

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

Astor Crowne Plaza New Orleans, Louisiana

August 15, 2016

VOTING MEMBERS

- Greg Stunz.....Texas
Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
Myron Fischer (designee for Patrick Banks).....Louisiana
John Greene.....Alabama
Kelly Lucas (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
Robin Riechers.....Texas
Andy Strelcheck (designee for Roy Crabtree).....NMFS
Ed Swindell.....Louisiana
David Walker.....Alabama

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

- Kevin Anson (designee for Chris Blankenship).....Alabama
Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
Doug Boyd.....Texas
Pamela Dana.....Florida
Leo Danaher.....USCG
Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
Tom Frazer.....Florida
Martha Guyas (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
Campo Matens.....Louisiana
John Sanchez.....Florida

STAFF

- Steven Atran.....Senior Fishery Biologist
Matt Freeman.....Economist
John Froeschke.....Fishery Biologist - Statistician
Douglas Gregory.....Executive Director
Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
Karen Hoak.....Administrative & Financial Assistant
Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
Emily Muehlstein.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist
Claire Roberts.....EFH Specialist
Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
Camilla Shireman.....Administrative Assistant
Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Director

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

- Ken Anderson.....Panama City, FL

1 Pam Anderson.....Panama City, FL
2 Patrick Banks.....LA
3 Eric Brazer.....Reef Fish Shareholders' Alliance
4 Derek Breaux.....New Orleans, LA
5 Chester Brewer.....SAFMC
6 J.P. Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy
7 Traci Floyd.....MS DNR
8 Benny Gallaway.....LGL, TX
9 Sue Gerhart.....NMFS
10 Gary Jarvis.....Destin, FL
11 Joe Jewell.....MS DNR
12 James Kejonen.....NOAA OLE, LA
13 Bill Kelly.....FKCFA
14 Rich Malinowski.....NOAA, St. Petersburg, FL
15 Ron Messa.....NOAA, LA
16 Bonnie Ponwith.....SEFSC
17 Lance Robinson.....TX
18 Mike Rowell.....
19 G.P. Schmahl.....Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary
20 Clarence Seymour.....Ocean Spring, MS
21 Bob Spaeth.....SOFA, FL
22 Jessica Stephen.....NMFS
23 Stephen Szedlmayer.....Auburn
24 Helen Takade-Heumacher.....EFH
25 Amanda Wimbish.....CLS America

26
27
28

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Contents.....3
4
5 Adoption of Agenda.....4
6
7 Approval of Minutes.....4
8
9 Action Guide and Next Steps.....5
10
11 For-Hire Reporting Requirements.....6
12 Modifications to Generic Charter Vessel and Headboat
13 Reporting Requirements.....6
14 Presentation on Electronic Reporting.....16
15 Review of Minimum Data Elements.....20
16 Summary of Potential Data Elements in For-Hire Program.....23
17
18 Cost Analysis of Commercial Electronic Reporting Program.....30
19
20 Atlantic Coast Cooperative Statistics Program Meeting Summary....31
21
22 Adjournment.....33

23
24 - - -
25
26

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, August 15, 2016, and was
4 called to order by Chairman Greg Stunz.

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

9 **CHAIRMAN GREG STUNZ:** We will call to order the Data Collection
10 Committee, and the materials for this committee can be found in
11 Tab F. The first order of business, it looks like -- Let me
12 see. I think we've got all of our committee members around the
13 table, so we meet those quorum requirements.

14
15 The first order of business is the Adoption of the Agenda.
16 There have been a few changes that I will tell you about in a
17 second, but does anyone else have any changes they would like to
18 make to the agenda?

19
20 Seeing none, one of the changes is Bob Gill is not able to be
21 with us today for that Item Number IV on the NFWF Presentation
22 for the For-Hire Pilot, and so we won't be getting that
23 presentation. I would recommend to staff that we put that on
24 for the next meeting agenda, because I think we're all kind of
25 interested to hear how that's going, and that will play quite
26 well into the discussions that we're having, and so we will hold
27 off on that. Otherwise, I think our agenda, with that
28 modification, will remain the same. Is there a motion to
29 approve the agenda?

30
31 **MR. ROBIN RIECHERS:** So moved.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** It's seconded. Is there any discussion or any
34 other changes? If none, the agenda is approved. The next item
35 of business is Approval of the Minutes. Are there any changes
36 or edits to the minutes? Seeing none, does anyone want to make
37 a motion to approve the minutes?

38
39 **MR. RIECHERS:** Move to adopt the minutes as written.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** There is a second. Seeing no discussion, the
42 minutes are approved. We will move on to our first order of
43 business, Item Number III, which is the Action Guide and Next
44 Steps that Dr. Froeschke is going to walk us through. While he
45 is getting ready to do that, just a summary of the last time of
46 what we did.

47
48 We had several motions at the last committee meeting, and one

1 was to accept the recommendations of the Data Collection
2 Technical Committee, with obviously the intent to build that
3 into the document, and I'm sure John will go over that with us.

4
5 Myron was concerned last time about defining some of these
6 minimum data elements a lot better, and so we had a motion to do
7 that that I think we'll hear some discussion on. Then the last
8 thing that everyone can be thinking about as we're going through
9 these discussions is we made another motion to convene the
10 technical committee after this meeting.

11
12 I am recommending that probably we're going to need some motions
13 to charge this committee with exactly what we want and some
14 products and some things like that, in terms of action, and so
15 be thinking about that as we move along. With that, John, do
16 you want to talk us through our action list?

17 18 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**

19
20 **DR. JOHN FROESCHKE:** Good morning. I'm going to start on Item
21 V. Item V has three parts, essentially. There is the Updated
22 Generic Reporting Document, which I will give you an overview of
23 the changes and the reorganization of the actions and
24 alternatives, to reflect the guidance you provided at the last
25 meeting. That is Tab 5(a).

26
27 Tab 5(b) is a summary spreadsheet that I put together compiling
28 a list of reported data elements relative to catch, effort, and
29 trip information from twenty-two programs in the Atlantic and
30 Gulf region, and I will go over that and we can talk about some
31 of the common fields.

32
33 Then the remainder of this item will be from SERO staff, and
34 they have a couple of different things. They have put together
35 a list of potential data elements to be included in the program
36 that you all are considering. They have organized them in
37 elements that would be reported prior to initiating the trip,
38 during the trip, and then possibly after the trip, with some
39 summary information, and Jessica has a presentation to give you
40 a feel for how this might work in a simulated trip, and so that
41 will be Tab 5(c).

42
43 The last two items, Item VI and VII, are informational. Item VI
44 is a report from Dr. Ponwith about the commercial electronic
45 reporting program that we asked for last time, or that you did,
46 and then, last, Greg has a summary from a meeting that he
47 attended on behalf of the council in May from ACCSP, where they
48 discussed for-hire reporting. That's what I've got.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** All right. Thanks, John. Then the next agenda
3 item would be to go through this Tab 5(a). Do you want to start
4 there, John, or how do you want to recommend that you go through
5 these materials? I will kind of leave it up to you, since
6 you've sort of got three related things.

7
8 **FOR-HIRE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**
9 **MODIFICATIONS TO GENERIC CHARTER VESSEL AND HEADBOAT REPORTING**
10 **REQUIREMENTS**

11
12 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I am ready. I would like to start on Tab 5(a).
13 If you're fine with that, just go to Chapter 2. It's on page 7
14 of the document. There are four actions in the document, and,
15 just to update you and for those new members, the way the
16 document is organized, Actions 1 and 2 are essentially the same,
17 the difference being that Action 1 refers to documents that we
18 consider charter vessels. Action 2 considers vessels that we
19 consider headboats.

20
21 Understanding that the distinction between these can be murky,
22 the way we have continued to define this is if a vessel
23 participates in the Southeast Regional Headboat Survey, it is a
24 headboat and it would be included under Action 2. The remaining
25 vessels would be under Action 1.

26
27 The actions and the alternatives, there are four in this
28 document. They are essentially unchanged from the last time
29 that you saw them, and what this refers to is the frequency and
30 mechanism of data reporting.

31
32 You have previously selected Preferred Alternative 4 that would
33 require federally-permitted charter vessels in Action 1 to
34 submit fishing records to NMFS for each trip via electronic
35 reporting, using NMFS-approved software prior to arriving at the
36 dock. The clarification or the additional information on the
37 types of devices and things are covered in Actions 3 and 4, and
38 so we will get to those.

39
40 Just for our new members, the difference or the rationale for
41 Preferred Alternative 4 is trip-level reporting is the only way
42 that we can require them to provide information prior to them
43 returning to the dock. For example, a daily reporting, if they
44 only submit one a day and they do multiple trips, they wouldn't
45 have to submit their information before returning to the dock,
46 and that's a fundamental break in the type of validation that
47 can be done.

1 If they have to submit their report before they know whether or
2 not they will be intercepted, it provides an additional rigor to
3 the validation process that we're always interested in. In many
4 discussions, we've always considered that sort of the gold
5 standard of validation, and that's the primary motivation for
6 selecting that alternative. While I've got the mic, Alternative
7 2 is exactly the same, but it just refers to headboats. I will
8 stop and take any questions there.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** John, I have something, or go ahead, Myron.

11
12 **MR. MYRON FISCHER:** I know this has been our preferred
13 alternative in Action 1, to go with Alternative 4, since the
14 beginning of the document, but -- It doesn't have to be this
15 meeting, but I do think we need further discussion.

16
17 Our local fishermen have expressed displeasure about it, because
18 of the type of boats they operate, mainly. 95 percent of them
19 are outboards, and, reading Bob Zales's letter on the boats that
20 make the multiple trips, we envision, from the state standpoint,
21 a different method of validating, where we're taking a sample of
22 the vessels arriving and checking a random sample. We have
23 always felt the burden should be on the agencies doing the work
24 and not putting the burden on the fishermen.

25
26 This may not be the place, but I would like to put a bookmark to
27 one day we do discuss this, because it's all part of the larger
28 picture of what are we trying to get, what data elements, and so
29 we can't decide whether we want them to report prior to getting
30 to the dock until we know the whole basket of data elements that
31 they will be offloading. I think I would rather wait to have
32 the discussion until we see all the data that's going to be
33 necessary and then come back and discuss this.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Thanks, Mr. Fischer, and I believe we'll
36 discuss some of that data today, and so then maybe we can
37 continue that, but my comment was related to along your same
38 lines and the same email that I got from Mr. Zales about these
39 multiple trips and how that confounded things and added all
40 sorts of problems that we weren't really anticipating.

41
42 How we handle that, I don't know, John, and did you see those
43 emails, John? Were you on those? Maybe you can comment, if you
44 can, how this reporting -- How we could alleviate that,
45 essentially, is what I'm looking for.

46
47 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I did read the emails. They were pretty long,
48 but one thing that I am not clear, just to try to reflect your

1 intent in a subsequent draft, is, as we understand it, if you're
2 reporting per trip before you hit the dock, the validation would
3 still occur. A subsample of those would be validated, and so
4 it's not clear to me, to revise the document, how that's
5 inconsistent.

6
7 I guess the only difference could be, as I understand it, is the
8 estimate of catch would be determined based on what they report
9 and not from the subsample of the intercepts, and so I'm not
10 sure if that's where the confusion is, but it seems like this
11 was consistent with the validation that Myron is describing.

12
13 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Fischer.

14
15 **MR. FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and it goes back to the
16 purpose and need. If the purpose is timeliness and accuracy, we
17 still feel you can get the same timeliness and the same accuracy
18 with reporting after the fact, reporting either that night or
19 some other window. It won't really affect it.

20
21 I think the concept, or what's in some people's mind, is they
22 hit the button -- On all the boats, they're hitting the button
23 and suddenly a red light goes off in Roy's office to shut it
24 down, and that's not the way it's going to work. Maybe, after
25 we have all of the discussions on all of the aspects, we could
26 come back and review, but I think we're attempting to burden a
27 lot of fishermen unnecessarily, because I don't know at what
28 speed this data is going to be utilized.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Bonnie.

31
32 **DR. BONNIE PONWITH:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You're absolutely
33 right that this does not take the place of dockside validation.
34 There would still have to be an equivalent dockside validation
35 component of this. The notion of submitting the data prior to
36 hitting the dock enables that dockside validation to be done
37 with a higher level of precision.

38
39 Essentially, if a captain submitted their data, it would have
40 effort data in it and it would have catch data in it, and those
41 data would be submitted before they had knowledge of whether
42 they were going to be intercepted by a biologist or by a law
43 enforcement officer.

44
45 What that does is it creates a stronger incentive for the report
46 that is submitted to actually map very tightly with what's on
47 that vessel and map very tightly with the actual effort and
48 catch of that fishing trip.

1
2 If a captain comes back at the end of the day and records what
3 was caught, we would, over the dockside intercepts, be able to
4 take a look at what the average catch was across captains and
5 what the average landings report that was submitted
6 electronically was and do a comparison, but that creates a
7 looser comparison, a much less precise comparison, between those
8 two to refine them and calibrate them. The intent, I don't
9 think, is to use those data in absolute real time, but it's to
10 create a much more precise report.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Robin.

13
14 **MR. ROBIN RIECHERS:** Bonnie, I mean obviously you summarized the
15 notion of incentives there. Getting to Myron's point, you know,
16 as this document started, and I don't remember which meeting it
17 was at, but certainly we heard from lots of folks, and
18 specifically it was the Venice area, of fishermen who didn't
19 think this current notion of on-the-water reporting was going to
20 work for them.

21
22 In your point, Bonnie, it really comes down to a cost-benefit
23 question of the expense, what you're gaining from the reporting
24 and that level, versus what you're gaining if you do it at the
25 end of day or by the next day or whatever that case is.

26
27 I think, whether it's three trips or one trip, I think that can
28 all be worked out in whatever the questionnaire and the design
29 of the reporting is, but I think those are the issues that we're
30 struggling with.

31
32 The other thing that's a little bit left unsaid here in this
33 document is we're struggling with what's it going to cost and
34 what's it going to cost to the fishermen, and, right now, those
35 are unknowns, and we're kind of leaving it unknown in this
36 document, and so you're asking the council to possibly go
37 forward and approve something where we don't know what it's
38 going to cost various angling groups. We've got some estimates
39 and some ranges, and I understand that, but I think that's one
40 of the questions, as we try to select what it is, what those
41 true costs are going to be as well.

42
43 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** First, I have Andy and then Mr. Greene.

44
45 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** Jessica will be speaking to this a little
46 bit later in the committee. We've given a lot of thought to
47 this, especially the hail-in requirement. In the commercial
48 fishery, when you hail-out, we've thought about the differences

1 between what the commercial fishermen would provide versus what
2 a charter vessel could provide to help with data validation and
3 on-the-dock, essentially, reporting.

4
5 With the hail-in requirement, we have also given some
6 considerable thought in terms of, if it is required, how can we
7 simplify it and have a minimum number of data elements, so that
8 it wouldn't be a huge burden on those that are participating in
9 the program.

10
11 At the end of the day, we're constantly criticized for our
12 statistics and data, and so we're trying to build a system,
13 obviously, that's going to be a balance for the fishermen and
14 for the agency, those that are using the data, that ultimately
15 is going to be better than what we're currently using, and so we
16 have to figure out where that happy medium is.

17
18 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Greene.

19
20 **MR. JOHNNY GREENE:** I am looking forward to that presentation as
21 well, but, in the state that I reside in, in Alabama, it is
22 required through the State of Alabama. There is an app that you
23 have to report before you hit the dock. Obviously the State of
24 Alabama has put that in place for a particular reason. I am
25 certainly not going to put them on the spot, but I do believe
26 it's certainly going to reduce the recall bias.

27
28 I have used the electronic logbook program this year. It's
29 taken a little getting used to, but it's something I can do
30 within three to four minutes now, understanding everything
31 that's in it, and it goes through some pretty detailed
32 information, as required through the MRIP process, and so, while
33 I appreciate the conversation around the table, I think that
34 this alternative is the correct one at this time, but I
35 certainly want to hear more discussion about it and see the
36 presentation and see how we go about it. With that conversation
37 to be continued, I will let it go at this time.

38
39 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Anson.

40
41 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Thank you. Johnny, you touched upon a little
42 bit of it. Alabama's program has the mandatory reporting
43 requirement before a fisherman lands their snapper in Alabama.
44 Granted, we've had relatively low participation rates, as far as
45 the timing of that report being submitted before the fish are
46 actually brought onshore, but it kind of is in line to the
47 comment that Dr. Ponwith had mentioned regarding the use of the
48 data, if there was a mandatory reporting requirement before the

1 trip had ended, but yet you weren't going to be using that
2 information for any estimation of catch at a point in time, and
3 did I hear you correctly when you said that?
4

5 **DR. PONWITH:** Those data would absolutely be used to reflect
6 effort and absolutely be used to reflect catch. It's that the
7 reason for pushing the button before you hit the dock isn't so
8 that you know whether you have hit your ACL before you hit the
9 dock. The timing of that is not going to be that precise. It
10 is to be able to more tightly map the record from the vessel
11 report to the intercepts, to be able to do a closer comparison
12 of how closely those match.
13

14 If they match very closely, it bodes very well for the success
15 of the electronic reporting. If there is a wide disparity
16 between what's reported on the vessel and what shows up at the
17 dock, it points to there being reporting error, and that
18 reporting error has to -- You have to adjust those landings to
19 calibrate for that reporting error, and so that would be the
20 strongest use of those data.
21

22 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Lucas and then Mr. Swindell.
23

24 **DR. KELLY LUCAS:** Thanks. I just wanted to point out, when
25 Johnny was talking about Alabama's program and requiring them to
26 report before they hit the dock, we too have a mandatory
27 reporting system in Mississippi. We do not require them to
28 report before they hit the dock, but we do require them to
29 submit information before they leave the dock, letting us know
30 they are going fishing.
31

32 We do have a very high compliance rate, and I noticed, during
33 our MRIP review of our program, that three of the four
34 professors of statistics that they had in the room did not say
35 that reporting before they hit the dock was important to the
36 system.
37

38 The compliance rate being what it was was beneficial to them,
39 and having the information where you notified that you were
40 going out fishing was important, but, because of the high
41 compliance rate, it was more of a concern of who wasn't in the
42 system at all, in terms of the validation, more so than being
43 required to report before you hit to dock.
44

45 I am not a professor of statistics. They can probably explain
46 it a little better than I could, but I was impressed that they
47 felt that that wasn't necessary and that there were other ways
48 to get at the data.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Swindell.

3
4 **MR. ED SWINDELL:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The problem in
5 Louisiana is that a vast majority of the charter boats that go
6 out, as far as twenty and even forty miles, are center-console
7 boats with no head cover or no nothing.

8
9 I was out there snapper fishing last year and out there was a
10 boat that I estimated to be twenty-eight feet long, forty miles
11 out in the Gulf, fishing around the same rig we were fishing
12 around, and that boat had no cover. As we started back in, it
13 was raining. There's no way this guy can do a before landing
14 report in the rain aboard that vessel. There was no way that
15 that was going to happen.

16
17 Too many times, and I don't know about Texas, but I think Texas
18 has a lot of center-console charter boats that are going out
19 twenty miles, fifteen miles, whatever it may be, to catch red
20 snapper, and I just don't see that this is a practical way for
21 us to try -- I agree that we would love to do the great
22 validation of what is really being done, but I just don't see
23 that we can demand that these people report as they return.
24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25
26 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** We will move on here in just a little bit, but
27 these are probably some good points as we start thinking about
28 how we want to charge the technical committee, if we decide we
29 want to do that, but the state reps here have brought up some
30 good points, and that is that we need to have some discussion at
31 some point, and we won't have enough time today, I don't think,
32 but how is this program going to interface with the programs
33 that they already have going on?

34
35 That's going to be something important, but, related to what
36 Robin said, in terms of costs, I am concerned about not only
37 real costs, but also time costs as well. I mean, I'm a big
38 proponent of reporting before you get to the dock, but I was
39 surprised, in those emails that we all got, that there was
40 actually three trips going on per day. That is something we
41 obviously want to capture.

42
43 What I am wondering, and maybe Bonnie can tell us or someone
44 else around the table, but, from a time cost, when you're
45 stopped for validation, how long -- If you're turning around
46 another trip, or two more trips, potentially, that day, how long
47 does the validation take, on average?

1 **DR. PONWITH:** That's a tough one to answer, and it's because a
2 lot of it would be dependent upon how many passengers the vessel
3 had. I can go ahead and look at, right now, what the average
4 MRIP dockside intercept looks like, in terms of the timing, and
5 give some statistics on that. I don't have that right now,
6 because the dockside intercepts are being run by the MRIP
7 program at this point.

8
9 If you're interested in that, I can see if I can gather up some
10 statistics on that, but, if the vessel is a large vessel with a
11 lot of passengers and the catch is large and it has big species
12 diversity, it can take some time.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Strelcheck.

15
16 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Headboats obviously aren't making a lot of
17 multiple trips a day, but, in the Headboat Collaborative, this
18 was recognized as an issue early on, and we worked with the
19 Headboat Collaborative members and our port agents to set up
20 some efficient sampling methodologies that everyone can work
21 with, so that we avoided the problem of passengers having to
22 wait a considerable amount of time in order to do that dockside
23 validation. We can't obviously codify anything like that in
24 regulations, but I'm sure there is avenues to make sure that
25 that process is as efficient as possible, moving forward.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** In the interests of time, we probably need to -
28 - Mr. Greene, if you have your hand up, go ahead.

29
30 **MR. GREENE:** I have participated in the program, and, going back
31 just a second, the units that we're using right now in the
32 program that we're in is a little bigger than my iPhone, roughly
33 twice the size. It's in a waterproof case.

34
35 I understand the points that everybody makes, but I can assure
36 you that if a captain is offshore and he gets a text message or
37 an email about a fishing trip, he is going to reply to that. In
38 the same amount of time it takes to reply to an email or a text
39 message about a trip, he could report without any trouble.

40
41 Now, as far as the question about the timeliness, if they are
42 running three or four-hour trips in a day, they're not going to
43 have a whole lot of species diversity, to speak of, and they're
44 not going to have, typically, a whole lot of people, because
45 they're typically smaller boats and it shouldn't be that big of
46 an issue. It's not going to be a large headboat coming in with
47 149 passengers, to any degree.

1 The times that I am at the dock and the people are at the dock
2 to do the validation, by the time we get in and get the fish
3 unloaded, they go through them and process them and weigh them
4 and measure them and do the stuff. By the time, we get through
5 cleaning fish, they are typically pretty close to being done.
6 They're probably working on the surveys with the individual
7 anglers, and it seems like it always works out to be fairly
8 close in time.

9
10 Now, if there is a situation where there is a little bit of a
11 time lag, any good, astute captain is going to explain what
12 we're doing and why we're doing it, in an effort to get the data
13 right, and people understand that there might be a little bit of
14 a delay, but I don't think you're talking about hours and hours
15 of time. I mean you're talking about a few extra minutes to get
16 something right, and I don't think anybody would be opposed to
17 such an idea.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That's exactly what I had envisioned, Johnny,
20 to that point. I think the technology now is -- I am
21 envisioning a three to five-minute entry process, at least once
22 it's set up and all your fields are populated the same each
23 time, so this not a big burden. John.

24
25 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I just wanted to chime in briefly on this. My
26 intent here was just to sort of give you a 30,000-foot overview
27 of the changes to the document. I think a lot of this will be
28 more clear on how it could work during Jessica's presentation,
29 and so I guess I would propose that I briefly just highlight the
30 changes we made in Actions 3 and 4 and then perhaps we could
31 just turn it over to her and let her make the presentation, and
32 some of this would be -- Some of these questions might be
33 answered.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Yes, John. If that's okay with the committee,
36 I suggest that we do that, because we do have these two
37 presentations that we need to move forward as well.

38
39 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Okay. What I would like to do now is just
40 briefly go over Actions 3 and 4 and just give you some
41 information on how we reorganized this. Then I think we can,
42 like I said, come back to anything that you need to discuss.

43
44 Action 3 now refers to the trip notification and reporting
45 requirements. As has been discussed and recommended by the
46 technical committee, we have hail-out and hail-in
47 considerations.

48

1 The action is constructed of three alternatives. Alternative 1,
2 there are no hail-out or trip notification requirements. The
3 only caveat to that is that dual-permitted vessels that are
4 participating in the commercial reef fish fishery, they do have
5 a hail-out requirement when participating as a commercial reef
6 fish participant, but it isn't directly applicable to this.

7
8 Alternative 2 addresses the hail-out, and so this is the
9 starting of the trip. There is an Option a and b, which
10 pertains to charter or headboats, and it's really just, prior to
11 departing for each trip, a vessel would be required to hail-out
12 the trip and include the expected return time and landing
13 location, and this was recommended from the technical committee
14 report.

15
16 Alternative 3 could be selected in addition to this, and it
17 addresses the hail-in requirement. This is, prior to arriving
18 at the dock at the end of each for-hire trip, require the vessel
19 operator to hail-in and submit the fishing records via
20 electronic reporting. The device is addressed in Action 4, and,
21 again, there is two options, a and b, for charter vessels and
22 headboats.

23
24 There is a note here describing that the mechanism is not
25 determined yet, and so we have some broad distinctions in Action
26 4 for your review. Some of that will be described in the
27 presentation that's coming up. Is there any questions about
28 that? Otherwise, I will move to Action 4, quickly. Okay.

29
30 Action 4 addresses the types of devices that were considered,
31 and, if you want to put up Figure 2.4.1 in the document. It's
32 on page 15. As we've discussed, there are really sort of three
33 types of devices.

34
35 Alternative 2 addresses the cellular-phone-based archived GPS
36 capabilities. If you look on the figures, that's sort of the
37 one in the middle there. Electronic logbook with archived GPS,
38 that's analogous to Alternative 2.

39
40 Alternative 3 refers to something intermediate between that and
41 a full-fledged VMS, in which this would be a portable tablet-
42 based device, but, instead of working on a cell-based system, it
43 would work on a VMS satellite-based system that could transmit
44 location and reporting information anywhere in the world. It
45 would have some safety at sea improvements, and it would
46 accommodate places in the Gulf where cell range is limited, but
47 this still would be a portable type of device, and so VMS lite,
48 perhaps.

1
2 Then Alternative 4 would be akin to full-fledged VMS, if you
3 will. That's similar to what currently is used in commercial
4 reef fish and CMP vessels. It would be permanently affixed to
5 the vessel. You could submit report information as well as
6 hail-in and hail-out types of information, and so it's sort of a
7 good, better, best type of arrangement.

8
9 The costs and things sort of reflect that. Depending on the
10 council and depending on where your deliberations go, it may be
11 possible that you select one and then everything better than
12 that could also be included. For example, if you pick the
13 middle one, that would also allow a full-fledged VMS to be used.

14
15 That is sort of the arrangement of the document, based on our
16 last discussion. I am not asking for you to make any
17 recommendations, I guess, at this time, but perhaps we could
18 lead into Jessica's presentation, to sort of outline how this
19 could work.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** All right. Thanks, John. Unless the committee
22 members have any comments, I think it might be a good idea to
23 let Jessica give the presentation and then we can have some
24 discussion after that. Are you ready? This is going to be Tab
25 F-5(c).

26
27 **DR. FROESCHKE:** F-5(c)(1) is the PowerPoint.

28
29 **PRESENTATION ON ELECTRONIC REPORTING**

30
31 **DR. JESSICA STEPHEN:** What we did is we came up with kind of a
32 flow chart of how the process would work, from when they leave
33 the dock to when they get back to the dock, and we based this on
34 a lot of the information we've had available from commercial
35 boats, from the headboat pilot program, as well as knowledge of
36 other reporting mechanisms throughout the country.

37
38 The first thing to start with is the hail-out requirement. One
39 of the good things about a hail-out is you know that a vessel
40 has left for a trip. In this, we anticipate an idea where the
41 vessel would be identified and they would select a landing date
42 and time when they are expected back as well as a location.
43 They might even choose something such a target species, if they
44 had that knowledge known. That would probably differ between a
45 headboat and a charter boat. A charter boat might have more
46 knowledge of it.

47
48 With building into this, we could have that hail-out built into

1 a system that emails both law enforcement and port agents, so
2 that they're aware of a trip being sent out. We did use that
3 with the headboat pilot program, and it was very effective, and
4 I will go into a little bit more detail about this step now.

5
6 As I mentioned, one of the good things is that this becomes an
7 indication that a trip was taken, and it's also a spot where you
8 can start identifying a unique trip identifier that identifies a
9 trip throughout the entire process, so you can link everything
10 together.

11
12 If we use something like a landing location -- In the commercial
13 and the headboat pilot program, we used approved landings
14 locations. The benefit of that is that they can use a code or a
15 name that's been approved and law enforcement knows exactly
16 where that is. Most charter and headboat guys come and go from
17 the same place, and so they will know that prior to the start of
18 the trip. Again, this would be different from what the
19 commercial hail-out requirement is.

20
21 They would also give the estimate for the return time for their
22 hail-in, and this helps plan a bunch of different types of
23 activities for it, and a lot of information, such as the vessel
24 identifier and all of that, could be preloaded into the form, so
25 that they don't have to enter it every time, and keep that in
26 mind for some of the other information as we go through.

27
28 Then they would go out fishing. At some point in time, we would
29 require a hail-in. Now, depending on the system chosen, they
30 could possibly record their at-sea information while they were
31 fishing or after, as they're heading back after the catch has
32 actually been taken.

33
34 Again, we would have a mechanism for email that would go to law
35 enforcement and port agents, to notify them that they are coming
36 in. If the hail-in had a requirement of some kind of catch
37 effort, they would have that information given to them for
38 biological validation of what they caught.

39
40 At-sea data collection, the location information could be
41 automatically collected from the system they would use. This
42 would be a little dependent on whether they chose a VMS or
43 archived GPS, whichever methodology for hardware was chosen. `

44
45 Then the hail-in, again, it might not be viable for all hardware
46 options, and so I'm going to start with the VMS. The hail-in
47 would work, but, if we move to something like a cellphone, a lot
48 of times you won't have cellphone coverage until you get very

1 close to land, and so consideration of what type of hardware is
2 used kind of goes hand-in-hand with what you want to consider
3 for the hail-in.

4
5 If you want them to hail-in prior to coming in to land and you
6 want a certain timeframe above that, you have to consider that
7 cellphone won't work, because then they will have to idle out
8 there to work with it. Some locations, I believe we don't even
9 have cellphone coverage really close to where the landing
10 location is.

11
12 What the hail-in does, and I think Bonnie has kind of mentioned
13 this before, is it allows a comparative validation of what you
14 have. You have stated in your hail-in that you have that many
15 fish onboard. They're able to count that. That makes it better
16 data collection for what we use the data for, in the long run.
17 This was instrumental in the headboat pilot program in double
18 checking what they were landing against what was reported in the
19 landings.

20
21 Now, the hail-in can be used in a couple of different of manners
22 when you're thinking about it. We could use it solely as a
23 validation tool, where it's used to check against the biological
24 agent, or you could use it as part of the final logbook dataset.

25
26 If you were thinking of it as a validation tool and you were
27 concerned about how much entry was going on at sea, you might
28 want to consider something that has more of a species-specific
29 reporting validation tool. Maybe you don't have to report all
30 the species you're catching in the hail-in, but you want to
31 report the ones that are of high interest, and NMFS would
32 probably make the determination of which species would be
33 reported. For example, red snapper would probably be one we
34 would want reported coming in.

35
36 The opposite way is looking at it as part of the final logbook.
37 In that sense, you would want the entire catch reported in the
38 hail-in part, and that just, later on, becomes part of the final
39 logbook record. We connect it to the hail-out information as
40 well as the hail-in information and some other information as we
41 keep going on. Again, there is a unique trip identifier to link
42 it back to the other information, and we could also allow them
43 to provide an updated landing date and time.

44
45 You all know the weather changes when you're out there or a trip
46 maybe got extended because people weren't catching a lot. You
47 could then send through something that says, you know, we
48 thought we would be in at nine, but now we're going to be in at

1 ten. That allows the agents, again time to plan and schedule.
2
3 Then there is the final part of that, the final submission of
4 all the data. This has some information that -- As we go into
5 the data elements, we will see that there are some data elements
6 that probably aren't necessary to be reported while they're at
7 sea or the person who is reporting, the captain or the first
8 mate, might actually not know that. This is typically the
9 socioeconomic data that's needed or information about fees for
10 the trips, things like that.

11
12 At the final logbook completion, that type of information could
13 be entered in, and, again, with a unique trip identifier, it
14 would link it all back to one record. Then you have to think
15 about timeframes to complete this final record. As I mentioned
16 before, the idea of at-sea validation and the fact that there
17 are multiple trips, we want to think about recall bias or mixing
18 up information from one trip to another.

19
20 One of the suggestions would be to do it at the trip-level
21 reporting where we're at. We did have problems, occasionally,
22 in the headboat pilot program where two trips were run in a day,
23 and the captain got confused about what was what when they were
24 doing their landing records. What helped us is that the hail-in
25 straightened out what that was, because they reported them at
26 the time they were doing the trip.

27
28 The last thing I want to go over is I was out in San Diego, and
29 I was working with an electronic reporting and monitoring group,
30 and what we got to do is we went out on -- We didn't go out to
31 sea, but we went on the charter vessels out there, the charter
32 headboat and partyboat vessels, and they created their own
33 system for reporting that is similar in concept to what we're
34 trying to do here.

35
36 Now, this is not run through NMFS. It is run through the
37 charter association there. They voluntarily put it together,
38 but there were some lessons learned there that I just kind of
39 wanted to go over.

40
41 One of the things is they had a four-section logbook reporting.
42 They had a pre-departure, which is very similar to what we kind
43 of have in our hail-out requirement thoughts. They had the
44 vessel information and they had the port they were returning to,
45 and they also there could also declare a no-fishing activity.
46 If they were taking a sunset or dinner cruise out instead of
47 fishing, they could claim it right there and that would be the
48 end of their records.

1
2 Then they had information about the trip itself. They had
3 information about the length of the trip and the target species,
4 information about bait and gear. Some of that, they could fill
5 out before they even left for the trip. They kind of knew what
6 they were going to target and what type of gear they had
7 onboard.

8
9 Then they collected the trip catch information while at sea, and
10 they had rugged tablets that were waterproof. With that, they
11 kept information about the species that were caught. They kept
12 both kept fish as well as discarded fish and fish that were lost
13 to predation.

14
15 That information was all entered at sea. They had an app-style
16 webpage that they could enter it in on, and then they had --
17 When they got back into range, that information was sent to the
18 system. Finally, they had the post-trip information. This is
19 the stuff the captain might not necessarily know, is how much
20 did everyone pay to go out, how much fuel did we use, things
21 that maybe the owner had more information on.

22
23 Here they had departure and return times finalized, number of
24 hours fished, the depths that they fished at, number of
25 fishermen and crew, et cetera. At this point, I've gone through
26 kind of what we had in mind, and I am willing to take any
27 questions about the kind of concept and thought we were having.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Any questions? If there are no
30 questions or maybe while you're thinking about it, Dr. Froeschke
31 also wanted to talk about these minimum data elements and sort
32 of a review of some of the other programs and that kind of thing
33 of what they're collecting, and so, John, would you like to do
34 that now? This will be a good time, and then maybe we will have
35 the full suite of information, at least for this meeting, that
36 we can have a little more discussion.

37
38 **REVIEW OF MINIMUM DATA ELEMENTS**

39
40 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Yes, and so what I would propose is I'm going to
41 go over 5(b), which is a summary of the minimum data elements
42 that I will describe, and then I'm going to let Jessica go over
43 the 5(c), the spreadsheet that they prepared.

44
45 What I did is the ACCSP put together a report, and they reviewed
46 twenty-two or twenty-three programs, in terms of the minimum
47 data elements that were collected, in terms of trips, vessels,
48 and catch and effort. This spreadsheet and the PDF really just

1 sort of describes this. There are three tabs for them, and I
2 was just going to go through them one-by-one and not get too far
3 in the weeds.

4
5 For example, in this trip tab, the way that spreadsheet is
6 organized is the fields are on the columns, on the top, and then
7 the programs are on the rows on the left, in Column A. Then if
8 that information is submitted as part of the trip, then it just
9 has an X in the column.

10
11 You can see that there is some consistency and some different.
12 What I did, in order to sort of make heads-or-tails of this a
13 little bit easier is, if you scroll down, there's a chart at the
14 bottom of this. What I did here is I took each of the programs
15 and then I just tabulated, for each of the fields, how many
16 programs reported a particular data element.

17
18 As you will see, there are a few of these, dates and times and
19 things like that, that are reported in almost everything, and
20 then there's sort of a natural break there, about the fourth
21 element, where there is fewer and then it just sort of decreases
22 on in.

23
24 The trip identifiers and things like that are fairly standard in
25 nearly every program. As you get further down into the weeds
26 and depth fished and sea surface temperature and things like
27 that, it's only a few of those, but it, I think, provides some
28 depth or breadth of the types of fields that are presented.
29 Again, if you want to go deep into these, they're in the
30 briefing book, and so I wasn't planning on going deeper than
31 that, unless you had a specific question.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** John, I think that's probably fine for now,
34 unless a committee member has an alternative suggestion. This
35 graph that you have here is very informative, in the sense
36 that's what most common among these different programs, but I
37 didn't see that in the briefing book, or maybe it's -- It's hard
38 for us to read here, and maybe you could provide that, so we can
39 take a closer look at that, particularly for future discussions,
40 because, at least to me, I think what I'm seeing is a lot of
41 these things are starting to really fall out, in terms of what
42 all of these programs are feeling is essential. We just need to
43 decide where we're going to draw the line as you go down that
44 chart. Go ahead, John.

45
46 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Yes, and we can certainly share the spreadsheet
47 with you. The vessel tab, if you click on the vessel tab, it's
48 sort of the same pattern. Again, you can see the programs,

1 which are the same. They are in Column A, and then the specific
2 attributes that are collected are, again, in the columns. Most
3 of this is vessel registration and things that you can think of
4 that could be pre-populated, and so they're not attributes that
5 would require at-sea kinds of things.

6
7 Again, if you scroll down, you will see there is a chart, and,
8 again, I ranked these in terms of the number of attributes
9 collected by programs. That was sort of a declining field.
10 There isn't really strong break like in the vessel, but you can
11 get a pretty good idea on what's collected in nearly every
12 program.

13
14 Again, we can certainly provide this to you to delve into, and
15 so the last tab, which is the catch and effort tab, it
16 summarizes perhaps the types of attributes that are collected
17 potentially at-sea or reported at-sea. It's the same programs,
18 and this deals with the number of anglers, the number of fish,
19 and primarily the species, what are caught and how many.

20
21 Then some of these programs are pretty detailed, in terms of
22 lengths, weights, and discards. Many others don't have quite
23 that much detail, and then, again, there's a summary of most of
24 those down there. For example, everyone collects species.
25 Number of rods and things, there is only a couple, and so
26 there's a pretty good range and perhaps some natural breaks,
27 depending on what you felt is appropriate for this program.
28 Then Jessica has put together a summary of synthesizing some of
29 the things that we've talked about at the IPT level, perhaps how
30 it could work in the programs that we're discussing now, and so
31 if you want to bring up 5(c), the spreadsheet.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** John, while she is bringing that up, at least I
34 didn't find it, but the summary graphs that you did of each of
35 those tabs and the spreadsheet, if you could provide those, that
36 would be good. It helps to synthesize what's in these charts.
37 Maybe they're there and I just missed it, but I couldn't find
38 them.

39
40 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I think that they didn't come through in the
41 PDFs, which was in the briefing book. After the committee, I
42 can certainly send those around.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** While she is pulling that up, Andy, did you
45 have a comment?

46
47 **MR. STRELCHECK:** John, I would be interested in your take on the
48 summary graphics. Looking through the programs, there is

1 certainly some differences, I think, in what they're intending
2 to collect. There is some discard programs in here, a catch
3 card program, and so how comparable would you say the graphics
4 would be if some of that would be removed? Do you still think
5 the same trends would exist or do you think that the variables
6 that are being collected would be more consistent with the
7 program that we're envisioning implementing here?
8

9 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I am not aware, in my review of these, that
10 there's anything that's exactly what we're doing. I think, in
11 terms of the tabs and how the information is divided into when
12 it is reported, is similar. In terms of specific data elements,
13 I don't know. There are a number of them, and so there's a fair
14 bit of variability, but I think most of them all have aspects of
15 the -- There's a description of the trip, a description of the
16 passengers and vessels and what was caught.
17

18 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** The last meeting, or at least the last couple
19 of times, Myron, you specifically had brought up several good
20 points about we need to know specifically what are we collecting
21 and what are these data elements and that kind of thing. I
22 think, and maybe I'm wrong, and I don't want to speak for you,
23 but I think this Table 5(c) here probably captures what you're
24 thinking. If it doesn't, and, John, please go through it, but
25 if it doesn't, Myron, certainly let us know if that's what
26 you're envisioning. John, are you going to talk us through the
27 5(c)?
28

29 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Jessica is going to go through that.
30

31 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Go ahead, Jessica.
32

33 **SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL DATA ELEMENTS IN FOR-HIRE PROGRAM**

34

35 **DR. STEPHEN:** What we did as the IPT is we went through and we
36 looked at a bunch of different data elements, and I am going to
37 concentrate on when they're reported and what types of things
38 versus what previous surveys or whatever collected, since John
39 kind of covered that.
40

41 A lot of these fields, you will notice there is auto-populated
42 field there, and that means that we can minimize data entry by
43 the participant by having it auto-populated or kind of saved as
44 a template from it.
45

46 The information we felt that was needed within a hail-out would
47 be some kind of vessel number, the vessel identifier.
48 Typically, this is the Coast Guard vessel identifier.

1 Occasionally, it is the state vessel identifier.
2
3 The type of trip that they were going on, and this is typically
4 used to identify if they're doing a commercial trip versus a
5 headboat/charter type of trip or some other trip, such as the
6 research cruises or sunset cruises that a lot of these vessels
7 also take.
8
9 Landing location and landing date, as we mentioned before, and
10 an estimated time of the return time, with the landing time.
11 That estimated time could also be the final time. As I
12 mentioned earlier, they might have an ability to update that
13 time in a different portion of it after we get past the hail-out
14 portion of it.
15
16 The other information in it would be also what the species
17 targeted for that trip would be, and, again, this might be
18 something more suited to a charter boat than a headboat, which
19 might not target a particular type of species. That type of
20 information though is extremely helpful in the analysis of the
21 data we collect, and especially with the socioeconomic aspects.
22
23 Then, the very last thing that we were thinking that could go
24 into the hail-out would be the number of passengers onboard.
25 This would be the number of paying passengers, and, again, this
26 information starts to get relevant when we're doing additional
27 analysis to it, and that is known before you leave for a trip,
28 and so it's one of those information that you can do that you're
29 not worried about being out at sea and entering more
30 information.
31
32 The next thing we thought about is what could go into either the
33 hail-out or logbook style. If you remember the presentation, we
34 kind of had the hail-in part could be just catch and effort or
35 it could be everything, catch and effort and all the other
36 information you want in the logbook, versus having just the
37 catch information and some additional information later for the
38 final logbook.
39
40 Then the fields we were concerned about adding there would be
41 the landing time, which would be the actual time, if it differed
42 from the time put in on the hail-out. The number of hours
43 fished, the number of anglers onboard, and remember this could
44 be different than the number of passengers. Not all passengers
45 are anglers.
46
47 The species that were caught, and we would want that both as
48 retained catch, what they're landing, as well as released catch,

1 which are the discards. What type of trip was going on, and so
2 their pay type, that is some boats charge by person and some
3 charge by group. Some have a mixture of these types of things,
4 depending on what type of trip they're doing. Again, this is
5 helpful information in the final end, to summarize it, and that
6 might be information that is more well suited to be done in the
7 logbook at the very end, versus something being done at sea.
8 Again, this is something that the person who is physically
9 entering the data might not not be aware of all of that,
10 especially if it's a captain or a mate running the vessel and
11 filling out this information.

12
13 There is a bunch of fields that we thought would probably be
14 more well suited to a subsample versus a census of all
15 information, and these are grouped together here. They're under
16 the charter fee, the amount of fuel used, the fuel price, how
17 much the crew gets paid.

18
19 The next set of fields have to do with gear, for the most part.
20 What type of gear was used, and some of these in purple are ones
21 that we're still thinking about, such as the type of hook, in
22 particular the manufacturer, the number, and the size of the
23 hook.

24
25 A lot of the hooks might change by different manufacturers, and,
26 depending on the analysis done, that might be something we would
27 want to investigate later. It's not necessarily something we
28 are going to require here, but we want everyone to start
29 thinking about how that could be used and how that would better
30 suit our data analysis after the fact. That's all I have now,
31 if anyone has any questions about the different types of fields.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Thank you, Jessica. Johnny, hold that
34 thought one minute. We're, as usual, running out of time here,
35 and so I want to make sure that we get through a few things,
36 because there is a few items that we need to take care of, but,
37 Johnny, go ahead.

38
39 **MR. GREENE:** I was just going to give a little feedback to
40 Jessica. Like on the fuel quantity and fuel price, that's
41 something that is in the current program that I've been using,
42 and it's always kind of been a estimation on the amount of fuel
43 burned, as well as the cost.

44
45 I think that's something that you could almost do retroactively
46 and say, okay, during this past week, was the average amount of
47 fuel burned and what was the average cost of the price, because
48 it's kind of hard, as fuel may fluctuate a little bit while

1 you're gone, as well as fuel burned as well, and so that may be
2 something that you could have -- If you want to do stuff daily,
3 then that's great. Then if you want to have a set of parameters
4 that was due weekly or biweekly or something to that effect that
5 would kind of capture that, it may work out as well.

6
7 I mean everybody is going to have a copy of a fuel ticket. Now,
8 I know that there are some places that charge a fare plus fuel,
9 and there are other places who charge a total fare including
10 fuel, and that may be something to look at as well.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Yes, and that's a good example of a concern
13 that I share here, I think with some other people, and maybe
14 this is a good charge for this technical committee. I guess I
15 can say this, because I'm as guilty as anyone. When you turn
16 scientists onto something like this, we want the kitchen sink,
17 but then what do we really need?

18
19 Maybe what would be a good exercise for this technical committee
20 is what's the essential -- I mean the hook manufacturer, that's
21 great, and, believe me, I completely understand that a 4/0 from
22 one company is different than a 4/0 from another one, but that
23 is not as important as how many red snapper did you land, for
24 example, and so what's the bare essentials that you need to do
25 effective management? What are really needed and then maybe
26 what is this bonus kind of thing?

27
28 That's where I kind of recommend we go with that, because, at
29 least from our experience, we don't want to burden the captains
30 and the anglers with entering too much, where they're
31 disenfranchised.

32
33 This needs to be a simple, clean process and then figure out
34 other ways to get at some of this other information, an example
35 that Johnny is talking about. Anyway, that's my comment on
36 that. I am looking around the table to see if there is any more
37 comments, because we need to see where we really want to go with
38 all of this, since we're running out of time here, but, Andy, go
39 ahead.

40
41 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I think that was the intent here, was to give
42 you what we believed were the minimum data elements, and I
43 think, going down to at least crew pay, maybe some of those
44 economic variables weren't necessarily minimum data elements,
45 but most of these are, and many of them can be auto-populated,
46 and so we're trying to minimize the burden while also collecting
47 the necessary biological and economic data for fishery
48 management and science.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Thanks, Andy. I guess, committee, if
3 someone wants to make a recommendation on how we want to proceed
4 here. I mean obviously we need to have some more discussion,
5 which we're not going to have time. I think we'll have about
6 forty-five minutes during full council that we can discuss some
7 more of these in a few days, but we had a motion the last time
8 to convene this technical data collection group, and I don't
9 know if we need to provide them with a charge or I don't know --

10
11 Maybe, Doug, you can give me some comments or suggestions on how
12 you normally do this. When we're asking the committee to do
13 something, do they need a charge from us? I think it would be
14 nice, to make sure we're getting what we want. Then, really,
15 where do we want to go from here with this amendment, given that
16 we have about eight minutes left and Dr. Ponwith still wants to
17 give us a brief summary of this commercial cost analysis? Andy.

18
19 **MR. STRELCHECK:** This is fairly atypical, for I guess the
20 council to be discussing or even getting the technical
21 subcommittee to advise on data elements. This is something that
22 is typically specified by the Science Center, in conjunction and
23 coordination with the council and the SSC and others.

24
25 To me, this is essentially the information needed as a
26 placeholder for the document itself. It's laying out the intent
27 of the information that would be collected, and it's certainly
28 the opportunity of the council to provide input into that, but,
29 ultimately, at the end of the day, we need to make decisions
30 about what is necessary for managing the resource and the
31 science. I am questioning the need to send this back to the
32 technical subcommittee to discuss this further, given the amount
33 of work and time that's already been put into this.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. That's a good point, Andy, and one
36 discussion that we had that's related to what you pointed out is
37 that if we specify this in too great detail in the amendment
38 process, that kind of hamstrings us just a little bit in terms
39 of if we want to make some changes on something that's not
40 working. We're going to have to go back through a relatively
41 burdensome process to make the changes, rather than giving you
42 some flexibility, but, on the other hand, we also want to
43 maintain some control, in a way, so we can ensure that the
44 captains and anglers are getting what they want out of the
45 program, and so I'm not real sure where the balance is there.
46 Maybe we don't want to have this group meet. I don't know, but
47 does any of the committee have any suggestions on that?
48

1 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** Based on what Andy was saying, I'm not sure
2 that the technical committee can provide any more insight into
3 those elements, other than saying, yes, these look good, and we
4 all were kind of struggling with what are we going to charge
5 these guys with, and we all just kind of looked at each other.
6 If we can't come up with something fairly quickly, maybe we
7 don't need them to meet.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** I feel like we're at a spot with this amendment
10 that we have sort of gone a long way to -- I mean there's still
11 some more discussion, certainly, but, at least on this topic,
12 we've kind of gone as far as we can go without moving it to the
13 next level. Johnny, did you have your hand up? Then, Myron,
14 you're next.

15
16 **MR. GREENE:** Thank you, Chairman. If you remember a couple of
17 meetings back, we had a liaison for the South Atlantic Council,
18 and they said that they had put in the -- In this portion of the
19 document, in the appendices, is where they went in and put in
20 the data fields, and I think -- I thought it was a good idea
21 then, and I still think it's a good idea, because obviously
22 every document we do is going to be a living document, and that
23 may very well be the way to go to kind of find our way out of
24 this.

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

27
28 **MR. FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe where we are
29 today is a function of we assembled the technical committee with
30 the charge to look at the minimal data elements, and it was in
31 conjunction with the Southeast Center, who we thought might be
32 making the presentation, but it's not until this meeting that we
33 see this list.

34
35 When they met, they didn't have this list to look at, and the
36 technical committee is made up of the data specialists from each
37 of the five states and Gulf States, along with some Science
38 Center staff. It was to give us advice that may not necessarily
39 be needed on what data elements should be involved in a program,
40 and possibly that's their call. It's very possible that that's
41 the Science Center and National Marine Fisheries call on exactly
42 what is needed.

43
44 This committee did meet, and I think they are scheduled to meet
45 again, and it might be by webinar. I am not sure. I would have
46 no problem with them reviewing this, because some states might
47 collect different datasets, and so you don't want to omit
48 something that a state is collecting. At the same time, they

1 may feel something is useless, and so I would like to at least
2 see their comment. That's what the original motion was about.
3
4 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. So are you recommending that we proceed
5 through a webinar or a conference call type of thing with them
6 or how would you recommend that we move forward?
7
8 **MR. FISCHER:** I don't recall what was set up, and Doug would
9 have to answer that, but I thought I had seen where it might be
10 a webinar.
11
12 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR DOUG GREGORY:** Are you talking about with the
13 technical committee? John arranged all of that. I don't
14 recall.
15
16 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I was discussing something with Jessica. Can
17 you repeat the question?
18
19 **MR. FISCHER:** We were discussing your raise, but I don't think
20 anyone was in agreement. It was the technical committee coming
21 up, and was that to be by webinar or it was going to be an in-
22 person, or was it even going to happen?
23
24 **DR. FROESCHKE:** We have it sort of on our radar to happen. In
25 terms of whether it was a webinar or in-person, we hadn't
26 decided, and I think that kind of hinged on what happens here or
27 my raise or whatever.
28
29 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Mr. Donaldson.
30
31 **MR. DONALDSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Based on what we want
32 them to do, I think we can handle it through a webinar. I don't
33 know that we need to have them face-to-face, because we're just
34 essentially having them review that one document, and so I would
35 recommend that, if we do decide to proceed, that we do it via a
36 webinar.
37
38 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Dr. Lucas.
39
40 **DR. LUCAS:** As part of the webinar or part of the information
41 provided, I would like to have the states submit also -- I mean,
42 I see that we've got MRIP and all the different programs, but,
43 like Myron said, states may have a different thing, and so make
44 sure that those are included in that chart as well.
45
46 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** That's a very good point that Dr. Lucas brings
47 up, and also a way, during that webinar, to somehow liaison with
48 the state programs, to make sure that this meshes well. I think

1 that's where we're going with that. Mr. Chairman, I know we're
2 running out of time here. We probably can continue some of this
3 discussion, particularly as it relates to the alternatives,
4 during that time in full council.

5
6 I know Dr. Ponwith wanted to give a quick brief on the cost
7 analysis, and I was asked to report really quickly on that
8 ACCSP, and I think we can do that in just a very few short
9 minutes, but how would you recommend that we proceed here, since
10 we're almost done?

11
12 **MR. ANSON:** I would suggest go ahead and try to knock out that
13 last agenda item and Dr. Ponwith's comments, and Andy is
14 frantically waving his hand over there.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Sorry, Andy. I can't see you down there behind
17 seven or eight other people.

18
19 **MR. STRELCHECK:** If I can make two closing comments. One is I
20 think, to convene the technical subcommittee, it's very
21 important to decide on how you want to proceed with the hail-in
22 option as well as hardware, because some of these data elements
23 are contingent on those reporting mechanisms, and so, if that
24 could be discussed during full council, it would be highly
25 beneficial, in particular to select preferreds at that point.

26
27 The second part of this just a recommendation for the next
28 council meeting. An hour-and-fifteen minutes is obviously way
29 too short for this committee, and we need to spend more time on
30 this. This has been a lingering issue for quite some time, and
31 so I would certainly recommend that more time be devoted to Data
32 Collection at the next meeting.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Mr. Chairman, if we
35 could maybe get a little more time the next time. Dr. Ponwith,
36 do you want to briefly talk to us about the cost analysis?

37
38 **COST ANALYSIS OF COMMERCIAL ELECTRONIC REPORTING PROGRAM**

39
40 **DR. PONWITH:** Yes, and thank you, Mr. Chair. I will try and
41 help you keep on track, and that is we talked a little bit about
42 the fact that, at the South Atlantic Council, we're making a
43 presentation on what we learned during the pilot study for the
44 commercial electronic logbook pilot about some of the costs that
45 were incurred, or could potentially be incurred, if we went
46 operational on this.

47
48 We have got some materials together. They are in review right

1 now, and so I don't have materials that made it into the
2 briefing book. With the council's indulgence, what I would like
3 to do is do a good thorough job of reviewing those materials and
4 then get them into the briefing book for the October meeting and
5 have a longer discussion about that, because it's twofold. It
6 is what we learned about the potential costs to the charter
7 industry of an electronic reporting option for meeting that
8 reporting requirement, but, secondarily, we are looking, on the
9 technical side, on timing.

10
11 If a commercial vessel voluntarily wished to report
12 electronically versus on paper, number one, does that meet the
13 legal intent, the way the amendment or the plan is written right
14 now? Number two, what would those costs be to actually do that,
15 rather than doing it on paper? Three, when would we be able to
16 receive, on a voluntary basis, that information electronically,
17 because there are some steps that we would have to go through to
18 be able to ingest those data.

19
20 I bring all this up right now, but we will have two
21 presentations at the next council meeting that are carefully
22 reviewed and ready to look at at that point, but I would like to
23 plant a seed with the council right now, because, ultimately, we
24 think that it would be valuable to shift toward mandatory
25 electronic reporting in the commercial logbooks.

26
27 We are interested in the council's views on that. We think what
28 that would do is provide us finer-scale information, more timely
29 information, and ultimately get that information transitioned
30 much more efficiently than the current logbooks.

31
32 The real issue then is, if the council is interested in doing
33 this, how do we set that in motion, so that the regulatory side
34 of it sets up nicely with the timing of the technical side of
35 it, so that we finish and cross the finish line at the same
36 time?

37
38 Again, we would have two presentations, the voluntary reporting
39 and what it would take to get there from here, some of the costs
40 of hardware and software, and then a discussion about shifting
41 from voluntary to mandatory, if that is in the council's
42 interest.

43
44 **ATLANTIC STATES COASTAL COOPERATIVE STATISTICS PROGRAM MEETING**
45 **SUMMARY**

46
47 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** Okay. Thanks, Dr. Ponwith. I am speaking for
48 the committee here, and if someone disagrees, please jump in,

1 but I think that would be very useful and we could build that
2 into the agenda for the next time, if that's okay with you, Mr.
3 Chairman. John, if you would please get with me, and we will
4 work with Bonnie to get those built in for our next meeting in
5 October.

6
7 That brings us to the last formal thing on our agenda, if
8 there's not any other comments, and hopefully we can carry some
9 of these discussions into full council, when we meet on that in
10 a few days. The last was this Atlantic Coastal Cooperative
11 Statistics Program.

12
13 I didn't know I was representing the council there, but I was at
14 least there, and so they asked me to present. The key staff
15 people from NOAA there were Rich Malinowski, who is back there,
16 as well as Ken Brennan, and I know Dave Donaldson and Greg Bray
17 were represented there as well, but, for those of you not
18 familiar with that group, it's obviously Atlantic States
19 centric, but their goal is to organize federal and state
20 partners and essentially coalesce the data and then serve that
21 back out to managers, in, ideally, a really rapid QA/QC'd
22 process.

23
24 They put together this workshop on electronic reporting, and
25 also electronic monitoring, particularly for the for-hire
26 sector, in terms of what was working broadly across the sectors,
27 and hopefully, in a second here, Dave Donaldson can just chime
28 in quickly on how this relates to what is really happening right
29 here in the Gulf with that sister group, but, anyway, what came
30 out of that, in terms of the for-hire meeting, was that several
31 things -- For example, like how do you deal with the HMS system
32 and the for-hire one we're dealing with here, for example, but
33 they agreed to have this workshop, and the report is still
34 pending.

35
36 This is all preliminary, but they will send a letter to all the
37 councils requesting a reduction in duplicate reporting, because
38 a lot of that is going on, particularly in the Atlantic states.
39 They provide a lot more technical guidance on minimum data
40 elements, which certainly would be relevant to this group, and
41 as well as what are just some of the best management practices
42 for electronic reporting.

43
44 Also, summarize some of the working directly with the fishermen
45 and what their concerns are and what's really best for their
46 business. Then the final outcome of that workshop was to
47 provide a summary of all the pilot projects that are going on
48 and hopefully coalesce those into some working real projects,

1 but that was the overall summary from the meeting. There will
2 be a final report that will ensue here, hopefully in just a few
3 weeks, and so, Dave, I don't know if you want to mention real
4 quickly how this might interface with some of the work here in
5 the Gulf.

6
7 **MR. DONALDSON:** Well, ACCSP is kind of the sister program to
8 GulFFIN here in the Gulf of Mexico, and the staffs from both
9 GulFFIN and ACCSP work closely together, and have for a number
10 of years, because we realize there are some benefits in learning
11 from what we're addressing versus what they are, and so we are
12 closely aligning what we're trying to do and they're doing and
13 learn from their programs and vice versa and share ideas and
14 outcomes routinely.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN STUNZ:** So there is a lot of similar things going on
17 among all of our areas, and there is a lot of lessons learned
18 and that kind of thing. As we're all trying to move forward,
19 this is just trying to facilitate that process, essentially, and
20 so I will forward that report on as soon as it comes out, for
21 those that are interested. That will bring us to our last item
22 of Other Business for this committee. Are there any committee
23 members that have any other business? Seeing no other business,
24 I will adjourn the Data Collection Committee.

25
26 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on August 15, 2016.)