

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

Astor Crowne Plaza New Orleans, Louisiana

January 30, 2017

**VOTING MEMBERS**

- Greg Stunz.....Texas
Kevin Anson (designee for Chris Blankenship).....Alabama
Roy Crabtree.....NMFS, SERO, St. Petersburg, Florida
Pamela Dana.....Florida
Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
Myron Fischer (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana
John Greene.....Alabama
Kelly Lucas (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
Robin Riechers.....Texas
John Sanchez.....Florida
Andy Strelcheck (designee for Roy Crabtree).....NMFS
David Walker.....Alabama

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

- Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
Doug Boyd.....Texas
LCDR Leo Danaher.....USCG
Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
Tom Frazer.....Florida
Martha Guyas (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
Campo Matens.....Louisiana
Ed Swindell.....Louisiana

**STAFF**

- Steven Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
John Froeschke.....Fishery Biologist - Statistician
Douglas Gregory.....Executive Director
Mara Levy.....NMFS
Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
Charlotte Schiaffo.....Research and Human Resource Librarian
Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Director

**OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

- Eric Brazer.....GMRFSA
J.P. Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy
Mark Brown.....SAFMC
Tony Bruce.....Zachary, LA

1 Gary Bryant.....Gulf Shores, AL  
2 Richard Fischer.....LA  
3 Traci Floyd.....MS DMR  
4 Sue Gerhart.....NMFS  
5 Scott Hickman.....Galveston, TX  
6 Joe Jewell.....MS DMR  
7 Bill Kelly.....FKCFA  
8 Jason Klosterman.....Destin, FL  
9 Bonnie Ponwith.....SEFSC  
10 Lynn Stokes.....CLS America

11  
12  
13

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1  
2  
3 Table of Contents.....3  
4  
5 Table of Motions.....4  
6  
7 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of Minutes.....5  
8  
9 Action Guide and Next Steps.....5  
10  
11 Presentation Update on CLS America Project.....6  
12  
13 Final Action - South Atlantic Council's Modifications to Charter  
14 Vessel and Headboat Reporting Requirements.....25  
15  
16 Final Action - Modifications to Generic Charter Vessel and  
17 Headboat Reporting Requirements.....34  
18     Review of Public Comments.....34  
19     Review of Amendment.....35  
20  
21 Adjournment.....56  
22  
23                   - - -  
24

TABLE OF MOTIONS

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

PAGE 33: Motion to accept all the preferred selections within the South Atlantic Electronic Reporting Amendment to the Full Council. The motion carried on page 33.

PAGE 36: Motion that Alternative 2 be the preferred alternative in Action 2. The motion failed on page 41.

PAGE 43: Motion that the committee accept the IPT recommendations for the alternatives in Action 3, Trip Notification and Reporting Requirements. The motion carried on page 44.

PAGE 54: Motion to accept the IPT recommendations for Alternative 4, in Action 4, Hardware/Software Requirements for Reporting. The motion carried on page 55.

- - -

1 The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery  
2 Management Council convened at the Astor Crowne Plaza, New  
3 Orleans, Louisiana, Monday morning, January 30, 2017, and was  
4 called to order by Chairman Greg Stunz.

5  
6 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**  
7 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
8

9 **CHAIRMAN GREG STUNZ:** I will call the Data Collection Committee  
10 to order. If you're looking, our materials are at Tab F, and  
11 the first item of business is Adoption of the Agenda. Several  
12 people have brought to my attention that they might like a minor  
13 modification of the agenda, and that's is that Item VII be  
14 removed in front of -- I guess, looking here, it's kind of out  
15 of order, I guess, but, essentially, they would want to move the  
16 South Atlantic Amendment discussion in front of our amendment  
17 discussion, because that might be informative, and so I don't  
18 know if anybody has an issue with that. I don't.

19  
20 If you do, please speak up. If not, if someone would be willing  
21 to make a motion to adopt that agenda with those modifications.  
22 Moved by Myron and it's seconded. I don't see any opposition,  
23 and so the agenda is adopted.

24  
25 The next is Approval of the Minutes, if everyone has had a  
26 chance to look through that. Is there a motion to approve the  
27 minutes?

28  
29 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** So moved.

30  
31 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**  
32

33 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** It's seconded by Dr. Lucas. I don't see any  
34 opposition, and so the minutes are approved. The next item of  
35 business is to briefly talk through the Action Guide. Dr.  
36 Simmons, I don't know if you want to do that. It's a relatively  
37 short action guide, but we do have a lot of discussion, which is  
38 final action on two particular items.

39  
40 Before we get into the presentations and other things, is there  
41 any comments that you have?

42  
43 **DR. CARRIE SIMMONS:** No, and thank you, Mr. Chair. I will just  
44 walk you through each of the documents and try to keep the  
45 committee on task. Thank you.

46  
47 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That's good. If we can just go through that as  
48 we go, that would be great. The next item on the agenda is a

1 presentation on the CLS data reporting project. Dr. Lynn Stokes  
2 is going to present that. Lynn, when you're ready, and I know  
3 that we have your presentation.

4  
5 While she is coming up to the podium, if many of you guys don't  
6 know Dr. Stokes -- She is kind of new, I guess, to the council  
7 process, but she is heavily involved as a consulting  
8 statistician with MRIP as well as several panels for the  
9 National Academy of Sciences and things, trying to solve some of  
10 these data collection issues, broadly, that we're having across  
11 the U.S. as well as in the Gulf, and so she's an expert at that,  
12 and so, Dr. Stokes is from Southern Methodist University, by the  
13 way, and so, Dr. Stokes, whenever you are ready, go ahead.

14  
15 **PRESENTATION UPDATE ON CLS AMERICA PROJECT**

16  
17 **DR. LYNN STOKES:** This work was done with the help of two of my  
18 graduate students, Ryan McShane, who is a PhD student, and Mo  
19 Chen, who is a master's student at SMU, and so they are the data  
20 wranglers on this.

21  
22 First, I will just start with an overview. You most all know,  
23 probably, but so we're all in the same place, sort of the idea  
24 about how the electronic data reporting is used to make  
25 estimates of catch.

26  
27 Of course, there is voluntary reporting of catch by the  
28 captains, and then the data are reported by satellite by the  
29 captains who have these devices on your boats. What you're  
30 going to see is that not all of them do it, even if they have  
31 the devices.

32  
33 Then, in our shop, we get data from the MRIP estimation  
34 shoreline data, and not the trip data, but the shoreline data,  
35 and we match the captains' reports to sample encounters that  
36 MRIP makes. So far, that's the only encounters we're using in  
37 this estimation procedure.

38  
39 Then this combined data are used to do estimation of catch. You  
40 can also estimate other features of the trips, number of trips  
41 and various other things, but what I am going to present you  
42 today is the actual catch by species. The engine that makes  
43 that go is that, because the MRIP sample is a probability  
44 sample, we can estimate the ratio of -- We can use, as an  
45 estimator, the reports and the sample, be that catch reports or  
46 trip reports, to the total in the sample, be that total catch or  
47 number of trips.

1 That ratio then, you can use that estimator to estimate the  
2 ratio of reports to the total in the population. That's  
3 reported catch to the total catch in the population, and then  
4 you can use that as a calibration you just solve for the total  
5 catch in the population, and so that's where all the information  
6 comes from, and so there's lots of steps in there that are  
7 places where you can change the properties of the estimator.

8  
9 As of the last report that you guys got, and I think Bob Gill  
10 came and gave you a presentation about the descriptive  
11 statistics of the data through August 31. At that time, there  
12 were 234 installed vessels and, at that time, there were 6,073  
13 reports. We hadn't done anything about matching the last time  
14 you heard about this, and so that's what I am going to be  
15 reporting on today, and no estimates had been calculated.

16  
17 Now, we have roughly, through December 31, roughly 6,700  
18 reports. This slide, the red line represents the data that was  
19 talked about at your last meeting. Then, right of the red line,  
20 is the remainder of the data that we have gotten since then,  
21 through the 31<sup>st</sup>.

22  
23 This was a graph that you saw before, and the next graph is also  
24 one that you saw before, but updated, and so this is the number  
25 of reports per captain, or per device. What you see is that  
26 there's still a substantial number who haven't reported any  
27 trips, or just a few, but there is some that report a lot. The  
28 175 bin has several devices that have reported that many times,  
29 or around 175 times.

30  
31 What we have done with that data is to match these reports  
32 through Wave 5. We haven't yet done the Wave 6 matching, and  
33 what we did was we used the boat ID -- We identified the boat,  
34 the date, and the time and tried to match the reports with the  
35 encounters in the MRIP sample. We were pretty accurate. We are  
36 very accurate on boats, we believe, because we got a file from  
37 Greg Bray. He provided a file that gave us a cross-walk between  
38 the way that the reports come from the captains and the way they  
39 are recorded in MRIP, and so we think we have a very good handle  
40 on that.

41  
42 Identifying the actual trip is pretty error prone, the way it is  
43 now, because captains seem to report trips -- A lot of them  
44 report contemporaneously with arriving at the shore, which helps  
45 us to identify which encounter that trip is matched with, but  
46 many of them report later, like much later, like four hours or  
47 eight hours or ten hours later, and so it's hard to now, if a  
48 captain makes two trips in a day, which report goes with which

1 encounter.  
2  
3 We have tried several ways of matching, just using the date and  
4 time identifiers, and I am going to show you two of those  
5 efforts today. One matches -- One we call a match, we call an  
6 MRIP encounter, a match with a report, if it occurs the same  
7 day. That means we know we are overestimating matches in that  
8 case, to some degree, because, if people make two trips in a  
9 day, then we're matching it, regardless of which trip it was.  
10  
11 Then we also have done matching where we match only if the  
12 encounter and the report time is within three hours of each  
13 other, and so that's probably not an underestimate. Not by  
14 much, I think, but it could actually miss both ways when you do  
15 the matching that way, and so I have numbers for both of those.  
16  
17 One reason we realized that we were having problems is that you  
18 also have what the captain reports, in terms of catch, by  
19 species. For some species, when we do the broad matching, we  
20 get negative correlations between what the captain says and what  
21 the MRIP encountered, and so it seems as though we are matching  
22 wrong trips, a different trip, in those cases.  
23  
24 What we're doing now, actually -- Before I show you the numbers,  
25 I will say that what we're doing now is my graduate student has  
26 worked on trying to figure out a way to follow the coordinates,  
27 the GPS coordinates, of the boat. It reports every hour, and so  
28 we are trying to trace trips and then, by GPS coordinate, find  
29 when it gets close to a place where it was encountered and see  
30 if those match.  
31  
32 In other words, instead of just using the date and time, we're  
33 actually using the shape of the trip, and so we think that we've  
34 made some progress on that, but I'm going to talk about that a  
35 little bit later. That's not complete, and so I don't actually  
36 have the match rate from that yet.  
37  
38 Here is the first data that I'm going to show you. These are  
39 various kinds of match rates between the APAIS encounters and  
40 the electronically-reported data. I have match rates here,  
41 collectively, for all species, and so this would just be trips  
42 and not trips with a given species for Waves 3, 4, and 5.  
43  
44 The number of APAIS encounters there are the ones that were made  
45 in the general area where these captains are, and then I have  
46 three ways of calculating match rate. The first one is assuming  
47 that -- It's not really a match rate yet, but it assumes that,  
48 if every captain that was encountered by an APAIS sampler



1 reported. In other words, this is like the maximum possibly  
2 match rate for the number of devices that are installed now and  
3 not the way the captains are behaving, but the way the devices  
4 are installed.

5  
6 The proportion of captains that are encountered who have the  
7 device installed has increased over these three waves from 31  
8 percent up to 42 percent, and so that is 42 percent of the  
9 encounters by a sampler are with boats that have the devices,  
10 and so that's kind of our maximum possible at the current rate.

11  
12 The next column is the current matching using the three-hour  
13 window. If a captain of a boat that has a device on it reports  
14 within three hours of the time that MRIP said that it was  
15 interviewed, then these are the match rates. These two -- Well,  
16 they haven't actually gone up. It's roughly around 10 percent.  
17 It's 8 percent, 10 percent, and 8 percent for the three waves,  
18 and so that's the current time.

19  
20 The last column is the kind of optimistic matching rate, which  
21 is the one where, if we match by -- If the proportion of the  
22 boats that are encountered by MRIP, the proportion that have the  
23 device and report in the same day. That is higher, 12 percent,  
24 12 percent, and 9 percent, for the three waves.

25  
26 Now the estimation. What does that mean? What kind of quality  
27 of data does that give you, as far as estimating catch is  
28 concerned? How does the standard error associated with that  
29 kind of match rate compare with what MRIP is getting? That's  
30 what I am going to show you next, and I have done it for those  
31 very three categories that we just looked at.

32  
33 I am not actually going to present estimates by catch, because I  
34 believe it's going to be an overestimate. We didn't even  
35 actually make them. We have worked on variances rather than the  
36 estimates themselves. If the match rate is too small, that is  
37 if we don't find all of the trips, then we will overestimate  
38 catch, and sometimes substantially, because these match rates  
39 are quite small, and so it inflates the estimate.

40  
41 What I am going to do instead is show you the variance by  
42 species for the estimates under the current matching, that is  
43 the plus or minus three-hour matching, for the semi-optimistic  
44 matching, which is the one-day matching, and then, for the  
45 ultimate matching at current installation rates, which is if  
46 every captain who has the device reported all the time, and so  
47 I'm going to show variances, but variances compared with what  
48 MRIP gets, and so I'm going to report these as efficiencies,

1 which is the ratio of the variance of the MRIP estimate to the  
2 variance of the electronic logbook estimate by species for these  
3 three categories.

4  
5 As I said, I'm going to give you three scenarios, the same three  
6 that were on the match rate slides, and by species. Two of  
7 those are plausibly current, depending on what is the closest to  
8 actual matching that is happening right now, and the third one,  
9 that one that assumes what if all the captains were reporting  
10 all the time, that one isn't happening now. That is  
11 speculative, but it, in theory, could happen, with the current  
12 level of sampling and penetration of the devices.

13  
14 This is what you're going to see, this efficiency, and so, if  
15 the efficiency is equal to one, it means that the variances are  
16 the same. If the efficiency is greater than one, that means  
17 that the electronic logbook estimates are better, and, if it's  
18 less than one, it's worse. I am going to present the  
19 calculations for Waves 3 and 4, and so those are the two bars  
20 inside the red lines here. It's where most of the reporting and  
21 most of the catch happened.

22  
23 Here is my money slide. This is the data. I have reordered the  
24 columns from most pessimistic to most optimistic. The one on  
25 the left side is the current efficiencies with the current  
26 matching, the way it is now, and so we simply matched any  
27 encounter in MRIP, if it was with a CLS boat, and it was within  
28 three hours of the time that -- The report was within three  
29 hours of the time that the encounter happened, then we called it  
30 a match.

31  
32 You see that it ranges from an efficiency of 4 percent, meaning  
33 that you can sort of think of that as being that the sample  
34 size, the verification sample size, would need to increase  
35 twenty-five times to have equal variances for the estimate of  
36 catch for white grunt with the electronic logbook and the MRIP  
37 estimates up to 24 percent for red grouper, which means that it  
38 would only have to have a sample size of about four times as  
39 big, and so that's with the current matching that we have now,  
40 the sort of most conservative kind of matching.

41  
42 The middle two columns are when we expand it to a day. We match  
43 anything that's within a day, and so these match rates go up, in  
44 some cases, considerably. We are up to, for example, for red  
45 snapper, 50 percent, almost, 49 percent, in Wave 4, with an  
46 average of 38 percent in Wave 4 and 26 percent in Wave 3.

47  
48 Then the most optimistic view, and I would remind you that this

1 is not the way things are now, but this is the way they could be  
2 if all captains reported, with the current number of devices.  
3 These are considerably better. For red snapper, you see that,  
4 in both waves, the estimates actually would be better, more  
5 efficient, than the current ones. Others are not so successful,  
6 but, on average, the efficiency for Wave 3 is 64 percent. For  
7 Wave 4, it's 78 percent.

8  
9 Let me say something about the accuracy of catch reporting. I  
10 have described this as a problem with match rates, but the  
11 captain also -- We also can compare what the captain says about  
12 catch to what the APAIS sampler says about catch, and so there  
13 is two issues. One is the captain may not report exactly  
14 accurately. It turns out that, if their estimates are well  
15 correlated with what the APAIS sampler finds, it's not very  
16 damaging to the estimator.

17  
18 The problem is with the matching, really, where, if you match  
19 the wrong trip, it can be completely off. It's like unrelated  
20 to the catch, and so, if we improve the matching, make it more  
21 accurate, and not just higher, but more accurate, then the  
22 estimates are going to improve also, and that's not included in  
23 the efficiencies that I showed you there, because I can't  
24 speculate on what would happen if I matched more accurately. I  
25 mean, I can speculate, but I don't know what would happen if I  
26 matched more accurately.

27  
28 There is some where they are completely orthogonal to each  
29 other, things that look like they match by our simple rules,  
30 that the captain is reporting all of this species and none of  
31 those, and it's exactly backwards or something, and so that can  
32 have a serious effect.

33  
34 In fact, when we take even our three-hour matching, it turns out  
35 that some of the comparisons between what the captain reports  
36 for some species and what APAIS samplers report are negatively  
37 correlated. In fact, negative 0.9 we even got for one species,  
38 and I can't remember which one it is now, but I don't think  
39 that's the captain. I think that's us figuring out when the  
40 trip ends and matching it with the encounter. If we can make it  
41 more accurate, I believe not only will we get the match rate up,  
42 but we will also gain some efficiencies from the accuracy of the  
43 reports.

44  
45 How can the current estimates be improved? Because there are so  
46 many moving parts in this estimation procedure, there is a lot  
47 of places that you can increase the information, the amount of  
48 information, that is coming in, and so that is the number of

1 devices. If that was increased, then there would be more  
2 precision, better estimation.

3  
4 If you can increase the reporting rate, we have seen, in the  
5 table, how much that can improve the precision. If you increase  
6 the verification sample size, and, at the beginning, they were  
7 talking about how many additional verification samples do we  
8 need beside what APAIS does currently, and I will have some  
9 numbers on that in a minute, but, if we could find a way to  
10 identify and use in estimation all trips from equipped boats,  
11 even if they aren't reported, actually that would improve the  
12 estimation too, because that would help us pin down the number  
13 of trips better.

14  
15 The catch is related to both the number of trips and the catch  
16 per trip, which is actually the way the MRIP system currently  
17 goes at it, by estimating those two separately, or at least for  
18 the private anglers they do anyway.

19  
20 There is uncertainty in both of those, and so if we could --  
21 Even if the captain doesn't say anything, if we can identify  
22 when he made a trip, that would be helpful, too. Now, that  
23 would be one advantage of trying to do it with this following  
24 the GPS trail. The problem there, of course, is it's possible  
25 that they're not making charter trips, and so that would be a  
26 little iffy, but still, if we had a way to make sure that we  
27 could identify when the boat had made what would somehow be  
28 defined as a trip, by the area it traverses, that would be  
29 helpful.

30  
31 It also would be helpful, for us, if there was a way to get more  
32 accuracy in the matching via a way to have the captain either  
33 trained or have the software trained so that a trip, the end of  
34 a trip, could be recorded. Even if we are able to identify the  
35 area, have some algorithm for identifying the end of a trip via  
36 the traversed path, we will have inaccuracies, because we only  
37 get a GPS ping every hour.

38  
39 If the hour falls in a certain way and the boat is not back, we  
40 don't know for sure if that was the end of one trip and the  
41 beginning of another trip, and so it's possible -- I don't know  
42 enough about the software to know if that would be something  
43 that could be done, but I think having the captain have to  
44 remember to do that is -- Human error is a problem, and so if  
45 there was some way to have that hardwired in there, so we could  
46 at least know when they ended, that would be helpful, too.

47  
48 What I did next was to try to take some of those ways that one

1 could improve the quality or the data or the amount of  
2 information in the data and made combinations of them to figure  
3 out how much increase would be needed to match current MRIP  
4 standard errors. There are many ways you could do this, and I  
5 just picked a few, to give you an idea of how much of an  
6 increase in resources would be needed to be equivalent to MRIP's  
7 estimates now.

8  
9 If you kept the current number of devices and the current level  
10 of reporting, but we improved our matching, so we actually did  
11 get all the captains that reported, that would be somewhere  
12 between that 8 and 12 percent match rate, then you would  
13 approximately need to quadruple the verification sample size to  
14 make it equivalent, and so, if nothing else changes, except we  
15 match a little better, then you would need to increase the  
16 verification sample size by four.

17  
18 Another combination that would work is if you double the number  
19 of devices, take the current level of reporting, but you make it  
20 accurate, and so this time say that the captain reports exactly  
21 right each time. Then you would need to increase the APAIS  
22 sample size, or the verification sample size, by about 75  
23 percent, and so not double.

24  
25 Then the third scenario here is if you kept the current number  
26 of devices and you had the captains do 100 percent reporting,  
27 and so no more devices, but they just report every time, but the  
28 accuracy is at the current level, and so we're not assuming  
29 they're perfect in their reporting, but actually the way the  
30 accuracy is now. Then you would need to increase the  
31 verification sample size by only about 40 percent to have an  
32 average efficiency of one, and so that's my story. Any  
33 questions?

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Dr. Stokes. Are there some  
36 questions for her? Dr. Ponwith.

37  
38 **DR. BONNIE PONWITH:** Thanks very much, Dr. Stokes. That was  
39 really informative, and, of course, the discussions on looking  
40 at electronic reporting are driven by a couple of things. We  
41 all yearn for better landings estimates, and we yearn to have  
42 those better estimates faster.

43  
44 The thing that I am loath to do is get them faster, but then  
45 have the precision of the data unacceptably low, and this was  
46 interesting, to actually quantify what we've been thinking about  
47 kind of all along. This is really helpful, because we also need  
48 to have a program that gives us what we want, better data

1 faster, but also that's affordable.

2  
3 This puts some mathematical boundaries around that problem, and,  
4 to me, I know there's been a lot of discussion here in the Gulf,  
5 as well as in the South Atlantic, about the merits of having  
6 positional requirements for these electronic reporting programs.

7  
8 By positional, I mean some sort of affixed to the vessel GPS,  
9 and the whole reason for that is, number one, we have to have a  
10 way to verify effort, because catch per unit effort is important  
11 to know. What did a fisherman catch is important to know, but,  
12 if you don't know how many people for sure went, you don't know  
13 what to multiple that catch per unit effort by to get total  
14 landings.

15  
16 The matching has been a vexing problem all along, and that is,  
17 without the GPS, without some unique identifier that identifies  
18 a trip down to the vessel and its landings, then our ability to  
19 verify how close the report on what was electronically reported  
20 of what was caught versus what observers, port samplers, are  
21 seeing on the dock ends up having to be averages.

22  
23 Basically, you sample vessels that went out, and you take a look  
24 at what they caught, on average, and then you compare that to  
25 what vessels caught, reported, on the average, and compare those  
26 averages. That is a much messier math than to actually be able  
27 to say that Vessel A went fishing and landed their fish and  
28 Vessel A pushed the button before they got back to the dock.  
29 They didn't know whether they were going to be sampled or not.

30  
31 They were sampled, and their catches were nearly identical to  
32 what they electronically reported while they were bouncing  
33 around in the water or not, and that kind of one-on-one matching  
34 is sort of the gold standard, in terms of having your data very  
35 quickly and having a fast way to make corrections for  
36 misreporting at sea, which we recognize will happen. It's a  
37 chaotic process to enter data while you're bouncing around at  
38 sea.

39  
40 Those tables, I think, were really enlightening, in terms of  
41 bounding just how challenging it is, creating those averages and  
42 comparing sort of the average possible match to the average  
43 possible vessel and finding out those numbers don't -- They're  
44 not performing very well right now without significant  
45 additional investment. I think that's going to be an important  
46 thing to take into consideration when we have the conversation  
47 about the amendments later on, and I thank you.

48

1 **DR. STOKES:** I can say that I mentioned the correlation between  
2 reported and observed was negative 0.9 for one species. On  
3 average, however, it was good, even with the matching we have  
4 now. It's about 0.7, on average. We had, for some species,  
5 it's one, the correlation is one, and so I believe that the  
6 negative 0.9 is because of a matching problem.

7  
8 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Stokes, we have several questions for you,  
9 and so don't go anywhere still. I have several people in line  
10 here, but Dave Donaldson is next.

11  
12 **MR. DONALDSON:** Thank you, Dr. Stokes. I don't actually have a  
13 question, but I just have a comment, and it's kind of feeding  
14 off of Bonnie's and the investment on doing this. You mentioned  
15 that, to improve the information, that you need to increase your  
16 verification sample size.

17  
18 **DR. STOKES:** That is definitely one way to do it, yes.

19  
20 **MR. DONALDSON:** 40 percent to quadrupling it. It's worth noting  
21 that, through the MRIP sampling now, which is funded through  
22 GulfFIN, we have been level funded for a number of years.  
23 Because of that, we're actually taking cuts over the last  
24 several years that is impacting the number of samples that we  
25 can get.

26  
27 In Florida, for example, we've had to cut a significant number  
28 of samples, and so not only are you looking to increase -- You  
29 have the cost of increasing the verification sample size, but  
30 we've got to take into account that it's actually even more  
31 expensive, because we need to restore those cuts, and I think  
32 it's an important fact, important to note, that it's going to be  
33 even more expensive, and it's something that needs to be  
34 considered when we're looking at this.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Captain Walker.

37  
38 **MR. DAVID WALKER:** Thank you, Dr. Stokes. I appreciate that. I  
39 actually have a CLS America VMS on my commercial fishing vessel,  
40 and I find that it works very well. It's mandatory, and it's so  
41 easy that a caveman could operate it. It works really well, and  
42 not only with reporting, but there is times, like if we need  
43 communication with maybe a mechanic or parts, that we have the  
44 email capability, where we can email and have a part lined up  
45 that may save a fisherman a trip the next day. Just that one  
46 trip could help pay for the VMS, and so I mean, as far as cost,  
47 and we have the fixed antenna on the boat, and we have a tablet  
48 that we can take off with us and download.

1  
2 These are all just comments, but the safety of it, the  
3 communications, the data that comes from it, and everyone is  
4 always asking for better data. Better data equals better  
5 science, and all the science is -- We can all appreciate better  
6 data, and I would just like to thank you for coming today and  
7 giving this, and keep up the good work.

8  
9 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Lucas.

10  
11 **DR. KELLY LUCAS:** Thanks, Dr. Stokes. It's great seeing you  
12 again. I think Dave may have covered a little bit of this with  
13 his comment on the verification, but, on this, on the second  
14 bullet, where it says double the number of devices, what are the  
15 current number of devices that were here, so that I can consider  
16 what it was when you doubled it?

17  
18 **DR. STOKES:** Somebody help me on this, but I think it's like  
19 230. About twenty-some-odd have never reported, and so that's  
20 part of the doubling, would be to just have those guys do it.

21  
22 **DR. LUCAS:** With that though, you could -- I mean, some of the  
23 amendments that we're considering is having everybody in the  
24 charter/for-hire fleet, whatever that number is, 1,300 or  
25 whatever it is, and we could determine what the sample size is  
26 that we would need to increase, if all those people were  
27 reporting, and see what that number was to determine how much  
28 verification we're going to have to do in order to make this  
29 work.

30  
31 **DR. STOKES:** Yes.

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Brown.

34  
35 **MR. MARK BROWN:** I'm Mark Brown from the South Atlantic Council.  
36 We are working on a pilot program. We're doing a pilot program  
37 right now, and I am doing that pilot program. We have a  
38 function on the tablet that you can turn on or turn off that  
39 will track your trip, and it will give you your coordinates  
40 anywhere you're going during your trip, and so that can be sent  
41 in too, along with your report.

42  
43 I also am doing the Southeast electronic headboat report, and  
44 we're currently working on that, with changing the map on it and  
45 trying to get the map a little bit more accurate, so that you  
46 can just actually click on that and it will give you your  
47 location and you can report it that way.

48



1 Then I'm also doing the South Carolina charter electronic  
2 logbook, and I'm doing three different ones at the same time,  
3 but they're all three just a little bit different, but we're  
4 trying to incorporate some of the things that we're seeing with  
5 the other ones to come up with a standard version of something  
6 that will work real well.

7  
8 The tracking feature seems to be really something that the  
9 people in the Northeast, the trawlers and stuff, like. They  
10 said that they can send that in and it gives their entire trip  
11 location as they're going along and wherever they're at, and  
12 then that goes in with their report.

13  
14 Another thing too though is, in the South Atlantic, we only have  
15 fifty-nine headboats, and so we don't have very many boats, but  
16 we have 2,000 or more charter boats, and so verification on  
17 whether the boat went fishing or not with the headboats is not  
18 too bad, because we have port samplers that go around and check,  
19 and people are able to verify whether the boat went or not, but  
20 one of the challenges is going to be with the charter fleet,  
21 with verification, on whether or not they actually went or not,  
22 and so that's one of the things too that we're probably going to  
23 have problems with.

24  
25 **DR. STOKES:** Probably some of the solution to making this better  
26 is technology, making the software do things that human beings  
27 are not as good at doing, I think, but we do get and we do use  
28 the GPS, and we get those every hour, and so that's what we're  
29 trying to use to do the matching now.

30  
31 My graduate student found the GPS coordinates of every MRIP  
32 sampling spot, found the GPS coordinates, and then he wrote an  
33 algorithm that would find when the captain -- He gets it every  
34 hour and then he finds the closest place to a possible MRIP  
35 sampling area, and that was part of his definition of what is a  
36 trip.

37  
38 The problem is that, if they are coming in, then that's their  
39 being, and then they come in and go out. You don't know whether  
40 they actually landed or not, and so there's some uncertainty  
41 with that, and so there may be a way to somehow record when you  
42 hit land somehow that would let us identify a trip a little bit  
43 better. They are supposed to do it, I think, but I'm sure  
44 there's lots of other things that are more important to do when  
45 you get back than lean on that button.

46  
47 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Anson.

48

1 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Dr. Stokes,  
2 for being here. I am familiar with the ratio estimator and  
3 trying to match vessels in Alabama, with just the red snapper  
4 trips, and it is quite a challenge. I have a question and then  
5 a comment, or I will bring up the comment first, and that is  
6 relative to the software.

7  
8 Mr. Kelly is back there, and I'm sure you all have been  
9 discussing it, but just, being a part-time biologist, I guess,  
10 and not a software programmer for GPS equipment, but you would  
11 think, or it might be possible, to program, into each unit, a  
12 northerly or a westerly, as to where that particular vessel was.  
13 Like, in Orange Beach, right at the pass there, you have that  
14 northerly location. Then you can say, once the vessel goes  
15 beyond this, it's out. Once it comes back, it's in type of a  
16 thing, and so I don't know. That's again, just a comment or a  
17 suggestion.

18  
19 The question I have relates to Slide 15, if you can pull that  
20 up. You have a bullet of find a way to identify and use in  
21 estimation all trips on equipped boats, even if catch is not  
22 reported and so, if the trip isn't being reported, what is the  
23 utility of that and trying to match? I am having a hard time  
24 understanding that.

25  
26 **DR. STOKES:** The estimator we use now doesn't do this, but there  
27 is kind of two things that you're estimating when you estimate  
28 total catch, and one of them is -- I mean, you're not physically  
29 doing these separately. You are doing them simultaneously, but  
30 on the same data.

31  
32 One is the total number of trips and one is the total number of  
33 catch. If you could pin down the total number -- If you  
34 actually knew the total number of trips that were made, then  
35 estimation is a lot better. In other words, if you just have to  
36 get catch information. If you knew, for a fact, exactly what N  
37 is, the number of trips, you could do an improved estimator.

38  
39 If it was possible -- So there is some information laying on the  
40 table there. All those captains who are not reporting their  
41 catch, if we just knew that they went on a trip, then that pins  
42 down the number of trips better. We have a bigger sample, more  
43 information, to help us estimate number of trips, and so I don't  
44 think there is a current estimator that does it, but I am going  
45 to assign that to one of my graduate students, to figure out how  
46 to use this extra source of information that we're not actually  
47 using now and we're just throwing it away.

48

1 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you.  
2  
3 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** We still have several people on the list that  
4 want to ask you a question, Dr. Stokes, and I think that we  
5 should let this go a little longer, because it's going to be  
6 very informative to our discussions in a minute, but up next is  
7 Mr. Boyd.  
8  
9 **MR. DOUG BOYD:** Thank you, Dr. Stokes. You said that there were  
10 about twenty captains who are not reporting?  
11  
12 **DR. STOKES:** Michael might know that better, but I think yes. I  
13 think, the last time that I looked, it was roughly twenty.  
14  
15 **MR. BOYD:** Okay. Approximately 10 percent of the vessels that  
16 are in the program are not reporting.  
17  
18 **DR. STOKES:** Have not reported.  
19  
20 **MR. BOYD:** Has anybody contacted those captains to find out if  
21 it's an equipment issue or if it's a time issue or if it's an  
22 attitude issue or what are the reasons that 10 percent are not  
23 reporting?  
24  
25 **DR. STOKES:** I don't really know that, but we have given that  
26 information to Bob Gill, who comes to our conference call every  
27 week. When we run into questions or something, we ask him, and  
28 so he knows that, and he asked for the information about it, and  
29 we gave it to him, and so I don't know what he's done with it,  
30 whether he has contacted them or what.  
31  
32 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Lynn, related to that question that Mr. Boyd  
33 asked, if you have avidity or whatever you want to call it,  
34 because, in your chart, it showed that some don't report at all,  
35 but then some report a lot, but it's a lot fewer, but that's  
36 accounted for in the estimator there to build it?  
37  
38 **DR. STOKES:** Yes.  
39  
40 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Riechers.  
41  
42 **MR. ROBIN RIECHERS:** Thank you for the presentation, certainly.  
43 Like Bonnie, I appreciate you trying to kind of create a  
44 situation where we kind of think about the extra effort we will  
45 need in places, whether it's devices or validations or how that  
46 would work. One thing I want to understand, because, as I  
47 understand it, what you're doing is you're matching variance and  
48 then solving, for the backend of this, what we would need to

1 increase.

2

3 **DR. STOKES:** That's correct.

4

5 **MR. RIECHERS:** If we were, because we are considering making  
6 this mandatory and getting it -- Which would, in effect, mean  
7 all people would have to report, but does your estimations here  
8 hold if the -- I would think they then would change if, for  
9 instance, instead of twenty non-reporting, that percentage  
10 increased in the non-reporting.

11

12 **DR. STOKES:** That's true.

13

14 **MR. RIECHERS:** Even though this is a great estimate for us, kind  
15 of thinking forward, if any of those values change  
16 proportionally, does that --

17

18 **DR. STOKES:** It will affect it, and so that's why some of this  
19 is pretty speculative. Not only that, but also, right now,  
20 we're benefitting from the fact that the captains that are in  
21 the program have larger catch, and it turns out that, in this  
22 variance expression, there is a reduction if the average catch  
23 per reporting trip is bigger than the average catch for a non-  
24 reporting trip, and that is definitely true. If you expanded it  
25 to everybody, then, of course, that ratio couldn't be as big.

26

27 **MR. RIECHERS:** To add to that, I mean just so that we all are  
28 aware, obviously these are people who are voluntarily in the  
29 system now, and so they are more likely to be more concerned and  
30 report at a higher rate and a better rate. I shouldn't say  
31 better, but possibly with higher quality reporting parameters  
32 than we might see when we average it out across from Brownsville  
33 to Key West and have everyone involved.

34

35 I can't say that, because, if we do a good enough education job,  
36 maybe that's not the case, but one could certainly think that  
37 when we're dealing with this first pilot, or really this is the  
38 third pilot, I believe, because we had a pilot earlier in Port  
39 Aransas and the Panhandle.

40

41 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Right, and that's what I was getting at with  
42 the avidity and how that might influence the future down the  
43 line. Mr. Strelcheck, did you have a question?

44

45 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** I was involved, five years ago, in the  
46 MRIP logbook pilot, and one of the things that we noted was that  
47 the logbook report catch rates, on average, were very comparable  
48 to the dockside sampling. Do you have information on the catch

1 rate information that's being collected through this and how  
2 it's comparing with the logbooks?

3

4 **DR. STOKES:** Do you mean per passenger or what?

5

6 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Just, on average, global average.

7

8 **DR. STOKES:** The average catch per boat is larger for the  
9 reporters than for the non-reporters. I don't mean for the non-  
10 reporters. We haven't actually looked at that, reporters and  
11 non-reporters. We have looked at reporters and people that  
12 aren't in the program. What I am asking is for those that are  
13 reporting and those that were sampled at the dock, and so the  
14 matching trips. Are the catch rates comparable?

15

16 **DR. STOKES:** For some species, yes. For some species, no. I  
17 know it's not entirely the captain's fault. Some of it is the  
18 matching. It's to figure out is this the trip that they were  
19 talking about. I mean, as I say, some of the correlations  
20 between catch reported per species is one, for certain species,  
21 between the captain and the dockside sampler, but, for the  
22 others, it's not, and so yes and no.

23

24 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Then, to follow on to Doug Boyd's comments,  
25 and, in particular, kind of a QA/QC component, I mean, it is  
26 concerning, obviously, that there is a lot of non-reporting  
27 occurring, despite the vessel monitoring systems being on and  
28 knowing that trips are being run.

29

30 With the headboat program that we ran a few years ago, one of  
31 the things we found is that it's really important to have that  
32 QA/QC, kind of the real-time monitoring and matching occurring,  
33 but, based on what I can tell, your students and yourself are  
34 kind of doing the matching after the fact, well after the  
35 reports have been submitted and the data is obtained, and is  
36 that correct?

37

38 **DR. STOKES:** I wouldn't say it's well after, but we haven't  
39 gotten -- Of course, you have to wait until the MRIP data is  
40 available, and then we actually get it from a different source  
41 than it goes to MRIP, and so it's definitely not real time.  
42 It's, I don't know, maybe six weeks later, by the time we  
43 complete the matching, after the end of the wave.

44

45 **MR. STRELCHECK:** In comparison, we were doing it in a matter of  
46 days, matching those trips.

47

48 **DR. STOKES:** We don't have any source of the data coming in, and

1 so that would be -- If it would be possible for us to receive  
2 the MRIP data in real time, we could do better on that.

3  
4 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Just for the council's knowledge, to CLS's  
5 credit, when they submitted this proposal, it had close to  
6 three-quarters-of-a-million dollars, I believe, set aside for  
7 dockside sampling that was cut out of it because of using the  
8 MRIP program, an existing program, for filling that need.

9  
10 I think it points to the challenge of electronic reporting  
11 programs. You really can't do them on the cheap if you want to  
12 do them well and have that necessary source of dockside  
13 validation.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Sanchez.

16  
17 **MR. JOHN SANCHEZ:** Thank you. I have a couple of questions.  
18 First, did the grad students or the university participants, did  
19 they sign some kind of confidentiality agreements for this  
20 fishing-location-specific information?

21  
22 **DR. STOKES:** Yes.

23  
24 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Thank you. The second question is some of the  
25 non-reporting, could it be attributed to people that entered the  
26 program participation late in the process?

27  
28 **DR. STOKES:** It could be.

29  
30 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Could you elaborate on that a little bit?

31  
32 **DR. STOKES:** I don't know a lot about that, exactly when -- I  
33 didn't show you the Wave 2 data, because that was when people  
34 were entering at a rapid clip, and so, starting in Wave 3, I  
35 don't believe there's been a large change in the number of  
36 devices installed. There has been an increase in the amount of  
37 reporting, but we matched the boats. As I said, Greg Bray  
38 helped us match the boats, and that was back in about July, I  
39 think, and so we were pretty far in, and I believe we have had  
40 very few added since that time.

41  
42 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Walker.

43  
44 **MR. WALKER:** I was just going to make the comment that some of  
45 the concerns about the non-reporting was some of the folks  
46 didn't get their equipment onboard until after snapper season,  
47 and that's where some of the non-reporting came in. It's kind  
48 of like when I was a kid. My mom used to put peas on the plate

1 and say to eat your peas and they're good for you. I think, if  
2 it's mandatory, and it becomes mandatory, that people will  
3 report better. It will be mandatory, and they will follow the  
4 rules. Thank you.

5  
6 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Captain Greene.

7  
8 **MR. JOHNNY GREENE:** Thank you. Just keep in mind that this is  
9 the first year that this program has run, and it was voluntary,  
10 and there was a lot of work within the industry to get people to  
11 be involved. You had people who received units because all they  
12 had to do was sign up. Some of them didn't want to use them at  
13 first because, as Captain Walker said, they didn't have to or  
14 they got busy and they forget to report.

15  
16 There was some discrepancies and issues with that, but I think,  
17 with any type of first-year type of program, as you go through  
18 that first year, it's going to get better and better and better.  
19 As you go into the second year, it should continue to trend  
20 upward.

21  
22 Now, there were some equipment issues that had to be worked  
23 through. I had some of those equipment issues, but we were able  
24 to resolve them and move on rather quickly, and so this is a lot  
25 of information that has come from the first year of a program,  
26 and I think there's a lot of utility here, and so just bear that  
27 in mind, because, as we get into the second year of this, the  
28 information should be a whole lot better.

29  
30 It's a lot easier for me to use it now. I know that, when I'm  
31 getting close to the pass, I need to make sure that I've got all  
32 my stuff together. It just took a while to get into the groove  
33 of something that was new and different, and I think that the  
34 numbers will continue, but I do think, as Mr. Boyd mentioned,  
35 attitude is some of the issue.

36  
37 There are some people who just are all for it, and there are  
38 some people who are just all against it, and so you've got a  
39 little bit of this stuff going back and forth, and I think,  
40 hopefully, that people will see some utility in this, and  
41 finding out how they were able to match trips and how much  
42 effort has gone into this is just astonishing to me, and I  
43 appreciate that effort.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I don't see any other questions around the  
46 table. Dr. Stokes, I do have a comment, or sort of a question,  
47 for you. First, thanks for coming and sharing your expertise.  
48 Obviously what you're talking about is very important to the

1 council, as we're making some important decisions, today in  
2 fact, on how we want to move with the data collection.

3  
4 With that in mind, I guess, we're debating how we want to  
5 implement this program in the next series of discussions. Is  
6 there any advice that you would like to give us, based upon what  
7 you have learned here, as we're about to put some of these  
8 programs in place, potentially?

9  
10 **DR. STOKES:** I believe that main one would be to help us with  
11 this matching, if there was a technological solution that could  
12 improve the very error-prone -- Relying on people to remember to  
13 do things, when they're very, very busy, and that would be the  
14 main advice that I would give.

15  
16 Also, I will second what was said over here about it being the  
17 first year. You know, at the very beginning of this, as you  
18 said, or someone said, there was money in the budget for  
19 increased verification sampling, which was taken away, and I  
20 think I'm the one who said, well, let's just try it the first  
21 year with the number of samples that are already collected for  
22 APAIS and then we'll just see where to go from there, and so I  
23 actually didn't expect that the precision would be comparable.

24  
25 I actually don't think that it's surprising either. I think a  
26 modest increase in verification sample size, and certainly --  
27 Well, if you can make it mandatory, I think that would be a slam  
28 dunk, but, short of that, I just think that better matching and  
29 a modest increase in verification sample would be the sort of  
30 smoothest path to equal precision.

31  
32 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Thank you, Dr. Stokes. Thank you for  
33 sharing your advice with us. Madam Chairwoman, we obviously  
34 have two major final action items on our agenda to complete, but  
35 I see we're kind of up against your scheduled break, and so  
36 would you like us to take a break at this point?

37  
38 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** If you think that you're on schedule to meet  
39 your timeframe, then yes.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** We're a little behind, but I think we're good.

42  
43 **MS. BOSARGE:** All right. Let's take our fifteen-minute break,  
44 and we will pick back up at 10:15.

45  
46 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** We are going to go through the South Atlantic



1 amendment, since hopefully that will go quicker and leave us  
2 time for discussion on how we want to proceed. Dr. Simmons is  
3 going to talk us through both amendments, in fact, and so,  
4 Carrie, do you want to take it from here? Thanks a lot.

5  
6 **FINAL ACTION - SOUTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL'S MODIFICATIONS TO CHARTER**  
7 **VESSEL AND HEADBOAT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**  
8

9 **DR. SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have Ryan and Mr.  
10 Brown that can help me with the South Atlantic Council document,  
11 and also John Froeschke, Dr. Froeschke, is on the webinar to  
12 help us with the Gulf document. Let's start with Tab F, Number  
13 6(a), and let's just go straight to page 9, Action 1.

14  
15 Just to let everyone know, the South Atlantic Council took final  
16 action on this document at their December 2016 meeting. It  
17 says, in here, that it's the goal of the South Atlantic Council  
18 to have a mandatory logbook program begin January 1, 2018, yet  
19 they recognize that there are a lot of issues and items to work  
20 through.

21  
22 Again, the South Atlantic Council took final action on this  
23 document in December of 2016. Let's look at Action 1. Before  
24 we get into this, I should note that there is some verbiage in  
25 both of the documents, both the Gulf's document and the South  
26 Atlantic document, and, if you look at the PDF version, and this  
27 is on page 57 of the South Atlantic Council document.

28  
29 Something that they put in here, and was talked about at their  
30 committee and council, was that, in order to keep around 402  
31 vessels from having to report in multiple systems, they stated  
32 that, if vessels have both a Gulf charter/headboat reef fish or  
33 CMP permit, in addition to a South Atlantic permit, that they  
34 would be required to abide by the Gulf's more stringent  
35 reporting requirements, regardless of where fishing, whether it  
36 be in the Gulf or the South Atlantic waters.

37  
38 That is something to keep in mind as we're going through this  
39 document and what their preferred alternatives are. The  
40 preferred alternative for the South Atlantic Council for Action  
41 1 for charter vessels, for the frequency and mechanism of data  
42 reporting, is Alternative 2a of Alternative 2, which requires  
43 the operators of charter vessels with a dolphin wahoo, snapper  
44 grouper, or CMP for-hire permit to report all effort and all  
45 catch, including harvest and discards, regardless of where the  
46 trip takes place and what species may be targeted. That was the  
47 preferred alternative that they took final action on for charter  
48 vessels. I will stop there, or I can go through the whole

1 document and we can talk about it, depending on what you want to  
2 do.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I will ask for the pleasure of the committee,  
5 if you guys want to just go through the whole document. Just  
6 for clarity, Carrie, do we need to have just one final motion to  
7 approve their document, or do we need to piecemeal this? If  
8 it's just one, I think I would prefer that, and so I don't see  
9 any objection around the table, and if you just want to go  
10 through it. Then, if there's any questions at the end, we can  
11 come back to anything.

12  
13 **DR. SIMMONS:** Let's go on then to Action 2. It's on page 14.  
14 Myron has his hand up.

15  
16 **MR. MYRON FISCHER:** Thank you, Carrie. On Preferred  
17 Subalternative 2, it was also their reporting frequency or does  
18 that get covered under frequency? When we get to the right  
19 point, I think I would also like a definition, and it's in both  
20 documents, of "via National Marine Fisheries Service approved  
21 hardware or software", and just maybe a sentence explaining  
22 specifically what that is, so there is no change in thought that  
23 what it is the day of the document -- Of course, technology  
24 grows and technology gets better, but I think some of us were  
25 always under the belief that a cellphone app could operate under  
26 this guideline, and then we found out differently, and so I  
27 would like that spelled out. Not necessarily in the South  
28 Atlantic document, but when we do get to that in our document.

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Myron, that was my question, and so, if you  
31 want to just hold that discussion until we get to our document  
32 and just move forward with theirs. If that works for you, then  
33 I would recommend that's what we do.

34  
35 **MR. FISCHER:** Also, they discussed in the Preferred 2, of weekly  
36 reporting. They had other parts that we just skipped over, and  
37 I would like to hear some dialogue, and possibly from the South  
38 Atlantic, why they thought that was sufficient to have weekly  
39 reporting.

40  
41 **MR. BROWN:** The main thing was we were trying to align it with  
42 the headboat program that's already in place. It's been in  
43 place for about a year-and-a-half now, and we're trying to bring  
44 the reporting more in line, so that everybody is on the same  
45 program.

46  
47 **DR. SIMMONS:** Thank you. I forgot to mention the frequency.  
48 It's weekly, the Tuesday following each fishing week, is the

1 preferred alternative. Let's go to page 14 for headboats,  
2 Action 2. The preferred alternative is for the headboats is to  
3 require that headboats, while operating as a headboat, submit  
4 fishing records to the Science Center Research Director weekly,  
5 or at intervals shorter than a week, if notified by the SRD via  
6 the electronic reporting with NMFS approved hardware or software  
7 device weekly, the Tuesday following each fishing week.

8  
9 As Mr. Brown stated, that would be consistent with what the  
10 charter vessels are being -- The frequency for the charter  
11 vessels for the reporting requirements, and so I will stop  
12 there.

13  
14 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I don't see any questions, Dr. Simmons. Go  
15 ahead.

16  
17 **DR. SIMMONS:** All right, and so let's go on. There is one more  
18 action in this document. It's on page 17, and it's to modify  
19 the electronic reporting requirements to require vessel or catch  
20 location reporting, and this is for charter vessels, because  
21 this is not currently required, but I believe it is for the  
22 headboats in the South Atlantic Council, and it's Preferred  
23 Alternative 2, which is to require federally-permitted charter  
24 vessels to report location fished electronically by manually  
25 entering the latitude and longitude, in degrees and minutes, or  
26 by clicking on an electronic chart, and this was the preferred  
27 alternative.

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Fischer.

30  
31 **MR. FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'm not certain,  
32 again, where the answer would come from. It may have to come  
33 from the South Atlantic, but the electronic chart, is this  
34 technology that's been in existence? Is it something that  
35 actually operates? I don't know anything about the electronic  
36 chart technology.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I would defer that to Mr. Brown, since this is  
39 his amendment.

40  
41 **MR. BROWN:** This is something that has been implemented since  
42 the beginning, and it's being modified though currently, with a  
43 different type of a chart, to where it's a little bit more  
44 accurate. It has some areas of reference on it, as far as your  
45 depth and everything, and it's just kind of giving you a more  
46 precise area that you can look at when you're clicking on it  
47 too, but you can scroll across it, and it will give you your  
48 lat/long as you're scrolling across the chart.

1  
2 Then you can click on this location, but this is -- That's also  
3 something that's going to be different than the charter logbook.  
4 The charter pilot program, right now, does not have a map  
5 associated with it. You have to enter the lat/long in there  
6 manually, and they are working on a map right now that they are  
7 going to implement into it, but it also, as I said before, they  
8 have this option on there to where you can click it and you can  
9 track your trip, and so it will give you your location along  
10 every point as you're underway.

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Did that answer your question, Mr. Fischer?  
13 I've seen it before in other similar programs. It's kind of  
14 like the location services on your phone. It knows where you  
15 are. It kind of says this is where I'm at. It's kind of smart.  
16 You can click "yes" or "no" or move it in a pretty refined  
17 manner to get a high level of location accuracy. Mr. Fischer.

18  
19 **MR. FISCHER:** If I could ask a follow-up, if it's user-friendly,  
20 if the captains felt that this is something they preferred  
21 doing, or it was more burdensome.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Brown.

24  
25 **MR. BROWN:** What part is more burdensome?

26  
27 **MR. FISCHER:** If using the map. If the map was something they  
28 felt was easier to use or if it was a burden to use.

29  
30 **MR. BROWN:** No, I think it was easier. Some of the older  
31 captains that still use TDs, rather than the lat/long, it helped  
32 them too, with having reference points on there, and giving them  
33 some idea of where they were located and trying to associate the  
34 TDs with the lat/long. Clicking on it gives you that location,  
35 being able to define it fairly easily.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Fischer, I think it actually facilitates  
38 it. It enters the lat/long for you, and so it actually is a  
39 very useful utility, at least from the experience that I've had,  
40 but Mr. Riechers had a question.

41  
42 **MR. RIECHERS:** I want to understand. Right now, it's a separate  
43 program that is not included in kind of the electronic catch  
44 reporting, or is it actually another program that talks to that  
45 program and basically enters those lat/long as you go, if you  
46 punch it and say I fished here? Then my second question is how  
47 does that really play into a weekly notion, if that's what the  
48 preferred alternative is speaking to?

1  
2 **MR. BROWN:** The software has it built into it, to where, when  
3 you click on it, it does everything for you. Then when it's  
4 submitted, it goes to ACCSP or the Southeast Fisheries Science  
5 Center. There is certain entities that can access this right  
6 now, since it's a pilot program, but, when you click on it, it  
7 already gives you all of that, but I was trying to remember,  
8 what was the second part of it?  
9  
10 **MR. RIECHERS:** I guess I was wondering how that -- It sounds  
11 like that's a real-time, everyday kind of program, and then how  
12 that then plays into the weekly reporting, and they may be two  
13 completely separate programs. I am just trying to figure that  
14 out.  
15  
16 **MR. BROWN:** Right now, you can submit it daily if you want to,  
17 on a daily basis, but, as a requirement, it only has to be done  
18 weekly, and so, actually, you could do all of your reports every  
19 day and then you could submit the batch of all the reports at  
20 the end of the week if you wanted to, and so that's really the  
21 discretion of the operator.  
22  
23 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Brown, I have a question for you. Is this  
24 just one location, or, if there's multiple areas they're fishing  
25 that could be, theoretically, fairly far apart, how is that  
26 handled?  
27  
28 **MR. BROWN:** With the charter headboat, you click, like I said,  
29 on the map, and it's in a grid. It gives you a certain distance  
30 on the grid, but, with the charter logbook, it has like  
31 different -- If you were changing your effort and changing  
32 different areas or something, or even changing the way you fish,  
33 you can change -- There is a place where you can click on it  
34 that shows different efforts. If you're going from one area to  
35 another, or, like I said, changing one fishing mode to another,  
36 it will indicate that.  
37  
38 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Dr. Simmons, do you want to continue?  
39  
40 **DR. SIMMONS:** That completes our report on the South Atlantic  
41 Council document. We don't have, I don't think, the codified  
42 text yet for the committee to review. I think, by Full Council,  
43 we will have that. Sue is nodding her head. We'll have that  
44 for the council to look at and deem, so you can move it forward  
45 to the Secretary, unless you have more questions or concerns at  
46 that time.  
47  
48 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. I do have a question, but I think Mr.

1 Strelcheck has a comment he wants to make.

2  
3 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Just another question for Mark. I expect, here  
4 shortly, that we're going to have a conversation about GPS-  
5 enabled devices. The South Atlantic Council, in their  
6 amendment, did not consider those. Was there discussion around  
7 that, in terms of using a GPS-enabled device? If so, why wasn't  
8 it further considered by the South Atlantic Council?

9  
10 **MR. BROWN:** That's a good question, Andy, but it is available on  
11 this pilot program. You can enable it, but it's still kind of a  
12 soft situation, to where it's not a requirement yet to make that  
13 happen, but that is an option. Right now, I think we're just  
14 trying to get this moved forward, to where we can get some  
15 reporting to start happening. Right now, it's on a voluntary  
16 basis, and it will become mandatory as of January 1, 2018, and  
17 so we're working through some of just trying to figure out how  
18 we want to do this.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Ponwith.

21  
22 **DR. PONWITH:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. The council members, in  
23 their questions to our liaison from the South Atlantic, have  
24 noted some very big differences between the amendment as it has  
25 evolved here versus there.

26  
27 What you see is the major differences are the periodicity, the  
28 weekly reporting versus daily reporting, the potential for  
29 reporting before you hit the docks here, the potential for GPS-  
30 enabled systems, so that we are able to account for actual  
31 effort, and we discussed that this morning, the importance of  
32 knowing what that effort is for making the corrections to the  
33 landings when the reported landings and the observed landings  
34 differ or not.

35  
36 Those differences are going to make a very starkly different  
37 program in the Gulf of Mexico versus the South Atlantic, and we  
38 had a lot of discussions regarding the notion of weekly and  
39 regarding the use of GPS, and I think, in the South Atlantic,  
40 the idea was that this is a baby step toward a program that  
41 would be more comprehensive and generate higher-precision data  
42 and, therefore, data of higher utility, but this was a baby  
43 step.

44  
45 That baby step is to have the charter/for-hire data collection  
46 mimic, as closely as possible, the headboat, and the difference  
47 is that the charter fleet is an order of magnitude bigger than  
48 the headboat fleet, and it does raise some concerns.

1  
2 I think those contrasts are important to note and what the  
3 program gets you, in terms of the comparison in the South  
4 Atlantic to here, what the preferred alternatives are in the  
5 Gulf. Those are important discussion points.

6  
7 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** All right. Thank you, Bonnie. Mr. Brown.

8  
9 **MR. BROWN:** I would just like to follow up on what Bonnie said  
10 too, and I think that, because of the way that we have done it  
11 so far -- You know, we've gotten a lot of positive response, a  
12 lot of good feedback from the charter fleet.

13  
14 You know, obviously, there were some people that did not want to  
15 participate or be part of this, but, as a whole, looking at it  
16 across the board for all the different states, we did get some  
17 really good feedback from a lot of people, and that is what I  
18 think has helped move this program forward.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Diaz.

21  
22 **MR. DALE DIAZ:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not on your  
23 committee, but I did want to ask a question, because I want to  
24 be able to think about this before we get to Full Council, and  
25 this might be for Dr. Ponwith.

26  
27 Dr. Ponwith, what I've been trying to think about, as we go  
28 through this, is, ultimately, I would like to see some  
29 electronic reporting put into place that is rigorous enough to  
30 help us in the future with in-season monitoring and to  
31 potentially replace MRIP in the future. Could you speak to  
32 that? Is this South Atlantic system rigorous enough to do those  
33 two things? Thank you.

34  
35 **DR. PONWITH:** I think that having another data stream has value,  
36 because it enables you to do comparisons and look for  
37 similarities and look for differences and study the rationale  
38 why.

39  
40 My personal opinion right now, as the South Atlantic amendment  
41 stands, it will not be adequate to eventually replace MRIP, but  
42 it's an important step. As the council views, it's an important  
43 step on evolving to that point, and they view it as a necessary  
44 step.

45  
46 If the goal of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council is  
47 to create a program that could eventually be certified as the  
48 data collection program for the Gulf of Mexico, and ultimately

1 be calibrated in against the MRIP time series, then I think the  
2 Gulf of Mexico is heading down the correct path, particularly if  
3 they want that to happen sooner rather than later, and that is  
4 to have a very rigorous program where, and we heard that  
5 presentation this morning, where matching is facilitated, where  
6 it's as simple as possible to know who pushed that button at-sea  
7 and whether that is the same person that you are sampling at the  
8 dock. That gives you the highest level of statistical power.

9  
10 The other thing in the presentation we learned this morning is  
11 the sample size that it takes to do that can be mitigated for if  
12 you have 100 percent certainty on how much actual fishing effort  
13 there was, and that is aided by having GPS-based systems affixed  
14 to the vessel, so we know when someone went fishing versus when  
15 they did not. That combination is very, very powerful, and it  
16 puts the Gulf of Mexico program on the right path and on an  
17 expedited path to ultimately being the program that replaces  
18 MRIP, because it's superior.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Bonnie. On that note, we probably  
21 need to move forward, because we have a lot of discussion. One  
22 reason we obviously moved this forward with some of this is  
23 bleeding into our amendment, and I guess, just to follow up on  
24 Bonnie's comment, my general take on this is that, depending on  
25 where we go obviously, if the programs are very different like  
26 they are headed towards now, you might have some comparisons,  
27 and so it's a useful contrast, but I certainly feel like, based  
28 on Lynn's discussion that we just had, that we're going to need  
29 a little bit more frequency of reporting to really make it work.

30  
31 I guess, to move this forward, Carrie, because I am not totally  
32 clear how we need to do this, and maybe this is a question for  
33 Mara. We don't have the codified ready right now, but we'll  
34 have it at full council, and so do we need to make a motion now  
35 to move this forward and do the codified text at Full Council or  
36 how -- In other words, I'm not sure what we need to do here at  
37 this point.

38  
39 **MS. MARA LEVY:** I think you could wait and do it all at Full  
40 Council if the committee -- Another option is for the committee  
41 to make a motion that it accepts all of the preferred  
42 alternatives that the South Atlantic, because you just reviewed  
43 them, that the South Atlantic chose and then recommend that to  
44 Full Council. Then, at Full Council, the Full Council could  
45 agree with that and then make the broader motion to approve it  
46 with the codified text.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** If it's okay with the committee, I think I



1 would prefer that, simply because -- In other words, I would  
2 like to make a motion here to give some indication of where  
3 we're going with the South Atlantic, which might influence our  
4 discussions here in a few minutes.

5  
6 We can wait on the codified text and officially, I guess, do  
7 this, or whatever we need to do, at Full Council, but I think it  
8 might be important, for public testimony and a variety of other  
9 things, that at least we give some indication of what the  
10 committee feels about where we are with their alternatives.  
11 Unless there is opposition to that, I would entertain a motion  
12 to that effect, regarding the South Atlantic's amendment. Mr.  
13 Riechers.

14  
15 **MR. RIECHERS:** I will try to help you out here, Greg. **The**  
16 **committee recommends to the Full Council that we accept all the**  
17 **preferred selections in the South Atlantic Council amendment,**  
18 **and I am trying to scroll back up to the number, whatever the**  
19 **number of their amendment is. Mark, you may know it right off**  
20 **the top of your head. It's Amendment Number --**

21  
22 **MR. BROWN:** 39.

23  
24 **MR. RIECHERS:** 39. Okay. **It's dealing with all the different**  
25 **species, and so let's just say "within the electronic reporting**  
26 **amendment" and make it simple, in that respect.**

27  
28 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mara.

29  
30 **MS. LEVY:** I guess it doesn't matter that much, but I don't  
31 think the committee really needs to recommend it. You can leave  
32 it like that. Generally, when you're making committee motions,  
33 you're just making a motion to accept all of the preferred  
34 alternatives in the South Atlantic amendment. Then, when you do  
35 the committee report, you're saying that, but it's up to you if  
36 you want to leave it like it is.

37  
38 **MR. RIECHERS:** I am fine with that, with however you want to do  
39 **it.**

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Riechers, is that your motion?

42  
43 **MR. RIECHERS:** Yes.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Is there a second to the motion? Mr. Fischer  
46 seconds the motion. **Is there any opposition to this motion?**  
47 **Seeing none, the motion passes.** Carrie, do you want to move us  
48 forward?

1  
2 **DR. SIMMONS:** Yes. Mr. Chairman, would you like Emily to go  
3 through the public comments before we get into our amendment, or  
4 do you want me to go through action-by-action and then hear the  
5 comments she has?  
6

7 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Let's let her go through the public comments,  
8 since we'll have that information before we get too far along.  
9

10 **FINAL ACTION - MODIFICATIONS TO GENERIC CHARTER VESSEL AND**  
11 **HEADBOAT REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**  
12 **REVIEW OF PUBLIC COMMENTS**  
13

14 **MS. EMILY MUEHLSTEIN:** I can do that. If you direct your  
15 attention to Tab F, and it's Number 5(b), and what I will do is  
16 we've actually reported comments to you throughout the  
17 development of this document a couple of times, and so the  
18 comments that I am going to give you right now are simply the  
19 ones that we have received since the October council meeting.  
20 However, you will see on that on that tab that there is a full  
21 record of the comments that we have received throughout the  
22 development of the document.  
23

24 These are separated action-by-action. We'll start with Action  
25 1, which deals with the frequency and mechanism of data  
26 reporting for charter vessels. We heard that charter boats in  
27 Mississippi especially support the no-action alternative for  
28 Action 1, because a majority of trips occur inshore, and the  
29 boats don't want to have to report in Mississippi if they are  
30 doing mostly inshore activities.  
31

32 There was also support for Preferred Alternative 4 expressed,  
33 and that alternative would require operators to submit the  
34 fishing records via electronic reporting prior to landing. This  
35 support was expressed because trip-level reporting offers the  
36 most accurately and timely application of electronic logbooks,  
37 and it reduces recall bias, and it also provides for data  
38 verification.  
39

40 Moving on to Action 2, which considers the frequency and  
41 mechanism of data reporting for headboats, there was support  
42 expressed for the council's current Preferred Alternative 4,  
43 which would, again, require operators to submit fishing records  
44 via electronic reporting prior to landing, and the same  
45 rationale was expressed here as in the earlier action. It's  
46 because trip-level reporting offers the most accurate and timely  
47 application of electronic logbooks, it reduces recall bias, and  
48 provides for data validation.

1  
2 Moving to Action 3, support for Alternative 3 was expressed.  
3 Alternative 3 would require vessels to hail-in before landing,  
4 and the rationale provided was that hailing-in would maximize  
5 dockside sampling efficiency and enhance validation. It was  
6 also mentioned that reporting all the released fish should be  
7 included in any reporting requirements that the council decides  
8 to set.

9  
10 Then, finally, Action 4, which looks at the hardware and  
11 software requirements for reporting, we heard that the use of  
12 VMS is not supported and that electronic reporting is okay as  
13 long as that VMS is not required. Electronic logbooks should be  
14 used immediately. It was also said that any expense that comes  
15 from a vessel monitoring or reporting system should be incurred  
16 by the agency rather than by the fishermen.

17  
18 Then there was support expressed for Preferred Alternative 2,  
19 which would require vessel operators to submit fishing records  
20 via National Marine Fisheries approved hardware/software with  
21 minimum archived GPS capabilities. That is what we had public-  
22 comment-wise between the last meeting and now.

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thanks, Emily. Carrie, do you want to move us  
25 through the document, please?

26  
27 **REVIEW OF AMENDMENT**

28  
29 **DR. SIMMONS:** We will be looking at Tab F, Number 5(a), the Gulf  
30 Council's ELB document. Let's start with Action 1 on page 7,  
31 Modify the Frequency and Mechanism of Data Reporting for Charter  
32 Vessels.

33  
34 I just want to remind the committee that the preferred  
35 alternative is Alternative 4, require that the owner or operator  
36 of a charter vessel for which a Gulf charter headboat permit for  
37 reef fish or coastal migratory pelagics has been issued, submit  
38 fishing records to NMFS for each trip via electronic reporting.  
39 That is a NMFS-approved hardware/software device prior to  
40 arriving at the dock.

41  
42 We did make a few revisions to the notes here, and so I just  
43 wanted to point out that, in the notes, the intent of the  
44 council for reporting during catastrophic conditions, and you  
45 can see that's laid out better, probably, since the last time  
46 that you reviewed it.

47  
48 Then delinquent reporting and then the no-fishing reports. It

1 links it back to Action 4, which is the hardware or software  
2 device being permanently affixed to the vessel, and it says,  
3 unless there is a permanently-affixed hardware on the vessel  
4 that records location information, then a no-fishing report  
5 would be required if no fishing took place during the reporting  
6 period. These notes have been modified a little bit, and so I  
7 just wanted to point that out. Moving forward, the other thing  
8 --

9  
10 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Carrie, before you go too far, I just wanted to  
11 make a quick point here. So the committee is aware of what has  
12 happened, and maybe you can summarize it better than me, Carrie.  
13 There was some questions by a lot of folks, us and others, about  
14 the intent of the council versus what it actually said in the  
15 amendment, and so the IPT and council staff and others worked to  
16 modify the document, and you will see that coming up soon more,  
17 to make it clear what our intent was.

18  
19 For those of you looking through this, I would pay close  
20 attention to the notes, to make sure that this document is  
21 conveying the intent of the council, so we can -- Essentially,  
22 we were trying to tighten it up a little bit. Am I capturing  
23 that appropriately, Carrie, or if you want to add to that.

24  
25 **DR. SIMMONS:** Yes, that's correct. Along those same lines,  
26 staff wants to clarify that it is the intent of this amendment  
27 to require owners and operators of these permits to report at  
28 least the minimum requirements that are outlined in Table 2.1.1,  
29 as the headnotes do, which is species caught, number kept, and  
30 number released for each trip.

31  
32 That means all state species. It could be state species as well  
33 as HMS species, and so we just want to make sure that that is  
34 the council's intent. That would be consistent with what the  
35 South Atlantic document is now proposing to require as well as  
36 the MRIP dockside intercept survey, and so I will stop there.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Fischer, earlier in our discussion on the  
39 South Atlantic amendment, you mentioned -- We were kind of  
40 holding off some of the discussion for here about frequency, and  
41 this might be a good time, or if you prefer to wait. I don't  
42 want to guide you, but we're kind of to that area of the  
43 document.

44  
45 **MR. FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Somewhere in this  
46 document, I think it's known that I am going to propose that  
47 Alternative 2 be our preferred alternative, and I have a  
48 multitude of reasons, but, if I don't get a second, I need not

1 go any further.  
2  
3 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** We have a motion. We need a second. We will  
4 wait to get the motion on the board.  
5  
6 **MR. FISCHER:** On Action 1.  
7  
8 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mara.  
9  
10 **MS. LEVY:** Can we make the motion be the motion and then put the  
11 alternative language after it? I don't want to get in the habit  
12 of throwing the whole alternative up there as the motion. It  
13 will be really hard to put in a -- It's going to be confusing, I  
14 think, and so the motion should be that Alternative 2 be the  
15 preferred alternative, and then you can put the language of the  
16 actual alternative below it.  
17  
18 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That's a great point, and Mr. Fischer is okay  
19 with it. Mr. Fischer, is that your motion?  
20  
21 **MR. FISCHER:** Yes, it is.  
22  
23 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** We need a second to this motion.  
24  
25 **DR. LUCAS:** Second.  
26  
27 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Lucas seconds the motion. Any discussion?  
28 Mr. Fischer.  
29  
30 **MR. FISCHER:** We are making the motion on behalf of our state  
31 charter boats, who we met with the principal owners throughout  
32 the state. We had a series of workshop meetings over the last  
33 couple of weeks, and this is the system that they would prefer,  
34 and so we will defend them, for showing up at those meetings and  
35 giving us a system to work with.  
36  
37 Other issues are, as we feel, is you're going from no system to  
38 an extremely tight system of reporting before you get to the  
39 dock, and we thought there should be elements involved where you  
40 begin to crawl and then you begin to walk long before you begin  
41 to run. There will be growing problems and growing pains  
42 involved, and we think it should start out with a smaller  
43 version of the logbook, something like this, that is due weekly,  
44 before we get into one that's due before you get to the dock.  
45  
46 I don't think Louisiana charter boats are extremely unique, but  
47 probably 95 percent of our fleet are outboards, and they just  
48 felt it was difficult, especially the Venice boats coming up the

1 river and trying to enter data into a logbook and dodging ships  
2 and dodging logs, and the Mississippi River is treacherous, and  
3 it's their feelings, and we support it. Thank you.

4

5 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Riechers.

6

7 **MR. RIECHERS:** I think, obviously, part of what our difficulty  
8 in determining which method to use is we don't really know which  
9 management system we're trying to put in place here, and so, as  
10 Bonnie pointed out, you can go for the gold standard that will  
11 fit any management system or you can basically go for something  
12 that fits the current management system, or one that may be  
13 better than what we now have.

14

15 I think, as many of you recall, we sent this to our science  
16 committee. We had a special working group that dealt with data  
17 collection and state representatives, as well as federal  
18 representatives, on that, from a science perspective, and I am  
19 not recalling exactly their recommendation, but none of their  
20 recommendations spoke to the daily reporting. They said either  
21 we could go the next day or a weekly reporting interval, given  
22 the current management system that we're trying to employ.

23

24 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Donaldson.

25

26 **MR. DONALDSON:** I also will point out, when we did the MRIP  
27 logbook pilot, it was weekly reporting. It wasn't Gulf-wide.  
28 It was done in the Aransas area in Texas and the Panhandle in  
29 Florida, but that was the preferred when we did it in those  
30 regions.

31

32 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Ponwith and then Mr. Strelcheck.

33

34 **DR. PONWITH:** In light of the presentation that we had today and  
35 the difficulty in matching the data, weekly reporting will make  
36 matching those data even more challenging, my view is, and the  
37 matching of those data have very large implications as the  
38 precision of the numbers that you generate based on it.

39

40 We got a really excellent talk this morning that shows what  
41 those data look like and how influential the ability to match  
42 those data, a trip to a dockside observation, and my view is  
43 that going to a weekly reporting makes the matching more  
44 difficult and not easier.

45

46 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Strelcheck.

47

48 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I would pretty much echo Bonnie's comment here,

1 that the challenge we have is trying to improve both the  
2 accuracy and timeliness of data, and, by taking this step back  
3 from daily reporting to weekly reporting, the matching of that  
4 data will become more difficult, and I expect less timely and  
5 likely not meet some of the potential management goals you are  
6 now laying out for your for-hire program in the near future.

7

8 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Walker.

9

10 **MR. WALKER:** I agree with Bonnie and what she said, too. I  
11 think it's more accurate if you get this data during the day.  
12 It's not that difficult to get the data entered into the system.  
13 We are wanting better data. Everybody is wanting better data  
14 for better science, and, like I said, it's not that difficult to  
15 enter in this data. I think it would be more accurate and  
16 fresher on the fishermen's minds to stick with the before you  
17 land the fish, reporting your data.

18

19 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Mr. Boyd and then Mr. Anson.

20

21 **MR. BOYD:** I am not on your committee, Mr. Chairman, but I  
22 assume, and please correct me if I'm wrong, but I assume that,  
23 at a later date, we could -- If Alternative 2 was the preferred,  
24 we could come back in another amendment and change that to where  
25 it is trip reporting. Is that correct?

26

27 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Yes.

28

29 **MR. BOYD:** Okay, and so we don't lose anything, other than  
30 immediate trip reporting here. We go to weekly, in this case.

31

32 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Anson.

33

34 **MR. ANSON:** Myron, I appreciate your comments and bringing them  
35 forward from your charter boat guys, and I can certainly  
36 appreciate kind of the gradual easing-in to a certain data  
37 collection program, but I think we're going to have that, to  
38 some degree, because, as Bonnie had mentioned earlier, this is  
39 going to be a process unto itself, as far as it becoming  
40 approved, or my sense is that they will have to be -- The data  
41 will be collected for several years and then that will have to  
42 be compared against the MRIP data for charter boats. If  
43 everything goes through the certification process, then they can  
44 be used in the toolbox, is my sense, and so there is going to be  
45 a break-in period.

46

47 Granted, it's going to be, if it goes with the current  
48 preferred, a daily reporting, versus the weekly reporting, and

1 there are some issues with recall bias and such associated with  
2 waiting until the end of the week to report data, particularly  
3 if you're trying to match that information, and so that's my  
4 comment.

5  
6 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. We will probably need to move this  
7 along, because we're running out of time for the committee, and  
8 I have several more to go, but I do have Mr. Greene on the list  
9 and Dr. Lucas and Mr. Walker, and so try to make this as quick  
10 as we can, so we can move on. Captain Greene.

11  
12 **MR. GREENE:** Thank you. I speak in opposition to this. I am a  
13 charter boat fisherman, and have been since 1996, and I worked  
14 in the cockpit for a long time before that. There's no reason  
15 to back up here. I mean, if you have to stop your boat and take  
16 two minutes, literally two minutes, to fill out a report before  
17 you hit the dock, there is nothing wrong with stopping your  
18 boat. Stop the boat and fill out your report. The customers  
19 get into it. They like what they see. They like the fact that  
20 you're engaged in the process.

21  
22 I have deckhands that help fill out the logbook. It is not a  
23 complicated deal, and it's something that is going to get us  
24 where we are. I understand where people who want this  
25 alternative are coming from, but I just don't see any reason to  
26 back up at this particular point.

27  
28 You run into recall bias, and you're going to run into just a  
29 whole host of things that we've talked about in the past before,  
30 and while I am certainly understanding of some charter fleets  
31 throughout the Gulf, there are some states who require you to  
32 report whether you're recreational or charter before you hit the  
33 dock, period, and so, building on that, I think that we need to  
34 stay with Preferred Alternative 4, and so I speak in opposition  
35 to this motion.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Lucas.

38  
39 **DR. LUCAS:** Myron, I supported the motion for the sake of  
40 discussion, and I appreciate -- I know exactly where your  
41 charter/for-hire are coming from, because my charter/for-hire  
42 over in Mississippi are in the same place, and they have  
43 expressed some concern about permanent hardware and stuff and  
44 having open-console boats. That can cause problems with that,  
45 as well as reporting before they hit the dock, but I am thinking  
46 that weekly is a little extreme on that, just given some of the  
47 reporting issues that we've had in Mississippi, and so I think  
48 I'm going to have to vote against the motion.



1  
2 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Walker and then Dr. Dana and then we need  
3 to vote on this.  
4  
5 **MR. WALKER:** I was just going to say that this year in Alabama  
6 that there was a mandatory game check, and you cannot move the  
7 animal until you take the piece of paper and pencil or pen and  
8 paper or whatever and fill out the form. You cannot move the  
9 animal, and also they have an app, where you don't have to worry  
10 about carrying a piece of paper or a pen with you.  
11  
12 You can use that app to record the animal when you move it, and  
13 it's just good data. Alabama wants successful game management,  
14 and I would like to see the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management  
15 Council work in the same direction for successful data  
16 collection for the charter industry, and I think daily would be  
17 better, before you land the fish. It's not that difficult.  
18  
19 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Dana.  
20  
21 **DR. PAMELA DANA:** Thank you, Chairman Stunz. As a charter boat  
22 owner too, I have had to do these kind of reporting in the pilot  
23 in the past, and, frankly, it's harder to do it on a weekly  
24 basis or waiting any longer than that day, because you forget.  
25 I mean, I completely understand where Myron is coming from, but  
26 just, for practical reasons, it's harder.  
27  
28 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I would add to Dr. Dana. Mr. Greene brought up  
29 about recall bias, but it is clear in the literature that there  
30 is recall bias. The longer you wait is a problem. We heard the  
31 discussion from Lynn this morning with all the matching issues,  
32 and so I don't support changing our alternatives as is, but we  
33 do need to move this forward, and so we need to dispense with  
34 this motion. **If we can take a vote, those in favor of the**  
35 **motion of changing our preferred alternative, please raise your**  
36 **hand; those in opposition to the motion, please raise your hand.**  
37 **The motion fails.** Carrie, do you want to continue through the  
38 document, please?  
39  
40 **DR. SIMMONS:** So staff was correct with the intent, as far as  
41 all species potentially being reported for this. We didn't any  
42 comments there, and so let's move on to Action 2. It's on page  
43 11, and this is Modify the Frequency and Mechanism of Data  
44 Reporting for Headboats.  
45  
46 Again, I want to point out there are some similar edits to the  
47 notes as I discussed in Action 1. That's pretty much the exact  
48 same verbiage that you saw in Action 1, underneath the

1 alternatives. Again, just the permanently affixed portion of  
2 the hardware, if that's put on the vessel, and, again, you would  
3 not have to submit those no-fishing reports, and that could  
4 potentially reduce burden on the owner and operator.

5  
6 These are the same notes, and, again, your preferred alternative  
7 here is Preferred Alternative 4, the trip-level reporting, and  
8 so I will stop there, for headboats.

9  
10 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Anson.

11  
12 **MR. ANSON:** I know you have explained it, Carrie, but, in Table  
13 2.2.1, those are the elements that are currently collected in  
14 the Southeast region headboat survey and there aren't --  
15 Specifically, I guess, I'm asking what about disposition? Is  
16 that something that is collected in the headboat survey or is  
17 not, the disposition of released, discarded, catch?

18  
19 **MR. STRELCHECK:** We can double-check, but I'm pretty sure that  
20 it's not collected and that they just apply a release mortality  
21 rate to the numbers released.

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

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Go ahead.

26  
27 **DR. SIMMONS:** Moving on to Action 3, it's on page 15, the Trip  
28 Notification and Reporting Requirements. You will see some  
29 yellow here, and this is the hail-out and hail-in requirements  
30 that you've been working on. You can see your current preferred  
31 alternatives here for both charter vessels and headboats  
32 requiring, as currently drafted.

33  
34 As an IPT, we have some minor suggestions for just cleaning up  
35 the language here for this action, and it's really the last part  
36 of the alternative, when we're asking -- I guess it's the whole  
37 alternative throughout, but primarily the last part, where we're  
38 asking, prior to departing for any trip, the owner or operator  
39 of a vessel issued a charter vessel/headboat permit for Gulf  
40 reef fish or Gulf CMP is required to declare, hail-out, the type  
41 of trip. That would be part of the new language, and then, when  
42 departing on a for-hire trip, they must include the expected  
43 return time and landing location, and so that's just slightly  
44 different wording than what you see above for Alternative 2.

45  
46 Then, for the proposed IPT-recommended language for Alternative  
47 3, you can see that, in the last part of that alternative, we  
48 have recommended that we add the "via the NMFS approved

1 hardware/software" device, as determined in Action 4, instead of  
2 just "via electronic reporting". Those are some recommendations  
3 that the IPT had regarding this action.

4  
5 Then, on the notes from the last time you reviewed this, we have  
6 added some information in about an approved emergency system. I  
7 think you asked us to add this in after a Reef Fish AP had  
8 suggested that we have a type of emergency system put in as a  
9 back-up, and so that's a new sentence or two that has been added  
10 to the document.

11  
12 Then there's just a note that, if the council selects the VMS as  
13 preferred, the hail-out reporting requirement could be  
14 accomplished via that system, unless an alternative mechanism is  
15 approved. I will stop there.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Does anyone have any comments or  
18 concerns about the changes to this language in the document?  
19 Mr. Anson.

20  
21 **MR. ANSON:** I am wondering what the agency thinks about that  
22 last comment, about as far as an approved emergency system  
23 needing to be developed. Is that something that is acceptable  
24 or doable?

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Strelcheck.

27  
28 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and we have systems in place for the IFQ  
29 programs for the commercial fishery to use VMS, and so it would  
30 be similar to that.

31  
32 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** If there is no other comments, Carrie, go  
33 ahead. I guess there is one from Mara.

34  
35 **MS. LEVY:** I just think that we need to make clear, by a motion  
36 or something, that the committee accepts the IPT-recommended  
37 language. Is it okay for the IPT to substitute that language  
38 for what is currently in the alternatives?

39  
40 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I guess we can make a motion. I don't have any  
41 problem with that. I was just working under the assumption  
42 that, if we voted on this document in a little while, that, by  
43 default, we did that, but, Mara, if you think that we need a  
44 motion, if a committee member would like to make a motion that  
45 we accept this text, I don't see an issue with that. Mr.  
46 Greene.

47  
48 **MR. GREENE:** I will make a motion that in Action 3 that we

1 accept the IPT recommendations.  
2  
3 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Mr. Greene, is that your motion? Okay.  
4 Is there a second to the motion?  
5  
6 **MR. ANSON:** Second.  
7  
8 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Anson seconds the motion. **Is there any**  
9 **opposition to this motion?** Andy, go ahead.  
10  
11 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Not opposing, but just a minor clarification  
12 regarding the IPT recommendation for Alternative 3. It  
13 references hardware or software, as determined in Action 4,  
14 which is specific to GPS locational data and services, and I  
15 think we could just remove the "as determined in Action 4",  
16 since that could be independent of the GPS locational device for  
17 reporting. You could essentially have a separate device for  
18 collecting the GPS information independent of the software or  
19 hardware that would report.  
20  
21 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Andy, I'm sorry, but I'm not following  
22 exactly what you're asking there.  
23  
24 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I am simply asking that, for the IPT  
25 recommendation for Alternative 3, that we drop "as determined in  
26 Action 4" and so just leave it a "via NMFS approved  
27 hardware/software".  
28  
29 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. I see. Does the committee have any  
30 problems with that? No? **If there is no more discussion on this**  
31 **motion, is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing no**  
32 **opposition, the motion passes.** Carrie.  
33  
34 **DR. SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let's move on to Action  
35 4, the Hardware/Software Requirements for Reporting. Again, you  
36 will see quite a bit of yellow here. Your preferred alternative  
37 is Alternative 2.  
38  
39 I think you modified that at the last council meeting in  
40 October, and that would require vessel operators to submit  
41 fishing records via NMFS approved hardware/software with the  
42 minimum archived GPS capabilities that provides vessel position.  
43 This was a technical committee recommendation, and that's both  
44 for charter vessels and headboats.  
45  
46 You will see that the IPT, again, has some recommended language  
47 for all of the alternatives, Alternative 2, 3, and 4, and  
48 primarily it's focused on the fact that there would be a portion

1 of the hardware that would be permanently affixed to the vessel,  
2 and that's some recommended language that we've put forward for  
3 the committee to consider, and we're primarily recommending that  
4 to provide the best method of validation for effort monitoring.  
5 Also, this would reduce the burden, I guess, placed on the owner  
6 or operator to submit a no-fishing report if there was some  
7 portion of the hardware that was potentially affixed to the  
8 vessel. I will stop there. I had one other point that I did  
9 want to clarify with the committee, but I will stop there.

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Mr. Riechers.

12  
13 **MR. RIECHERS:** I think didn't we just require them, up top, to  
14 go ahead and do a no-fishing report, as I am recalling? There's  
15 a little conflict here, if we're in fact going to use that as a  
16 possibility for them to not have a no-fishing report.

17  
18 The other thing that I might point out here, at least from my  
19 recollection of the motion that Martha made last time on this  
20 alternative and the IPT directions here, certainly I think, when  
21 Martha made that motion and the discussion that we had, it was  
22 not to have an affixed piece of hardware permanently affixed to  
23 the vessel.

24  
25 Frankly, I am not necessarily opposed to that, but I need to  
26 know more about what that device looks like, costs, et cetera,  
27 et cetera, so that we can understand what it is that the IPT is  
28 truly recommending here, and I don't know that we've got -- That  
29 hasn't been fleshed out in the document at all, and so maybe we  
30 can get some of that on the record and maybe we can get some  
31 discussion about that and/or some description of that.

32  
33 If it's very minimal and minor in nature, then maybe it falls  
34 within what Martha was attempting to do. I just don't know,  
35 based on our last discussions, but I do know that the  
36 recommendation is kind of contrary to the discussion that we  
37 had.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Mara.

40  
41 **MS. LEVY:** Just to the point about the no-fishing report, the  
42 language above in Action 1 and 2, said that you would be  
43 required to submit a no-fishing report, but it said that that  
44 would only be required if you didn't have the permanently  
45 affixed portion, and so it was meant to say that it's required,  
46 but, if you do this permanently affixed, so that NMFS knows when  
47 you're leaving and when you're coming back, then you don't need  
48 to do that, because the agency will know that you didn't go

1 fishing.

2  
3 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Does the committee need some clarity  
4 then, Robin, because I agree with what you're saying about the  
5 permanently-affixed hardware. Carrie, can you expand on that  
6 just a little bit, please?

7  
8 **DR. SIMMONS:** I think I will need some help from NMFS staff, but  
9 I think the idea was that you have some portion on there that  
10 cannot be removed and potentially may always be on the vessel,  
11 such as the antenna, I believe, like is on for the commercial  
12 fishermen with the VMS, and so maybe a similar antenna could be  
13 on all the time, such as with the shrimp ELB, but I'm going to  
14 let NMFS staff help me with this.

15  
16 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Andy, do you want to help with this?  
17 The reason I'm concerned on this too is I'm just thinking, from  
18 center-console-type boats, does that technology -- It's all sort  
19 of one unit, and a lot of them are taken off for security  
20 reasons. They don't want the unit stolen, and it's all kind of  
21 one unit, and so I'm trying to see -- I am not necessarily  
22 opposed to it, but I'm just trying to see how it would work.

23  
24 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Right. To back up a little bit, and Bonnie can  
25 certainly speak to this as well, and she mentioned it earlier.  
26 One of the hardest components to get information on in the  
27 fishery is obtaining accurate effort data. The goal here is to  
28 collect as close to a census or a census as possible.

29  
30 With locational data, you are able to determine if a trip in  
31 fact occurred or did not occur and then link that up to any sort  
32 of logbook report that may have been submitted or hasn't been  
33 submitted, so there is that one-to-one matching validation that  
34 would occur from the start of a trip to the end of a trip.

35  
36 The reason that the recommendation is for affixing it to the  
37 vessel is all of us have cellphones and tablets, and there is a  
38 lot of ways to defeat the locational services, by turning them  
39 off or leaving them at the dock, and so, by affixing it to the  
40 vessel, you ensure that that locational information is going to  
41 be maintained and obtained as that boat leaves port and comes  
42 back to port, and so that's where the IPT recommendation came  
43 from, to ensure better validation of fishing effort.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Riechers.

46  
47 **MR. RIECHERS:** Andy, I certainly understand what you said and  
48 what it says, but the whole notion now is basically we've got

1 Alternatives 2 through 4 that are, equivalently, a VMS system  
2 now. What I asked for was a description of what other kinds of  
3 devices where were, short of that VMS, that we think we can use,  
4 and so explain a little bit more about how that may work with  
5 that other reporting device and how that -- What kind of affixed  
6 systems are we really talking about? That was really the  
7 question that we're trying to get at, so we do understand how  
8 those differ.

9  
10 I am not certain it's in the write-up at this point in time. I  
11 mean, I haven't -- From our last meeting, I know that -- Again,  
12 that was contrary to the discussion that we had surrounding  
13 Alternative 2, and so I just need a little bit more explanation.

14  
15 **MR. STRELCHECK:** This council has previously approved shrimp  
16 electronic logbooks, several years ago, and that's very similar  
17 to an archival GPS device that is affixed to a shrimp vessel.  
18 It collects locational information while the vessel is at sea,  
19 and, when it returns to port, it automatically sends that data,  
20 via cellular data, to the agency for data collection and effort  
21 computations, and so that is not a VMS unit, because it's not  
22 collecting data real time and sending it to a satellite.

23  
24 It's considerably less expensive than VMS units, as well as the  
25 monthly costs that are associated with the VMS unit. There are  
26 certainly examples that fall between that cellular-based kind of  
27 archival GPS system that shrimp ELBs use and a full-blown VMS  
28 unit.

29  
30 This also, just for clarification, is we're talking about  
31 minimum standards, and so this wouldn't preclude use of VMS for  
32 those vessels that have VMS, and we now have several hundred  
33 vessels that have VMS on their boats. We have vessels that are  
34 dually-permitted in the commercial and for-hire fleet, and so it  
35 would allow them to continue to use VMS, if they so choose to  
36 use that, rather than having to use multiple data-reporting  
37 systems.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Andy, to your point, where I am not  
40 quite clear on this text is this is something -- What happens  
41 when you're in port and it's off, or it is something that has to  
42 remain on the whole time? That is where I am -- When you're on  
43 a trip, on a charter, it kind of makes sense to me, but, when  
44 you're not on your boat, is this device just off and you don't  
45 know where they are or that's the whole point of it?

46  
47 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I don't think the amendment, at this point,  
48 gets into any specificity on that. Certainly there is

1 advantages to maintaining it on, to know that it's operating and  
2 when it's leaving port and not leaving port, versus when it's  
3 shut down and we're not able to, obviously, see if it's making a  
4 fishing trip or not.

5  
6 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Right, and that's kind of the way that I  
7 understand what the intent might be, but I just don't know if  
8 that's possible on these small boats that don't have shore power  
9 and things like that. You're running a device off of twelve-  
10 volt batteries, which is -- Anyway, Mr. Anson has a question.

11  
12 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Let me just add to that. We have run into this  
13 issue for years with the VMS program, and we do have power-down  
14 exemptions that have helped, obviously, for unique situations  
15 like you're talking about.

16  
17 We do have a lot of vessels that have VMS onboard a center  
18 console vessel as well, and so it's not impossible, and it is  
19 used. I think it's feasible and practical, whether we're  
20 talking VMS or some other system, to be able to put it on these  
21 center console vessels and smaller vessels.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Anson.

24  
25 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you. I was just going to mention or ask what  
26 you just asked, Dr. Stunz, is to the practicality of what type  
27 of technology could be used to allow those smaller vessels that,  
28 more than likely, will be turning the power off and don't have  
29 shore power, nor generator power, while they're at the dock, and  
30 if it was going to be a continuously-operating machine. It  
31 sounds like maybe there is some opportunities there to allow a -  
32 - I am a little nervous about giving exemptions and such, and  
33 how difficult that might be, but you asked the question. Thank  
34 you.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Greene, I know you have a question, but if  
37 you could just give me a second. Madam Chairwoman, I know we're  
38 over our time here, and so I'm trying to -- This is obviously an  
39 important discussion, and so would you like to provide some  
40 guidance on how to proceed.

41  
42 **MS. BOSARGE:** I think we've been working on this for a long  
43 time, and so we need to keep plugging away at this and finish  
44 this up, and so you keep going. We have an hour-and-forty-five-  
45 minute lunchbreak. That is pretty liberal, and I think you can  
46 keep moving along. We will find time to eat.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Don't put lunch on my shoulders, Madam



1 Chairwoman. Mr. Greene, go ahead.

2  
3 **MR. GREENE:** I keep my boat at a marina that's a pretty nice  
4 place. There's probably 300 or 400 boats, I guess, that come  
5 through there, and there is probably 150 or 200 boats that tie  
6 up there on a permanent basis.

7  
8 I walk down the dock at the end of the day, and I see a forty-  
9 two-foot outboard boat that has four 350-horsepower motors on  
10 it. It has a Sequalizer stabilizing device and it has a live  
11 well on it bigger than mine, and I had an interesting  
12 conversation. The guy there obviously was wanting to sell me a  
13 boat, and he just didn't realize that I didn't have that kind of  
14 money.

15  
16 Anyway, the boat was about three-quarters-of-a-million dollars.  
17 It was just the nicest, over-the-top boat that I think I've ever  
18 seen. We're sitting there talking, and the guy brings up this  
19 interesting point. He says, this boat even comes with an anti-  
20 theft device. I said, really? Then he said, yup. It's hooked  
21 up twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, and you can pull  
22 up an app and see where your boat is at the dock. No problem.  
23 Technology is there.

24  
25 I said, really, somebody would actually steal a boat? Because  
26 I'm thinking that there ain't nobody that's going to steal my  
27 boat. If they did, they would bring it back with a gift card to  
28 Boater's World.

29  
30 In that application, I can understand. With a three-quarters-  
31 of-a-million-dollar investment and people stealing boats and  
32 outboards, and so I went home and did a little research on it.  
33 I never realized that marine insurance -- I guess probably boat  
34 theft is a big deal, outboard-type boats and trailer boats.  
35 It's a big deal, and so I can certainly understand where an  
36 anti-theft device comes from.

37  
38 At the end of this conversation that we're having now, I see how  
39 one could kind of relay into the other and work together, and so  
40 I think there is a plausible solution to the problem. If you  
41 can have a boat, and, granted, that was over the top, and  
42 there's not a lot of boats that are out there that can have an  
43 anti-theft device on it, where you can track your boat and look  
44 at an app.

45  
46 Obviously there is some way that we can come up with something  
47 that will work, to allow these small boats that don't have big  
48 battery chargers or big banks or whatever. Maybe it has an

1 internal battery that has to be changed out every six months or  
2 eight months. I know EPIRB batteries on my boat last for two  
3 years, and they work like a champ. There are ways around it,  
4 and so I wouldn't get too wrapped up in this.

5

6 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Riechers.

7

8 **MR. RIECHERS:** I scrolled back, folks, to where we really have  
9 the cost information, direct and indirect costs, kind of way  
10 back in the document, things that we often don't look closely  
11 at. While we should, we don't often at least bring them up  
12 here.

13

14 At least estimation regarding this alternative that we're  
15 talking about, the lowest cost estimation for these  
16 alternatives, Alternative 2, figuring the low cost that is  
17 projected within this context, it's about \$3,500 per vessel to  
18 get started.

19

20 If you go to Alternative 4, that can raise to as much as \$8,700  
21 per vessel, and, Johnny, I agree with you. Some of these  
22 vessels, obviously, the cost of that is not -- It's not great  
23 compared to the cost of the vessel and the cost of those other  
24 things, but some of the vessels that Myron may have been  
25 speaking to, or Kelly may have been speaking to, certainly that  
26 cost is certainly a burden, in some respects, or could be a  
27 burden.

28

29 I think one of the things that we all want to consider, as we  
30 try to do these systems, is you don't want a new system coming  
31 into place to basically move people out of the industry at this  
32 point in time, and I don't think any one of these costs will do  
33 that, but certainly a combination of these costs, and, right  
34 now, I'm just speaking to the cost of the device, as I see it  
35 here. Without greater explanation, I can't tell you whether  
36 that covers it for -- If that's also the tablet reporting, and I  
37 don't think it is, based on the way they've broken this up, but  
38 those are going to be cumulative costs as we go through this.

39

40 We need to get a better reporting system, and I don't think  
41 anyone is against that, but I will say that, at least on this  
42 particular occasion, I think the framing of the discussion of  
43 last time has been changed by these IPT recommendations and we  
44 need to look at it closely before we make these decisions today.

45

46 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Well, so then I would look to the committee to  
47 -- I don't know if anyone wants to offer a motion or how do we  
48 deal with these IPT recommendations? I guess we're primarily

1 just talking about for Action 4. Does the committee have any  
2 suggestion on how to handle this GPS situation? Mr. Riechers.

3

4 **MR. RIECHERS:** One of the things I'm concerned about is the GPS  
5 situation is different than what we had out in public hearing  
6 and that we've presented to anyone prior to this time, and so  
7 one of our options is to -- Of course, we're here, and IPT  
8 recommendations come out now, and I'm not certain that we've got  
9 a good cross-section of people who will be here to speak on  
10 that, but it is a significant -- I say significant, but it's not  
11 an insignificant change in at least the discussion of the last  
12 time.

13

14 I, at this point, am not ready to accept the alternatives. I  
15 think what we need to do is maybe hear from some people in  
16 public testimony, and then I think everyone should look back  
17 into the back of the document and think about those costs as  
18 well as how that's playing out.

19

20 Now, obviously, Alabama has, more or less, your entire fleet  
21 under a system now, and so you're in a little different  
22 situation than say Myron and his fleet or even Florida and  
23 Martha's fleet, as well as Texas and Mississippi, and so I think  
24 we've all got to look at it from that perspective.

25

26 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** We don't have the codified text for this  
27 either, right, and so, either way, we have to wait until Full  
28 Council to fully deal with this, and so that might give us some  
29 time to hear any public testimony on this as well as think about  
30 what this means to everyone's fleet around the Gulf.

31

32 Unfortunately, I guess, that doesn't mean that we can take  
33 action on this amendment during this committee, is what I'm  
34 hearing. Is there any other -- What is the feeling of the  
35 committee? Mr. Strelcheck.

36

37 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I actually think otherwise. I think it would  
38 be beneficial for the committee to actually make a  
39 recommendation for the public to react to during their public  
40 testimony, and base, obviously, any changes in your decisions at  
41 Full Council from that public input that you received. I think  
42 we've been working on this long enough.

43

44 The recommendation that's provided, in particular in this  
45 action, is really just providing some clarity of some  
46 discussions that have been had with this council, since at least  
47 last August, about the unit being affixed to the vessel.

48

1 I know Robin was pointing to some cost estimates that have been  
2 worked up. I need to revisit those. I think it is an important  
3 part of the conversation, but, certainly with the shrimp ELB  
4 program, the costs that were mentioned are considerably less  
5 than that and also contingent on how much of the hardware  
6 purchases and whether that's funded by the government or some  
7 other means, rather than borne by the actual fishermen  
8 themselves, and so my recommendation would be to move forward  
9 with the amendment and have a committee motion recommending it  
10 to move forward.

11

12 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Ms. Bosarge.

13

14 **MS. BOSARGE:** I was just going to say, from the shrimp fleet,  
15 the ELB program that we have with our antenna, I can tell you  
16 that the monthly cellular cost on that is around about eighteen-  
17 dollars a month. In the big scheme of things, with the other  
18 costs that we have, it is fairly minimal.

19

20 I do think that it's important that the committee provide some  
21 direction to the public here, whether you're for or against the  
22 recommended-IPT language. That's up to you, but I think we  
23 probably should, since this is slated for final action. Let's  
24 give the public some idea of where we think we're headed now, so  
25 that they can chew on that and give us their feedback during  
26 public comment, and so I hope that you will do that.

27

28 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Mr. Walker.

29

30 **MR. WALKER:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was just going to mention,  
31 on this cost, that I think my cost for a state-of-the-art system  
32 was somewhere around \$2,800. I don't know where these other  
33 numbers came from, but say you're out on a charter and it's a  
34 Thursday and you have no communications, but you have this VMS  
35 that you're able to email for a part that you need to have at  
36 the dock and it needs to be shipped overnight for Friday,  
37 because you have a Saturday and you have a Sunday trip. If you  
38 miss that Saturday and Sunday trip and Monday or whatever,  
39 because you didn't get that time to get that part, that cost is  
40 going to be a lot more than one little unit.

41

42 As far as this amp draw, my system draws very few amps. I have  
43 AZM batteries onboard the vessel. Most new vessels are moving  
44 toward AZM batteries, with very little draw. It requires very  
45 little voltage to crank engine, even when they're rundown. I  
46 don't think any of these -- The cost is not an issue. I think  
47 it's an asset to have this piece of equipment.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Lucas.  
2  
3 **DR. LUCAS:** I think I just have a point of clarity or a point of  
4 order here. I mean, it looks like we're looking at six things,  
5 because the IPT recommendations are different than the preferred  
6 alternatives. I mean, we currently have a preferred  
7 alternative, but we need to make a decision whether we're going  
8 to accept the IPT's recommendations on this and then would  
9 determine whether that met -- Whether that was still the same  
10 preferred alternative that was listed, and so I guess that's  
11 what we're looking for, is a motion there.  
12  
13 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That's actually a good point, Dr. Lucas. To be  
14 consistent, we did have a motion to accept the text from the  
15 previous action above, and so, to move this further, if there's  
16 no other comments, then -- Are you calling a point of order? I  
17 need to make sure if I'm following Roberts Rules, or are you --  
18  
19 **DR. LUCAS:** I don't know if it's point of order or whether it  
20 was just a point of clarity, because there looks like there was  
21 two totally different things going on.  
22  
23 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** If it's a point of clarity, maybe, to move this  
24 further, if there is no other discussion, would someone like to  
25 make a motion about either accepting or rejecting this text from  
26 the IPT? Mr. Greene.  
27  
28 **MR. GREENE:** Sitting here reading it, and looking at Alternative  
29 4, underneath it, it's IPT recommendations for Alternative 4.  
30 If we as a council select a vessel monitoring system, then we're  
31 going to have to have an antenna and junction box permanently  
32 affixed to the vessel anyway, and so that recommendation is kind  
33 of a moot point, in my opinion. **I think my motion would be to**  
34 **accept the language for Alternative 4, as written, the IPT**  
35 **recommendation for Alternative 4.**  
36  
37 **DR. SIMMONS:** Action 4.  
38  
39 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Captain Greene, is that your motion?  
40  
41 **MR. GREENE:** Yes, Action 4, Alternative 4. That is my motion,  
42 Mr. Chairman.  
43  
44 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Action 4, Alternative 4. Is there a second to  
45 the motion? Mr. Sanchez seconds the motion. Give us just a  
46 second, but I need to just make sure that I understand what --  
47 This is just in Alternative 4. Carrie.  
48

1 **DR. SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I may, it's just  
2 spelling out a little bit more that it's the antenna and the  
3 junction box that are permanently affixed to the vessel,  
4 whereas, before, it just said provides the vessel position and  
5 it is permanently affixed to the vessel. It's not saying what  
6 would be permanently affixed.

7  
8 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Is there opposition to this motion?  
9 Andy had a comment. Go ahead, Andy.

10  
11 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I would like to make a substitute motion. It's  
12 the same as the current motion, except the committee accepts the  
13 IPT recommendations for Alternatives 2 through 4 in Action 4.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Strelcheck, is that your motion? Is there  
16 a second to that motion?

17  
18 **MR. WALKER:** Second.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** It's seconded by Mr. Walker. Is there  
21 discussion? Mr. Riechers.

22  
23 **MR. RIECHERS:** I opposed when we took a vote on the last one  
24 before, but you recognized Andy, and I opposed it then. I am  
25 not opposing it because I am against the notion. I am opposing  
26 it because it's actually changing the contextual discussion that  
27 we had at the last council meeting regarding Alternative 2, and  
28 so it's actually a change in alternative, somewhat, in that  
29 respect.

30  
31 As far as the costs go, Leann, I just took the costs out of the  
32 back of the document. Andy, if there is cheaper ELBs out there,  
33 if we know now that we can get them at a cheaper cost than maybe  
34 what was drafted in this document, then I would recommend that  
35 we change the back of the document to reflect that, because I  
36 just did the math. It's basically 1,200 vessels divided into  
37 the cost, the estimated costs, that you all had back there.

38  
39 One can argue that I used 1,200 and I should have been using  
40 1,352 or whatever the case may be, but it's pretty doggone  
41 close, and I used the lower end of those estimates, as opposed  
42 to the higher end, and so that's the minimum costs. If we have  
43 got lower-cost options, then they should be reflected in the  
44 document.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Is there any other discussion on the  
47 motion? We have a substitute motion on the floor that we need  
48 to vote on. **Those in favor of the substitute motion, please**

1 raise your hand; those opposed to the motion. It's four to  
2 seven and the motion fails.

3  
4 That moves us back to the original motion. I guess we don't  
5 have discussion on this motion at this point and we just take a  
6 vote for this motion. **The original motion, those in favor of**  
7 **the original motion, please raise your hand, six; those opposed**  
8 **to the original motion, four. The motion passes six to four.**  
9 Carrie, where are we with this document now?

10  
11 **DR. SIMMONS:** We want to think about the proposal for  
12 Alternative 2 and 3. Did you want to talk about Alternative 3  
13 any, or can we bring anything else for Full Council to help  
14 inform the discussion?

15  
16 One thing that I did want to bring up, and I think it's been  
17 said, but, just so everyone is crystal clear on this, is that it  
18 is the council's intent, based on the discussion that was had at  
19 the last council meeting, that Preferred Alternative 2 is the  
20 minimum requirement and that you would, in fact, be allowing  
21 someone else to use a greater or more burdensome device,  
22 potentially a more expensive device, if they have that and  
23 choose to do so.

24  
25 I just want to make sure that is crystal clear to everyone, and  
26 we have written some of that in the document, based on the  
27 discussion that was at the last council meeting, but it wasn't  
28 explicitly discussed, and so that's two different mechanisms,  
29 potentially, for reporting that the council would be allowing.  
30 I wanted to just make sure that everyone understands that.  
31 Thank you.

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I think everyone is clear on that. Is there  
34 any more discussion that you need to give the committee  
35 regarding this amendment?

36  
37 **DR. SIMMONS:** No, and just if we can bring anything else to Full  
38 Council for you.

39  
40 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. There was some discussion of whether we  
41 take action on this as a committee now or defer this to Full  
42 Council, and so what is the pleasure of the committee? Would  
43 anyone like to make a motion? I don't think it matters, and so  
44 we probably could defer this to Full Council then. All right.

45  
46 That takes care of Item Number V, which moves us on to Other  
47 Business. Is there any other business that needs to come before  
48 this committee? If there is no other business coming before the

1 committee, that concludes the business for the Data Collection  
2 Committee. We stand adjourned.

3

4 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on January 30, 2017.)

5

6

- - -