

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

Hilton Galveston Island Resort Galveston, Texas

October 5, 2015

**VOTING MEMBERS**

- 10 John Greene.....Alabama
- 11 Doug Boyd.....Texas
- 12 Roy Crabtree.....NMFS, SERO, St. Petersburg, Florida
- 13 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 14 Myron Fischer (designee for Randy Pausina).....Louisiana
- 15 Greg Stunz.....Texas
- 16 David Walker.....Alabama

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

- 19 Kevin Anson.....Alabama
- 20 Martha Bademan (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
- 21 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- 22 Jason Brand.....USCG
- 23 Pamela Dana.....Florida
- 24 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- 25 Kelly Lucas (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
- 26 Campo Matens.....Louisiana
- 27 Lance Robinson (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
- 28 John Sanchez.....Florida
- 29 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana
- 30 Roy Williams.....Florida

**STAFF**

- 33 Steven Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
- 34 Assane Diagne.....Economist
- 35 John Froeschke.....Fishery Biologist/Statistician
- 36 Doug Gregory.....Executive Director
- 37 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
- 38 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 39 Charlene Ponce.....Public Information Officer
- 40 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
- 41 Claire Roberts.....Essential Fish Habitat Specialist
- 42 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 43 Charlotte Schiaffo.....Research & Human Resource Librarian
- 44 Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Director

**OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

- 47 Pam Anderson.....Panama City, FL
- 48 Steve Branstetter.....NMFS

- 1 Eric Brazer.....Gulf of Mexico Reef Fish Shareholder’s Alliance
- 2 Bubba Cochran.....Galveston, TX
- 3 Chris Conklin.....SAFMC
- 4 Michael Drexler.....Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL
- 5 Traci Floyd.....MDMR, MS
- 6 Benny Gallaway.....LGL, TX
- 7 Brad Gorst.....Palm Harbor, FL
- 8 Marcie Jones.....EDF, Austin, TX
- 9 Bill Kelly.....FKCFA, FL
- 10 Rich Malinowski.....NMFS
- 11 Kristen McConnell.....EDF
- 12 Bart Niquet.....Lynn Haven, FL
- 13 Bonnie Ponwith.....SEFSC
- 14 Clarence Seymour.....Biloxi, MS

- - -

15  
16  
17 The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery  
18 Management Council convened at the Hilton Galveston Island  
19 Resort, Galveston, Texas, Monday afternoon, October 5, 2015, and  
20 was called to order at 2:50 p.m. by Chairman Johnny Greene.

21  
22 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**  
23 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
24 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**  
25

26 **CHAIRMAN JOHNNY GREENE:** I would like to call the Data  
27 Collection Committee together. All members are present. You  
28 have an agenda that has been presented to you. Are there any  
29 changes to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda will be adopted  
30 as written.

31  
32 Approval of the Minutes, is there any changes, additions, or  
33 deletions? Seeing none, the minutes will be approved as  
34 written. Next up is the Action Guide, Tab F, Number 3. It is  
35 available for your review. With that, we will move on into the  
36 Public Hearing Draft for Joint Electronic Charter Vessel  
37 Reporting Amendment, which is Tab F, Number 4(a), and Dr.  
38 Froeschke.

39  
40 **PUBLIC HEARING DRAFT - JOINT ELECTRONIC CHARTER VESSEL REPORTING**  
41 **AMENDMENT**  
42

43 **DR. JOHN FROESCHKE:** Thanks. What I would like to do is start  
44 and refer you to Tab F, Number 4(b), which is the South Atlantic  
45 Committee report from their Data Collection at their most recent  
46 September meeting.

47  
48 If you’ve had a chance to look at that and refer to page 3,

1 there is a motion on there and their motion is to, and it's  
2 referring to this document, develop a separate charter  
3 vessel/headboat reporting amendment for the South Atlantic  
4 Council's area of jurisdiction. In short, what they're  
5 recommending is splitting this document into Gulf and South  
6 Atlantic, two separate documents instead of one joint.

7  
8 At the Reef Fish AP that was just held last month, they made a  
9 similar motion and that's in the Reef Fish AP Report, Tab B-11,  
10 on page 7. It essentially suggests the same thing. The  
11 rationale is that, to date, the preferred alternatives that the  
12 Gulf Council has selected are very different from the vision of  
13 the South Atlantic Council and it didn't seem as if we were on  
14 the path to a reconciliation in that regard and they felt that  
15 they could proceed faster in the absence of the Gulf Council.

16  
17 I wanted to open that up for discussion and solicit your input  
18 on that, if you prefer to proceed in that way, and then we can  
19 talk about some other stuff.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Thank you, Dr. Froeschke. It sounds  
22 like the South Atlantic wants a divorce. Is there any comments  
23 or items that the -- Dr. Ponwith.

24  
25 **DR. BONNIE PONWITH:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Certainly I can  
26 empathize that it's easier to customize something new on a  
27 council-by-council basis than it is to create something that  
28 meets the needs of both sides. I get that.

29  
30 I will say, strictly from a science standpoint, and so this is  
31 no reflection on the management aspects, but from a science  
32 standpoint, that having one unified methodology that's uniform  
33 across a broad geography is, in general, going to give you a  
34 stronger, more statically reliable result than partitioning and  
35 it certainly is also true that you gain economic efficiencies  
36 having one program carried out across both the Gulf and the  
37 South Atlantic region.

38  
39 It's typically going to be cheaper to run than having a program  
40 that's different from one place to another. Examples might be  
41 that if you implement the program one way here and it's  
42 different in the other place, the methodologies you might need  
43 to groundtruth those data could differ, which results in  
44 different protocols and different approaches.

45  
46 Another might be the math behind how you make adjustments for  
47 reporting error and things like that and so, again, I am  
48 certainly emphatic to the fact that it is easier to go separate

1 routes on this, but I just want to raise to your attention that  
2 there could be some loss of economies of scale in terms of the  
3 finances and some statistical implications as well. Thank you.

4  
5 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you, Dr. Ponwith. Dr. Stunz.

6  
7 **DR. GREG STUNZ:** Yes and Bonnie's points are loud and clear and  
8 I happen to agree 100 percent, but, in looking through some of  
9 the documents and what they proposed and what we discussed last  
10 time, it seems like there were some major points of discussion  
11 that we just couldn't agree upon.

12  
13 For example, whether it was reporting before you reach the dock  
14 and there were certain other things like that that just didn't  
15 seem like -- Each council or each group want very different  
16 things and so it didn't seem like we were going to be able to  
17 come together on that, even though it would obviously make sense  
18 to have one broad thing and it would be a lot better from a  
19 scientific perspective. I don't know if we're ready to  
20 compromise. It doesn't sound the South Atlantic is and so it  
21 doesn't seem like there's much we can do here.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Thank you. Any other discussion?  
24 Okay, seeing none, I guess we'll take that into consideration.  
25 Dr. Froeschke.

26  
27 **DR. FROESCHKE:** So am I to infer that you're going to propose a  
28 motion to separate and give us some guidance on how you would  
29 like us to proceed?

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Dr. Crabtree.

32  
33 **DR. ROY CRABTREE:** I mean I've been, of course, on both of the  
34 councils and it's pretty apparent to me that where the South  
35 Atlantic is going is weekly reporting and it's not -- Where  
36 we're going is trip-based reporting and so, given that we're  
37 going to have different approaches to this and that's because we  
38 have different needs. Ours is being geared towards red snapper  
39 tracking and things and weekly reporting is not going to work  
40 very well for that.

41  
42 **Given that we're heading down different directions, there**  
43 **doesn't seem to be, to me, much gain by keeping this together**  
44 **and so I will make the motion that we agree with the South**  
45 **Atlantic and separate the amendment in two.**

46  
47 **DR. STUNZ:** I will second that.

1 **DR. CRABTREE:** Two separate amendments.

2  
3 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. We have a motion on the floor and it's  
4 seconded by Greg. Any further discussion? **Seeing none, any**  
5 **opposition to the motion as written? Seeing no opposition, the**  
6 **motion carries.** Dr. Froeschke.

7  
8 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Thanks. What I would like to do next is after  
9 the last meeting, and we talked at the IPT level and various  
10 things, and the difficulty we face is that we don't have enough  
11 information about the proposed structure of the program, the  
12 anticipated costs and who will be administering the program and  
13 things, to complete the analysis to compare the alternatives and  
14 those sorts of things.

15  
16 We developed a letter and we provided it to Dr. Ponwith and we  
17 tried to provide some specific requests for more information  
18 about what their vision and their needs are and perhaps this  
19 could facilitate discussions and provide some more information  
20 and so this letter -- I think a copy was provided to each of you  
21 today. It was sent on September 20.

22  
23 I will just summarize of the ideas and then I will ask Dr.  
24 Ponwith if she could perhaps provide some guidance to us, but  
25 relating to specific hardware or software, we have in the  
26 motions that NMFS approve software or hardware. In other  
27 sectors, for example the commercial, we do have an approval  
28 process and there is approved software. I am unsure if those  
29 are the same things or we would anticipate different vendors or  
30 software specifications or anything and so it would be nice to  
31 have some discussion about that.

32  
33 The costs of the program, if you recall in the technical  
34 subcommittee that led to some of this discussion last year,  
35 there was a section in there and it was provided to you all at  
36 the January 2015 council meeting. Just to summarize, the costs,  
37 sort of the recurring costs, depending on if you went with the  
38 VMS route or the non-VMS, it ranges between \$5 million to \$7  
39 million a year in recurring costs.

40  
41 In the table in the back, it's on page 124 of the document here,  
42 Tab F, Number 4(a), if you want to look at that table, but we  
43 haven't really had much discussion about those costs and if  
44 that's something that is feasible in the current constraints and  
45 if there are recurring costs or startup costs or something and  
46 industry share. Those are the kinds of things that I think are  
47 necessary for us to complete some of the economic analyses.

1 A couple more bullets and really regarding who would be  
2 administering the program. Is there a transition plan or a  
3 calibration plan necessary that we've talked about for other  
4 things and is the idea that this will be a complete census, as  
5 was recommended by the technical subcommittee and that we've  
6 discussed? At this point, I guess I will ask Dr. Ponwith if she  
7 can provide us some answers from her view.

8  
9 **DR. PONWITH:** Thank you. These are all very good questions and  
10 I can certainly recognize that answers to those would make the  
11 development of this or the economic analysis of this easier. In  
12 some of them, it's a chicken-and-egg scenario. As the amendment  
13 evolves, answers to how the management is going to be carried  
14 out influences answers on what the costs would be associated  
15 with the science or the data collection.

16  
17 I see the answer to several of these being iterative and so  
18 really, for this type of a shift, from a sampling program that  
19 we have in place now to a census-based, self-reported data  
20 collection that's ground-truthed with dockside sampling, that  
21 shift really requires almost like a program management approach  
22 to be able to pull it off.

23  
24 The piece that the council is responsible for and has made some  
25 laudable progress on is the regulatory piece and that is to cut  
26 the regulations that guide the requirements for submitting these  
27 data.

28  
29 The second piece is the technical piece and that is  
30 mathematically how you take the data that you would create with  
31 this type of reporting and convert it into management advice  
32 with respect to that ACL.

33  
34 There are many, many components to this technical piece. It  
35 includes what hardware you use and what software you use and the  
36 algorithms behind making corrections to self-reported data if  
37 the intercepts show that the data we're seeing on the docks are  
38 different than what's being reported electronically.

39  
40 There are going to have to be correction factors and the math  
41 behind those correction factors has to be devised and then the  
42 next piece is the calibration piece. You know we've got a time  
43 series of landings and we want to be able to calibrate that time  
44 series of landings against the data in the way it comes to us  
45 using this new technique, to be able to reconcile the historic  
46 time series with the new. So that calibration is pretty much a  
47 requirement, particularly because, in many cases, the time  
48 series is an important input for stock assessment.

1  
2 Then, of course, the last piece is the financial piece and that  
3 is how do we work in the collective to determine what the costs  
4 of shifting from one model to the other model is and then how do  
5 we, in the long term, keep that data stream going once it goes  
6 operational.

7  
8 Again, the regulatory piece, the technical piece, the  
9 calibration piece, and the financial piece. If we don't  
10 orchestrate the timing of the development of each of those  
11 components, we don't have a program. Basically, if you create  
12 this amendment and it gets passed and none of the work has been  
13 done on any of the other components, you don't have a program.  
14 You have a regulation with nothing underneath it.

15  
16 Going to the questions that you've asked, these, I think, are  
17 the right questions. I think getting answers to these questions  
18 will be iterative and may take some time going back and forth to  
19 be able to get at.

20  
21 Right now, the last bullet is, is it the intent of the science  
22 program that this is a complete census? A lot of the technical  
23 questions of how this runs is going to require close, close  
24 collaboration with MRIP, because, as you know, the current  
25 method for collecting these data is through MRIP.

26  
27 From a science perspective, I can only use science, either  
28 estimates or census data, coming out of the new method that is  
29 at least of the same quality as MRIP or superior. To get at  
30 that, we're going to have to have MRIP as key players and so  
31 whether the -- Whatever the role is of the Science Center, it's  
32 going to have to be in extremely close collaboration with MRIP.

33  
34 Right now, MRIP is funded to do this data collection and I am  
35 not. I don't collect the charter-for-hire data. They have a  
36 funded program and it's a matter of how do we resource creating  
37 a new program while that program continues, to be able to see  
38 how the two of them perform against one another to compare those  
39 numbers. I think that's another imperative, getting at that  
40 calibration piece.

41  
42 You ask if the program will be administered through the headboat  
43 survey. The headboat survey right now is sized for the headboat  
44 fleet and so the way the headboat program is staff and sized,  
45 it's not capable of taking on a brand new program. It's  
46 possible with augmentation that that could be done, but, there  
47 again, it gets back to the question of do you have the  
48 collectors of the data now as it stands and continue to collect

1 those data or do you find additional resources to be able to  
2 incorporate that into the headboat program and I don't know the  
3 answer to that, but it's something that we have to explore  
4 together in the collective to get at.

5  
6 Costs to the industry is another question and if indeed you are  
7 talking about some geospatial-referenced, at-sea reporting, that  
8 is the more expensive approach, but it certainly creates checks  
9 and balances and creates, in my mind, a superior product at the  
10 end and more readily usable in real time, or in near real time,  
11 under those circumstances.

12  
13 I believe that the South Atlantic asked a similar question of  
14 Dr. Crabtree's shop and of my shop and the answer that came back  
15 is, right now, the resources available for being able to fund  
16 hardware for anything other than VMS is limited, out of the VMS  
17 pot.

18  
19 Now, I think there is talk about the notion of using VMS to  
20 georeference those reports, but it's a nuanced question of  
21 whether that qualifies as VMS for the use of that pool and  
22 that's something that we would have to look into.

23  
24 I think the short answer to that question is it's realistic to  
25 expect that there would be offset of a large portion of the  
26 costs for the hardware and the data transmission requirements  
27 from the fleet, but, again, I think we need to look into this a  
28 little more deeply from the standpoint of the VMS, which is  
29 different in the Gulf than it is in the South Atlantic, and get  
30 a more definitive answer.

31  
32 We are consulting with Headquarters on the questions that are  
33 posed. I think you're asking the exact right questions to be  
34 able to round out the amendment. We don't have the answers for  
35 you yet, but we will be back to you with a letter when we do.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you, Bonnie. I have a question and I  
38 will get you in a second, but, Bonnie, is there not other  
39 regions within your agency that have done similar work? I have  
40 read about Alaska and Alaska fishery managers celebrate  
41 milestone for interagency e-landings systems and isn't their  
42 information already out there that could potentially be used  
43 that wouldn't have to be so invented as we go?

44  
45 Is there other technologies that are being used in other regions  
46 that we could piggyback on and potentially use? I know there's  
47 some talk in the Northeast region as well.

48



1 **DR. PONWITH:** The answer to that is absolutely. We have made  
2 great strides in electronic reporting and one example is right  
3 here in our very own region and that is electronic reporting for  
4 the commercial dealers. In my mind, that has been a very  
5 successful program and has yielded some extremely high benefits  
6 in terms of our knowledge of the current state of landings  
7 relative to ACLs.

8  
9 We can certainly take what we've learned from that process and  
10 we can take what we've learned from transitioning to electronic  
11 reporting for the headboats and absolutely go out to other  
12 regions to glean information from them and make the transition  
13 to this lighter work, but the work still has to be done.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you. Dr. Stunz.

16  
17 **DR. STUNZ:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and this is really a question  
18 for Dr. Froeschke, maybe, or maybe you, Mr. Chair. The last  
19 meeting, we passed a motion to form this technical committee to  
20 sort of move the ball down the road a little bit in terms of  
21 developing a reference document or just sort of address some of  
22 the issues and main concerns.

23  
24 I know, Bonnie, you were gone the last meeting, but it was  
25 somewhat of a loose document, but at least start talking about  
26 what are some of the main issues. A lot of it is specified here  
27 in this letter, but there was also a lot of moving parts, John,  
28 because the South Atlantic was tied to it at that point and now,  
29 after this last motion, maybe not. Where are we with that or do  
30 we need to -- Do we need another motion like that or are you  
31 good with what you've got to proceed or what do we need to do to  
32 sort of keep it on the burner?

33  
34 **DR. FROESCHKE:** The discussions that we had is that, in order to  
35 bring back additional information, they needed some information  
36 on -- We provided, the technical subcommittee, and I say "we"  
37 because I was on it, but, in that capacity, they provided the  
38 information before and they never really got feedback. They  
39 recommended a census and certain other aspects and we haven't  
40 really gotten information of okay, we want to proceed and now  
41 there's additional questions or these additional questions --  
42 It's hard for them to comment, because I don't feel like we have  
43 -- There's not enough pieces in place to really answer these  
44 questions and so, from the IPT, we're kind of stuck.

45  
46 I understand it's a chicken-and-egg and, in the past, what we've  
47 done with dealer reporting and the headboat, the last time we  
48 modified this, is the science part was in place and we were

1 following with regulations.  
2

3 What I am fearing now is that if we were to just develop these  
4 regulations that, one, you can't really -- You can't analyze the  
5 alternatives, because you don't know how the data will be used  
6 and so it's hard to say if one way will be better than another,  
7 but the bigger fear is developing a program with regulations  
8 that doesn't meet the needs of the science and so we're trying  
9 to facilitate this dialogue and I think, for various reasons,  
10 we're stuck at the moment. Anything that you all can think of  
11 to help us move forward, we would be appreciative of.  
12

13 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Anybody else? I do know that there is  
14 -- Is there somebody else that wants to speak? Go ahead.  
15

16 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG GREGORY:** If I may, to follow up what  
17 John was saying, is we just can't go any further with this  
18 document and so it seems like we need to just put it on the  
19 shelf until the funding becomes available or something and we  
20 can get leadership on the Center on where we're going with this  
21 and I agree that it doesn't make sense for two or three regions  
22 within one Center to do different competing data collection  
23 systems.  
24

25 When we get going down that road, then we can back it up with  
26 regulations. I mean we want this really badly, but we're just  
27 stymied right now, as John said. We can't move forward and we  
28 certainly can't go to the public without some of these answers,  
29 because we have nothing specific to tell the public what we're  
30 going to implement.  
31

32 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Anyone else? Well, I have a comment,  
33 or maybe a question. Bonnie, there is a lot of desire in the  
34 Gulf for this type of program and there has also been a fair  
35 amount of money that has been put forth for this program to move  
36 on and there are currently VMS units being installed on charter  
37 boats now and how is that going to play out moving forward?  
38

39 **DR. PONWITH:** If the council cuts a regulation that requires  
40 VMS, then there is a portion of the vessels who would already be  
41 outfitted and those costs would be offset and so there is --  
42 That puts you partway down the road in terms of managing the  
43 costs.  
44

45 Right now, the program that's underway is a voluntary program  
46 and, if I understand the council's intent, the intent is for it  
47 to be a mandatory program going forward. From a science  
48 perspective exclusively, that would be my recommendation, that

1 if you're going to make it -- The whole goal here is you've got  
2 a program that exists that generates estimates for you.

3  
4 If you supplant that with something, you have to supplant it  
5 with something that's better and so if you create a census  
6 program and that census is mandatory and there are some teeth in  
7 it and you have good dockside validation, you could end up with  
8 a product that is superior from the current product, mostly  
9 because you would have it faster and it would enable you to be  
10 more limber in your decision making.

11  
12 The current program, again, gets you partway down the road in  
13 terms of the percentage of vessels who would have to participate  
14 once this went mandatory and that would already have VMS  
15 onboard.

16  
17 There would still be additional costs that you would have to  
18 find solutions for and that would be sort of the technical  
19 aspects, developing the mathematical systems to handle the data  
20 on an operational scale from that point going forward and  
21 generating the algorithms and all of that.

22  
23 That work would have to be done and I think we could create some  
24 categories of what type of startup costs there might be in the  
25 amendment, the way it looks right now, and, in collaboration,  
26 look at what the long-range operational costs on the agency side  
27 and on the industry side could look like. That's something we  
28 can do, but it would take collaboration to do that.

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** So, just to be clear, there was a bunch of  
31 money that was set aside to put units on these boats and was  
32 there monies also set aside to help you come up with the  
33 information and develop the programs and protocols to accept the  
34 information?

35  
36 **DR. PONWITH:** The study right now includes, for this voluntary  
37 program, includes absorbing that information. How close that is  
38 being carried out to the system that would be in place or be  
39 required to be in place to handle the data with the expectations  
40 that your amendment has, I don't know and I would have to take a  
41 look at comparing those protocols against what the current  
42 amendment, in its current shape, are to really be able to do an  
43 analysis to see how close those are.

44  
45 At the very least though, everything we learn from this is going  
46 to be valuable and, secondarily, we've got a pilot that's  
47 happening for the charter-for-hire fleet in South Carolina.

48

1 Again, they're creating algorithms to be able to ingest those  
2 data electronically and do whatever correction factors have to  
3 have happen based on differences between patterns they're seeing  
4 in self-reported versus patterns they're seeing in the dockside.  
5 Everything we learn from that can be put into practice for how  
6 you would carry this out at the operational scale.

7  
8 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Any further discussion? Dr. Froeschke.

9  
10 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I guess, circling back to the three tiers, the  
11 council regulatory bit and the technical bit and the financial,  
12 it would seem to me that, as incomplete as the document might  
13 be, we're far ahead on that regard in comparison to the other  
14 two and so if we do nothing else, will those other two parts  
15 catch up on their own or is there some action that we should be  
16 taking to facilitate those additional pieces?

17  
18 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Mr. Gregory.

19  
20 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR GREGORY:** John, were you asking that of Dr.  
21 Ponwith specifically or was that just a generic question?

22  
23 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I guess, but at this point, I am just pleading  
24 for help from anyone that can help. I am just not sure what to  
25 do. I mean if we do nothing on the document, will the rest of  
26 it fall into place on its own and at such time as we have the  
27 other aspects, we can finish the document and do it or is there  
28 some other way that's better?

29  
30 **DR. PONWITH:** Well, one of the things that got us to this point  
31 was the creation of that technical advisory group that put  
32 together the white paper on if you're going to do it, here are  
33 some things that you should be taking into consideration.

34  
35 One thing that's making this challenging is you're right that  
36 the regulation is preceding the technical aspects and that does  
37 make it more challenging.

38  
39 One thing that could happen is to pull together a very small  
40 technical group from the Center, from MRIP, from the region, and  
41 from the council to make sure that we're synchronized on the  
42 regulatory side and on the technical side and that there's some  
43 interchange back and forth, so that if you get a jam where you  
44 can't do an analysis that you need to do, because you need an  
45 answer, you can be in communication with the technical group so  
46 that they can tell you, well, we need to know how you want this  
47 done or what end product you want to be able to tell you  
48 technically how it would be done.

1  
2 Basically, it takes that iterative process and makes it more  
3 flexible and more limber in getting that information back and  
4 forth to be able to narrow down on both how you do it, from a  
5 technical standpoint and from a regulatory standpoint.

6  
7 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Dr. Crabtree.

8  
9 **DR. CRABTREE:** I think if you set this aside and stop working on  
10 it, I am not convinced we will get there. If you wait until  
11 there is money put in a budget somewhere to pay for all of this  
12 -- I mean we work on continuing resolutions and things and you  
13 need -- We've got a lot of problems with red snapper and if you  
14 see solutions to put them in place, you need to put your plan  
15 amendment together to put those solutions in place and then if  
16 it turns out there is no money and we can't do it, then okay,  
17 but I mean I wouldn't sit around waiting on that, because the  
18 chances that Congress is going to appropriate a big slug of  
19 money for this until you can tell them here is what we want to  
20 do, I don't think it's going to happen,

21  
22 If this is what you guys want, you need to figure out, in as  
23 much detail what you want out of this and what you're going to  
24 use it for, and keep plowing ahead on this.

25  
26 If there are specific questions about it, then ask them, but I  
27 don't think you need to worry about what specifically the  
28 software is. Someone in the agency will have to figure that  
29 out, but we do need to figure out what we want reported and what  
30 we want to know and what we're going to use it for and we want  
31 it on a trip basis or do you want it to have VMS?

32  
33 I would suggest you operate on the assumption that the industry  
34 is going to have to pay for a lot of this and they're likely to  
35 have to buy whatever hardware there is and they're going to have  
36 to pay, probably, to have it installed and they're going to have  
37 to pay a monthly fee for the services of it.

38  
39 Now, that may not happen, because Congress might appropriate  
40 some funds for it. If this is a VMS unit, then there may be  
41 some money in the VMS pool, but I mean we don't have a budget  
42 right now and I don't know if we're going to have a budget until  
43 after the presidential election and so I think you just need to  
44 figure out what you want to do with it and move forward with it  
45 and if there's no money to pay for it, maybe the agency can't  
46 approve it and we can't implement it, but at least we'll have a  
47 program here that we said we need this to fix red snapper and  
48 the next time folks from the Hill come saying why don't you guys

1 fix red snapper, you can say, well, here's a piece of that fix  
2 and help us get it done. That's my take on it.

3

4 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you. Dr. Lucas.

5

6 **DR. KELLY LUCAS:** Thanks. I am not on your committee, but, to  
7 Roy's point and I guess to this document, but when I read this  
8 document, it doesn't say we're solving a red snapper problem.  
9 Everybody else keeps trying to solve a red snapper problem and  
10 it says that this is all federally-permitted vessels.

11

12 Then we start getting wrapped around how to solve one problem  
13 and so I mean is the purpose wrong? Is this not a data  
14 collection for everybody? Is it one thing? What problems are  
15 we trying to solve?

16

17 **DR. PONWITH:** I can say, from my understanding of what I've  
18 heard and from the IPT involvement in this, is this is shifting  
19 the federally-permitted charter-for-hire fleet from a sampling  
20 regime for estimating what their effort and what their landings  
21 are to a self-reported census and those data will benefit the  
22 ACL monitoring for all species that they harvest, but, first and  
23 foremost, among those will be red snapper.

24

25 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Dr. Lucas.

26

27 **DR. LUCAS:** Again to that point, though, so it's just federally  
28 and so plenty of the states have their own charter-for-hire  
29 fleet that fish in state waters and catch, but you're only going  
30 to be solving the federal for-hire and you're going to have to  
31 marry whatever programs operate in that state on those charter-  
32 for-hire with whatever programs are operating in the federal  
33 for-hire fleet.

34

35 **DR. PONWITH:** To that very point, I'm glad you asked that  
36 question, because we have already had a discussion about the  
37 fact that the Gulf and the South Atlantic want different -- They  
38 have high-level philosophical differences about how this program  
39 should run and so what they want to do is split. Now, instead  
40 of one program running exactly the same throughout the region,  
41 we have two that have some very significant differences.

42

43 What we're looking at right here is the federally-permitted  
44 fleet in the charter-for-hire, but, if you look at that a little  
45 bit more closely, right now MRIP operates as the tool for  
46 estimating landings for all charter-for-hire vessels and that's  
47 what we use to understand what those landings and what those  
48 effort levels are.

1  
2 If we modify exclusively the federally-permitted charter-for-  
3 hire vessels to operate under this new census approach,  
4 basically what that means is MRIP must persist, because we still  
5 have all those other ones that we need to know what their  
6 landings are, so that, particularly if we have species that are  
7 landed in both state waters and federal waters, but it's a  
8 federally-managed species, we need a system.

9  
10 Instead of having just two systems for the charter-for-hire at  
11 large, we have a system in federal waters in the Gulf and then  
12 MRIP in the coastal margin and so that means we have that in the  
13 Gulf and we have that in the South Atlantic and so there are  
14 four systems that we have for the charter-for-hire fleet.

15  
16 One of the things that I think makes this stronger is to say, if  
17 you're going to do this for the federal waters, is it worth, at  
18 the same time, thinking about doing this for the entire charter-  
19 for-hire fleet? I put that out there strictly from a  
20 statistical standpoint, from a science standpoint. I know  
21 that's difficult, but it certainly would give you more robust  
22 numbers for those species that are caught in both federal and  
23 state waters.

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you. Dr. Stunz, I skipped over you and  
26 I'm sorry.

27  
28 **DR. STUNZ:** To Roy's point a few comments ago, that was the  
29 intent, at least when I made the motion at the last meeting, was  
30 to do exactly what Roy was saying, to continue working on this  
31 by formation of this technical subcommittee.

32  
33 At the time, of course, it was broader, because of the South  
34 Atlantic and things, but, John, maybe we just focus that in on  
35 Gulf issues and form that of the committee where it's most  
36 relevant to the Gulf and Bonnie's group, but at least to  
37 continue working within the construct of that motion and that  
38 technical subcommittee.

39  
40 Now, I don't know what we need to continue doing that or how  
41 much time and effort it involves of your staff and Bonnie's  
42 staff and that's certainly something to consider, but, I think  
43 by either reworking that or just working within that framework,  
44 we can at least continue to develop some ideas and move this  
45 down the road a little further.

46  
47 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** John.

48

1 **DR. FROESCHKE:** At the last one, I think the biggest challenge  
2 to bring to this group was that we had two completely different  
3 programs in two different regions in the same document. That  
4 seems to be resolved, for our purposes.

5  
6 Based on the comments and things, you know working  
7 collaboratively with the Center and the Region, and, as you are  
8 aware, that's basically the composition of the technical  
9 subcommittee and so perhaps what should be done is -- Through  
10 this discussion, we have those questions that we have posed and  
11 we need to take the document and fill out those lists of  
12 questions and get this group in a room and we'll just work  
13 through the document and come out with guidance on how to make  
14 this happen and develop, hopefully, a path forward or things  
15 that we need in order to complete the analysis to submit the  
16 document.

17  
18 That's what I'm afraid of, is we want to have this document  
19 ready to go such that when an opportunity presents that perhaps  
20 we could move it forward, but we can't complete the analysis of  
21 the document until we have this stuff. I mean I don't see how  
22 it could get approved and so maybe that's the path forward for  
23 now.

24  
25 **DR. STUNZ:** That seems reasonable to me.

26  
27 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Anybody else want to weigh in? Dr.  
28 Simmons.

29  
30 **DR. CARRIE SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a suggestion  
31 or a question to Dr. Froeschke and Rich Malinowski. They've  
32 been working on this document and would it be appropriate to  
33 remove the headboat portion and move that forward? Is that  
34 possible to change that more rapidly under the current regime we  
35 have to a trip-level reporting requirement under the current  
36 regulations we have and then the technical subcommittee could  
37 focus on the charter vessels, federally-permitted charter  
38 vessels?

39  
40 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Perhaps and we had talked about that at an  
41 earlier council. One difference on the headboats is they are  
42 reporting electronically now and that would simplify it. They  
43 are not set up for trip level at this point and they have the  
44 ability to go back and report on the web at a later time. I  
45 think that would be more of a bigger step.

46  
47 One small incremental step, if we wanted to do that, is one  
48 thing that's been noted is this delay between the -- The seven-



1 day delay between the weekend reporting and the report  
2 submission is too long and the seafood dealer -- The week ends  
3 on a Sunday and the report is due on a Tuesday and we did talk  
4 about doing something like that. That would be a modest step  
5 for the headboats only and I don't know if that's worth doing at  
6 this point or not.

7  
8 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Anybody got any desire to weigh in on  
9 those items? I am kind of at a loss here. I am trying to  
10 figure out which way to lead us ahead. I guess the thing I keep  
11 coming back to is that there's a lot of money that went through  
12 Congress, millions of dollars, to make units available and for  
13 the units just to be put on a boat and there's not to be  
14 anything that comes back out of that, I think it would certainly  
15 not go over very well.

16  
17 I think that the work will happen as we move forward, as we go  
18 along. I think we will uncover these items as we move forward  
19 and I think that's the way I understand this, but I think we're  
20 going to have to move ahead regardless.

21  
22 I don't know if it would be prudent at this time to separate out  
23 the headboats from the for-hire or not. Bonnie, do you have an  
24 opinion either way that you could share with us on that  
25 particular item?

26  
27 **DR. PONWITH:** Let me just say again that my -- When I speak,  
28 it's exclusively from a science standpoint, because I don't want  
29 to meddle in the management issues, but from a science  
30 standpoint, if you were going to do something for the headboat  
31 survey that made that a superior survey and it was demonstrable  
32 that this is better or more reliable or more precise or more  
33 timely, then doing that change is compelling.

34  
35 If the notion were to, by incorporating headboats into this, go  
36 from a weekly report to a trip-level report, then what that  
37 gains you is knowing before they -- I will tell you from a  
38 science standpoint that what that gains you is that if they push  
39 the send button before they hit the dock, before they know  
40 whether they are going to be encountered by a dockside port  
41 sampler or not, it gives us the ability to look at what was  
42 reported into the electronic database and compare it to what was  
43 seen by boots on the dock and then get one-to-one matching on  
44 how close those two numbers were to one another and then use  
45 that as the reporting error correction factor to give you what  
46 your final landings were.

47  
48 When vessels go out and report at the end of the week and

1 vessels are encountered by dockside samplers while they are  
2 returning, you basically are comparing an average. This is what  
3 the average person coming back said they caught compared to what  
4 the average person coming back actually landed and comparing  
5 those averages and it can be done, but it's just not as tight of  
6 a validation methodology and you would have to construct your  
7 confidence intervals on those estimates accordingly.

8  
9 Those are the differences. Again, if you have a strong desire  
10 to have the headboat survey benefit from that level of  
11 precision, that's what you would gain by incorporating it into  
12 this.

13  
14 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Does anybody else care to speak? Okay. Just  
15 as a follow-up to that, we just went through two years of the  
16 Headboat Collaborative Program and I believe there were issues  
17 where the fish were not as big as what they were initially  
18 forecasted to be and it worked out to where those fishermen were  
19 allowed more days to fish, working on an average.

20  
21 Those type of things have already been dealt with, to a degree,  
22 and so I think there's a big advantage here, because when you  
23 can get down to where you're saying, hey, these fish don't weigh  
24 nine pounds and they're only 4.5 pounds, obviously that's twice  
25 as many opportunities.

26  
27 There is a lot of advantages to doing this and moving forward  
28 and I don't think there's a lot of opposition to stop that from  
29 happening, but you know it just -- A comment that we're probably  
30 going to hear tomorrow is everybody here in the for-hire  
31 industry that will probably get up and speak is probably going  
32 to be in favor of it. I know they're willing to pay the monthly  
33 cost and do whatever they have to do.

34  
35 I think that we need to continue it forward. John, I am trying  
36 to help you with as much information as I can and I don't know  
37 if I am walking you in circles in the fog here or if I'm leading  
38 you in any particular direction, but if any other committee  
39 members or any other members at the table wish to weigh in. Go  
40 ahead, David.

41  
42 **MR. DAVID WALKER:** I would just like to -- I am sitting here  
43 taking a few notes and listening and we've got an opportunity to  
44 get superior data. I heard that twice and we need to explore  
45 science together and work collectively to create the checks and  
46 balances for more reliable, more real-time data. I think that's  
47 what everyone wants and I don't see any reason we shouldn't  
48 continue working on this and we have the opportunity here to

1 make things better.

2

3 You've heard Johnny say that and they found out that the  
4 headboat pilot program fish were smaller and I mean there's just  
5 so many things and here's an opportunity for this council and  
6 everyone to work together and go in the right direction and this  
7 better data is what I hear everyone always asking for and so  
8 let's get together. Doug can talk with the council staff and he  
9 can work with Bonnie and we can all work together and we can  
10 figure out a way to get this amendment rolling.

11

12 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Mr. Williams.

13

14 **MR. ROY WILLIAMS:** I was going to say I see some advantage in  
15 picking up Carrie's suggestion and trying to perhaps implement  
16 the headboat reporting a little faster than the rest of it, in  
17 the sense that we would be proceeding with a smaller and then  
18 going to a bigger universe and trying to work out the problems  
19 with this smaller group and then implement it with all the  
20 charter boats.

21

22 On the other hand, I suspect we would get a lot of feedback from  
23 the charter fishery asking us not to do that and that they find  
24 it compelling to get their reporting implemented as fast as  
25 possible and so I guess, Chairman Greene, I would ask you if you  
26 have a feeling on that, because I like the idea of what she's  
27 talking about.

28

29 It's always easier to start with a smaller set and then expand  
30 to the bigger one, but I just fear that the charter fishery is  
31 going to say no, by golly, we want reporting and that's what  
32 I've been hearing, is that we want reporting yesterday and we  
33 want to be accountable. Do you have any feeling in that regard  
34 as to how we ought to proceed?

35

36 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Well, I think you're right. I mean that's all  
37 I've heard for months and months and years and years and meeting  
38 after meeting after meeting, is that particular topic.  
39 Obviously there is enough support for Congress to put millions  
40 of dollars' worth of VMS units in the Gulf to do something with  
41 it and so obviously there is some industry buy-in and there's  
42 also some political buy-in associated with it and so I think it  
43 would be -- This is just me personally and not as Chairman or  
44 anything else, but as a fisherman and I would like to see them  
45 stuck together at this point and continue to move on and if we  
46 see, six months from now, that there's a big reason to divide or  
47 something, then we could so at that time, but I think that the  
48 industry as a whole probably would like to stick together, but

1 we will certainly get a lot of public testimony on this and we  
2 can certainly talk to some other fishermen and get their ideas  
3 as well. Leann.

4  
5 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** Thanks. I am not on your committee, but it  
6 sounds like there's some questions that John has that this  
7 working group or technical subcommittee, whatever it was, has  
8 some questions that they need answered in order for this  
9 document to move forward.

10  
11 We seem to be ahead of schedule and I mean this committee isn't  
12 scheduled to adjourn until 4:30 and can we go through the list  
13 of questions and give you some feedback, while we have the  
14 council and the Center and NMFS sitting here?

15  
16 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Please do. That was one of the things that I  
17 sort of thought maybe we could brainstorm, is if we want to  
18 convene the technical subcommittee. Last time, we agreed to do  
19 that, but we didn't really develop a charge and so perhaps we  
20 could develop these lists now.

21  
22 I mean my vision is that we would sort of set this financial bit  
23 aside for now and that's the guidance I am understanding and  
24 proceed as if the best-case scenario and do it and develop a  
25 list of things that we need to do to complete the analyses of  
26 the document.

27  
28 **MS. BOSARGE:** Well, I am not on your committee, but I would love  
29 to hear the discussion.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Dr. Crabtree.

32  
33 **DR. CRABTREE:** I think, John, if there are questions, give us  
34 specific questions and we will do the best we can to come up  
35 with answers and guidance.

36  
37 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Okay. Question one is who is in charge, I  
38 guess? Is MRIP going to administer this program? That's the  
39 guidance I am understanding and the headboats right now are  
40 through the headboat survey and if we go to a single program, it  
41 didn't sound like the headboat is capable of absorbing them in  
42 and so would they all shift to MRIP?

43  
44 **DR. PONWITH:** That is definitely a question that needs to be  
45 resolved. To get to that answer, the Center will absolutely  
46 have to work side-by-side with MRIP on the charter side, because  
47 right now MRIP owns those protocols and MRIP has the resources  
48 to monitor the charter fleet and how we would transition from

1 that scenario to the self-reporting census is something that has  
2 to be discussed.

3  
4 The Center would have to discuss that with MRIP, but it would  
5 have to be in heavy consultation with the council, to make sure,  
6 again, whatever technical changes were contemplated to get to an  
7 answer to that question aligned with what your expectations were  
8 from a management standpoint.

9  
10 I don't have an answer to that. It is something that would have  
11 to be discussed and having input from the council to help in  
12 that discussion would be beneficial, in the form of like a  
13 technical representative.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you. Mr. Swindell, did you have a  
16 comment?

17  
18 **MR. ED SWINDELL:** I am not on the committee either, but in  
19 listening to all this, there are many systems that are available  
20 to go aboard vessels and to go on ships and on trucks and the  
21 European Union has an electronic logbook system, to where  
22 vessels have to report to them on a regular basis on the fish  
23 they catch and where they land it and what they do with it and  
24 put it on another boat or whatever.

25  
26 I mean all those systems are available, but it's just what  
27 Bonnie has to do with it once you get the information and what  
28 information we're going to have to gather. As far as electronic  
29 systems, tugboats up and down the river all have electronic  
30 reporting systems that monitor their vessel operations that they  
31 report on constantly and I mean the systems are available for  
32 you to do this, but it's just a matter of -- To me, Bonnie, if  
33 I'm correct, it's getting the group together and just what  
34 information do you really want to get and what are you going to  
35 do with it when you get it and how are you going to collect it.

36  
37 **DR. PONWITH:** That's a pretty accurate assessment. You know  
38 we've had this conversation over and over again of hey, I have  
39 this app on my phone and I push the button and you know how many  
40 fish that I caught.

41  
42 In a way, that's the easiest piece. That's the easiest piece.  
43 You push the button and the answer is forty-two. It's the fact  
44 that you're shifting mathematically from one kind of a data  
45 collection and the math infrastructure it takes to catch those  
46 data and convert them to a product and the math is different for  
47 a sampling program from a census program.

48

1 It's just a matter of getting the infrastructure up to be able  
2 to accept that different kind of data and turn that into a  
3 reliable product in the kind of timeliness constraints that  
4 you're looking for. That's the piece that has to happen and  
5 that's part of that technical piece, the software piece.

6  
7 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you. Go ahead and was it to that point?

8  
9 **DR. FROESCHKE:** No, but if you want to continue down this, I  
10 have more questions. I don't know if that's the way you want to  
11 go or not.

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** We're going to get to them.

14  
15 **DR. LUCAS:** Mine was to the point of Bonnie and to John. So the  
16 question is -- I mean we've constantly asked the Science Center  
17 about your resources and your ability to accept and process the  
18 data and how quickly you can do it. From what I heard you say,  
19 we need to ask MRIP -- They are the ones that we need to be  
20 talking to about how quickly they can accept the data and turn  
21 the data around and provide the data to you and so definitely  
22 they're a missing link here.

23  
24 **DR. PONWITH:** You're almost correct. What I would say is that's  
25 a discussion that would be probably best held with MRIP and the  
26 Center in conjunction with one another, to reach sort of a  
27 shared notion of -- You know, currently you do this and  
28 currently I do this and if we merged them and created something  
29 new, who is in charge of this and how would you finance the  
30 transition from the current process to this new process that's  
31 different from both?

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** To that point?

34  
35 **DR. LUCAS:** To that point, currently we receive data from MRIP.  
36 I mean we just finished the second wave and we got it sometime  
37 at the end of August or something like that, but not all the  
38 states in the Gulf are even participating in MRIP and their  
39 timing affects that as well and so how would you -- You're going  
40 to ask MRIP how they're going to deal with the states that  
41 aren't currently utilizing the MRIP system for this collection?

42  
43 **DR. PONWITH:** So that is certainly one of the questions and  
44 that's why we need to make sure that we have strong dialogue  
45 between federal scientists, the council managers, and our state  
46 partners in this.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. One more question and then we'll go

1 back to Dr. Froeschke. Mr. Boyd.

2  
3 **MR. DOUG BOYD:** A question for John. John, you've got a working  
4 group that was put together at the last meeting. I can't  
5 remember exactly what we called it that you established, but is  
6 MRIP a part of that group? If they are, you already have the  
7 charge to call the group together, don't you, that you need to  
8 make that kind of decision, based on what Bonnie just said?

9  
10 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Yes and no. The group that we would have would  
11 be the technical subcommittee. That's the only one and that's  
12 sort of been a long-standing group, well since at least a year-  
13 and-a-half ago. That does include MRIP.

14  
15 Prior to this meeting, in which we decided to go from a joint  
16 document to a split, that was sort of the dominating question,  
17 if you will, is how do you proceed with two different programs?  
18 For better or worse, that seems to be resolved and so now we  
19 have this other list of issues and so I do think that it would  
20 be a more focused discussion for this group to convene and go  
21 through the document with a little bit of understanding and just  
22 remove the financial component for the time being and say, based  
23 on what we're planning to do, what problems do you see and how  
24 could you help us get the information we need to complete the  
25 analysis, such that we could complete the document and submit  
26 it, such that when or if funds are available the science is done  
27 and we could implement the program. That's my understanding.

28  
29 **MR. BOYD:** If you're going to call that group together and  
30 you're going to have this discussion between MRIP and the  
31 Science Center, do you need a motion from this committee in  
32 order to do that or do you feel that you can just go ahead and  
33 do it under your current charge?

34  
35 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I feel like we've -- It seems to me we have the  
36 motion that was made at the last council meeting and what we  
37 didn't have earlier was this charge and that's something that it  
38 seems like we're kind of working out and maybe we could sort of  
39 formalize this in the committee report and come up with a charge  
40 for the meeting, or at least a process about how to do that.

41  
42 That was the problem that we had, is reaching out to some of the  
43 members. There wasn't enough dialogue, based on what we had  
44 already done, to move forward and it seems like we have  
45 something now, or at least assuming X, Y, and Z, how can we  
46 proceed? We didn't really have that before.

47  
48 **MR. BOYD:** Okay. Thank you.

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay, John, what other questions would you  
3 like answered?  
4

5 **DR. FROESCHKE:** One question is this idea of best science and  
6 things and how are these data going to be used? For example, to  
7 compare, in the alternatives, a weekly submission rate versus a  
8 trip level, on one hand, the validation part benefits a trip  
9 level as well document and we've discussed that a lot.

10  
11 If the data are only going to be used on a weekly basis, the  
12 benefits of trip level are only the validation and not the  
13 increased frequency of it, but we haven't really gotten much  
14 feedback on it, but that's how it's been used and so I'm hoping  
15 maybe we can talk about that.  
16

17 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Bonnie.  
18

19 **DR. PONWITH:** That's an interesting question and I've spent a  
20 lot of time thinking about this periodicity question and so I've  
21 already explained what you would gain statistically from having  
22 trip-level submission.  
23

24 You go out fishing and you push the send button before you get  
25 to the dock and then you get sampled when you get to the dock.  
26 Are those two data records identical or are they not identical?  
27 If they're different, the difference creates a correction factor  
28 for a reporting error and that reporting error is applied to all  
29 of the self-reported data and that gives you a corrected  
30 landings.  
31

32 What I can envision, I think one of the most pressing desires  
33 for daily reporting, is for ACL monitoring, because right now  
34 one of the things we all struggle with is the fact that the MRIP  
35 as a sampling program generates an estimate forty-five days  
36 after the end of a two-month wave, which for a very short  
37 fishing season could be well after the season needs to close and  
38 so you have to close it based on projections and what you think  
39 is going to happen, as opposed to using real-time data.  
40

41 The question is you wouldn't be able to use dockside-validated  
42 data for real-time, because it takes time to collect those data  
43 and get those data into a system, but what you could do is  
44 incentivize extremely accurate reporting by if the dockside  
45 validation that you do at the end of the year or at the end of  
46 some period of time matches very, very close to the self-  
47 reported data, the benefit that you gain is a level of comfort  
48 with using those self-reported data for actually closing down



1 the fishery, monitoring the progress toward an ACL and closing  
2 down that fishery, based on real-time, in-season data.

3  
4 If you see that people's ability to accurately report is  
5 hampered by the fact that that could end up closing the fishery  
6 and you see the landings numbers that are self-reported quite a  
7 bit lower than the dockside, then you run into a situation where  
8 you could essentially overshoot your ACLs and, in that  
9 situation, that's when accountability measures kick in the  
10 following year.

11  
12 Nobody wants accountability measures to kick in the following  
13 year and so, in a sense, that really incentivizes having those  
14 two types of observations, the self-reported and the actual  
15 dockside sampling, to be as close to identical as possible.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. I had skipped over Mr. Fischer. I'm  
18 sorry. I apologize, Mr. Fischer.

19  
20 **MR. MYRON FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mine was a minute  
21 ago question, but it was to ask John if he could supply us with  
22 the makeup of the technical subcommittee. If we're going to  
23 split away from the South Atlantic on this, I would like to  
24 possibly review who is on this committee at some future time. I  
25 would like to see who is on it and make certain it's people who  
26 have our concerns in mind.

27  
28 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Mr. Diaz.

29  
30 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** This is kind of to Dr. Ponwith's discussion a  
31 minute ago and this is to help me get this straightened out in  
32 my mind, Dr. Ponwith. You talked about correction factors and  
33 what I am going to call the Cadillac program and that's where  
34 people report before they get to the dock and so we've got that  
35 really good validation step right there.

36  
37 Then the next level down program I am going to call like the  
38 Pontiac program and that's where people go out today, but  
39 they've got to report by noon tomorrow. I mean could we  
40 actually come up with some correction factors that would be  
41 acceptable with that type of program and still get to the same  
42 endpoint that you got to, where we could use that for in-season  
43 monitoring? Kind of tell me what you think the pros and cons  
44 are and how much you think we would be giving up if we went to  
45 the second-tier program. Thank you.

46  
47 **DR. PONWITH:** Dockside sampling, just for locking this notion  
48 down, will have to happen, regardless of whether you push the

1 send button while you're still at sea or whether you can come  
2 home and sit at your computer at home and type that information  
3 the same day, the next day, or a week later.

4  
5 You have to dockside validate the self-reported data to  
6 groundtruth those reports with what we're seeing on the docks.  
7 The real difference is that one could reasonably hypothesize  
8 that people might report more accurately if they didn't know  
9 whether they were going to be sampled or not at the dock and so  
10 what we were seeking by the hit the send button at sea, that  
11 real-time reporting, is basically incentivizing the absolutely  
12 most accurate reporting as possible.

13  
14 You asked the question of can we still use in-season -- Can we  
15 benefit from the timeliness of electronic reporting in-season,  
16 even if we don't require them to report while they're still at  
17 sea and the answer is scaled by the accuracy of those reports.

18  
19 If people are reporting accurately, as measured by comparing  
20 those reports against the dockside sampling, regardless of  
21 whether that happens the next day or a month later, if those  
22 reports are accurate, it builds a level of confidence in using  
23 that as a reliable mechanism for using in-season information.

24  
25 If the delta between the self-reported data and what the port  
26 samplers are seeing on the docks are profoundly different and  
27 those differences fluctuate over time and, in other words,  
28 they're different and they're not stable, then it creates some  
29 risk associated with using those data in-season for monitoring  
30 your ACL.

31  
32 Then you would have to take a look at are those risks bigger  
33 than using a projection of when they're going to need to be  
34 closed? If the answer is no, those risks are smaller than a  
35 projection, you could still end up using those data and you  
36 would have to build buffers. That's kind of -- I know it's a  
37 long answer, but it's kind of a decision tree that steps you  
38 through how you would use each type of data, depending upon the  
39 decisions you make.

40  
41 This is actually a very good example of why I can't tell you how  
42 much it would cost or how you would set it up, is because the  
43 direction you go with the management needs, what data do you  
44 want and how do you want to use them, influences how you would  
45 set up the science to do that.

46  
47 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. I've got a couple of people on the  
48 list. Greg, Kelly, and then Kevin.

1  
2 **DR. STUNZ:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just one thing, maybe sort  
3 of a point of clarification, is it seems like we're talking  
4 about we'll have this one self-reported system and then the MRIP  
5 or whatever we're currently using for states and I don't really  
6 see that at all.

7  
8 I mean I would suggest the systems run concurrently the first  
9 few years, just to see where we are, so we don't have this issue  
10 that Bonnie brought up of overrunning the ACLs. We still have  
11 the system going that we've got and it may turn out the self-  
12 reported data is not working so good or it may turn out it's  
13 working really, really well and then we could gradually, I  
14 guess, shift over and so I wanted to make that point.

15  
16 Then also that a system like this would just supplement what  
17 we're already capturing in terms of data, in addition to what  
18 MRIP -- There was a little bit of discussion about at what level  
19 and Dale's Cadillac version, which of course I support, is the  
20 best way, but then there's some saying for many fisheries we  
21 don't necessarily need that level of trip level.

22  
23 Well, if we capture the data at the trip level, it's very easy  
24 just to begin to report that at weekly or monthly intervals for  
25 other species that we don't need that level of resolution and so  
26 I think there's the sort of two points, but, overall, I mean I  
27 think we can run this alongside our current MRIP and it would be  
28 very informative to see how well we're doing with this self-  
29 reported data.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you. Kelly.

32  
33 **DR. LUCAS:** I would also, and, Bonnie, this may be something you  
34 can speak to also, but it's the electronic monitoring system is  
35 not necessarily the only way to get that. Clearly we have seen,  
36 and get ready for this, Myron, your compliment here, but  
37 Louisiana was able to implement their LA Creel. MRIP has  
38 accepted their LA Creel as an accurate program and they are able  
39 to monitor real time during the season to determine whether they  
40 have fished their quota or not.

41  
42 Many states do this on many different levels, but I am pointing  
43 out to Louisiana, because MRIP has already accepted their data  
44 and so they're able to show whether they can keep their season  
45 open or whether they need to close their season and they did  
46 this without electronic monitoring.

47  
48 Now, certainly electronic monitoring is a way to do it, but it

1 may not be the only way and so is it the most cost-effective way  
2 would also be a consideration that we need to consider.

3  
4 **DR. PONWITH:** That's a very good question, because up until this  
5 point, we've been talking about landings. We've been talking  
6 about the catch piece. The piece we haven't really talked that  
7 much about is effort and my understanding is that the electronic  
8 monitoring is our way of ground-truthing effort.

9  
10 You know what vessels are at sea exercising some sort of  
11 activity that is or resembles fishing versus being docked in a  
12 port somewhere and so the generation of landings information,  
13 that effort piece is very, very important.

14  
15 It's particularly important for a sampling regime, because, of  
16 course, the math is you need effort and you need catch per unit  
17 effort and when you multiply those two together, you get total  
18 landings. With the census, again, the math is different, but it  
19 will be important to know whether the fleet is fishing or what  
20 proportion of the fleet is fishing versus not.

21  
22 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Kevin.

23  
24 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm not on your  
25 committee, but just to a point that Dale brought up earlier  
26 about the Cadillac versus the Pontiac and there is some  
27 subtleties there as to how you might want to approach it when  
28 you look at those two programs.

29  
30 One thing to consider, and Bonnie kind of touched upon it, is  
31 the complexities for the validation component, at least on the  
32 catch portion of those two programs. This might be considered a  
33 souped-up Pontiac, but as you have a larger time window that  
34 they can report versus when you validate, and we experienced  
35 this in the Alabama mandatory reporting program, is that you  
36 could get confusion, if you will, among what trip is being  
37 reported and what trip is being validated.

38  
39 It's something in the weeds at this point that the technical  
40 folks will have to deal with, but I just wanted to let you be  
41 aware as you might be thinking of leaning toward one way or the  
42 other for the reporting, is that it is a little bit more complex  
43 as you open up that window from the time that the trip is  
44 actually made and the time that the report occurs.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Roy.

47  
48 **DR. CRABTREE:** Just to Kelly's comments about LA Creel, it is in

1 the process of MRIP certification, but it has not been certified  
2 by the program yet. There have been a whole series of reviews  
3 conducted and comments have been provided to Louisiana and I  
4 think they've all been pretty favorable and I suspect it will be  
5 certified, but it hasn't happened yet.

6  
7 They are running MRIP this year alongside the LA Creel survey,  
8 to see what sorts of differences there are. There will need to  
9 be calibrations and all of those kinds of things at some point,  
10 but that's still an ongoing process.

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Thank you. Mr. Fischer.

13  
14 **MR. FISCHER:** Thank you. That's correct, Roy, and we've had  
15 Steve Turner and others from the Center review it and everything  
16 seems to be favorable, but what I wanted to do is make a  
17 different point. Whatever type of program we build, let's keep  
18 in mind that we need a scalable program.

19  
20 We may find out that this is too intense and we don't want a  
21 program that we have to abandon the entire thing. If it's  
22 weekly reporting is sufficient, then let's build a program that  
23 will accordion in and out, and that's got a little bit of Cajun,  
24 but that's not far across the border right here, and so  
25 something that will accordion in and out and something very  
26 scalable that we can work with on different levels.

27  
28 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** I am going to make a comment and then I'm  
29 going to turn it back to Dr. Froeschke, but, Dr. Crabtree, would  
30 you like to go ahead? One thing I do know about is fishermen  
31 and I can talk about the low-rider Chevrolet pick-up truck  
32 version of this plan.

33  
34 If I think somebody on the water is catching fish and they are  
35 not reporting them, I will drop a dime on you in a hurry. It is  
36 kind of the two kids fighting over ice cream and you just throw  
37 both of them in the trash because they're fighting over  
38 something they got that they probably could have had, but I can  
39 tell you one thing, that if there is 1,250 charter boats in the  
40 Gulf and somebody thinks they are getting something from  
41 somebody else, somebody in enforcement is going to know about it  
42 pretty quick.

43  
44 This is a pretty simple deal. If I know, just like when I fill  
45 out that card in the back of the room to speak and give public  
46 comment, that when I hit send that there is some type of  
47 attachment to the end of it that is going to have a permanent or  
48 something else tied to it, this problem is solved. We're done

1 and we can move on to the next one. With that, Dr. Froeschke.

2  
 3 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I am going to swing for the fences here and the  
 4 question, I guess, or the problem kind of in the letter is how  
 5 would we structure the transition plan? Is this something that  
 6 we would include in the document?

7  
 8 My understanding of this, and please correct me if I'm wrong,  
 9 but under what we have now, if we were to do this, we would  
 10 transition the charter MRIP to I'm calling it the new MRIP,  
 11 whatever that ends up to be, and we would have the Texas program  
 12 would go to the new MRIP and we would have the LA Creel,  
 13 assuming that goes forward to the new MRIP, and we would still  
 14 have the state charter that would exist under the current MRIP.

15  
 16 That would be a lot of different things to coalesce under a  
 17 single umbrella and who needs to take charge of figuring out a  
 18 process? Is that something that we would do in the amendment or  
 19 is that something we would seek guidance from the technical  
 20 subcommittee or is that something we would wait for the Science  
 21 Center?

22  
 23 **DR. PONWITH:** Because so much of those steps are dependent on  
 24 the science, the transition of the science, I would certainly  
 25 like to take those first steps with the technical group and have  
 26 discussions and then take what they learn from their discussions  
 27 of how would you stage this out and then take those results and  
 28 hand it to the IPT and the council that way.

29  
 30 The thing you don't want to do is handcuff you scientifically by  
 31 putting something in the amendment and by basically regulating  
 32 the science. You don't want to regulate the science and you  
 33 want the science to be a tool for helping you regulate the  
 34 fishery and so that's how I would do it if I were king.

35  
 36 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Dr. Crabtree.

37  
 38 **DR. CRABTREE:** I think you need to be more focused on the  
 39 regulatory requirements of this. What are you going to require  
 40 these vessels to do? Now, it could be that you put this  
 41 requirement in place and the data is terrible and it never gets  
 42 certified by MRIP, because of all kinds of reporting problems  
 43 and things.

44  
 45 Maybe we could address those and I don't know, but if you want  
 46 certainty as to whether this is going to work or not, then we  
 47 need to start talking pilot studies to test it all out, but some  
 48 of that is going on with this project funded through NFWF, but

1 my sense of this council has been you didn't want to wait for  
2 that and you wanted to move forward with requiring this.

3  
4 If you want to move quickly and require this now, you're taking  
5 a certain amount of risk, because you don't know for sure how  
6 this program is going to work, but I mean we've made some  
7 decisions in the amendment already and we've got preferreds that  
8 we want trip-level reporting and we want trip-level reporting  
9 for charter boats and for headboats.

10  
11 I am assuming we want to try and sometime use this for tracking  
12 ACLs and all those kinds of things, but I don't know that you  
13 need to get into the transition plans and calibrations and those  
14 kinds of things. It seems to me we have transition plans and  
15 we've done calibrations and so that's out there, but I don't  
16 know that that needs to be in the document.

17  
18 At some point this program will have to go in place and there  
19 will have to be some determinations made about the quality of  
20 the data. If the data is very high quality, then presumably it  
21 will be used, but if we have terrible compliance and we have  
22 reason to think that the numbers aren't matching up with what  
23 we're seeing at the dock and we've got all sorts of problems,  
24 those will have to be fixed before the data is going to be used  
25 and how fixable some of those things are, I don't know, but if  
26 we try right now to get so in the weeds of this, I don't know  
27 that we'll get there.

28  
29 Remember back when we put the IFQ program together for red  
30 snapper and there were all kinds of technical decisions about  
31 what kind of software are we going to use and how is it actually  
32 going to work and who is going to keep the data and we didn't  
33 get into any of that. We just got into the requirements of the  
34 program and what information do we need reported and how often  
35 do we need it and that was it. The details got worked out later  
36 by the folks who are going to use the data and so I don't know,  
37 John, but that's my take on it.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** John and then Kelly.

40  
41 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Okay. Let me take a different approach then.  
42 Sticking to the regulatory requirements, I guess instead of  
43 worrying about the calibration, if the various -- Since there  
44 are these various entities, if one or more of them does not  
45 participate, do we -- Is this something that's going to be  
46 required as part of the regulatory and, if not, where does that  
47 leave us?

48

1 **DR. CRABTREE:** What entities are you referring to?  
2

3 **DR. FROESCHKE:** For example, if Texas decided they didn't want  
4 to participate in this.  
5

6 **DR. CRABTREE:** This is a program requiring federally-permitted  
7 for-hire vessels to report and that's it. Whether Texas does  
8 something with their survey or not doesn't seem relevant to me.  
9 That's our authority and that's what we can do.  
10

11 Now, how big of a problem is that, because you're going to have  
12 state-water vessels and all those kinds of catches? I don't  
13 know, but this is what we have authority to do.  
14

15 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Kelly.  
16

17 **DR. LUCAS:** Roy, to your point, and I guess this is something  
18 that we've all -- It keeps coming up, but nobody says it. What  
19 are you going to use the data for? I mean are you using it for  
20 in-season monitoring, like is being suggested, and what level of  
21 detail do you need for the in-season monitoring? Are people  
22 just using it to get a better accurate catch, because we know  
23 that we're not estimating that correctly? I mean I think if you  
24 answer some of those questions that it helps you develop a  
25 program.  
26

27 **DR. CRABTREE:** Well, I think your intent has been to use it for  
28 in-season monitoring, right? That's what I am gathering from  
29 you. Now, will it work? I don't know until we put it in place,  
30 but that's been pretty clear to me and it's been clear to me  
31 this partly came out of sector separation and the desire to  
32 track a lot of these red snapper quotas when we have a specific  
33 quota for the for-hire vessels. I think that's what we've been  
34 talking about and if I'm wrong, let me know.  
35

36 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Bonnie.  
37

38 **DR. PONWITH:** Just to that point, this is an example of the  
39 chicken and the egg and I don't want to beat that dead horse  
40 more, but the fact is that until the council has absolute  
41 clarity what desired outcome they are shooting for, it makes  
42 answering the questions about how do you get there from here  
43 very, very difficult.  
44

45 I think that that would be the -- If we were going to spend the  
46 rest of the afternoon on one question, that's the question to  
47 ask. Are you trying to come up with a system that you can use  
48 for monitoring your progress toward an ACL within season instead



1 of using pre-season projections about how long the season is  
2 going to last or is it to create catch records on a boat-by-boat  
3 basis? The answer to that question is actually very important  
4 in determining the design and even what data fields we record in  
5 the process.

6

7 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Kelly.

8

9 **DR. LUCAS:** To that point, it wouldn't just be the in-season  
10 monitoring, but it's which species and which level do you need?  
11 Like if you're going to real-time monitor on a day-to-day basis  
12 to determine to close red snapper and everybody is reporting on  
13 that level, does that carry forward to all the other species  
14 that are being represented in the charter-for-hire that you were  
15 imposing this on?

16

17 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Roy.

18

19 **DR. CRABTREE:** I think the answer is we want these vessels to  
20 report everything they catch and we want them to report what  
21 their discards are, right? At least there is no mystery to me  
22 about what we want. We want real-time data on everything  
23 they're catching and everything they're discarding and we want  
24 to be able to go on the website and punch a button and see that  
25 number pop up as of right now. Now, can any of that happen?  
26 Will it work? I don't know, but I think that's what we've been  
27 talking about, right?

28

29 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Well, I mean that was certainly my  
30 understanding as all this has moved forward, because it doesn't  
31 -- Operating a charter boat, it doesn't take me any difference  
32 to mark down how many triggerfish I caught as opposed to b-  
33 liners as opposed to anything else.

34

35 It's one of those things and we can do as many species as you  
36 want or as few and it doesn't really matter, but if we're out  
37 there collecting the data, even if you can't use it, but if  
38 people get in the habit of doing it and you need it down the  
39 road, it's there and so it's one of those things. Yes, ma'am,  
40 Dr. Lucas.

41

42 **DR. LUCAS:** Then the other question would be not only that, in  
43 terms of you want it for every species and for all these details  
44 or whatever, but if we can't respond that quickly to that amount  
45 of data, if we can't respond management-wise that quickly to it  
46 and if we can't respond from a resource perspective, both staff  
47 time and money and everything else, then do you really need it  
48 that detailed if you can't meet those other requirements?

1  
2 **DR. CRABTREE:** The do you need it is kind of something you need  
3 to think about and we've had this discussion. Do you want to  
4 manage, essentially, this fishery the same way we manage  
5 commercial fisheries, which is real-time monitoring and we close  
6 you when you hit it and you're only going to get a few days'  
7 notice to it?

8  
9 Now, I have always come at the position with recreational  
10 fisheries and charter fisheries that they want stability from  
11 year to year. They want to know when they can fish. This is  
12 not going in that direction and this is going opposite of that  
13 direction.

14  
15 Now, is that going to work for them and is that what they really  
16 want? I don't know. I come to these meetings, like all of you  
17 do, and I hear charter boat fisherman after charter boat  
18 fisherman tell us that's what they want and so okay, I guess  
19 that is what they want, but they're going to be booking trips  
20 not knowing if they're going to be open or not.

21  
22 If you want to get to stability as your goal, then you don't  
23 need real-time data, because you're going to try to set a season  
24 and not change it very often. I don't have the answers to those  
25 questions and those are questions you are going to have to  
26 decide, but it does seem to me that we've -- My sense from the  
27 council has been that you want real-time data and that's the  
28 path you're going on.

29  
30 Maybe I am wrong about that, but it seems to me that's the  
31 tradeoff. Do you want stability or do you want real-time data?  
32 Real-time data is going to be expensive and it's going to cost  
33 these charter boats a lot of money and time and it's going to  
34 put a lot of burden on the Center to track it and all that  
35 stuff.

36  
37 If we go down that path and at the end of the day decide that,  
38 well, we would rather just have a stable season and not change  
39 it that often, I think that's an important decision to make.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Mr. Anson.

42  
43 **MR. ANSON:** To Roy's point, as I recall some of the discussion  
44 that led up to this and where we are today, it was to that very  
45 point. It was that real-time data was going to be worth  
46 something and it was going to be something that we could use to  
47 try to get some of the 20 percent buffer that was currently  
48 taken away.

1  
2 Yes, there is the chance that you set a season up in advance,  
3 based on what you think will happen, but as you go through the  
4 season and the weather might be a lot better than you  
5 anticipated, based on your historical information that you used  
6 to formulate a season, and then as you get close to that and the  
7 weather is good and you might come in and say, seven days before  
8 the end of the season, that we have to shut it down and you have  
9 some trips out there that won't get taken and they will have to  
10 be cancelled, that's some of the pain, I guess, that you get  
11 with trying to extend out the number of days beyond the current  
12 situation, which is to take the 20 percent right off the top.

13  
14 **DR. PONWITH:** That is an excellent observation and so that  
15 creates the question of do you want to continue the way we're  
16 going now, which is you use a projection that is generated pre-  
17 season to give you an advanced notice and based on what we know  
18 right now your season will be X number of days, and then have a  
19 system that allows you to fine-tune that as the season goes  
20 along, so that if this year is an atypical year you've got some  
21 signals to be able to tell you we're probably below or we're  
22 probably high and fine-tune that pre-season closure date  
23 decision.

24  
25 That is technically possible and it could be done in a way  
26 that's less onerous than the daily sampling, where you say no,  
27 our sampling is going to be based on how many we caught  
28 yesterday plus how many we caught today and when we see  
29 ourselves hitting it, it's over.

30  
31 That's why, philosophically, this is a T in the road, and  
32 knowing how you want to manage your recreational fishery and how  
33 you want the charter landings to inform that is really  
34 important, because that helps us make sure we design the system  
35 that meets that desired outcome.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Kelly.

38  
39 **DR. LUCAS:** Just kind of to what Roy said about stability and  
40 electronic reporting, the State of Mississippi has a mandatory  
41 electronic reporting just for red snapper. We started the  
42 program basically because we didn't feel -- We recognized MRIP  
43 had limitations in the fact that it cannot capture short  
44 seasons. It just can't.

45  
46 Just in this year, where I've got MRIP saying that our private  
47 recreational fishermen caught zero fish, although I know exactly  
48 what they caught, because they are under mandatory reporting.

1 In that case, I would argue it was going to give them a lot more  
2 fishing days, you know depending on which way you went, because  
3 you all said that -- NOAA was estimating that they caught zero  
4 and so, according to them, they can fish 365 days a year,  
5 because they're not catching any fish.

6  
7 I think we may determine, just from the electronic data in  
8 general, that we're not really estimating effort right to begin  
9 with and that's even to notice that Alabama's data was less than  
10 what was reported by MRIP.

11  
12 I don't know what lead time charter-for-hire necessarily needs,  
13 but I think with some of the electronic reporting and looking at  
14 it that you might can give them a little bit better projection  
15 than two days before you close.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Mara or Roy or somebody down there I saw.

18  
19 **DR. CRABTREE:** Just bear in mind when we're talking about a  
20 season that's all of ten or eleven days now that there's not  
21 going to be a lot of lag time. I mean if we had LA Creel, it's  
22 about a two-week turnaround. It wouldn't be real time and we  
23 couldn't use it to track catches and so even if we had  
24 everything LA Creel, we would still be putting the whole federal  
25 season out by projections.

26  
27 The other complication to all of this is we have Amendment 41  
28 and Amendment 42 in the pipe somewhere, which could  
29 fundamentally change the way we manage these fisheries and it  
30 could completely change what we want to do with the data  
31 reporting.

32  
33 So I mean we've got a lot of things going on that need to be  
34 decided and I understand there is concerns about the buffer, but  
35 this is only part of the buffer and we're going to have to have  
36 a lot more predictability and coordination with the states or  
37 the buffer is not going to go away, because we have fishing  
38 patterns and seasons changing after the fishery is already  
39 closed and so there is an awful lot of things here that need to  
40 change and this is just one little piece of it, but I mean there  
41 are just so many wheels going around right now and I think  
42 that's part of what is getting us all wrapped around the axle on  
43 this.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Mr. Fischer.

46  
47 **MR. FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. When we built the LA  
48 Creel system, it is very scalable and, fortunately for

1 management, we only have about a hundred charter permits, of  
2 which they're not all active. We have the ability to shrink the  
3 amount of days on turnaround of data for the charter industry.

4  
5 Now, on the private industry, we have upwards of 20,000 people  
6 in our offshore permit system and so that has a little more  
7 difficulty in it, but, when it comes to push, the ten days we  
8 have to get the data out, we can shrink it back, because instead  
9 of a two-month wave, we are using a one-week time period and  
10 we're starting our calls on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday and  
11 so we can get a quicker turnaround.

12  
13 It may be difficult to get very instantaneous, like before you  
14 get to the dock type of sampling, but we do have a very scalable  
15 system that we can test it to its extremes.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Anyone else? Mr. Swindell.

18  
19 **MR. SWINDELL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just reading  
20 through the white paper that was published, NOAA's white paper,  
21 in February of 2013 and one of the things they say is there are  
22 seventeen federal fisheries out there that are using vessel  
23 monitoring systems.

24  
25 It seems to me like we ought to be able to get some real-time  
26 information from them, some way or another, that we could more  
27 quickly design and get a better handle on just what we want to  
28 do, because they have been through already a lot of the ups and  
29 downs of what information you need to have and how you're going  
30 to get it and what you're going to do with it.

31  
32 It looks like most of these are in the Northeast and Alaska and  
33 so is there not some way we can't get some of this, Mr.  
34 Chairman?

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** I would think so, but I certainly would defer  
37 to someone else on that. Anyone else want to weigh in? Dr.  
38 Froeschke, any other silver-bullet questions you've got?

39  
40 **DR. FROESCHKE:** No, I think I'll stop while I'm ahead. I guess  
41 the -- We have put the membership of the technical subcommittee  
42 up there on the board and if you all wanted to review that and  
43 then we talked about we could draft some charge for the meeting  
44 and have it ready for you to review at the full council and then  
45 the last thing is Carrie wanted to go over the AP  
46 recommendations from the Reef Fish AP very quickly.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Do you want to do that now, Dr. Simmons?

1  
2                                   **REEF FISH AP RECOMMENDATIONS**  
3

4 **DR. SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Reef Fish AP met  
5 over a day-and-a-half meeting in September and they reviewed  
6 several items and this was one of the ones they reviewed, and  
7 it's Tab B, Number 11, and made recommendations on.  
8

9 We had very good attendance. Twenty out of twenty-three people  
10 attended and Mr. Boyd was our council representative and, later  
11 on, Martin Fisher, Captain Martin Fisher, is going to be here to  
12 help answer questions during Reef Fish on other items that we  
13 covered.  
14

15 For this particular item, I just want to go through the motions  
16 that the AP made regarding this amendment. This starts on page  
17 6 of the document. By a vote of sixteen to thirteen with one  
18 abstention, the AP recommends in Action 1 that Alternative 4 be  
19 the preferred alternative, which is the council's current  
20 preferred alternative.  
21

22 They talked about trip-level reporting and said that it would  
23 improve validation routines and recall bias and they expected it  
24 to improve accuracy and confidence in these data, facilitating  
25 its use in science and management.  
26

27 Next, by a voice vote of seventeen to three, the AP recommends  
28 adopting Preferred Alternative 2, which is also the council's  
29 preferred alternative, which would require headboats to submit  
30 fishing records for trip level via electronic reporting.  
31

32 They talked about the various reporting methods currently and  
33 the differences in effort and landings estimates for charter  
34 vessels compared to headboats and then, after more discussion,  
35 they talked a little bit about VMS and a motion was made that  
36 failed and that's at the end of the report if anybody is  
37 interested in that, but the one that was passed was a vote of  
38 sixteen to two and the AP recommends in Action 3 to adopt  
39 Alternative 2 as the preferred alternative, which would require  
40 federally-permitted for-hire vessels to use a NMFS-approved  
41 electronic device that automatically records vessel location at  
42 specified time intervals for later transmission. They selected  
43 the two subalternatives for both headboats and charter vessels.  
44

45 We talked about a lot of these concerns that this committee has  
46 spent a lot of time discussing today and the council as well  
47 regarding the economic analysis, social analysis, et cetera.  
48

1 Then John already went through the last motion that was made  
 2 about separating the amendment and so I guess, just in summary,  
 3 we will move forward on the committee's recommendation and we  
 4 will draft a charge.

5  
 6 Our understanding is the committee wants to move forward with  
 7 this and maybe we will talk to the IPT about how the language  
 8 should be crafted as far as the intent, so that it's clear to  
 9 the public that this is the council's intent and then when the  
 10 funding comes or when that becomes available, it's a little bit  
 11 more clear that this is what the council's desire is and whether  
 12 that's able to be accomplished or not, so there's not serious  
 13 repercussions from that. I think that was one of staff's major  
 14 concerns and we just probably need to bring that out a little  
 15 bit more in the document.

16  
 17 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Dr. Crabtree.

18  
 19 **DR. CRABTREE:** So the technical subcommittee -- The list I was  
 20 looking at, this is one that includes a number of South Atlantic  
 21 folks as well as Gulf, right?

22  
 23 **DR. FROESCHKE:** It includes one South Atlantic staff as well as  
 24 some state folks that have participated in pilot programs that  
 25 happen to be located in the South Atlantic.

26  
 27 **DR. CRABTREE:** If we're going to proceed separately, should we  
 28 repopulate the technical subcommittee, do you think, or should  
 29 we leave it as is? Should we repopulate it to make it Gulf-  
 30 focused or is that a bad idea? I don't know.

31  
 32 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I don't know either. We were looking at it and  
 33 I don't have a consensus. Mike Errigo is the only -- He is a  
 34 South Atlantic staff member and the rest of them I don't know  
 35 and however you think is best is certainly fine with me.

36  
 37 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Council members, do you have any  
 38 preference on populating the subcommittee? Dr. Stunz.

39  
 40 **DR. STUNZ:** It seems to me that it should be populated by people  
 41 with a Gulf interest, since we're going in that direction. Now,  
 42 I am not saying that someone from the Southeast might not have  
 43 expertise that is relevant to that and we don't want to exclude  
 44 that level of knowledge, but you know it's sort of our deal at  
 45 this point, it seems like.

46  
 47 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. I believe they're getting the list back  
 48 up on the board so we can look at that and decide what to do

1 from here. They've got the list up on the board and, Dr. Stunz,  
 2 I think you make a good point about your comment earlier and so  
 3 if you want to go through that, that's fine. Mr. Fischer, did  
 4 you have a comment?

5  
 6 **MR. FISCHER:** I believe there's probably about four Atlantic  
 7 people on this technical committee and we probably do have some  
 8 expertise in the Gulf. I think the states of Louisiana,  
 9 Mississippi, and Alabama would like to possibly have input on  
 10 the direction this committee is going, if they have anyone  
 11 qualified, and I would hope we do.

12  
 13 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** So what was the criteria for the initial  
 14 technical subcommittee that we used to populate this? Does  
 15 anyone know?

16  
 17 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** Johnny, at least for the Gulf states, I  
 18 think a request went out to each of the five states if they  
 19 wanted to include a member on this particular group and Florida  
 20 and Texas were the only two that volunteered, if my recollection  
 21 is -- I don't know about the Science Center and MRIP and  
 22 whatnot, but at least with the Gulf states that's how those  
 23 folks were selected.

24  
 25 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Well, it seems to me that we would just  
 26 remove the South Atlantic people from this list and then just go  
 27 forward with it from there, I believe that's what may be the  
 28 simplest thing to do, rather than having to just stop everything  
 29 and start all over again, but does anybody have any feelings one  
 30 way or the other? Dr. Stunz.

31  
 32 **DR. STUNZ:** I think that's a good move, Mr. Chairman, unless Dr.  
 33 Froeschke or maybe Bonnie or Roy has some key people from their  
 34 groups that aren't on this list that they see would add value to  
 35 it.

36  
 37 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Thank you. Lieutenant Commander Brand

38  
 39 **LCDR JASON BRAND:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. There may be a  
 40 possibility where we may want to have Coast Guard involved, just  
 41 for some -- Some devices may offer some safety at sea type of  
 42 items, where we may be able to provide some input on that, but  
 43 if it's going to be only considering the technical data -- I am  
 44 not sure what the charge is and whether or not you may want to  
 45 consider input from safety or life at sea issues or even  
 46 potentially some enforcement benefits.

47  
 48 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. I think staff is going to work on the



1 charge, but I certainly concur there are some items with safety  
2 at sea that may be very big-ticket items and so I think the  
3 intent is just to remove the South Atlantic people and then when  
4 we get the charge, Lieutenant Commander Brand, we'll come back  
5 and see if it's something that you feel that we should put  
6 someone else on there and I can't imagine that anyone would have  
7 any issues with that at all. With that being said, are you  
8 clear with what we're doing?

9  
10 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Sort of. I am taking that Mike Errigo from the  
11 South Atlantic would be removed and Eric Hiltz -- The way we did  
12 this before, you developed this and we sent out a letter to the  
13 various entities, MRIP and the Science Center and things, and  
14 they appointed someone from their staff to man the committee, if  
15 you will, and so that's how we got to where we are and Eric  
16 Hiltz, he was brought on, and Doug Mumford, based on the reason  
17 of, hey, these folks have experience with this for X, Y, Z  
18 reasons. Eric Hiltz, Doug Mumford, and Mike Errigo, keep or  
19 leave?

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Well, being that we're already five minutes  
22 past our scheduled time, maybe we will just pick this back up at  
23 council, if you so desire. I don't know if you want to continue  
24 on, Chairman Anson, or what you would like to do. It's your  
25 call. I certainly don't want to cut anybody off, but --

26  
27 **MR. ANSON:** If you think you can wrap this up in a few minutes,  
28 then I would say go ahead and get it knocked out.

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** All right. Mr. Fischer.

31  
32 **MR. FISCHER:** I know Dave had his hand up before me and I would  
33 recognize him if he had something.

34  
35 **MR. DONALDSON:** Go ahead.

36  
37 **MR. FISCHER:** Okay. I will make a motion to -- It might be an  
38 awkward motion and I am not prepared, but to remove the South  
39 Atlantic members from those states, meaning South Carolina --  
40 The names that were discussed and obviously they're not on the  
41 screen and I don't know these people.

42  
43 What I would like to see is, once again, give the opportunity --  
44 - If this is going to be statewide and going to need state  
45 cooperation, I mean Gulf-wide and going to need state  
46 cooperation to work, we would like to see someone from  
47 Mississippi, Louisiana, and Alabama on this committee, because  
48 you're going to need buy-in from all the states.

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Is that your motion that you --  
3  
4 **MR. FISCHER:** Right and so we have someone from the Atlantic  
5 Commission, the South Atlantic, South Carolina, and North  
6 Carolina. I believe those four come to mind. It could offer  
7 the states that are not represented to forward names and we  
8 could take this up as soon as full council.  
9  
10 **MR. DONALDSON:** I would also recommend Mike Cahall from ACCSP be  
11 removed.  
12  
13 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay, Mr. Fischer, does your motion read as  
14 you wish?  
15  
16 **MR. FISCHER:** It should be four of them, if I'm not mistaken.  
17 Greg Bray is Gulf States. Then, to that, have the three Gulf  
18 states not represented have the opportunities to submit names  
19 for approval and if we move on it, we could probably have that  
20 for full council in a couple of days. Not to leave it open-  
21 ended, we could just remove these now and bring up adding  
22 membership during full council.  
23  
24 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay, Mr. Fischer, does that motion read as  
25 you wish?  
26  
27 **MR. FISCHER:** Yes.  
28  
29 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Is there a second to this motion?  
30  
31 **MR. DONALDSON:** Second.  
32  
33 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** There is a second for the motion. **Is there**  
34 **any opposition to this motion? Seeing none, the motion carries.**  
35 With that, I will turn back to Dr. Froeschke.  
36  
37 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I am done.  
38  
39 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Me too. Okay. We had no other business and  
40 this concludes the Data Collection Committee.  
41  
42 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m., October 5,  
43 2015.)  
44  
45 - - -