

39  
40 When looking at options for vessel reporting, we established  
41 four possible options moving forward, and the potential for each  
42 option to provide sufficient data is summarized in the following  
43 slides.

44  
45 The first option is no vessel-based reporting, and that requires  
46 no effort data through the vessel, and we would move to using  
47 only state trip ticket data, which appears to not capture all  
48 trips reported to NMFS, and it has less spatially-explicit

1 information and so, instead of those lat and longs, we have  
2 areas.

3  
4 Further, efforts could only be estimated through days at-sea,  
5 which would be incomparable to the historic units that we use  
6 now and that's used as the basis of various regulations, and so,  
7 for example, the shrimp biological opinion and the Gulf shrimp  
8 amendment.

9  
10 Option 2A and B is GPS vessel reporting. In general, Option 2  
11 requires basically the status quo, where the vessels would need  
12 to transmit time-stamped GPS data at ten-minute intervals, with  
13 the trip start and stop date and time, upon returning to port.

14  
15 With Option 2A, in addition to the above, it would require a  
16 trip ticket link, and so trip ticket number transmitted with GPS  
17 report. Survey-level GPS reporting still requires an algorithm  
18 approach, but the link would improve that match efficiency  
19 between the trip ticket and the lat and long position  
20 information. survey-level reporting may still poorly reflect  
21 the inshore fishing activities, and that's a caveat of  
22 continuing to do this.

23  
24 For 2B, in addition to the requirements that we just mentioned,  
25 it would require census-level coverage of the federally-  
26 permitted shrimp fleet, and so a census provides greater  
27 coverage of the inshore effort, which is important in various  
28 regulations, and a census would improve the accuracy of total  
29 shrimp effort estimates. No algorithm would be needed to  
30 estimate that effort. With a census, there is no need to link  
31 to the state trip tickets to estimate effort. However,  
32 establishing a link to the trip tickets would allow for  
33 validation purposes.

34  
35 Option 3 would be enhanced vessel reporting, and so this would  
36 essentially have vessels reporting gear information upon  
37 returning to port, and so gear information is required to be  
38 reported annually via that twelve-page mailed paper survey.

39  
40 The electronic reporting application could be developed such  
41 that gear information could be saved, eliminating the need to  
42 update gear information, and then transmitted with the GPS and  
43 trip ticket number upon the vessel returning to port.

44  
45 This leads to more accurate dealer data, and it would be more  
46 efficient than the paper survey that we get currently, and it  
47 would eliminate that data collection, and so fishermen wouldn't  
48 have to fill out that annual survey, and they would just be

1 reporting their gear information through the application.

2  
3 Option 4 would be even more enhanced, and we would get tow-by-  
4 tow vessel reporting, and this requires vessels to report  
5 landings and weight by shrimp species at the tow level.  
6 Currently, effort is derived by matching that cELB effort to  
7 trip ticket landings and allocating it to the area and the stat  
8 zone.

9  
10 With tow-by-two landings, we would have an exact measure of  
11 effort for each tow, which would be precise by the stat and  
12 depth zone, and it could be derived, improving the accuracy of  
13 effort estimates used in the turtle bi-op and the red snapper  
14 bycatch analysis.

15  
16 With 3G technology being discontinued at the end of 2020, a new  
17 shrimp data collection program and reporting requirements are  
18 warranted. For the council's consideration, we have presented  
19 these four options to update the current vessel reporting  
20 requirements, and so, once again, that Option 1 would produce  
21 incomparable units, because we would just be using trip tickets,  
22 and those will be coarse and less accurate.

23  
24 Option 2A and 2B would achieve status quo reporting, with some  
25 refinement, and Options 3 and 4 would provide enhanced vessel  
26 reporting, incrementally improving the accuracy of the  
27 analytical information.

28  
29 The council will need to pursue an amendment, if it chooses, to  
30 make changes to the expiring effort data collection and/or  
31 require shrimp dealer permits and all permitted shrimp dealers  
32 to submit weekly electronic reports to NMFS. I think that may  
33 be it. I'm sure that there will be lots of questions, and I  
34 will try my best.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Dr. Gloeckner. Were there any  
37 questions from the committee or others for Dr. Gloeckner? Let's  
38 see. I see Robin Riechers' name popping up on my screen.  
39 Robin, go ahead.

40  
41 **MR. ROBIN RIECHERS:** Dr. Gloeckner, I am wondering about -- When  
42 we say the end of 2020, and so, obviously, in the current  
43 situation we're in, it's going to be hard to roll out new  
44 reporting requirements, and certainly new reporting technology,  
45 and so are we -- I mean, tell me a little bit about the time  
46 table and what your thoughts are, as far as how we continue what  
47 we have, if there's a stop-gap measure, and what are the  
48 thoughts there?



1  
2 **DR. GLOECKNER:** For the time table, 3G may be going away, but I  
3 think those units will continue to work for a little while, and  
4 so, at this point, we are just trying to get the ball rolling on  
5 developing some other method to collect this information, and,  
6 currently, we have been working with Benny Gallaway and  
7 researching whether or not we can just use the P-Sea Windplot  
8 software that is used by most of the fleet and modifying that,  
9 so they can just output the vessel tracks.

10  
11 That is, I think, where we're going to try to go here very  
12 quickly, and so I think what we'll do is roll that out to the  
13 fleet as soon as we can, and I think that would be very soon  
14 after the beginning of the year, so that we can start using that  
15 information reported from the selected vessels and use the  
16 current information on the 3G units to calibrate that cELB with  
17 this new method and then switch over to a new method.

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I will jump in here, just for a second,  
20 Robin, to kind of expand upon that a little bit. The industry  
21 was made aware that this technology is going to go away, and we  
22 realized, at that point, that, as you just said, we're on a  
23 pretty quick schedule to have something done.

24  
25 The council and government wheels turn kind of slowly, which  
26 that's fine, and there is good points to that, but we know that  
27 that information is important, right, and we don't need any gaps  
28 in it, if at all possible, because it's used for a lot of  
29 different things.

30  
31 He mentioned a few things, and you can remember the coral  
32 amendment that we worked on here recently, and we saw that  
33 effort data quite a bit, to see where the shrimp fleet trawls in  
34 relation to a lot of that coral, to make sure that we get our  
35 boxes as tight as possible, when we draw boxes around that  
36 coral, and so we know how important it is, and we don't want it  
37 going away either, and so here's what industry has done to try  
38 and assist and do our part in this.

39  
40 This effort is collected kind of like in the background on our  
41 boats, and it doesn't actually require active human involvement,  
42 right, and it's not like reef fish, where you have to -- Those  
43 guys, the IFQ guys, have to hail-in and hail-out, and they have  
44 to call the government, and there's a lot of interaction from  
45 the man on the boat.

46  
47 Ours actually tracks our movement, and it has a formula that it  
48 uses to see, in between pings, how far did the boat move, and we

1 tow for certain species -- When our nets in the water, we're  
2 moving a lot slower than any other time that we're moving, and  
3 so that formula can tell when we're towing and trawling and when  
4 we're not.

5

6 **MR. ED SWINDELL:** Good morning.

7

8 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Hi, Ed. We hear you, and you can go ahead  
9 and mute yourself, if you don't mind. So, anyhow, where was  
10 that? So the problem is the algorithm and the formula and  
11 everything is fine, and the problem is the platform that it's  
12 being used on, which is the cellular electronic logbook  
13 platform, and the technology is rapidly expanding, and the boxes  
14 that we have on the boat are going to be invalid pretty soon.

15

16 That expanding technology is not going to go away, and that's  
17 always going to be something we're fighting, and so what the  
18 industry looked at is what can we get up and going quickly, very  
19 quickly, and, well, on our shrimp boats, on most of the Gulf  
20 shrimp boats, we use a computer plotter, and so it tracks our  
21 movement on a computer, and there is a software program called  
22 P-Sea Windplot in that computer.

23

24 That software program actually has the capacity for us to do a  
25 little tweaking to it, with the manufacturer of the software,  
26 and allow it to track our GPS movement and use the same  
27 algorithm that NMFS currently uses to collect the data in  
28 exactly the same way, using the P-Sea Windplot platform instead  
29 of the cELB that's going to be going out pretty soon.

30

31 What industry has done is they have kind of come up with a  
32 proposal to get out to some of these boats and getting the  
33 technology developed and put onto the boats and have that effort  
34 data collected and then turn that over to NMFS and let them take  
35 a look at it and make sure that it's comparable to the old  
36 effort data.

37

38 If it is, if that works well, then NMFS would be able to take  
39 that proof of concept project that the industry gets up and  
40 running and essentially scale it up and run with it. We would  
41 have to have that proof of concept up and running within a  
42 matter of months, and hopefully the early part of next year, and  
43 we hope to have some data before that, but, to be able to hand  
44 it off to NMFS and let them scale it up, it would probably be  
45 early next year.

46

47 Essentially, what industry is waiting on to pull the trigger on  
48 that, because there's a hefty price tag for us to do this, is to

1 have some feedback from the council and see if the council is  
2 interested in us doing that, so that we don't have a gap in this  
3 data and so that we do have something up and running, and  
4 industry, just FYI, would partner with Dr. Benny Gallaway at  
5 LGL, who was the -- Dr. Gallaway and his company, LGL, were the  
6 original creators of the algorithm and the electronic logbook  
7 program that was originally on the boat. I will open it back up  
8 to questions, and, Robin, did that answer yours?  
9

10 **MR. RIECHERS:** Well, certainly my question was just more at not  
11 all the history, Leann, to some degree, because I do, obviously,  
12 remember Benny being real participatory in this and the ELBs  
13 being used, but I was just trying to get at the whole notion of  
14 -- Both you and Dr. Gloeckner answered it with the notion of  
15 modifying the current, some of the current, technology that you  
16 now have on vessels to try to go ahead and basically -- I am  
17 guessing, and I would have to go back up to the screen, but  
18 that's more of the Option 2A and B options, is what it seems  
19 like, as opposed to more of the higher bells and whistles  
20 options further down. That's kind of what I'm assuming that  
21 means.  
22

23 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, Robin, and you're correct. When you get  
24 into Options 2A and 2B, you start getting into some trip tickets  
25 and electronic transmittal of trip tickets, and we can probably  
26 take that up at a later date and another committee, maybe where  
27 we have some more time, but I have done a little research on  
28 what is causing the issue with matching effort to landings,  
29 matching an actual trip, effort trip, to the trip ticket for  
30 that trip.  
31

32 I think, before we get to in-depth with electronic reporting of  
33 the trip ticket to NMFS, I think what we need to do is sit down  
34 and take a look at the unmatched trips and landings, because  
35 that is a list that kicks out of the program, the algorithm  
36 program, every time it runs, and we need to try and understand  
37 what's causing the mismatches.  
38

39 I have some ideas, and I think, honestly, when you go the P-Sea  
40 Windplot system, where you're not using that antenna that is on  
41 the current cELB, your matches are going to get a lot better.  
42 What happens is those antennas on the cELB -- They are just  
43 really not made to be out in the weather like they are, and so  
44 your transmitting doesn't work as well as you would like it to  
45 sometimes, and we may not know it's not transmitting until we  
46 get back to the dock.  
47

48 I think that that will help, when you go to the P-Sea Windplot

1 system, and you will have a lot better matches, and I think  
2 going through that unmatched list to figure out what the other  
3 issues are and addressing the actual issues and trying to get  
4 better matches that way, whether it be adding another field to a  
5 state trip ticket program, so that we get the end date of the  
6 trip narrowed in a little better -- I think there's ways to fix  
7 that.

8  
9 I think, right now, we better focus on the 3G that's going to  
10 expire, and making sure that we don't lose the data that we  
11 have, and then, once we get that off the ground and running,  
12 let's see what issues we still have, or what issues didn't go  
13 away, and then we can look at maybe fixing those. Were there  
14 any other questions for Dr. Gloeckner?

15  
16 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** Leann, I have a couple of questions and a  
17 comment.

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Go ahead.

20  
21 **MR. DIAZ:** All right. First, I do -- I am happy to see that the  
22 industry is stepping up to try to help fill the void and head  
23 off the problem, and I want to commend the shrimp industry for  
24 doing that, and I do realize that we have to have good data to  
25 manage this fishery also, and so all of this stuff is very  
26 important.

27  
28 I do have two questions, and the first one, Leann, is for you,  
29 and the second one is for Dr. Gloeckner. The industry effort  
30 that you're talking about, right now, we have about 40 percent  
31 coverage on the system that we're using now, and what percentage  
32 coverage do you anticipate in this industry-led effort that  
33 you're talking about?

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** The industry-led effort, Dale, that would  
36 just be a proof of concept, and so how NMFS decides to scale it  
37 up after that, whether they go 40 percent or 100 percent,  
38 however they choose to do it, that would be determined by them,  
39 and I would probably let Clay answer that question, but I assume  
40 that he would at least want the coverage that he has now, but  
41 the proof of concept --

42  
43 We would get out there and get this technology downloaded into  
44 some of the vessels that currently have cELBs on them, and, that  
45 way, they will have both running at the same time, the cELBs and  
46 the P-Sea Windplot program, using the same algorithm, and get  
47 that data back to NMFS, and it won't be many boats. It will  
48 just be a handful of boats, and it's just a proof of concept,

1 right?

2  
3 The industry cannot afford to do a full-scale project, and you  
4 start getting into seven figures, when you want to look at  
5 something like that, and it's bad enough that we're in six  
6 figures and sorting out the money for that, but, anyway, I will  
7 let Clay answer the question about 40 percent or greater.

8  
9 **DR. CLAY PORCH:** Thank you, Ms. Bosarge. 40 percent would be  
10 okay if we could do a better job with matching, which you were  
11 already talking about, and that's why we were recommending  
12 including the trip ticket number associated with each trip, and,  
13 that way, we can do a much better job figuring out what fraction  
14 of the total effort we're actually picking up with that 40  
15 percent coverage, and we could do the expansion.

16  
17 We're still recommending that, and I'm not quite so optimistic  
18 that, just by going to the unmatched list, we'll be able to  
19 resolve all those issues of how we can match better, and it's  
20 still going to be a lot of work down the road, and there will  
21 always be that kind of thing coming up, whereas, if everybody  
22 reported their trip tickets, it would be a lot easier to match.

23  
24 I do like the idea of using the P-Sea Windplot platform, and I  
25 think that could work very well for us. Ideally, we would get  
26 something closer to 100 percent coverage, and that was the  
27 Option 2B, I believe, but, again, we could live with 40 percent  
28 if we could do a better job matching, and the trip tickets would  
29 help a lot with that.

30  
31 The other thing that I wanted to point out was that those  
32 Options 3 and 4 give us a lot of the information that we collect  
33 rather inefficiently now for a lot of the economic analyses, and  
34 so some of the things that the council has been asking for could  
35 be better provided if we collected it in the manner that Dave  
36 described with those three and four options.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dale, did you want to go ahead with your  
39 question for Dr. Gloeckner?

40  
41 **MR. DIAZ:** Dr. Gloeckner, as you were going through your  
42 options, one of the things that kept popping into my head was  
43 cost, and so could you speak a little bit to what costs might be  
44 borne by the industry with relation to going to the monthly  
45 tickets for the dealers, and also the other options that might  
46 impact people in the commercial fishery?

47  
48 **DR. GLOECKNER:** If we want to talk about the going from monthly

1 paper to weekly electronic submissions by the dealer, it just  
2 depends on what the dealer currently has on hand, whether they  
3 actually have a computer on hand if they're still doing  
4 everything the old-fashioned way. If they have to buy a  
5 computer, you're probably talking about three-hundred-bucks  
6 worth and an internet fee of a monthly recurring internet fee,  
7 somewhere around eighty-bucks.

8  
9 Time-wise, it really doesn't cost any more to do it weekly, and  
10 you're entering the same number, but you're just doing it a  
11 little bit sooner, and so I think what we put together when we  
12 did the reef fish was an estimate somewhere around three-  
13 hundred-bucks for the dealers to take on electronic reporting,  
14 if they're not already doing it, and so we would have to go  
15 through, and I think Florida is pretty good, with most of their  
16 dealers already reporting electronically.

17  
18 It would be the other states in the Gulf that we would have to  
19 work with, right along with the Gulf States Commission, to  
20 implement that change in reporting. Does that get at that  
21 question?

22  
23 **MR. DIAZ:** It does, and, on the other options related to the  
24 commercial fishermen, do you have any idea if there would be any  
25 additional costs to commercial fishermen?

26  
27 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I don't see it being an additional cost over and  
28 above what is already paid. It's still operating in the  
29 background, and it's still using -- Actually, it's using a  
30 system that's already onboard, but it's just working with P-Sea  
31 Windplot to export that data somehow and transmit it, and  
32 probably using the same cellular method that the current logbook  
33 does, and so I don't see that changing much, unless we expand it  
34 to the rest of the fleet and require that.

35  
36 There may be some vessels that don't have computers onboard and  
37 aren't using P-Sea Windplot, and so we would have to get an  
38 estimate of that number of vessels from Benny and figure out how  
39 much that would cost. I think a license for P-Sea Windplot is  
40 \$900, plus you would have to put a computer on the boat, and so  
41 that's probably somewhere between \$500 and \$1,000, but I think,  
42 after that, you've got a recurring cost of transmission, and I  
43 think that's it, unless there is upgrades that you want to make  
44 to your P-Sea Windplot.

45  
46 **MR. DIAZ:** Thank you, Dr. Gloeckner.

47  
48 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Those are the costs that I kind of expect, but I

1 will need some feedback from Benny, and we were hoping to meet  
2 again before this meeting, but we couldn't work it out.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. I have a question. You mentioned  
5 that there's a twenty-four-hour window for matching. I am kind  
6 of getting into the weeds, but I would like to delve into it  
7 just for a second. Essentially, you get the effort information  
8 from the vessel, and you can see when the trip ended for the  
9 boat, based on when the boat quit moving.

10  
11 Then you get a trip ticket from Mississippi or Louisiana or  
12 Texas or something, and that trip ticket has a date, I guess an  
13 offloading date, and it would depend on which state as to what  
14 date they list on there, and some of them will have a number of  
15 days for the trip.

16  
17 Are you telling me that the offload date on that trip ticket has  
18 to be within twenty-four hours of when that boat landed, when  
19 the boat hit the dock, in order for the system to make a match  
20 out of it? If that's the case, there's a lot of issue right  
21 there with your matching, because we don't always offload within  
22 twenty-four hours of hitting the dock.

23  
24 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I think what we're using is we're using a three-  
25 day buffer to try to incorporate those differences between --

26  
27 (There is a gap in the audio recording due to a dropped phone  
28 line, but there is no lost data.)

29  
30 **DR. TOM FRAZER:** Leann, I think we're going to get started.  
31 Give it a whirl.

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Thank you so much. Now we're  
34 under the gun, and we have about six minutes to finish our  
35 committee, and so what we need to come out of this committee is,  
36 if the industry is going to move forward with this proof of  
37 concept project, where we actually get this same program  
38 algorithm up and running on a different platform on the vessels  
39 that currently have it, we really need to hear council  
40 encouragement for that idea, because it's well over \$300,000  
41 that will come out of the industry's pocket to make that happen,  
42 so that we don't have a large gap in our data.

43  
44 If the council is encouraged by that, using the P-Sea Windplot,  
45 to collect that same data that we have always been collecting, I  
46 would like to hear some feedback from the council, as well as  
47 from the Science Center, so that the industry can make a  
48 decision and get this program done.

1  
2 I heard Dr. Porch speak positively about the idea of using the  
3 P-Sea Windplot earlier, but did I interpret that correctly, that  
4 the Science Center is onboard with the idea, Dr. Porch?

5  
6 **DR. PORCH:** Yes, absolutely. I think it's a great idea, and, if  
7 we don't do something soon, the whole system is going to fall  
8 apart, and that's not only going to affect our ability to  
9 determine where the shrimp fishery is in regard to that 66  
10 percent regulation, but it's going to affect a lot of our stock  
11 assessments, and so it's really important to get on the right  
12 track here.

13  
14 The only thing I would say though is, as we move forward, I  
15 think we need to give strong consideration, again, to  
16 incorporating the trip ticket information, because, if we had  
17 that, we can automate things. If we don't have that trip ticket  
18 information, and we have to kind of use the fuzzy logic that  
19 we're having to use now to do the matching, we can't really  
20 automate it, and it becomes very labor intensive.

21  
22 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Dr. Porch. Anybody else? Dale,  
23 how do you feel about it?

24  
25 **Mr. DIAZ:** Earlier, I commended the shrimp industry for doing  
26 it, and I think I encourage you all to go forward, and I would  
27 suspect that, if everything matches, we would take that into  
28 consideration down the line, and that's my perspective. Thank  
29 you.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Riechers, you come from a big shrimp  
32 state. Tell me how you're feeling.

33  
34 **MR. RIECHERS:** I certainly like the notion of using the Windplot  
35 and using something that they already have on the vessel, and so  
36 I think that's certainly a beginning and an approach we need to  
37 attempt to take, if the Science Center -- The Science Center  
38 seems to be okay with that, and so I guess what I'm trying to  
39 figure out, Leann, is whether you still need an amendment if we  
40 do that sort of approach or what does the action need to be  
41 here.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I will let staff, and maybe Mara, speak to  
44 that, and I would assume, as long as you're simply changing the  
45 platform that you're collecting the data on, and everything else  
46 is staying the same, and your algorithm is staying the same, and  
47 what you're requiring to be submitted stays the same, then I  
48 wouldn't see where the council needs any kind of amendment for



1 that. It's simply a change of platform.

2  
3 Now, if, at some point down the line, we start getting into some  
4 of these other alternatives, where it's a much more in-depth  
5 reporting program, and there is new requirements, I would think  
6 an amendment might be called for at that point, but does staff  
7 or Ms. Levy want to chime in on that?

8  
9 **MS. MARA LEVY:** I think that's right. I guess we just need to  
10 look back at what you've done through council action. I mean,  
11 one of the things that you did more recently was the cost-  
12 sharing between industry and NMFS, and just to make sure that  
13 whatever happens with this new platform is still consistent with  
14 that framework action that provided the cost-sharing, and I  
15 don't know exactly how this new thing is going to be set up, and  
16 so I can't really comment to that right now.

17  
18 Then, when you put the ELB requirement into place, there was an  
19 option to have all shrimp vessels participating, or a  
20 statistically-valid sample participating, and the council chose  
21 the statistically-valid sample, and so, to the extent there's a  
22 desire to increase the number of participants, to make it more  
23 of a census of everyone, that type of thing, even though it's  
24 the same platform, is going to probably require some sort of  
25 council action.

26  
27 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Mara. Then do we have Louisiana  
28 on the phone? I don't know if we have Mr. Banks or Mr.  
29 Schieble, but how do you all feel? Do you like the idea of the  
30 pilot program and getting that up and running through industry  
31 and then letting NMFS take that and scale it up, as appropriate?

32  
33 **MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE:** Yes, I agree, and I don't see any issues  
34 with this. I know that our reporting comes in a little bit  
35 differently, how it's done, but I don't think that will affect  
36 that, and so, yes, we're in agreement with it.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, and so I'm hearing --

39  
40 **MR. DIAZ:** Leann, there are some people with their hands raised,  
41 just so you know.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. My hands are not over on the right of  
44 the screen, and it's the middle. I'm sorry. Robin, did you  
45 have another comment?

46  
47 **MR. RIECHERS:** No, ma'am. I am through.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Mr. Anson. I was coming to you next  
2 anyway.

3  
4 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Thank you. I agree as to provide an  
5 opportunity where we won't have a loss of data, and, if industry  
6 is willing to step up, I appreciate and commend them for doing  
7 so and offering to do that. Mara brought up one of the  
8 questions that I had relative to the sample size, or the  
9 participants, who would be getting the Windplot software and to  
10 have the ability to provide the data, and I just was curious as  
11 to if that was going to be the same group of folks.

12  
13 My understanding is that it's somewhat of a static sample size,  
14 and not necessarily a random draw of vessels, and I could be  
15 wrong, but, if Clay or Dr. Gloeckner has any comments to that, I  
16 would be curious to know about the participation, or the  
17 selection.

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Clay, do you want to chime in for that?

20  
21 **DR. PORCH:** I am not sure what the statistics are there. I  
22 don't know if, Dave, you know off the top of your head.  
23 Otherwise, we can find out.

24  
25 **DR. GLOECKNER:** It seems like it's a static sample, because we  
26 have actually put those hard drives out onto the vessels, and  
27 we're not planning on replacing them on other vessels, and so it  
28 would seem like it's a static sample.

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I would concur with that, but I will say  
31 that, before those devices were placed onto those vessels, there  
32 was a lot of thought that went into stratifying that sample and  
33 making sure that it was the best it could be, and, from what I  
34 understand, as we go through this again, there may be an  
35 opportunity to look at that sample again and see if it needs  
36 some tweaking, since it is somewhat static, and so thanks for  
37 bringing that up, Kevin. Then, Dr. Frazer, you had your hand  
38 up?

39  
40 **DR. TOM FRAZER:** Thank you, Leann. I am just trying to  
41 familiarize myself with a little bit of the history here. The  
42 Science Center was responsible originally for covering the cost  
43 associated with the units, right, and, right now, the industry  
44 wants to step in and essentially provide a bridge, and are there  
45 recurring costs, in that regard, to the industry?

46  
47 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Most of the offshore fleet does use the P-Sea  
48 Windplot system software, right, on their computer plotters,

1 but, if there are vessels that don't use that, and that's the  
2 platform we decide to go with, they would have to purchase that  
3 software program and get it solved.

4  
5 Because we're moving away from the cellular logbooks, where it  
6 uploads to a cellphone tower when you get within range, you're  
7 going to eliminate that cost, the monthly cellphone coverage  
8 that we have to pay for. The software that's going to have to  
9 be downloaded into P-Sea Windplot, I'm guessing there is  
10 probably going to be a cost to the industry for that, and we're  
11 at such the beginning phases of this that I really don't know  
12 what those costs are going to be yet.

13  
14 If we went with some of the other platforms, we would probably  
15 be having to purchase a new device for the vessels, if we try  
16 and go with 4G or 5G, and, yes, you would have to purchase new  
17 devices, and we don't think they could even get manufactured in  
18 time, but, to circle back, those are some of the questions that  
19 we really need the industry to give us some more feedback on.

20  
21 What I would suggest, to answer some of those questions, is that  
22 we get together the Shrimp AP, and the industry knows a little  
23 bit about this already, because we've, obviously, been talking  
24 amongst ourselves, but let's have a formal discussion with the  
25 Shrimp AP, as far as some of these other options, after we do  
26 this proof of concept project, what the costs may look like,  
27 because hopefully we'll know more then, what some cost-sharing  
28 ideas could be, and just anything else that they find relevant.  
29 I would suggest we send it to the Shrimp AP.

30  
31 The other thing that I would request at that Shrimp AP meeting  
32 is an in-depth discussion with some specific examples of the  
33 unmatched list for the landings versus effort, because I can  
34 think of a few things, off the top -- I am not necessarily  
35 opposed to having us submit the trip ticket number when we  
36 submit the effort information, but I just don't know that that's  
37 going to fix the problem, and I worry that we have an issue, but  
38 we don't really know what the problem is, what's causing it, in  
39 a lot of cases, and I think, before we put another regulation  
40 and burden on the fishermen, we should really look at the  
41 unmatched list and find what's driving that thing not to be  
42 matched.

43  
44 We have an electronic logbook on several of our boats, and one  
45 of them does mainly endangered species relocation all year, and,  
46 even if you make me submit electronically, you're still going to  
47 have lots of effort that has no trip tickets attached to it,  
48 because we're not catching shrimp. We are catching turtles to

1 relocate them, so they don't get killed.

2  
3 The past month, we've had a boat out shrimping that's been to  
4 the dock three different times, usually for five or six days at  
5 a time, because of these hurricanes. Well, in the effort data,  
6 that looks like it's the end of a trip, but you're not going to  
7 have a trip ticket submitted with it, because we're not  
8 offloading. It's not the end of the trip, but we're just at the  
9 dock because of weather, although an extended period of time.

10  
11 These are the kinds of things that we need to look through and  
12 see, on this unmatched list, what is causing it, and look at  
13 that match window and see if there's some things that can be  
14 tweaked to increase the number of matches before we put the  
15 burden on industry. If there's not, then okay. We will just  
16 have to submit our trip tickets to both the states and the feds.  
17 We get it, although that's what we're trying to avoid with other  
18 fisheries and having them report the same information twice, but  
19 we'll do if it we need to, but, first, I think we need to look  
20 at what is driving the matches.

21  
22 So give it to the Shrimp AP, and my last comment, real quick, on  
23 funding is the industry is going to come together and try and  
24 fund this pilot program, or this proof of concept project, let's  
25 call it, and I mentioned before that it's over \$300,000, and  
26 it's not cheap, and we're a poor industry. We don't make big  
27 money.

28  
29 I am hoping that all the people on this call -- You are very  
30 well connected, and we have lots of S-K funding that comes  
31 through, and that S-K funding is based on tariffs that come on  
32 the backs of the shrimp fleet, and most of the imports in this  
33 country, most of the shrimp eaten in this country, are imported,  
34 and it's what has made us a poor industry. Those imports drive  
35 our prices down.

36  
37 I am hoping that some of that CARES money could finally be  
38 rerouted to the people that feel the pain because of it, and  
39 maybe we can get some funding through there, and so I just ask  
40 you to all keep your ears open, and keep the shrimp industry in  
41 mind as we move forward with this and need some funding.  
42 Anything else? Any other feedback from the group? If not, then  
43 I am going to -- Go ahead, Mara.

44  
45 **MS. LEVY:** I just -- Again, as I hear you talk about it more, I  
46 mean, to the extent that there is going to be new funding  
47 burdens on people, to the extent we're going to require people  
48 to buy additional equipment, potentially, or software, that

1 wasn't contemplated in the framework action that divided the  
2 cost of the ELB program between industry and NMFS, and we're  
3 likely looking at some sort of council action, rulemaking, and I  
4 don't think we can just impose burdens like that on industry  
5 without that.

6  
7 Again, I don't know enough about it, but I just -- I know this  
8 is a time-sensitive thing, but, to the extent we get more  
9 information about what types of things you're going to be asking  
10 industry to do, it may not be as simple as just saying do it.

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mara, so, whether we go with P-Sea Windplot  
13 or we require industry to buy some other device, some other  
14 platform, either way, it's a cost to industry, and so I think  
15 you're right. As we get closer to this, we'll have to look at  
16 it. Really, the biggest cost is just the cost of getting to the  
17 boat, getting somebody to get to the boat, for us, for the proof  
18 of concept.

19  
20 We actually need to send someone to the boat to download the new  
21 software into the P-Sea Windplot program and then gather that  
22 information back up and get it to NMFS, and so you would think  
23 that wouldn't be that costly, but I guess nothing is cheap these  
24 days. Then I had another hand from Matt Freeman.

25  
26 **DR. FREEMAN:** Thanks, Leann. Just for clarification, for staff,  
27 you were suggesting having the AP meet towards the end of  
28 completion for this proof of concept, or if you could provide a  
29 little more guidance on when you would like the Shrimp AP to  
30 meet, and, also, sort of timewise, when that might be.

31  
32 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** That's a good question, Matt. I will have to  
33 get back to you on that one. I need to think about that a  
34 little bit. It's not just the timing of the project, but we  
35 need to think about shrimp season and peak shrimp seasons and  
36 when is the best time to do it for industry, and so I will  
37 circle back with you on that.

38  
39 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay. You've got my email.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thanks. Any -- I don't see any more hands  
42 up, and I appreciate everybody's patience with this. I think we  
43 had some good council feedback, and I hope that it was enough  
44 positive feedback that industry feels good about making that  
45 kind of financial commitment to get something off the ground and  
46 running quickly, and I will be sure to report back to you all  
47 and let you all know how all that's going.

48

1 Mr. Chairman, I'm about eleven minutes over, but, if there is no  
2 Other Business -- Any other business? Seeing none, I turn it  
3 back over to you, Mr. Chairman.

4

5 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on September 28, 2020.)

6

7

- - -