

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

**Westin Jekyll Island
Jekyll Island, GA**

March 10, 2016

SUMMARY MINUTES

Dara Collection Committee:

Mel Bell, Chair
Jack Cox
Dr. Wilson Laney
Mark Brown
Zack Bowen

Doug Haymans-Vice-Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chris Conklin
Charlie Phillips

Council Members:

Dr. Michelle Duval
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Jessica McCawley

Chester Brewer
Ben Hartig
LTJG Tara Pray

Council Staff:

Gregg Waugh
Mike Collins
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Chip Collier

John Carmichael
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
Amber Von Harten
Dr. Mike Errigo
Myra Brouwer

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Francine Karp
Mike Cahall
Robert Boyles
Dr. Mike Larkin
Amy Dukes

Erika Burgess
Leann Bosarge
Dr. Jack McGovern
Robert Olsen
Karla Gore
Dewey Hemilright

Additional Observers Attached

The Data Collection Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Westin Jekyll Island, Jekyll Island, Georgia, Thursday morning, March 10, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: I'm going to go ahead and call the Data Collection Committee to order. Just for clarification, just to make sure, the members of the committee are Anna Beckwith, Chris Conklin, Dr. Laney, Zack Bowen, Doug Haymans, Mark Brown, Jack Cox, and Charlie Phillips. We are missing a few bodies. I haven't seen Charlie, but we're going to go ahead and get going, because we do have an ambitious schedule here.

The first item on the agenda is Approval of the Agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda needed? I've got one item under Other Business that we'll add. If you recall, Fran Karp with Harbor Light Software, a few meetings ago, she demoed a system that they were working with with Rhode Island charter vessels for electronic data entry. She's got something that I think is geared toward private-boat anglers that at the tail-end here we will add, under Other Business, but she might be able to do a quick demo of that product for us, which would be really interesting, because that is, as we say, a really tough nut to crack, the data from the private sector. That's the only thing I had as maybe a change or an addition. If there are no other additions to the agenda, then the agenda stands approved.

Approval of the Minutes from the last meeting, which was the December 2015 meeting, are there any changes to the minutes or corrections? Seeing none, then the minutes stand approved from the December meeting. That takes us to our first actual agenda item today, which will be a briefing by Jack McGovern on bycatch monitoring. Jack, welcome.

DR. MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm going to give an update on a review of the bycatch information that a workgroup has put together. If you remember, I presented before and mentioned that there was a workgroup assembled, and it consists of Southeast Regional Office folks and the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. They were put together to review the Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodologies, or SBRMs, that are in place in sixteen FMPs for the Gulf Council, South Atlantic Council, and the Caribbean Council and develop ideas for updates to those SBRMs.

This workgroup has put together a fairly large document that reviews the SBRMs that are in place. It reviews the programs that are in place to collect discards and it provides the discard estimates and observer coverage and that sort of the thing for the different fisheries, and it has some ideas for updates that could potentially be made to the SBRMs.

This is what I want to cover in this presentation and, in addition to talking about some of the things that the workgroup has suggested, I am going to provide a summary of a new Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology proposed rule. This has relevance to what this workgroup is doing, because the SBRM proposed rule potentially provides guidance for how SBRMs in FMPs would be evaluated and how recommendations would be made.

I'm going to talk about a summary of the discards for the South Atlantic fisheries, which I've gone over before and so I will do that briefly, the SBRMs that are in place for South Atlantic Council FMPs, and then some ideas that the workgroup has had for potential improvements to the SBRMs.

Sam Rauch, at the CCC meeting, went over the SBRM proposed rule with the folks that were there, including Michelle and Charlie and Gregg. This proposed rule published shortly after that and the comment period is due on April 25. The proposed rule states that FMPs are required to establish standardized reporting methodologies to assess the amount and type of bycatch in a fishery, but the proposed rule also states that the standardized reporting methodology has never really been defined, and so the purpose of this rule was to try to articulate or clarify the interpretation of the SBRM provision.

There are three main components to this proposed rule. The first is to actually define what a Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology is. The second, which is kind of applicable to what this workgroup has been doing, is to clarify the procedures for reviewing SBRMs that are in place or establishing new SBRMs, and then it has a third item, which they refer to as adaptable implementation, which is supposed to provide flexibility for changing SBRMs within an FMP, and so it's more flexibility for that.

The definition of a Standardized Reporting Methodology, as stated in the proposed rule, is that a Standardized Reporting Methodology means an established procedure, or procedures, used to collect, record, and report bycatch data in a fishery or a subset of a fishery. It states that standardized procedures don't have to be the same for all fisheries. It can vary from one fishery to another, and it can also vary within a fishery. From one sector to another sector within a fishery it can vary, but it must provide a consistent approach for collecting, recording, or reporting bycatch data.

The proposed rule also states that there are multiple steps to address bycatch and that the SBRM is the first step, and that's to collect and record and report data. The second step is to use the bycatch data from the SBRM and other information to then incorporate into models and that sort of thing to estimate the amount of bycatch in a fishery, and then the third step is to use those estimates of bycatch to inform the council, so that they can put measures into place to minimize bycatch.

The proposed rule says that sometimes these first two have been confused, and it's thought that SBRM actually applies to both steps, and they're clarifying that it only applies to the collection, recording, and reporting of information. The purpose of an SBRM, therefore, is to inform the assessment or models on the amount of bycatch occurring in a fishery, so that conservation and management measures then can be developed to minimize bycatch, to the extent practicable.

The proposed rule says that FMPs must clearly state the required Standardized Reporting Methodology for each fishery and must explain why the methodology is appropriate for the fishery, based on a set of factors that are provided in this proposed rule. These required factors for establishing an SBRM, or reviewing the existing SBRMs, are to look at the conservation and management objectives of the fishery with respect to bycatch, and, for example, the snapper grouper fishery has fifteen conservation and management objectives.

Data quality and characteristics of the bycatch must be evaluated, including the amount of bycatch occurring in the fishery, the importance of bycatch, and estimating total mortality of fish stocks and the importance of bycatch to related ecosystems. The SBRM must be feasible. It must be able to be done according to cost, how much it costs, and whether it can be done technically. Every SBRM must be designed to be implemented within available funding.

Additional factors the proposed rule says can be considered are the overall magnitude or economic impact on the fishery and what scientific methods and techniques are available to collect and report bycatch. The third thing that I mentioned that this proposed rule has in it is something they call the adaptable implementation, and this is intended to provide flexibility in the use of an SBRM, such that changes in intensity or frequency of data collection and reporting can be made without having to amend the FMP.

If the proposed rule gets implemented and things don't change a lot, the proposed rule says all FMPs must be consistent with the rule within five years. Then councils should conduct a review of their existing SBRMs, which is kind of what this workgroup is doing now, and then the review should provide information on whether or not the FMP needs to be amended.

I will move on to now some of the stuff that the workgroup has been doing, and I went over the discards previously, and so I will summarize those pretty quickly. The South Atlantic snapper grouper fishery is characterized by relatively high, moderately high, discards, with the commercial sector being dominated by yellowtail snapper, gray snapper, black sea bass in pots, as Paul Rudershausen talked about yesterday, red snapper, and vermilion snapper. The recreational sector is dominated by red grouper, black grouper, gag, and yellowtail snapper.

The dolphin and wahoo fishery is considered to have relatively low discards. Dolphin dominates the discards in the hand line and trolling sector, and the South Atlantic coastal migratory pelagic also is characterized by relatively low discards, as is spiny lobster. Most of the discards in spiny lobster are stone crabs, grunts, spider crabs, and sea urchins. Golden crab doesn't have a lot of discards, either. It's mostly isopods. There are high discards in the shrimp fishery. Without BRDs, bycatch is dominated by finfish, shrimp, and the rock shrimp with BRDs has rock shrimp, finfish, and so on.

I will quickly go over the SBRMs that are in place for the South Atlantic FMPs, and for snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and coastal migratory pelagics, the SBRM currently is to adopt the ACCSP Bycatch Module and, until the module is funded, to require the use of a variety of sources of information to assess and monitor bycatch.

This SBRM is the same for the shrimp fishery, with the exception that there is specifics on how observer funds are to be allocated, with 20 percent being allocated to the South Atlantic and 80 percent to the Gulf of Mexico. Sargassum, there is no harvest of sargassum, but the SBRM is 100 percent observer coverage.

I will go over some ideas that this workgroup had for SBRMs, and one thing that was mentioned to me by a couple of workgroup members when I was developing this presentation is that I should mention that these are not a determination on the adequacy of existing programs, because we haven't gone over any kind of evaluation, such as what's being suggested in the SBRM proposed rule, and these are ideas that could be implemented, pending such an evaluation.

Some ideas that the workgroup has for the Snapper Grouper FMP, for the commercial sector, is to begin a pilot observer program to potentially supplement observer coverage with electronic technology. We had a lot of discussion about the discard logbook, and it's currently 20 percent of commercial fishermen are required to report by paper. The thought was this could be an electronic discard logbook and that 100 percent of fishermen could report, and that there could be specifics

is that discard logbook to include corals, protected species, and sargassum. One workgroup member said that we should include sargassum, because there is an FMP for sargassum.

For the recreational sector, the workgroup indicated that there are things that we're doing now that are collecting standardized information bycatch, and they should be included as SBRMs. This includes headboat observer coverage, discard reporting through MRIP, and electronic reporting of discards in the headboat survey. There was the thought that there could be electronic reporting of the discards for the for-hire sector and that eventually observed discards could be compared to electronic discards, or compared to self-reported discards, to look at potential differences.

For the dolphin wahoo commercial sector, the group felt that probably a lot of the dolphin wahoo fishermen are also snapper grouper fishermen, and that, if there was an observer program, that they would probably be covered under that observer program, and so they suggested maybe a one-year pilot program for South Atlantic dolphin wahoo to test this.

The coastal logbook is the same for dolphin wahoo, snapper grouper, and coastal migratory pelagics, and so the same recommendation was made for the discard logbook, that it could be made electronic and that all fishermen could report and that it could include specifics about corals, protected species, and sargassum. These are also the same recommendations for the recreational sector as made for dolphin wahoo.

For coastal migratory pelagics, the workgroup acknowledged that there are low discards for the trolling component and it might not really be necessary to have an observer program, a consistent observer program, and that periodic observer coverage could be made and that there could be calibration between the observer program and self-reported data. They felt that we could explore electronic monitoring options as an alternative to observers, enhance observer coverage in the gillnet sector, and then this has to do with the discard logbook, with making it electronic and having all fishermen report. Again, these are the same recommendations as for dolphin wahoo and snapper grouper.

For the Coral FMP, there is no fishery for coral. There is some allowable harvest for octocorals off the State of Florida, but there is no allowable harvest off of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. The workgroup felt that maybe bycatch information could be incorporated from active fisheries and that corals could be a specific component to the discard logbook, coastal logbook, for reef fish and in the Gulf of Mexico snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and coastal migratory pelagics.

For shrimp, possibly increased observer coverage, especially in the area with sawfish. Use electronic monitoring as an alternative to observers, if this is feasible, and have an electronic logbook program, I think similar to what's in the Gulf of Mexico for effort data collection, and a VMS is required for the rock shrimp sector, and so location-specific catch and bycatch data could be linked to VMS, potentially.

For the golden crab fishery, there is a logbook. It does have discard reporting associated with it, and the logbook could be made electronic. There is low bycatch in this fishery, and the group suggested maybe sporadic observer coverage, to allow calibration between self-reported and actual bycatch.

For the spiny lobster fishery, there isn't a logbook, and maybe there could be an electronic logbook, and it also appears to have low bycatch, and maybe observer coverage every once in a while. If there is an electronic logbook, it could potentially include information on protected species. That's it, Mr. Chairman, and I will take any questions that anybody might have.

MR. BELL: Any questions for Jack?

MR. CONKLIN: In the commercial hand line fishery, the method we have in place for the 20 percent coverage of reporting, would that pretty much be continued on, just the full 100 percent, or would we have to elaborate on that more?

DR. MCGOVERN: The group suggested that maybe you could elaborate on it for them to make some specific categories in there, for like corals and protected species and that sort of thing. They also suggested, and I didn't mention, that I think the discard logbook is trip level and that it could be made to be a set level form. There would be some elaboration, I guess, potentially, but I also should mention that these are recommendations that this workgroup came up with before we saw this proposed rule for Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology, and so I think we need to evaluate everything with respect to the potential guidelines provided by that proposed rule.

MR. BELL: Before we would be able to kind of move forward, that proposed rule needs to kind of clear the process and it needs to kind of resolve first?

DR. MCGOVERN: I would think so, yes.

MR. BELL: Remember, this ties so many things together that we touch on here, I mean everything from electronic monitoring and reporting issues to just throughout a diverse spectrum of fisheries, and so there's a lot of things involved here, but, recall -- Remember CE-BA 3? That's the mechanism that we have potentially in place to deal with this and to move forward at some point, in directing staff to kind of repopulating it. I see Chip standing up, and so you have, as an Attachment Number 2 in your suite of attachments, some discussion of the history of CE-BA 3 and all, but this would feed into that process, in terms of us moving forward, but are there any questions for Jack specifically related to any of the recommendations? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not on your committee, but, Jack, I noticed that it was enhance observer coverage or it was add observer coverage to the headboat sector, I think, and I know that we have observers on headboats in North Carolina. The state pays additionally for that, and so I just didn't know if that was already included and you would just like to see more observer coverage, maybe, because I think all the states do it.

DR. MCGOVERN: All the states do it, and I think the recommendation was just to look at it, but I think that evaluation has to be made based on what's in the proposed rule. It might be just the observer coverage that's being done now is just fine.

MR. BELL: I want to make sure I acknowledge the efforts of the workgroup and Jack and all to pulled this together, because it's a necessary step in allowing us to move forward into sort of what might be the next step.

MS. BOSARGE: I was just wondering, as you start to consider adding things to these collection activities that involve maybe coral or even turtles or something like that, protected species, I know fishermen are obviously pretty familiar with the fish they catch, but as you get into things that are not their targets, I am not sure what their level of experience would be in identifying certain things, you know type of coral was it or what type of turtle. Some turtles are pretty obvious, but sometimes they're not. If you put those kinds of elements into this program, did you have any ideas about how detailed you were going to get and how we would make sure that we weren't mislabeling things?

DR. MCGOVERN: We didn't get into that kind of detail. There are a lot of different species of corals, for sure, and most people I don't think could identify them to species. I think our idea was just to have maybe a category for corals and it would just be that level, but we didn't go into that much detail in that discussion. We just felt like there is a Coral FMP and it might be worthwhile having some kind of category on the discard logbook for that.

MR. BELL: Any other questions for Jack right this second? Chip, in terms of moving forward towards fleshing out or doing something with CE-BA 3, I guess we do need to let the proposed rule run its course, but then, at some point, I guess we would be turning to staff with a motion or something, at an appropriate time, to kind of start working some of this into CE-BA 3, right? I'm not sure what -- CE-BA 3 is just sort of a placeholder right now and it's not really an existing document, but what would be involved? I know we have a placeholder in the schedule.

MR. COLLIER: Yes, you guys do have a placeholder in the schedule, and I was just basically coming up to see when you want change it from the back burner to the front burner. It sounds like you want to wait until after the final rule is done, is completed, and NMFS has kind of gone through and made sure they've reviewed everything and this matches up with what they've put forward with the Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodologies.

MR. BELL: I guess is my rationale correct there? We really should let that run its course, and what's the timeline on that, Jack?

DR. MCGOVERN: The comment period for the proposed rule I think was April 25. I don't know how long it will take for them to publish the final rule, and so I can't speak to that. I don't know if Monica could speak to that, but I think we don't know.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I would think it would depend on the amount of comments they get, and I am going to guess they're going to get a fair amount of comments on this proposed rule. Then they will have to respond to the comments and/or maybe even reissue another proposed rule. I don't know, and so it's possible you could get it before your next council meeting; however, I think that's probably kind of unlikely.

MR. BELL: At this point though, in terms of direction to staff or whatever, it's sort of stand by to stand by or stand by to move this thing. I'm not sure how much we can really get into the details of fleshing something out. Is that right?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think so. This SBRM proposed rule is so intertwined with what we think you're going to want to do or look at and all that that it would make the most sense to wait until a final rule comes out. I am not sure, and maybe the working group has some other ideas

internally of things they want to keep moving on, but, in terms of the council action at this point, my advice would be to wait until you get to a final rule. Then you have some concrete advice from the Fisheries Service upon which you can build any FMP amendment.

MR. BELL: Then so I think direction to staff would be an update at the next meeting as to where we are and how things look, so we can kind of proceed from there. Does that work, Chip? Okay. Any other questions for Jack or Chip at this point? Zack.

MR. BOWEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not on the list for this committee, but I think I'm on the committee.

MR. BELL: I called your name.

MR. BOWEN: It's just not on the thing, but anyway, Jack, thank you for that presentation. It says here, on page 27, include corals, marine mammals, protected species, and sargassum as specific items to report in discard electronic logbooks. Can I get a little clarification on like -- Does that mean if we hook sargassum weed when we're trolling for pelagics that we have to -- Can you just elaborate a little bit for me? I'm from south Georgia, and I'm a little slow.

DR. MCGOVERN: We were kind of like the same way as you. We had one member of the workgroup that said we do have an FMP for sargassum and so it might be appropriate to have it in the discard logbook. The rest of us were saying you can get sargassum just hooking, and so, anyway, that was also our thoughts as well. It was just a suggestion by the workgroup. It's an idea. These are all ideas, and so it doesn't mean that it's definitely going to happen.

MR. BOWEN: So actually I picked up on something that your working group picked up on as well?

DR. MCGOVERN: I am not going to name who the working group member was, but we all felt like that was kind of a silly thing, but then the one working group member felt like there is an FMP for sargassum and it might be worthwhile having that in there.

MR. BELL: That's what drives this, Zack. There is an FMP, believe it or not, for sargassum. There is a fishery management plan, and it's also essential fish habitat. The guidance says you have to have this done for all of your management plans, and so that's why.

MR. BOWEN: I am going to be honest. I really didn't pick up on it. Chris picked up on it and wanted me to mention it.

MR. BELL: Duly noted. Way to go. Good teamwork, guys. Anything else on this topic right now? Are we good? Okay. Thanks. You'll see this stuff will all tie together here, but the next topic is Commercial Logbook Pilot Study Update from Dr. Ponwith.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a familiar topic. We've been reporting on it since the genesis of the project. This is an electronic logbook project, where we provided specifications to interested vendors and let them prepare the software and hardware to meet those specifications. This is just a list of some of the vendors. I think the indicator is that we had more vendors interested, which is very good news.

Going into the findings, this is just kind of an overview, to give you the context, again, for these findings. We had pilot project participants from around the coast. We had eight laptops and three iPads that were used in this, for a total of twelve vessels. The vessels were using different types of gear types that you can see there, and also we had some regional distribution too among the South Atlantic, the HMS species, and four vessels from the Gulf. Again, you can see the list of gears that are on there.

This is just a progress report. Many of these checkmarks are familiar, because what we're doing is just building sequentially on where we are in the project, and so I think all of those top ones you've heard over and over again. As we get down to the bottom, we get to see the progress that we've made since the last time we've talked.

In January and February of 2016, the data collection phase of this project was completed and we turned toward getting feedback from the fishermen themselves, the collaborators, and also from the vendors. The feedback that we got from the fishermen were very useful. They reported in several different ways. You can see that they submitted at the dock, using Wi-Fi. They used their home Wi-Fi and they also used the vendor's web portal as mechanisms, and the software was flexible to allow that to happen.

We have picked up all the hardware, and we have some fishermen who have retained the hardware to do some additional testing for us. Those tests are looking at cellular network reporting and we'll use all of that to finalize the data collection standards.

Some of the feedback that we've gotten from the participants, and this is including all phases of this, the hardware, the software, and the overall experience, and what we've found is that the feedback on this is varied. The perception of this e-log depends on what kind of gear the fishermen were using, and we'll talk a little bit more about that as we get down into the next slide.

The type of gear that they're using influences how many times during a trip they're reporting, and we feel as though a lot of the feedback was on that level of periodicity. Also, the different types of species that they're targeting. The more uniform your landings are, the easier it is. The more diverse your landings are, the more challenging the reports get. Also, another thing that came up was the experience of the computers themselves, and that depended on the configuration of the vessel. The bigger the vessel, the easier it was to have an instrument on there. The smaller the vessel, the more challenging.

The results showed changes to the data collection standards were needed, and what we actually found, and this is really why we value the fishermen's input and why we do a pilot in the first place, is we discovered that there were several of the data fields that we feel are really important that could be more efficiently gathered through other mechanisms, like the dealer reports, for example, that would eliminate the fishermen having to enter these data at sea. In our minds, that makes really good sense, and so that was very valuable feedback in the study.

The other is that most of the gear types can accommodate set-based reporting, which is just going to be invaluable at that resolution. The exception was the hand line and cast net. For that, we believe, based on what we learned from this, is that we're going to have to scale back to sub-trip reporting, for example, reporting your catch on a twenty-four-hour period basis, as opposed to a set basis. Another issue that was raised by the fleet was the hardware, and that is, again, the smaller

or more exposed cabin vessels with relatively small crew created some challenges for what type of hardware could be used. We learned from this, and we'll take that into consideration.

The other thing that became very apparent through this was the huge increase in the quantity of the data and the quality of the data that we're getting above the current paper logbook methods, and that's reasonable. We can get catch and effort data logged over multiple days with multiple sets per day, and the reports that we get through this electronic allow us to have a finer spatial/temporal scale, a finer temporal scale, and, again, get at that set level data. A lot of the entries, once we get this refined, can be automatically generated. The vessel name isn't going to change. Once you put it in there, you're done. Then you can really focus on the things that do change.

Finally, our overall findings on this, regarding the feasibility, is that it is feasible to go to an electronic logbook option in the Southeast and for HMS species, and that there's a range of technological options that meet the standards that we set up for this being a successful program. It enables us to collect the data at much more refined scales, temporally and spatially, and that's really going to be valuable.

The reports themselves can be submitted more timely, and they also contain fewer errors, because we can build error-checking mechanisms into the data entry, so that if you put in the proverbial forty-pound guppy, you can get a query back saying one of those two things is wrong. Either it wasn't forty-pounds or it wasn't a guppy. It also helps retain catch history and notes on the conditions for the fishermen themselves.

We believe that this data collection process can create some value-added data for our fishermen partners themselves, and, finally, improving the technology allows the flexibility in hardware choices, and so the more we learn through the pilot study, the more refined we can be in how we make those selections about what is good hardware for this program, sensitive to the concerns that the fishermen had. That is the report. Any questions?

MR. BELL: Any questions for Bonnie?

MR. COX: Bonnie, I have been a participant in the program, and I can just tell you that I'm certainly ready to get away from the paper logbooks, just with all the things that come with it. We don't have confirmation of when the information gets to the Center, and it takes sometimes months to get a report back, if there was an error on it. I guess I would just like to say I'm ready to get something that's very user-friendly and get away from the laptop and go to the more versatile iPad-type of setup. I just would like to say I encourage us to move along as fast as possible with this if we could, or at least get on a voluntary basis. Thank you.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I also started out as a participant with the e-logbooks, and I was kind of a little overwhelmed, given that I had regulations to put electronic monitoring cameras aboard my boat, with Amendment 7 that didn't have no pilot program. It was probably the first ever that I can recall, or look back on over, that National Marine Fisheries Service placed onboard boats without no pilot program, which is the camera program, and so thank you for having a pilot study on this here.

Some of the things that I found out is that it's easier when you include the fishermen in the making up of the data, which didn't happen either. We were given a, from my particular instance, a seventeen-inch logbook with here's your system. It would have been great to be able to work with the computer people or software people to develop something that would have been more user-friendly, but staff did a great job in helping me, even though I bowed out of it early on.

Something else is, in the pelagic longline industry, we recently had new VMS systems placed onboard our boats with this little -- It's probably about a six-inch-by-twelve-inch tablet, which is very user friendly for VMS, and it's real small. It also has Bluetooth capability, which I would maybe look into. I think it was CLS America that was my supplier for the VMS. It's real small, and it looks to be pretty good for the environments that we fish under, but including the fishermen at the very start, not after you've developed the software and you come there. I would go back to the drawing board and learn from what you have here and maybe start on that part, but I'm definitely ready and over filling out paper logbooks. We're in 2016.

The thing I'm afraid of though with your logbooks is -- There's not so many commercial fishermen up and down the coast, and I'm afraid you're doing some logbook study and the South Atlantic is going to do a logbook study, the Mid-Atlantic, the Northeast, and nobody is talking to each other. In that course, you will probably spend a few extra million dollars and it might take a little longer. If you put everybody in one room, you would get it figured out a lot faster. Thank you.

DR. PONWITH: To that point, I couldn't have paid you for a better critique, and the reason is because -- He didn't pay me, for the record.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: It's just based on personal experience and hard choices that I've had to live with.

DR. PONWITH: The point that you make about not reinventing that wheel is absolutely crucial, and I will tell you that we took that to heart at the very start, and the first place we started was the place that already had a logbook in place, and that was up in New England, in the Northeast, to make sure that we went to school on all their trials, tribulations, and successes and picked up from there, instead of starting from scratch and making the same mistakes over again, and certainly working very closely with ACCSP and the vast experience that they've got in collaborating with fishermen to modernize data collection approaches, and so I certainly appreciate that comment and believe and agree with you.

MR. BELL: Dewey, that really was good. We couldn't have paid you to -- You kind of set things up, but you're absolutely right in terms of whatever -- As we move forward with eventually implementation of things, you've got to do kind of the R&D involving the fishermen, and we talked about a diverse spectrum of vessels, a diverse spectrum of gears, fisheries, but all this has to be worked out for the specific fishery and with the specific folks in mind. You're absolutely dead-on right there.

To your point regarding communication, yes, there's a whole bunch of stuff going on, and, in a minute, we're going to hear from somebody who does get to talk to everybody, and so there is an effort to try to coordinate all these diverse efforts from different regions, and so any other questions?

MS. BOSARGE: I will just be real quick. Bonnie, did you have any smaller center-console boats that ended up in those twelve boats?

DR. PONWITH: The goal was to have as big of a range as gear types and as big of a range of sizes of vessels and configurations of vessels as possible. Whether we had those smaller center-consoles, I can't answer that specifically, but I can find out.

While the microphone is hot, let me just say one last thing, so that I don't forget to do that, and that is to absolutely thank each and every one of the participants in the pilot study, because their willingness to do this and their willingness to provide constructive criticism on the hardware, the software, and the project is what is going to make this a good thing when we decide to go operational. Again, we're really grateful for the collaboration from the industry.

MS. BURGESS: Bonnie, I'm curious. Could you please elaborate on those data points that you thought could be collected from dealer reports instead of fishermen?

DR. PONWITH: Let me see if they had some specific examples. They didn't include specific examples of the data points that they were talking about, but I will ask them for those, and if I can get them today, I will let you know.

MR. COX: Leann, one of my boats was included in the pilot project. It was a twenty-eight-foot center-console. What we had was they furnished us, the Science Center, with an iPad and it has a waterproof case on it. We entered the data in it, and it's got the Bluetooth connection, so you could take it right in the fish house and just shoot it right to the Center. It was pretty cool.

MR. PHILLIPS: I'm not on the committee, but, Bonnie, eventually are you going to try to overlay some like water temperature data and maybe even weather patterns, so you can see how that kind of stuff affects certain fisheries and landings and so on and so forth?

DR. PONWITH: I would say right now the real focus of these logbooks are getting the data that we would have gotten on paper and getting it at a finer scale. What you've talked about is my dream, and that's to be able to -- When we go out on a research cruise for fishery-independent data, and so not fishing, but collecting research data, one of the things we always do is try and link the biological part of the system into the physical and chemical part of the system, which means we're taking bottom temperature, salinity, whatever types of parameters we can measure, to get a better feel for how the biology responds to changes in the physical environment.

If we could evolve these data collections so that we can do the same on fishing vessels, we would be light years ahead in understanding the distribution and densities of these animals relative to patterns that we're seeing in the physical environment. I would say that that is a direction that I would love to see happen. What I want to do is be brilliant at the basics first.

MR. BROWN: Bonnie, how long are these pilot programs, and then how long after that before they can be used?

DR. PONWITH: The pilot program is officially over. The data collection ended at the turn of the calendar year. We're synthesizing our findings, and these are the coarse-level findings. We're synthesizing the finer-scale findings and incorporating that into pathways that we go next. Then

it's a matter of seeking the resources to actually go operational on this. I think the pilot is officially done and we're ready to figure out how to move forward at an operational scale.

MR. BELL: Any other questions for Bonnie on this particular effort? We certainly do appreciate you giving us the briefing.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Will there be a final written report that we should plan to provide to the committee at some point, just for my future meeting agenda topics?

DR. PONWITH: Yes, I think it's reasonable that we put together kind of a final synthesis of this and get it into the record. I think that would be good for us and whoever comes behind us to go to school on what we've learned. I would include that. If that changes, I will let you know.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Bonnie. Under kind of the heading of multiple things going on and folks that talk to everybody, Mike Cahall is going to give us an update. You heard Jack and Dewey say they're done with paper, and so there's more than one way to be done with paper. We're going to get an update. Remember we're kind of moving forward and actually trying to make something happen using ACCSP, since they do talk to -- As a data warehouse, if you will, they do talk to the different regions and have connectivity there, and that would be important in establishing, because fishermen and fish don't recognize our regional boundaries sometimes. Mike is going to give us an update on where we're going with this so far.

MR. CAHALL: Thank you so much. I'm thrilled to be here, although I'm sitting in the hot seat and it's a little bit nerve-racking, but I'm going to give you a little bit of an overview of the for-hire project that we're getting ready to start in collaboration with the council. Before I really go into that, I'm going to take just a couple of minutes and give a little more background on the project, on the program, so I can sort of put this work into the context of what's going on.

Most of you are familiar with ACCSP. We are created by Memorandum of Understanding between all the twenty-three agencies that manage marine fisheries on the Atlantic coast. The intention of ACCSP is to standardize data elements, data collection, standardize methodologies, and then be able to provide information systems to store the data and also to collect the data.

In addition to running our data warehouse, we fund program partner projects, one of which is this upcoming for-hire pilot. We also manage the Standard Atlantic Fisheries Information System, SAFIS, which is the data collection system that's being used by many of our program partners.

All of these end up in our data warehouse, which is intended to be a homogenized fairly complete suite of fisheries-dependent data. Currently, the dealer reporting and trip reporting data sides of the system are up running and being consistently populated. We do also have a biological and at-sea observer/bycatch piece. The biological piece is up, but we're getting ready to deploy a new version of that that's a little more consistent with modern practice. As we move forward, we hope to be able to complete the redesign of our bycatch at-sea portion and begin to bring in data especially from lesser-known, lesser-used datasets. There are many smaller state datasets, for example, that are not available to others. Our goal, of course, is to make all the data available to anyone who might need to use.

The Standard Atlantic Fisheries Information System is a real-time, initially web-based reporting system that was originally developed to do dealer reporting in the Northeast, specifically in the State of Rhode Island. It then became the electronic reporting system for the Northeast Region and has gradually expanded over time to now encompass a lot of the state-level dealer reporting and also some of the southern states dealer reporting as well.

We're collecting almost all of the federally-permitted dealer data on the Atlantic coast for NMFS, and we're also collecting a good bit of dealer and logbook data for our partner states. Originally, SAFIS was designed as an online, internet-based system. It would be you would go to a website and you would log into it and you would put your data in that way.

Of course, we don't need to go over too much, but the benefits of electronic reporting I think is relatively well understood. It's fast. It produces near real-time data. As long as your folks are more or less in compliance, you should be no more than maybe a week or two behind what's actually happening. It improves accuracy, and I think Dr. Ponwith pretty clearly articulated that.

One of the things that was noticed when electronic reporting was rolled out for the Northeast Region was almost immediately all of the coding errors that were caused by scanning or by transcription went away. Granted, folks could still put in information that doesn't necessarily make sense, and I think her guppy is a good example, but, nonetheless, it dramatically improved the accuracy and it allowed everyone who needed access to the data to have it immediately, and so it went into a single standardized repository so that, where we have overlapping areas of authority, like in many of the Northeast states, the state agencies had immediate access to the information, as did the Northeast Region.

As time passed, we began to look at making some expansions to how SAFIS data are reported. We began a project to consider how to move into tablet-based reporting. There are issues, of course, with using a regular PC connected full-time to the internet, especially when you're talking about folks that may be disconnected for extended lengths of time, for example when their vessels are out on the water. There are, of course, many shore-side areas that have a very poor internet connection, and we needed to think about developing systems that would be able to report without requiring a full-time internet connection.

We went with a tablet-based strategy. One of our keystones is to make sure that any application that we develop is universally available on all of the major tablet operating systems, which right now include IOS, and that would be Apple, and Windows-based systems and Android. They needed to be easy to use. They needed to be able to upload their data directly into SAFIS on the fly and to be validated right then and there.

Basically, our systems get around some of the issues that we've had with bulk loads before, where an entire group of records might be rejected. By doing the on-the-fly validation, we're able to say this particular record is wrong and this is why and please fix it and resubmit. That is another route that we use to do quality assurance, to help prevent that data from getting into the system.

The other piece of it is, because the online interface is still up and still available, those data are available to the submitters. There are a number of reports that are put into the SAFIS systems that provide both the dealers and commercial harvesters, and also for-hire harvesters, access to the information that they provided. There are some basic reports that are in the system, but we also

allow them to download those data if they want to use them locally. In addition, the systems themselves, tablet-based systems, do have some basic reports in them, and it's intended to be compatible with the online interface.

eTRIPS/mobile started its life, as our online dealer reporting did, in Rhode Island. We had a request from the DEP in Rhode Island and the Rhode Island party and charter/headboat association to develop a tablet reporting system that could be used in the for-hire fishery. We worked, along with our contractor, Harbor Lights -- Fran is here, and she'll be able to show you the system and similar ones after we're finished.

We developed it using a fairly small cadre of charter boat captains, but we worked very, very closely with them. As a consequence, from a developer standpoint, I look at how the system ended up looking, and it's not at all how I would have conceived it as a software developer. On the other hand, I think it's exactly what the captains wanted, and the feedback that we've gotten from them has been very, very positive. The pilot ran in Rhode Island last year and was successful. This tool is going to go live in Rhode Island on the 15th of this month.

Then it was also used successfully in a Northeast ocean use study by the Northeast Regional Ocean Council, NROC, and Seaplan. Again, it was very similar, in scope, of looking for wind farms and where are these vessels going. It was almost exactly the same tool, but because the tool has the capability of accessing the GPS that most tablets have, it was able to generate a track. This is not deployed in our standard version of the tool. We made a special one for this project, but they were able to successfully demonstrate precisely where their vessels were going and those data were provided to NROC, through a separate interface, to be used to generate the reports for their pilot study.

I think the feedback we got from the captains, as a consequence of these two studies, was very useful. We were very pleased. We got almost universally positive feedback from these folks. Granted, this is a self-selected group who are eager to do this and eager to work with it, but we got things like it reduced their stress, because they didn't have to worry about the paper. It was reliable, and it was economical, because they were able to use virtually any kind of tablet.

One of the issues that has been, for as long as I can remember with electronic reporting, how much does a ruggedized piece of equipment cost? How much are you going to have to spend to do this? I think our philosophy has been that we would prefer that you buy a cheap tablet and put it in an Otter case and if it dies, you buy another cheap tablet. It's much easier than spending \$2,000 or \$3,000 or \$4,000 for a waterproof, ruggedized system. I think, to a certain extent, that's been fairly successful.

Finally, we got quite a few -- We like testimonials, and we take quotes, and some of these are very positive, things like knowing that their data are backed up in a database or that the system saves favorites. It is designed to be easy to use, and we got almost universally positive feedback after we got the tool built and deployed. There are always issues, but the vast majority of folks who have used the tool in the previous two pilots have had very positive feedback to give us.

Kind of moving on to the specific project, we received a funding request from the South Atlantic Council last year as part of our annual funding. That was approved by our Coordinating Council at the end of 2015. It was intended to test the feasibility of wider-scale tablet-based reporting,

using mostly existing software. This pilot will be using the eTRIPS tool that was developed initially for Rhode Island and has already been used in two separate pilot studies.

The scope of this project is a group of Southeast federally-permitted for-hire vessels. I think I want to step back for just a second and emphasize that it is a universal tool. It is intended to be used in both commercial and for-hire fisheries, and it makes decisions on what it provides to you as options, depending on whether or not you have told it you are running a commercial trip or a for-hire trip.

There is going to be a selection of about twenty-three to twenty-five vessels from North Carolina to Florida, and the goal here is to advance the joint for-hire reporting amendment by backing up, with facts and findings, some assumptions that we know are going into some of these amendments.

It will utilize the existing eTRIPS/mobile software. For those of you who like big buttons, the first screen on the left is the one where you start the trip, and it is intended for a big thumb just to push right on that button, to go ahead and start it. The color schemes are intended to be extremely bright in a sunny environment, so that the backgrounds are black and the letters are white. The captains agreed that this green color, which is certainly a color I never would have selected as a software developer, made it much easier to see and much easier to use.

The eTRIPS/mobile system, which is already tested and was recently certified for VTR submission in the Northeast Region, is designed to work offline when at sea. It does transmit data directly into the SAFIS database; therefore, it becomes immediately available to all who might need it.

They are also going to modify the existing eTRIPS tool to use Bluetooth measuring boards, which will be an interesting innovation for us, and it is designed to handle any regional-specific requirements. Although these systems are built to the ACCSP standards, they are intended to be flexible. They are intended, because the system knows which jurisdiction you belong to when you log in, it's able to make adjustments in terms of the number of options that it provides to you, for example, species lists or gear types. You might not see some kinds of gears. You're not going to see probably a dual-parlor lobster trap in Florida and those kinds of things.

It's also going to develop electronic dockside validation. This is, from my standpoint, one of the more exciting pieces, because I think it may tie into a broader picture later. The goal here, of course, although folks generally believe census data better -- In other words, if you have a logbook, as opposed to somebody taking a survey, folks tend to trust logbooks better. It, nonetheless, must be validated, and the issue is always going to be exactly how is that going to happen.

There is a pilot running right now in South Carolina that's being sponsored by MRIP to develop a dockside validation methodology to be used in census reporting. It is our intention to take this methodology and use it in this pilot. At the same time, we will change the interview over to an electronic version of the interview, so that the data will be recorded electronically, again on tablets, and then transmitted electronically to a central database server to be processed to do the analysis.

It also will be able to do Bluetooth measuring boards, which I think is going to be lots of fun, and the validation method eventually will be submitted to the MRIP program to be certified. What that means is that the combination of this census report with the dockside validation will become a certified MRIP data collection methodology.

It's our long-term goal, and, by long-term, I mean it may take a long time, for as many jurisdictions as possible to switch to census-based reporting using this MRIP-approved methodology, and therefore, these data can be included in the MRIP estimates.

They are also going to be working to develop a compliance tool. This is actually a fairly simple piece of software that will query data out of the SAFIS database in real time to access the most recent reports from the captains and the vessels that they are intercepting, to determine whether or not they're in compliance with the reporting or potentially to ask any questions they may find or whatever. This will be a Smartphone application, and, in fact, compared to the other pieces, it's a relatively straightforward software development.

Included in the project is a good bit of outreach and training. We'll be using state folks, and probably our outreach coordinator at ACCSP and others within the MRIP program, to create training materials. There will be workshops for the participants in the pilot, to make sure that they're comfortable with the systems. They will also have the opportunity to provide input if they feel strongly we need to make some systems changes.

Although the data that the systems collect isn't going to change, how we collect it and how we set favorites up and how the buttons are positioned, what color they are, how they're laid out, all of that is subject to change if there is consensus amongst the pilot participation that it would make it an easier tool to use or it might provide better results.

We will also be conducting dockside visits to assist and work with the feedback and get feedback from folks to see how things are going. Of course, there will be a project workshop after it's all over to digest the results and share our lessons learned, and, of course, there will be also regional outreach materials that can be used later, when the time comes to actually deploy the tool.

Future steps, and I want to back up a little bit and go off-script for just a minute to give an overview of where ACCSP would like to take the SAFIS program and SAFIS tools in the future. Currently, SAFIS collects data for vessel trip reporting and for dealer reporting. We have begun, thanks to our ability to get some SK funds, to look at re-visioning SAFIS to be a complete and comprehensive data collection tool to cover all four of what we consider to be the fisheries-dependent data disciplines. Those would include vessel trip reports, dealer reports, at-sea observer data, and dockside samples.

We are looking towards creating a completely integrated data system over time. We expect this to take several years to complete. It's a very large-scale project. This piece is part of that. We would very much like to be able to connect our vessel trips to our dealer reports in real time, as the reports are being submitted. We would very much like to be able to connect that observer trip that might associated with that vessel trip report in real time, and we would very much like to be able to connect a biological sample that occurs dockside with all of the above.

That has been holy grail of data collection in fisheries-dependent data for many years, and we believe that the implementation of electronic reporting is going to provide us with an opportunity to potentially do that. It's going to take time, but I think that it's certainly doable with the available resources.

In terms of this particular tool, we are going to work towards back integration. Again, I have heard repeatedly that I don't want to have to provide a report more than once. I don't believe that we are going to have significant impediments to actually being able to provide a single report to any agency that needs them, but there's a lot of background work that still has to happen, because there are a lot of extant programs that have to be covered.

Then we expect, over time, to work with the MRIP Program to integrate the for-hire census reports into the MRIP estimates. Any of you who do much work with statistics can imagine that there's some complexity involved here and that it's going to take some time to work through it, but the MRIP program has been very supportive of this effort and in moving forward with this. That's an overview of the upcoming for-hire project. Does anyone have any questions for me?

MR. BELL: Any questions for Mike?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you for your presentation. I was wondering -- You said that your monitoring does commercial. Does it do pelagic longlining, does it replace the VTRs that would be in the Northeast for gillnetting that I do, and does it do the snapper grouper? If it does all three of them, can we meet in the back afterwards and maybe start seeing if it works?

MR. CAHALL: It's designed to be universal. The short answer to your question is that it can collect data for all of those fisheries. The longer answer is that it is only certified to submit vessel trip reports for the Northeast at this time. Yes, you could do any reports that you owe to the Northeast Region through the tool.

The implementation of the tool and getting it rolled out to the right groups is another of the longer-standing issues. We don't have a regional plan, at the moment, to deploy the tool to the Northeast Region. That doesn't mean you can't use it, but it just means that you would be kind of on your own using it, or you would have to work with my folks directly.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: One last thing. What would be the application of the mobile device that I would use and what does that cost or something like that?

MR. CAHALL: It will run on any internet-enabled tablet, and so that would range in cost from \$300 to however much you really want to spend. The application itself, of course, is free.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Basically, I could use it on an old iPad, and does it have Bluetooth capability? I don't know if my iPad does or not, but maybe I will talk offline with you afterwards.

MR. CAHALL: Sure.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Thanks, Mike, for the presentation. I really appreciate that. I am very intrigued by all the stuff you're talking about on expansions and where this is all headed. So far, we've really been talking about specifically just landings information. Has there been discussion about trying to use something like this to collect social or economic data that can be linked to landings? That would be a huge help when it comes to folks like us trying to prepare fishery management plan amendments and being able to make sure that when we're describing the social and economic impacts that we're truly describing the people who will be impacted.

Sometimes we can't always do that, but if you've got something in there that allows you to say these people caught this stuff and this is the social and economic information about those people, that greatly -- That provides a great amount of precision to the social and economic analyses that doesn't usually exist.

MR. CAHALL: The tool itself isn't currently designed to collect social and economic data. However, the underpinnings of the tool, which require a comprehensive permitting database, a comprehensive fisheries participant database, and a comprehensive vessel database, do. We know who is fishing and we know where they live and we know when they were born and we know what permits they have. We have that information now for most of the folks on the Atlantic coast.

If you think what it will require to drive this system, the reference information that the databases have to have, we have a lot of that information already, but we can also -- The tool is intended to be a basic -- It's intended to be a basic data collection tool, but the software itself, the base software, is available to anyone who wants it, and we have no objections to folks picking it up and making modifications to it, to add services to it, or do a value-added to it, as long as the basic data collection for the fisheries-dependent stuff isn't changed and the system can continue to provide data according to our requirements.

DR. CHEUVRONT: That's awesome. I think there is some real possibility for that in the future, because I know, at least here in the South Atlantic Council, we're talking about ways that we can beef up our ability to describe, socially and economically, what's going on in our fisheries, because the only thing that we're pretty accurate on is the economic value of landings. We can describe communities and we can -- That's commercial landings we're talking about.

The recreational stuff, sometimes we can't even get close, really. You might as well throw not even a hand grenade, but it's more like an atomic bomb, in terms of size of coverage when we're talking about consumer surplus for a particular recreational fishery. We kind of have to guess around it. We really don't know. I am hoping that perhaps we could find an application that we could add on to what you're doing.

MR. CAHALL: I will make one comment to the recreational in general. Keep in mind that the MRIP sampling frames are changing. They are using licensing frames now, and those data are available to MRIP, along with the vessel sampling frame. I think that your ability to do recreational analysis may be improved over time, in part because of the changes that have come to MRIP.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for the presentation, Mike. It was really informative. It's been obviously developed and piloted in Rhode Island. It's been used for the Northeast for the NROC ocean use study. Has it been used anywhere else in for-hire fisheries, federally-managed for-hire fisheries, in the Mid-Atlantic or New England at all?

MR. CAHALL: Not yet.

DR. DUVAL: I ask that question because obviously one of our agenda topics is a for-hire electronic reporting amendment that we're going to be discussing a little bit later, and Gregg gave an overview of this at the Mid-Atlantic Council meeting back in February, and I think the topic of discussion was ensuring that there is no duplicate reporting and that all information collected is useful and is being used.

Right now, vessels operating in Northeast-managed fisheries have to fill out paper vessel trip reports, yet those are not used for monitoring catch. I know that the Mid-Atlantic stated that they're also interested in moving forward and are looking into moving towards electronic reporting for their for-hire vessels as well, and that's why I was just curious if this had been actually piloted in any of the Mid-Atlantic or New England federally-managed fisheries, and have they reached out to you at all, either of the councils, to see about trying to do some kind of pilot, similar to what we're doing here?

Obviously we permit fishermen in the dolphin wahoo and coastal migratory pelagic fisheries, which are king and Spanish mackerel, dolphin, and wahoo, that operate up in the Mid-Atlantic, and even into the New England areas of jurisdiction. We just want to make sure that we're kind of moving forward in lockstep as well, in my mind, as well as with any piloting, so that we don't have sort of one group of captains in one area who have had the opportunity to provide feedback and another group of captains in another area who haven't had the opportunity to provide feedback on a particular tool and that happens to be the one tool that is available for everyone right now.

We all agree, between the Mid-Atlantic and the South Atlantic, that all data submission would go to the ACCSP. We only want captains to have to report once, and anyone who needs the data can just draw it down from the data warehouse. I apologize for that rambling question, but it's really more has there been any study? Has there been any reach-out to you all at ACCSP from the other two councils in terms of piloting?

MR. CAHALL: Most of the Rhode Island charter/headboat captains were federally-permitted. We believe that the tool will satisfy the Northeast requirements, and it has been certified for vessel trip reporting in both commercial and for-hire fisheries. Honestly, right now, anyone who wanted to use the tool to report to the Northeast Region could. It will just go right into their database and meet the requirements.

In terms of being contacted, we have been in touch with the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council. They are particularly concerned, right at the moment, with blueline tilefish. This tool is capable of handling that need if they wish.

I am also concerned that there comes a point where you have to stop piloting and start rolling out, and so I think that all tools over time evolve, and were we to -- I believe that at the conclusion of the pilot that we have, that we're getting ready to start out here, that we should be at a level of maturity that we would be relatively safe going ahead and rolling it out in a full on production mode. As I said before, right now, any Northeast federally-permitted vessel captain who wanted to use our tool could. Right now, the problem is that there is no logistical support for that, and there isn't a specific plan to roll it out to the federally-permitted captains in the Northeast Region.

We want to make sure that as we do roll it out that it has the support of the folks at the particular agencies that are going to be rolling it out, and on my list of things to do is to talk to the folks up at GARFO and see if we can't get a few of their port agents trained in how the tool works, so that they can provide that kind of support. Did I answer your question?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and I guess I could foresee it, like you said, as tools evolve -- I can see different tools being developed by different outfits. I mean Harbor Light obviously developed this particular tool, but if you all are ready to house the data and the standards have been established by the

Science Centers, then there is no reason a multitude of tools couldn't be used, as long as they could feed into the data warehouse.

MR. CAHALL: It uses a common data interchange software. It uses an API across the internet, in a language called JSON that transmits the data, and so it's standard. Any application that can transmit the data in the format, we could receive it.

MR. BELL: Good point.

MR. BREWER: First of all, thank you very much for the presentation. I found it fascinating, and I can just see all sorts of really good things coming out of it. I am a little concerned that I did not hear you discuss or mention or have a slide with regard to what economically is probably the most important segment of the fishery, and that is the private boat, the public, and you know what? Going along with what Brian had to say, right now NMFS has so little information from the standpoint of the socioeconomic value of recreational fishing in the United States that last year, even though many times in the past NMFS has had a report on the state of the fisheries in the United States -- They put out a value for commercial fishing. They have not put out a value for recreational fishing since 2011.

I don't think there's some great conspiracy. If you listen to the chat rooms, of course, there was this huge conspiracy, but I think they just don't know. When looking at what is an incredibly, I believe, valuable segment, it would seem that your approach here and what you're doing, your software, it would be fairly easy, and not necessarily from the standpoint of the implementation of picking out the recreational fishermen -- I mean charter guys are kind of the low-hanging fruit, but the actual guys that are out there recreational fishing on their boat, or on a friend's boat or whoever, or even from a pier.

To be able to input information, things like what did you spend on bait, what did you spend on gas, and what did you catch and how long were you out on the water, to get your CPUEs in line, it seems to me that that is something that could be very, very valuable. I sure would like to see it pursued.

Let me give you an example of the level of enthusiasm that I think is out there in the recreational sector to help to provide data. It's still ongoing. It's not as prevalent as it used to be, but, with regard to billfish research, it was necessary that there be a big tagging program. That was done through what's known as the Billfish Foundation. The foundation couldn't pay the money for all the tags that were necessary, but individual recreational anglers went out, and I think it was fifteen or twenty-dollars a tag, bought the tags and tagged the fish to help with that research program.

That was money out of their pocket. It wasn't a \$300 tablet, maybe, but it was money out of their pocket. That was the level of enthusiasm, and it got to be a badge of honor, literally, to come back in and have one of those triangular shaped burgees, red, with a T in it, meaning I tagged a billfish and let it go. I think there is a tremendous level of enthusiasm that can be tapped into out there and a lot of really valuable information that can be obtained from that segment of the participants in the fishery.

MR. BELL: Yes, and I think that's obvious. We've talked about this before. We're applying these tools right now into fisheries where it's kind of manageable. Once you start getting to the

private boat sector, you have now -- It's a lot of people, but, and you kind of hit on it there, there may be segments within the overall private boat sector that you could kind of work on that aren't as massive, but I'm thinking in terms of just South Carolina's licensed fishermen alone, we've got -- Technically speaking, there is 478,000 people holding licenses with privileges to fish in saltwater. That's a lot of people, and not that they all necessarily fish or fish for finfish, but that's a good point, and I think what we're doing right now is dealing with groups that are kind of manageable but, ultimately, you can certainly apply the technologies to the other areas.

MR. BROWN: Mike, good presentation. I do have a question on something that I was trying to understand. This program here, the boats are going to be feeding the data directly to the warehouse, and is that correct?

MR. CAHALL: Directly to SAFIS. Eventually they will land in the warehouse. SAFIS is the data collection system. The warehouse is a storage system, but to SAFIS, yes.

MR. BROWN: So SAFIS will be doing like the QA/QC on it, or will you be distributing it back out for that, or how does that work?

MR. CAHALL: Typically, the model that we follow right now is that we will collect the data. We do quality assurance as it goes in, so you can't put in invalid codes, but then the agencies who, and I will put this in quotes, own the data, who are responsible for the data collection, then do their own QA/QC on the information. Typically, they update the data that are in SAFIS, to keep it correct and current.

MR. BROWN: This is strictly for the commercial catch effort and recreational. What about is there plans in the future to incorporate the Southeast headboat?

MR. CAHALL: We need to work through that. I am not sure how that's going to land. We are talking to them back and forth. Certainly there is an intention to integrate their data together, to eliminate any duplicate reporting issues. Whether or not they migrate to a different tool, I don't know, but I know that we have been and will continue to talk with them to integrate the datasets.

MR. BOWEN: Thanks for the presentation. We've actually seen this a few times, and it gets better every time, actually. I guess what would rank higher on your priority list with this pilot program? Would it be to work out the bugs, per se, or was that done in the Northeast? Or would it be to get people onboard with using it, and maybe you can elaborate on both.

MR. CAHALL: It's got a couple of main thrusts. We're pretty comfortable we have a good tool. Obviously if we run into something we didn't expect, we will change it, but I think the thrust here is, first of all, to make sure it will work in the Southeast, and I can't imagine that it won't. Secondly, to integrate in the dockside validation piece for the census reporting and to create an electronic version of that dockside validation.

Then, finally, to build this compliance tool. The new pieces of this pilot are the dockside validation and compliance tools, along with a couple of bells and whistles. The Bluetooth measuring boards will be fun, and they will help with some of the data collection issues, but primarily -- We're pretty confident that the tool itself, the base reporting tool, is going to work fine. It's just we have a couple other things that we want to work through, so that we have a complete package.

MR. BOWEN: So you want to -- When this tool is being used in certain states, and the four states in the South Atlantic I guess, you want to collaborate with the states -- I am asking if this is your goal. Is it to collaborate with the states so when this reporting unit is being used that the states will take it upon themselves to have dockside validation at the docks when these boats come to the dock, to make sure that the data that the person or captain or deckhand or whoever is in charge of this tablet reporting validates and coincides with the catch at the dock, that the state officials document as well?

MR. CAHALL: That's correct.

MR. BOWEN: That sounds like a great plan. I'm excited. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Just a quick follow-up. Mike, who does the certification for tools? Developers want to come in and develop a new tool, and so, for this particular technology, who certifies it?

MR. CAHALL: We're going to have to work through that one. The ACCSP was certified by the Northeast Region for their vessel trip reporting system. However, the Northeast Region, and the Southeast Region also, are in the middle of a visioning project, to re-vision how they manage their data management tools and how they work back and forth.

I think that if we received a request for a tool to push data into SAFIS that we would probably need to pull representatives in from both of those regions to talk about how we would go about certifying it. Actually, it's a problem I'm looking forward to having, but I can't imagine that we wouldn't be able to work it through.

There's a fundamental minimum technical requirement. It has to be these codes, and the data have to be transmitted and labeled just in such a way. That's physically required and that can't be argued back and forth with. Then I guess the final piece would be a collaborative process to figure out exactly how we want to go about doing that.

DR. DUVAL: Then the Northeast Science Center certified the Harbor Lights tool?

MR. CAHALL: They didn't certify the Harbor Lights tool, per se, and, actually, it was the Regional Office. They certified the data feed from SAFIS, which is -- Do you understand the distinction? It doesn't matter what tool fed SAFIS. The data feed from SAFIS is what was certified.

MR. BELL: In the interest of time, we will take one more question.

MS. BOSARGE: Thank you. You mentioned something that I hadn't thought about before. We talk about trying to keep everything the same from region to region to region, and we mainly think commercial, but you're right that we have a lot of boats now that are dually-permitted with commercial and for-hire permits, and you said you have an option that they could pick is this a commercial trip or this is a for-hire trip.

I'm from the Gulf, but don't hold that against me, but so you know we have VMS on some of the commercial boats already that may be dually-permitted, and could this -- I am not real technology savvy, but can this replace VMS? You mentioned something about that you could turn on a GPS,

a tracking-type function in this, and so, if this was something that was implemented in the for-hire sector, could it eventually replace that VMS system, if that's a dually-permitted boat?

MR. CAHALL: It's a tricky question, and one I -- The technology that's available on the tablets, most of them have GPS functions built into them. Just like your phone knows where you are, the tablet knows where you are too, most of them.

When they're out of range of a cell tower or the internet, they cannot actively transmit. The pilot project that did in Maine and also in Rhode Island, what happened was that the tablet would periodically basically wake up and record its location and save that locally. Then when the trip was transmitted back to the database server, we would get the trip data and then the systems that were managing the pilot on behalf of the charter boat captains, or NROC, received the tracking data.

It can't do real-time tracking. It can provide a track at the end of a trip. It's because of the limitations of internet connectivity. Now, if you had a full-time internet connection, which is, honestly, the most expensive piece of VMS, yes, it could.

MR. BELL: If you have any other questions for Mike, I would suggest maybe he's going to be around for a little while and we can get with him offline. We've got a couple of other areas we need to get through. The next major area is shifting into a discussion of the for-hire reporting amendment, and there's some other stuff we've added on to that. Madam Chair, would it be possible to take five and shift people around? Are you good with that?

DR. DUVAL: You're the Chair. Go right ahead.

MR. BELL: But we do need to be out of here by five, for sure?

DR. DUVAL: There are some of us who have a phone call at five, and so if we can leave at 4:55 today, that would be great.

MR. BELL: Okay. If you promise to be here back here in five-minutes, we can take a quick break. Then we'll start the next section.

MR. BELL: We're going to go ahead and get started, in the interest of getting through the entire agenda here. This is Agenda Item Number 6. We're going to discuss the for-hire reporting amendment, but part of that is we're going to do a little demo here for you. Keep in mind that South Carolina has had a charter boat logbook requirement going back to 1993, I guess it is.

Amy Dukes, on my left, runs my statistics shop. She deals with the for-hire sector, and she deals with the commercial data. She is indispensable. Amy is here to keep me straight. We also have Robert Olsen, one of our charter boat captains, who is going to demonstrate something that we've put in place, because, just like you've heard from some other folks, some folk are tired of paper, and we've heard that from our fishermen that have been doing the logbooks for the for-hire sector for a while, that they're kind of tired of paper and couldn't we have electronic as an option.

We basically have developed a system that's an option for them. Bluefin Data LLC is the company that put this together for us, and Amy has been instrumental in working all this out, but we now

have an option, and it's been in place since December, where if someone wishes to report electronically, they can. We still have paper and we now have electronic and paper, but this is something that Robert can show you, as an actual fisherman, how this thing works, and he can give you a real-life opinion of -- I assume he's happy with it, or he wouldn't be here. Anyway, I'm going to turn it over, and just kind of do a little quick run-through, if you would, of how this worked for you.

MR. OLSEN: I have been a charter captain for years in Charleston, South Carolina. I just got enrolled in this back in January, for the electronic reporting on Bluefin. I haven't done a lot of trips on it, but you will see in a second -- You will see some of the overview, and I will actually go through the basic information and requirements for this platform. To me, I think it's way better than filling out the paperwork, and it doesn't take that long.

My first one or two of them, I was kind of looking at it and trying to figure it out. After that, and I've done maybe ten of them, it's pretty self-explanatory, and I think you all will be able to see when I open it up. Basically, first of all, it offers me my email address and a password. I just hit "login" and it will come up.

It will have a couple of things. There is a dashboard at the top left, and I can click on the dashboard. It has my one charter permit that I have on it currently. I have another one, but we haven't loaded that one up yet, but my license number. You can kind of just view and overview some of the trips that I have logged on. I have logged some back on January 14. You can see these are some of the trips that I've logged in, and if I wanted to go back and look at some of these trips, I can actually click on them and it will actually give me the trip information of all the different things that I filled out. Then it will log down and it will show you my catch data from those days also.

This particular day, I was fishing at a local reef off of Charleston. I filled in the information, and I'm going to actually do a trip with you that I just did a couple of days ago. I'm going to log on and do a new one.

It's the permit number, the date of my trip, the time that I started, the number of anglers that I had, the actual hours fished, the location, which a lot of people frown on location, location, location. This particular location app on this one, you can actually click the map and it will show up and it will actually give you a little grid coordinate. It's not necessarily anything that's very in-tune to exactly where I was fishing, but it will just go over certain areas already marked on a lot of artificial reefs that we have off of South Carolina, which we have a lot of.

You can actually just click on the spot where you fished, that grid area, which is a large grid area, and it will come up in your report there. Then you have another option for your location. You have pretty much inshore, which is the estuarine, the zero to three miles, which would be the inlets to our state waters, and then you have offshore. Pretty much it will give you your different methods of bottom fishing, and also, depending on where you click, like your location, it won't allow you to put -- At this coordinate here, it won't allow me to have an inshore as far as the type of fishing I did. It asks you the minimum depth and the maximum depth, and then it actually has a place for you to comment.

Then when you come down to your type of species, for this particular trip, I only had three species that were caught: black drum, sheepshead, and sea bass. It basically let's me dial in the exact

number of fish, the pounds kept, the number released, and if there was any discards, at least dead, and then if I kept fish.

This particular trip, I kept fifteen sheepshead. The pounds are an approximate weight. As a charter captain, you've got to do some rough justice on the amount and about the poundage you keep and what I released on that particular day. There's the amount of sea bass and the ones I released. It's not perfect as far as the amounts, but once you do it individually by the trip each day, it comes out -- The platform is very easy to use. I am actually going to go back up here and I'm going to actually create a trip and just go through one very quickly on this permit number. It's going to allow me to go back.

MR. BELL: Keep in mind this would be similar to the direction we're going in for the for-hire report for logbook, in terms of the types of data fields and things, and so it's just an example of how that might look. The boxes that Robert mentioned, those are the -- When we talk about the ten-mile headboat boxes or whatever, that's what those are. Amy is also demonstrating an important function of the state agencies in terms of working with people, and that is important. We talked about outreach and we talked about kind of -- Whatever we end up doing, there is a role for kind of helping things move along, and I think the state agencies are ideally suited for that, in terms of -- We have a lot of interaction with folks already. There is an artificiality to this, and we had him editing something, and so we're going to start from scratch here really quick. We can just start from scratch.

MR. OLSEN: What I'm going to do now is I'm actually going to create a trip. What I'm going to do is I'm going to go over this information with the new information, because it should let me do that. I am just going to -- My permit number is the same. I am just going to go ahead and -- Bear with me on my typing skills, because I am not the fastest in the world.

On this particular trip, three anglers and four hours fished. My location, of course, is going to be -- This particular map, you can zoom in and zoom out, and it will kind of -- Like I said, we have a very large area of different types of artificial reefs and marked buoys and what have you on this particular map, and so it makes it pretty easy to kind of pick where you were at. I am actually going to put a box in there that is an inshore box. When I go down here, it already comes up with estuarine, because it won't let me go to any other -- It doesn't give me the offshore for an offshore. It knows I'm fishing inshore.

My pick-up place, this particular item, it has every particular marina, boat landing, any kind of facility where you could possibly pick up anybody in South Carolina on this list. Like he was saying earlier, in the earlier presentation, once you start using this platform over and over again, it will recognize that you pretty much use the same one or two locations, and those will automatically come up for your selection, so you don't have to scroll down through the list.

I am picking up the Shem Creek Public Docks in Mount Pleasant. This, I should be able to leave blank, because there is no reef I was fishing at. My particular target species for the day is redfish, and so I can actually -- I should be able to just go "drum", and then it will give me a choice of the two. Red drum, and I fished on the bottom. There's my maximum depth. My minimum depth was two-foot, and I never fished deeper than five-foot. If I had any comments I wanted to add, you can pretty much add whatever you want to add there.

I can save that information right there, and I'm going to go down to my "add a catch". On this particular trip, of course, it's drum again, red drum. We didn't keep any fish this particular day at all. We did release twenty-seven redfish. I can add this catch. Then there would be a submit button that's right here. I would hit "submit" and then it would log on to that trip.

MR. BELL: It's still trying to take him back to the trip that he was on first, but --

MR. OLSEN: I'm actually going to go back to my dashboard here and I'm going to go to like an offshore trip that I did. Let's go to one that we had a lot of fish caught. This is a particular offshore trip that I did. I had six anglers. I filled out all the information and then my totals, for the bottom fish, is pretty much we caught everything that you were allowed to catch that particular day, the vermilion snapper. This is pretty much all you really could catch that time of year anyway, is what we caught. Then the number of what I released, and I just pretty much put all the information in there.

The platform, like I said, is very easy to use. In particular, for this trip, the location was offshore and the grid coordinate -- I pulled up the map and I was fishing right there. Overall, once I started doing it, it actually only takes me a few minutes, when it's working.

MR. BELL: It works, and one thing to keep in mind too is our system is set up for monthly reporting. The paper log is trip level, but you fill it out and you turn it in by the 10th. The nice thing about this is Robert can come back at the end of the day and he fills it out and hits the button and you're not putting off filling out the log or something. In terms of the accuracy of the data and the timeliness and all, it's much better with an electronic format like this.

Like he said, after you fill it out and you hit the button and it's done and then you go on to the next day and the next day. That's our system right now, in terms of we still -- The majority of our folks are still using paper, but we offer this as an option, and I think it has, as you can see, satisfied customers. I think it will catch on. Then eventually we will go to something for the federal side of the house, but this could be used by any of our 466, at the moment, charter boat captains. Mark, did you have a question?

MR. BROWN: Like with the electronic logbook, there is two different ways to enter it. One was through an app and then another one is online, with a separate program. Is that the way this is set up?

MS. DUKES: Currently, right now, it is just a web application. However, when you go to the website and you truncate it down, it can be viewed on a small phone or a tablet. Our hope is eventually, with increased funding or some other funding opportunity, we can actually design a mobile app. I encourage our anglers and our charter boats to do it the first couple of times on a computer and get used to the program and the drop-down menus, but I have actually successfully put in trips on my Android phone before.

MR. BELL: You have to have good eyes. I couldn't do that.

MS. DUKES: Mel referenced the 466 charter boat captains. Again, we rolled this out in an email format in December, as this is a tool and play around with it and whatever you decide to do. Since then, we've had -- Of the 466 anglers, we've had right at 50 percent of them login and become

Bluefin trip ticket users. Then, of the about 230 or so that have done it, we've actually had about 160 give us positive trips through this electronic platform.

MR. BELL: This is a voluntary-based system.

MR. OLSEN: The one thing I can say about is, now that I've switched over to it, like I said, it really doesn't -- You really want to go ahead and log your information in, rather than waiting. What you find when you do the electronic logbooks, and I've been a charter captain for a long time and I know there's others that are guilty, is we like to wait to the last minute to fill out those things and go through our charter log and see what trips we did on those particular days and flip the pages.

You do end up with a lot less, I would think, credible data that you're writing in on those pieces of paper, trying to fill in and get that information in by the end of the month, for us. This is something that we in South Carolina -- We've had to do it ever since I've purchased a charter permit, and so there is really no other way that we've ever done it, and so to people that say they've never done it before and it seems like it would be a hassle -- If they try it, I do think that in the long term that it's just going to give much more accountability for the fishery, for the for-hire charter sector.

MR. BELL: Another advantage too is, once the data are in there, Robert has access to his own data. He can go in there and pull his data up, as opposed to looking for pieces of paper or something.

DR. LANEY: Robert or Amy or Mel, can you -- I know it's easy to click on the map grid, but does it also give you the option of entering the real coordinates of where you actually are fishing if you want to do that?

MS. DUKES: You're referencing down to the actual decimal degree? Currently, it does not. It could be an application that we can change. We got a lot of feedback in the initial process, because we did our own little mini beta test from October to December. The captains were really concerned about giving that finite of a data point. Since we've been collecting this data since 1993, we've been using those ten-by-ten square grid boxes. Even in the beginning, we didn't have -- It's 32.78 A6, and it's kind of a little map that you draw lines to.

The guys that were piloting were not happy, because A6 was gone. It was just 32.78 and like some little decimal degree and the point of the box. They were like no, it's freaking us out and we want A6, and so we actually went back and redid the technology so it's the exact same map that we've been filling out since 1993. There is no decimal degree.

DR. LANEY: Obviously I'm sitting here thinking about use for fishery-independent data collection, and so if you did fishery-independent, you would probably want to be able to enter those specific coordinates in there.

MS. DUKES: Potentially, yes, and we could modify the system to do that.

MR. CARMICHAEL: You might be doing that at set level versus this is for the trip level. They fish a lot more when you get down to minutes. They're fishing in a lot more areas, degrees and minutes.

MR. BELL: Any other questions for Robert or Amy?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Excuse me if you already mentioned this, but how long do you anticipate that data being accessible so that he can go back and look for it?

MS. DUKES: The individual charter fishermen will have access to that data, once it's stored in Bluefin, indefinitely. In addition to that, we are in the process of working with Bluefin to create some non-confidential summaries. Not only can they see their trip level data, but we're going to try to incorporate some summary data for them to see kind of what the other charter boat captains are doing in and around the areas they're fishing, and probably even -- We might extend the area and maybe not do quite down to that ten-by-ten-square-mile box, but at least give them some summary reports on the number of trips, where they're fishing, and what they're currently catching.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Robert. I know I talked with you when we had our Mackerel AP and we were also doing a public hearing on the for-hire amendment down in Cocoa. A lot of the concern we heard at that hearing was I'm out fishing all day and I don't have much time, and so how long does it take you, when you're finished a trip in a day, to upload your data?

MR. OLSEN: It takes less than ten minutes. Like I said, if I had a lot more practice, which I have not yet, I would think it would be down to less than five minutes.

MR. BELL: Great. Any other questions?

DR. LARKIN: I just had a quick question. I noticed that it has you writing in the number of anglers, but not the number of crew. Do you usually have a set number of crew that goes on your charter trips?

MR. OLSEN: I personally don't have a crew. It's just me. I'm a one-man show.

DR. LARKIN: I was just wondering, even if there's just one captain plus the anglers, does the captain's bag limit count for the total bag limit of fish caught? I have noticed in the MRIP data, when we're doing bag limit analyses, it gets confusing, because a lot of trips show, for the charter mode, that they've exceeded the bag limit, but we don't have the number of crew or the captain, whether it's just one captain or a captain and a mate, for the charter trips. Just as a suggestion, maybe to add crew, captain and crew, to the report, so that when you're doing analyses for bag limits and things like that that you know the actual number of people on the boat rather than the number of paying anglers.

MS. DUKES: We deal with that now in analyzing our data, and often have to account for more than just the captain and the crew, yes.

MR. BELL: One more, and then we'll move on. Mark.

MR. BROWN: When I was looking at the map there and it has the little black dots, and I saw Robert put his pointer over it, it just gives you the latitude and longitude, and is that correct?

MR. DUKES: No, and actually, if you hover over the black dot long enough, it will give you what the reef name is, or the artificial reef name is, if you zoom in a little more. Our hope is to potentially get some Loran numbers in there as well in the future.

MR. BELL: I wanted to just kind of show you what we were doing, and it's kind of the direction we're moving in for for-hire, and you can feel free to talk to Robert or Amy further, but we'll go ahead and move along. Thank you so much, Robert. Under the heading of the For-Hire Reporting Amendment, I think John was going to do a quick update first on the public hearing overview, and then we'll actually get into the discussion of the amendment itself.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We're back on track here. It's only four o'clock, and so we've got plenty of time. The public hearing overview, which was Attachment 7, in this version I filled in a few blanks that we had on the ones that had gone out, and those are highlighted. For example, at the Q&A webinar, there were eight folks, and there were five comments at Cocoa Beach that addressed issues related to this particular amendment.

We just had a table of how many people came and the number of comments that we had. It was a little interesting in this round, because there were multiple things being done for hearings, and so you see a lot of people, and, in some cases, they came out and talked about other topics which were on the table and not so much about the reporting amendment, but you can see how many comments that we had.

We just have a couple of bulleted lists here that give you an idea of the types of things that people said who supported it and why they supported it and what they thought this could offer, and then there's a list of things about the opposition that people had.

When you look at the comments in support, one thing we know is like South Carolina has this going on, and so there are people that have experience. They tend to be supportive of it. There are other areas where people are just generally interested in it. They recognize the need to have better data and they recognize the electronic process is giving you more efficient data and better access to data down the road.

A lot of them are intrigued as a way of giving information back to the fishermen. Once the data are in some type of electronic system -- As we kind of mentioned here, there's a lot of different reports which could be made available to the fishermen to see how they compare with other fishermen in the area, or just landings in general, and give them records of where they've caught fish and when they've caught fish and all of that kind of thing. A lot of them recognize that, and they really think, if they get into something, that in return for them taking this burden upon themselves to report this information on a trip-level basis that they would like some things in return, which is more access to their data, more timely access to their data, things like that.

Then, of course, the opposition, which represents some things we may need to work or things to address as we go through the amendment, but one of the biggest was, of course, the time and effort required to file reports.

You heard from a lot of the charter boat folks that they work a long day already, and by the time they've gone out and they've done their fishing and they've come back and they've cleaned up the boat and they've got to deal with telephone calls and scheduling trips for another day, that then this is one more thing. I think you hear this a lot in the areas where now they're covered just by the MRIP program and it's just the survey, versus where there is some type of reporting, you're obviously not hearing this as much.

The South Carolina folks, they're intrigued by the electronic option, because they see that as more efficient than paper reporting. Where people don't have any sort of mandatory charter boat reporting, then it's seen as more of a burden.

On the other hand, I think we all recognize that if we ask many of those people, are you satisfied with the data that comes from the MRIP survey of the charter boat fishery, most of them would probably say absolutely not, and so there is a bit of a Catch-22 there. There is some burden, but, if you're not satisfied with the data, at some point we're going to have to do something to get better data. I recognize that concern, but I think it is ultimately going to come down to the cost of us getting better data and better data to manage the fishermen.

One of the things that comes up, and I think this affects the electronic aspects, is some complaints that they don't know what happens to the data now. I believe systems which give people more access to their data, as have been shown, certainly could resolve that. There are a lot of concerns about cost and hardship, which are things that I believe could be addressed as you work on the actual application.

One of the biggest things that people mentioned was giving one report. Folks don't like to have to give multiple reports, and some of them mentioned being involved in different fisheries. Especially if you get up in North Carolina, they might be involved in fisheries that happen in the Greater Atlantic Region, through the Mid-Atlantic. They're involved in HMS reporting, and they see this coming on and they're just feeling that they have to give many reports. That is definitely something that resonated throughout. People want to do this, and they want to do one report. That is a big way to reduce the time and cost and burden of people actually reporting.

One thing that was interesting is people didn't feel the data would be reliable unless it was collected by people who were willing. There's kind of a sense out there that making this mandatory could lead to people feeling like they're not going to be very truthful in their data collection. In a way, that's just something we have to work on in terms of outreach and data collection in general, and let them realize the value of being truthful, because the data ultimately affect their fishery and how they're affected by the management.

Area reporting was a really big concern, because we certainly experienced the issues with area reporting before. We saw what South Carolina does. The headboat online reports one-degree blocks within it, and so one-square-mile versus the ten-square-miles, and there are a lot of people that feel like they just don't want to provide that level of detail.

Another concern is if they're a charter boat operation and they're fishing in many areas. Which point do they pick? They might fish over a relatively broad range. Some people felt that the blocks of the size that South Carolina uses, which are consistent with what the headboat program used to use, sort of give them more flexibility and more representing the area over which they fished in a

day, as opposed to one-minute within a degree box that they just sort of pick somewhere in the center, maybe, of where they fished.

There is also some confusion, I would say, with regard to the data which they report to the agency versus the data which would be reported back, in terms of catch records and such, which would maybe in a report or -- If someone wanted to know how many pounds of gray triggerfish and such were landed and where, because, for the most part, those data are aggregated.

A general public person, for example, cannot go in and see, from the headboat program, individual records of every one-degree, one-minute spot where someone fished and what they reported as being caught, but I don't think that's widely understood by people at all, that there's a difference between what you report to the agency and what is made available in terms of just people looking at the information. Better awareness of that may help deal with some of the concerns that people could use this information that's reported to go find favored fishing spots.

There was a good bit of discussion about delinquency as well with the provisions that are in there about if you haven't filed a report that you wouldn't be allowed to go fishing. There were concerns of did that mean your permit got taken or it was just I couldn't go fishing. There were some suggestions that if they didn't report and they went fishing anyway that they might just go and file a quick I-didn't-fish report the prior week, rather than go through the time of maybe giving you four or five individual trip records for trips that they actually took.

I certainly think, from putting on my data hat, that we should be very careful with the compliance things, to make sure that we don't do something that provides any incentive for people not to report, because, at the end of the day, we want to get the data. If they're viewed as too punitive, people may decide the risk of fishing and not reporting versus the risk of just saying I'm just going to file a no-fishing report for the entire last week and not worry about it. That would really be undermining what it is that we're trying to achieve, and so we should keep that in mind.

They are also interested in reminders, which is another thing I believe an electronic reporting system could be very good with. They said why wait until I'm late? If you're going to require reporting on Tuesday, send me an email on Monday that says, hey, by the way, you haven't done anything for the last week. I think all of that could be worked into some sort of electronic thing, so that no one has to do it hands-on.

Along those lines, really the themes that came out of there was details for the area reporting, getting the single report. They recognized the council's intent to do that. There were a lot of questions about the details and how that's going to be achieved, which is something we'll have to talk about. There were questions of where the data go, the pathway, and we've mentioned ACCSP and seen their role in other places as a source of receiving those initial reports and then making them available to the partners.

Then, of course, the other one is the minimum data elements. Along the theme of not having to spend any more time reporting than they need to spend, they are very interested in making sure the data that are asked for are the data that are used. For example, one of them asked why do you care how many pounds of ice I used? What could you possibly do with that? I think we do need to take care to make sure that we're asking for data that we're going to use and they can see that those data are used. If we don't really use a variable, then maybe it shouldn't be something that gets

asked of every trip, and maybe there's more focused socioeconomic-type of information that we get out of a subset, once we get the basic catch for everyone.

Then I think, once we deal with those, really what our charge will be, as we get to this amendment next, is to me sort of the secondary. Once you get the basic things and we know how we're going to do the variables and we know where the data are going and we know how we're going to get all these different entities onboard, the system needs to be economical and easy to use.

They want data availability that matches reporting frequency, and I guess this is an issue that Mark has brought up quite often. What the fishermen were saying is I'm reporting daily, why is the data from this fishery not available but every two months? If I'm having to report daily trips on a weekly basis, then by the end of the month you should know what I have. I think all we've heard about electronic reporting is moving in that direction, and so I think they just want to see that it's actually going to happen and be in place for them.

They wanted to be reporting -- Some fishermen want to report when they get home. Some want to report at the dock. Some want to report when they're sitting on the gunnel of their boat after they've cleaned it up, and some of them said they want to report when they're heading in and they get within cell phone range or what have you, or computer range, and they want to be able to file their report before they even get to the dock.

I think, as we heard from the commercial guys in Bonnie's pilot, it's all really a matter of the type of vessel and the type of resources that they have and the space that they have and how complex it is what they're going to be doing.

They want confidentiality maintained, especially with regard to area, which largely is done. I just don't think it's widely understood. Then they want options for greater detail, and this is certainly intriguing, because discussion was brought up that if I go out and and I bottom fish on the way out and then I go out to the Gulf Stream and I troll and then I come on in, what do I put down for my effort and what do I put down for my area? I might have fished thirty-miles apart in two different places, and what do I enter?

Some of the fishermen said they were interested in giving us greater detail and that they could file a split trip. On this one day, I fished so many hours in this area bottom fishing and this is what I caught. Then later in that day, I fished so many hours trolling in this area and this is what I caught, and so that does get us closer to the set-level information and it will be less assumptions we have to make in terms of really understanding catch per unit effort and economic value and everything else about these fisheries on a trip, because some of them can be complicated.

Then, in your document, you had the record of all the comments and such that we received. That was sort of my take on the public hearings. They were well attended, overall, and the conversations that we had with people were very good. I felt it was an opportunity to really talk to some of these guys about what this is really all about.

MR. BELL: Any comments? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, I'm not on your committee, but I just wanted to add that we did not have a -- We had one public hearing in North Carolina, in Morehead City, and

we got some good comments there, but, just in looking at the spread of our for-hire industry throughout North Carolina, there were a lot of concerns from fishermen in the northern part of the state that Morehead City was a long way to travel for them. It's a good three-hours round trip.

I worked with a couple of folks to set up just an informal meeting up there in Dare County. Jack was available, and so he went up there with me, and Dewey was at the meeting as well. I think a lot of the concerns that John has outlined here are the same things that we heard from those guys up there.

A lot of folks are dually-permitted vessels, and so they will commercial fish in the offseason, when they're not charter fishing. It is definitely like a spring through summer or early fall season up there. A lot of folks feel like they already give us this data and that we're not using it appropriately. That was one of the major concerns, and also, again, that if we're going to make the for-hire sector report, then everybody needs to report, and we need to really impose reporting requirements on private anglers, because they represent the majority of the effort.

I just wanted to bring those forward. This wasn't an official meeting. I don't know if Dewey and Jack want to add anything else, but people weren't happy about it. They saw it as more government intrusion and had the same concerns about duplication in reporting efforts, because this is a component of the charter fleet that participates in many fisheries, and so I just wanted to bring forward a few things from our informal comment period.

MR. COX: Most of these fishermen were from Dewey's area. I didn't know very many of them. Dewey probably knew everybody there, but the sense that I had in the room was it was a good turnout. There were probably thirty-five fishermen there, most of them for-hire. They just felt like this might be another tool that will put them out of work, and they're going to end up showing more fish than probably what they think that might be counted already. It was just, I felt, a sense of fear.

DR. PONWITH: That's kind of where I'm going. When I listen to public testimony, the people that tend to come to the council meetings, particularly in the Gulf, and I'm not so sure if that's true here, are just absolutely adamant that they want this. They want this, and they want it now. They want it yesterday.

I guess one of my concerns is are there charter/for-hire fleet members who aren't coming to the council meetings who really don't really know what they're getting themselves into with this who are adamantly opposed to electronic reporting? Some way of knowing what proportion of the fleet that is I think is useful as the council makes its decision on if to go forward, when to go forward, and how to go forward, because I think that influences our communication pathways to doing a really good job on outreach for this.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I attended that meeting, and, like Jack said, I knew most of the people there. Just based on my personal observation as a fisherman and stuff, I think a lot of people -- One, they don't believe or have any confidence, none whatsoever, in MRFSS or MRIP. Some of the scenarios that I threw out is that in 2008 that MRIP or MRFSS said there was 35,000 discards of blueline tilefish off of North Carolina. Why would you discard something that doesn't have a minimum size?

You looked at, in south Florida, two intercepts, I believe, seven or eight fish. That might be off a little bit, but it produced 100,000 pounds of catch in the recreational industry. The charter fishermen in my particular area, my sense is, in listening to them, is that if we've got to do all this reporting, why doesn't the recreational got to be somewhere accountable on that level? Second of all, the Gulf of Mexico fisheries and the wants of the charter fleets and the different things placed on them, through various NGOs wanting stuff and the agency, is totally different from the east coast, and so we're talking about two different things.

Second of all, the things that I tried to tell them is that as I see -- There is no more buffets with annual catch limits. There's a portion of the pie, and we're seeing that here with cobia. It's playing out here this year, that there's a good chance, and more than likely, that people are not going to be fishing their same patterns.

In the Northeast, in the council -- For the Mid-Atlantic, I see where that if the charter/headboats had some reporting for black sea bass that they might be fishing in Wave 1 of January and February, instead where they're closed down, and so I just see where we have the annual catch limits and, the way regulations are going, it's that you've got to be accountable for what you catch and you still might not be sure that you can still go fishing.

When I look at the charter fishermen in my particular area and the stuff that they pass along, it's reality of what they see and some of the failures that management has done. They're wondering if we've got to be accountable and have to do this, why doesn't everybody else have to be? I have always told them what I have to do fishing. My boat tilts a little bit to the port side because I've got so much electronic monitoring aboard my boat now. I just pass that along to others, you know, and what makes you all so special? Why don't you have to report like I do? I do get a sense of their frustration, but I didn't write the law. I told them to go talk to their congressman or senator and redo Magnuson.

MR. BELL: I certainly understand the frustration with if I have to do this, or if I'm a commercial guy and I have to do this, why doesn't everybody have to do it? The reality here is that we're dealing with different sizes, I mean orders of magnitude difference in terms of the numbers, and that's not to say that it can't ever happen in terms of -- Right now, we have an opportunity.

Again, I'm in a little bit different position, in that I'm in a state that has had a reporting requirement for well over twenty years, and our guys have kind of adapted to that. We've adapted to it and we're used to it, and so we have a little bit different perspective, but if you have an opportunity to kind of help take control of the quality of your data and get a much better picture to represent your community, it would seem like that would be an appealing feature for folks. Does that make sense?

MR. HEMILRIGHT: One more quick thing. I think also when you go to do a presentation that it probably would help if you would have had somebody here with the logbook, electronic logbook, to show you what you're going to be doing, instead of telling you. It's kind of like when I got my vessel monitoring system and my cameras aboard my boat. I knew I was in bad shape, because that was the first time I had seen the equipment, and I knew it wasn't going to be up to standards.

If you're going to place something where you want people to try something, go there with the parts and the tools to show them and don't go and tell them to look at the board and this is what we want to do. Go show them how it works. South Carolina and what you all have done there with the

pilot program and what they've done in Rhode Island, take it there to them that day. Don't take it there to them after you've already forced or are hoping to get it for them to use it.

I just think it's crucial in the infant stages of the rollout of this stuff is that you have the hands-on and you have it there in your hands to begin with. That helps a lot to -- They still might not like it, but it's at least showing them what they have there versus telling them.

MR. BELL: Right, and that's what we were trying to do, just kind of showing how we do it, but I see what you're saying. It's better outreach and a more effective way of kind of showing people what it is that we're asking of them, and I fully agree with that. Something to keep in mind in all of this, and you touched on it, is that if we're going to require folks to do this, then they have expectations, and that's something that we're going to be challenged with, is managing their expectations. This is all about how we phase this in and how we get it up and operational.

I mean there is an expectation that the data that we ask are data that we need, are data that we use. There's an expectation that things be timely and that they get access to data. That will be a big challenge for us as we move through this whole thing, is making sure we can handle the expectations of the folks that are involved in this. That will be a big challenge, and then this carries on though things that we touched on briefly when we were talking about the law enforcement side of things.

There is the requirement to do it, and then there's what happens if you don't do it? If I am going to be a solid guy and do my reporting on time, how come this guy over here, who has not been doing it -- When are you going to come down on him? That's part of that enforcement piece and everything, which all has to come together, but it's all part of the expectations of this, I think, because what we're presenting folks is a way to achieve better data, better management, better decisions. Maybe we don't have the closures that happen sometimes because we're using better data now. I mean that's the way to kind of explain this, I think.

Any other questions about public perception or comments on anything right now? We could move right into the document. What I would like to do is we have the decision document, which I believe is Attachment 8. There is a number of things, in moving through it, that we need to address. There are some IPT suggested wording changes and things. We can just go through this one at a time, and there's some things that we will need to --

MR. CARMICHAEL: We will go through this. The changes you've seen. They're all tracked there in yellow, and then, places where we're asking for some committee action, those are the ones that are going to be highlighted in blue.

Kicking right off with the purpose and need, notice that there's a change in the purpose and need, and those are always reviewed by the council, and it's a relatively minor editorial change, but it's right here, to change the need to just say "the need is to improve charter vessels" rather than "the need for this action". That's just because there are multiple actions, and so that could be taken as misleading. The first question is accepting the recommended modification or not.

MR. BOWEN: **I make a motion that we accept the IPT's recommended changes.**

MR. BELL: Wilson seconds. **Any objection to that motion? Then that carries.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: Then the next one we come to will be under Action 1. This is the frequency and mechanism of data reporting for charter vessels. It deals with Preferred Alternative 2, and the intent here is to clarify that trip-level reporting is required and that the days are intended to represent the week, and this was an often raised point of discussion within the public hearings. It wasn't clear to people in that language that they're submitting fishing records to each trip.

Some people thought they were just going to report for all of the fish they caught over the prior week, and some people felt that if they reported on Tuesday that that covered whatever up to that Tuesday or whenever they reported. The idea that every week you're doing this by the following Tuesday was not becoming apparent to them, and so there's some language in there that just clarifies that it's per trip and that reports are due by Tuesday following the week that ends on Sunday, because we used the word "weekly" and "weekly" means different things to different people, and so hopefully this now makes it explicitly clear.

The approach is consistent with the Snapper Grouper AP, and this just clarifies the language. I put a lot of things in there about reporting week, because we wanted to make sure that we were dealing with terms that were already defined, because you already have some things for the for-hire amendment for the headboat reporting, that we're being consistent and all throughout.

MR. BELL: Is that clear? Anybody interested in a motion or do you want to think about that for a second?

MR. BROWN: I've just got a quick question. It says "in or from state waters adjoining the applicable South Atlantic" and so this is for state and federal waters, right?

MR. CARMICHAEL: **This is for federally-permitted vessels. Federally-permitted vessels would report all of their fishing, yes.**

MR. BOWEN: **Mr. Chairman, are you looking for a motion to accept the changes?**

MR. BELL: Motion from Zack. Is there a second? Second by Chris. **Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion passes.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: Moving on to the next one which is highlighted, this one is for the action dealing with the minimum data elements, and there is a lot of details in there, obviously. This is down on Action 4, page 6, at the bottom, after the couple of tables that show the different data elements. There were examples showing data elements collected by different programs.

The question here is whether or not the council should specify minimum data elements or leave those as something to be filled in and determined later. One of the issues is that if you specify it, then changing minimum elements could require an amendment, but, if you specify them, you are making it clear exactly what you consider the minimum information necessary, which I think could be very helpful when we get into coordinating that intent to have one reporting system across all of the different programs. If we know sort of what the minimum common denominators are, at least on behalf of you guys, we're in a better position to start figuring out how we get everything merged together into one.

DR. PONWITH: I have mixed feelings about this. I am always troubled by regulating science, because, as things evolve, that's exactly what happens. If you create too firm of a guideline there, you have to actually amend. The flip side of it is that it does a very good job of, if you include the minimum requirements, it gives a better job, an easier job, of the constituents who are going to be using this to understand what they're going to be on the hook for. I guess my question is would it be appropriate to include those as an appendix to the amendment, so that you get the best of both worlds? That's just an honest question, because of the fact that it's kind of a double-edged sword.

MR. BELL: Meaning though that whatever the appendix is, that's it. That's the minimum data elements at this point, right?

DR. PONWITH: That's part of the question, is I don't understand the implications of that in terms of what the legal ramifications are. I like the idea of having the minimum data requirements documented. I am worried about them being codified, because, again, what it does is it leave us inflexible, even if we all agree that a change would be better. That's my big concern. It's more a question. I don't know what creating an appendix and putting this in -- Does it then make it non-binding, but informative, or is that also as binding as if it's in the main body of the document? I don't know.

MR. BELL: Monica, do you want to weigh in on that?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Sure. It depends on how you structure the appendix and what you call it, or what it's used for. We have, in a normal fishery management plan, a number of appendices attached to the amendment. Those are no less important and they're no less a part of the amendment because they're an appendix to the amendment.

It's just like they're included in the amendment, but frequently there's a level of analysis needed or something that they don't want to put it in the main body of the document, but it's still part, and a necessary part, of that amendment, but if you refer to, for example, the appendix that Bonnie is talking about as here's an example of the data elements that would be required, however the list isn't exhaustive or -- You can structure it in that way, so that if the data elements get changed, as necessarily needed to by the Science Center or something, then you don't need to go amend your fishery management plan to change the data elements.

That is something I was concerned about before, is, okay, if you make some -- Depending on how you structure this, if you make some changes to the data elements, then you may need to go back and amend your fishery management plan, and we know that sometimes is a lengthy process and sometimes not. It's rarely not, I should say, but you could put it even in a framework, if that's what you wanted to do, to change the data elements, but I'm not sure that's where the council wants to go, but maybe it is.

Maybe the council has specific identified data elements that they absolutely want to include and those kinds of things would never get changed, but the Center might need to add to those data elements. There is a variety of ways that you can go.

MR. BELL: I think the approach that we started with was we have an existing headboat reporting system, and so there are data elements there that I guess are -- They are probably codified or something, right? Those were established already, and so we wanted to match that. Then there

was some concern, because we have an existing program in South Carolina. We wanted to kind of make sure we did something that wouldn't -- It's not all about us, and I know that, but there may be some additional things that we kind of added.

I think the thinking was that we could establish some level that we're telling the public right now, since we're asking you to trust us, this is what we're going to do is, boom, here is what we want, a minimum, and it's in the plan. I think this was, in part, because this is brand new for a whole bunch of people, and it's a balance between science and flexibility to do the science you want to do, but it's also trust that we're not going to just all of a sudden change this and think of ten other things that we didn't mention that all of a sudden next year we want to do. It is a balance.

DR. PONWITH: That's where the danger of calling these minimum data requirements are. Honestly, when I hear the words "minimum data requirements", it is we are, at the very least, going to require you to tell us the date that you fished, the return time that you returned, your vessel name, blah, blah, blah.

As minimum data requirements, those are inescapable. You're going to be asked for those, but "minimum" implies that there may be other things that are added in there, and these are the bones of the program. Again, when I look at these, these are all logical. It's hard to imagine not wanting these, but it's just whether at this point -- Trust me that I'm not trying to talk you out of this. What I'm saying is that it's a blessing and it's a curse to have it in there. It's informative and it tells people this is exactly what you're buying into with this regulation, but the flip side of it is it does create some concrete that's hard to get out of.

MR. BELL: Just for my education, I guess, with the headboat system that exists, how did we do that, or how was that actually incorporated?

DR. PONWITH: I do not recall, when that amendment went through, whether we dictated in the amendment itself the minimum. I can't remember.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I remember looking at the codified text from the generic amendment to look at the weekly thing, and I don't remember seeing variables in there, and so I don't think they were codified, but that was a program that was existing and it had reporting requirements before, and so I don't know if they were listed. Gregg, do you recall if the variables were actually listed in the headboat amendment?

MR. WAUGH: I don't think they were.

MR. CARMICHAEL: They weren't in the codified text, and so I would assume they weren't actually specified.

MS. BECKWITH: I agree with Mel. I think one of the perceptions that is of concern to the guides is the data creep issue. A little while ago, Brian came to the table and he was really excited about the potential to add some socioeconomic questions to the platform, and I think that's kind of a fundamental concern, especially for the small boat guys, is what do you guys want? A lot of them haven't actually seen the program.

I like the program that South Carolina has. I think it seems great. It seems really simple and very logical. It seems like the guys can do it on an iPhone or a computer or however they want to do it, and I think they will get used to it, but the fear is at what point are they going to start asking us about how much ice we've got on the boat and the cost of ice and what was the bait and how much was the gas? At what point does it sort of never end?

Where we can structure -- Some of that has been described in the document, where we have the concept of the base things that we're looking for, and using the South Carolina as an example, and then other things that we may be able to consider in volunteer fashion or in a survey fashion that takes into consideration the size of your boat and things like that. I think some flexibility is good, but the base concern is data creep and how much of a burden it becomes when you get a bunch of excited scientists that want to answer every possible question.

MR. WAUGH: From doing the hearings and stuff, the trust level we have with the public is not very high, and there is a lot of resistance to this. We buy some reassurance by saying here are the minimum data elements. What they are, that's mandatory. Everybody is going to be reporting that for every trip. I think putting that in the amendment gives the affected fishermen some reassurance.

We can make sure that's changeable by framework, and then we can modify that fairly quickly, but remember too that we're talking about working with the Northeast that's handling the New England Council area, the Mid-Atlantic, us, the State of South Carolina, the headboats, MRIP, and HMS, and getting everybody's agreement on a set of minimum data elements so there is one report.

I think it's critical that that be in the amendment and in the codified regulations, so it's clear to everybody what the minimum data elements are. The fishermen are reassured that there is not going to be this sort of science creep. Then, separate from that, on a sampling basis, maybe through our Citizens Science Program, we can do other programs to get additional data, but that would be on a separate, voluntary basis.

DR. PONWITH: The light bulb went off over my head that indeed we did not include minimum data elements in the headboat amendment. Point Number 2 is those data fields have shifted as that program has matured and evolved.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Bonnie. Mike, did you have something?

MR. CAHALL: I just wanted to comment that it's standard practice, within at least ACCSP, to define minimum data elements. Given the context of this discussion, they are precisely that. The database -- We've codified it to the point that the database will not accept reports that don't have -- Fill-in-the-blank. I'm looking at your list of elements and they make perfect sense, as Bonnie said earlier, but they are by no means complete, so that if you wanted to add things, you could.

Even still, the way our standards are written is that there is a set of basic minimum elements and then there is a longer list of other elements that are desired, so that they can be standardized across the enterprise. I think the issue that you have here is that if you don't define, at least at a minimum, what you need that you may not get it, and you will have people that will say, well, you didn't say I had to get it, and so you have, on the one hand, if you don't define your minimum elements, you may not get them. On the other hand, if Bonnie said, if you build it too inflexible and things

change over time -- But there are core common elements that you are always going to need that I would suggest that you keep in there. I recognize I am not part of the committee.

MR. BELL: No, and I appreciate your input, because you deal with this stuff, and that is essential here.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Mike, you mentioned minimal, but, in the end, you mentioned core, and I want to go back to one of the reasons we're talking about this, and Anna mentioned it and I think Gregg kind of mentioned it too, but one thing that came out at the public hearings was the concern about creep and adding additional variables, and I do have the concern, if we use the word "minimal", that people are going to feel like you're not doing anything to prevent creep, because it's not so much that they're concerned about the minimal, but they're concerned about the add-on of lots of extra variables.

Perhaps if we termed this the core data elements that were required, it might put some peoples' minds at ease, in terms you're not going to pile on fifteen other variables in six months because you decide you have me and I'm captive and you can start asking me any question you want.

DR. LANEY: Mike touched on it, but what I was going to suggest is that it would be appropriate to include whatever the ACCSP standards are, because every agency sitting around this table is a signatory to the ACCSP MOU, and so why not, at a minimum, include the ACCSP standards, whatever those are, as the core requirements? Isn't that something we should be doing anyway, as a partner to the MOU?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think we should look at those, but, since we don't have them before us, we probably shouldn't go as far as including them now, but I think if the council agrees that it does want to specify data elements that should be collected, then we can look at that and we can contrast it with South Carolina and we can contrast it with the headboat program and come up with a list and, perhaps whether it's included as an appendix or a list here, but just make it clear that it's something that could be modified through framework action. Would that suffice?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I have two questions, Mike. When you said you have these core requirements and you have to at least complete those, but you have other information that you would also like -- I don't know if they're requirements or not, but you ask additional information of people apart from that core?

MR. CAHALL: It's actually we don't ask for the additional information, but because when ACCSP built the data standards -- They're intended to be all-encompassing. I guess you could call them optional data elements, but for the minimal data elements -- I actually like that. I didn't mean to stumble on core, but I actually like that concept.

There is some stuff you just absolutely have to have. Who are you? What boat are you on? What gear did you use? Where were you? There is just some absolute bare-bones minimums you have to have, but then there's other things. In terms of ACCSP standards, just looking at this really quickly, for example the depths would fall into an optional category, because you don't absolutely have to have that to determine your CPUE and the basic data elements, the basic information, you have to derive from the trips, but we defined a very broad universe of data elements.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Then my second point really was to remind people that there's this act out there called the Paperwork Reduction Act. It's used for obtaining approval for the Office of Management and Budget for federally-sponsored data collections.

It is a process by which you have to go through if you're going to change, I would think, information that you're requesting from the public, and you have to, I think, put through an application and justify to OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, why you need this information and how much time it will take to collect and those sorts of things. I don't think people just immediately change what they request. I mean they have to give it some thought and get permission through the Paperwork Reduction Act to change those.

MR. BELL: So you're saying -- Let's say we had something now, but any changes to that in the future, regardless of whether it was in here or we had to do it through a framework amendment or something, we would have to go through that step as well?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes, and that's something that, in fact, many of the amendments -- If you want information from the public, the Fisheries Service goes through that process. They might not even tell you about it, but it's an act that they have to comply with. After you finish what you've done, we have to go also through the Paperwork Reduction Act and make sure we meet those requirements before it can be implemented.

MR. BELL: The question at hand though is do we want something that we're going to call core and maybe -- I am not familiar with what it might look like for ACCSP. Another thing to keep in mind about a core is that we're hearing, in the South Atlantic, that it would be nice if the core for the South Atlantic was -- If there was applicability in the other regions as well, because where we're eventually maybe going with this is something that will work anyplace. That may be what the ACCSP has. It may be more reflective of a core that crosses region, or a minimum that crosses regions, I guess, but it still comes back to do we want it in here or do we want it referenced outside?

MR. BOWEN: I would be willing to make a motion to require the five highlighted specifics in Table 2.1.1, so we could go ahead and get through this, if the committee is ready for that, you know as a minimum reporting requirement.

MR. BELL: I am not really sure which -- There is three different tables here.

MR. BOWEN: It's Table 2.1.1. The specifics are area fished, number of anglers who fished, hours of actual fishing activity, method of fishing, and targeted species, if any.

MR. BELL: PDF page 6, which is Table 2.1.1 that you're looking at?

MR. BOWEN: I think Anna wants to second it.

MS. BECKWITH: I was just going to say, to Zack's point, that that wouldn't include the number of fish or the discards or anything else we've actually already chosen as preferreds, and so that probably wouldn't meet what the goal of the amendment is, but my question was actually to -- Could we, in the June meeting, out of my personal curiosity, kind of get a list of what ACCSP would consider core versus additional elements? That may better help us to choose what elements we may want to codify in the test versus have in an appendix.

MR. BELL: I think, to that, what you're looking at in the first table, that's the MRIP for-hire survey. Then the second table, on the next page, 2.1.2, that's what is in the headboat. The third table represents what we have in place in South Carolina, and so we're not actually talking about one specific table at this point, and then there's what Mike has as well.

MR. CAHALL: We would be happy to work with you to identify what we would consider the core. I would also comment that the core is pretty universal. Again, I think it's very much like the list that Bonnie articulated a little earlier, you know what vessel are you on and what port did you sail from and what did you catch and what gear did you use? It's maybe ten or twelve total that are utterly required to be able to tell what's going on.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The table that Zack referenced there, that's the MRIP for-hire survey. My understanding is that was for effort and not for catch. That's why that doesn't have anything about species caught or species discarded. I don't know that that's necessarily the best model. Perhaps something that's more similar to the headboat or the South Carolina, or if you would like to see what the minimums are within the ACCSP standards.

MR. BELL: What we're really talking about is whether or not we want to include in this document a table that sort of doesn't exist at the moment, and that's where it could be a combination of these things, plus what Mike brings to the table. It's a do we want it in the document or don't we want it in the document, but we don't fully know what we're talking about.

MR. CARMICHAEL: To that, I think that perhaps if you gave guidance that you intend to specify core data elements, then the IPT could look at what's in here now and they could consult with what ACCSP has and they could look at some other areas where this is being done, and they could come to you in June with a list of potential alternatives for data elements and including alternatives for things like how these would be modified. Would these be modified through a framework and all of that? I believe if you just made a simple motion that you intend to specify core data elements that you open the door for us to then do all that work as a next step and bring you in the fully fleshed-out parts.

MR. BOWEN: **If it's okay, I will withdraw that last motion.** I am up to make another one that might be a little more helpful in this situation, whenever you're ready.

MR. BELL: I had somebody else that was going to make a motion. She might make the same motion. Did I jump over someone? I think I jumped over Mark, real quick.

MR. BROWN: There's like two or three different models that we can look at, right? I mean South Carolina has got one and we've got --

MR. BELL: What John is talking about is bringing something back.

MR. BROWN: Yes, bringing them all together, and then we can look at them and then pick out what we would like to see and put it together in a document.

MS. BECKWITH: **I was going to move to take John's suggestion to reconsider in June a list of potential data elements to consider. It would be to move to specify core data elements.**

MR. BELL: It would be developed in the way John described. Is that clear enough for a motion? Wilson seconds that. Does everybody follow what we're talking about now? It's basically we would have something to look at that would become the core elements.

MS. BOSARGE: I wanted to say thank you to Monica, because that's probably the best answer I've heard in a while as to what to do with these core data. In our data collection discussions in the Gulf, we get into this same problem of do we put it in the document? We put stuff in the document and then, from the science perspective, that's too prescriptive. Then we take it out and then it kind of becomes the chicken-and-the-egg of then what do you want, because it's not in the document.

Putting it in an appendix and referencing it as an example, I'm going to take that back to the Gulf, and I like the idea of maybe in that appendix we could have a core as well as optional group -- A core group and an optional group, and that would kind of give the fishermen an idea of this is the core that we're probably going to start with. These are the things that we've discussed as optional that we can see adding on, and it gives them kind of a limitation too that we didn't put your economic data in there and we didn't put all of that stuff in there, to kind of give them an idea of where our threshold is, where our cutoff is at this point. That's a good idea. I like that.

MR. BELL: Thank you. In the interest of time here, because I think some folks are going to have to bail, we have a motion and we have a second. **Any objection to the motion?** Does everybody understand what we're doing? **Seeing no objection, then that motion passes.** We've got a couple more things we need to try to get to here.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I told you more about this last time, but we mentioned all the different entities. There's a project underway now, under the umbrella of ACCSP, I believe, where they're doing an inventory of all the different for-hire reporting that's going on. I'm hoping by June that table is complete and I can show that to you, but just here's some things I added here, just to give you a sense of what's going on.

You have MRIP, which does the recreational data. You've got HMS, with various tuna and billfish and shark things. We've got the Southeast Regional Office and the Southeast Center with the headboat. In the Atlantic, they've got for-hire VTRs. We heard about them from Mike. South Carolina DNR has charter reporting. New York DEC has for-hire reporting in federal waters. NC has HMS for-hire reporting. There is the iSnapper in the Gulf. The ACCSP is kind of the glue that binds all of those things, and this is just the ones that hit the federal waters. All of these guys are going to be involved when we come up with one set of variables and one reporting thing.

Now we can finally move down to Action 2. In Preferred Alternative 2, just as in Preferred Alternative 1 up in Action 1, it's clarification of what's meant by the reports. It says electronic reports would be due by Tuesday following each week that ends on Sunday, instead of reports being due on Sunday. Remember that Action 2 is the frequency and mechanism of data reporting for the headboats. This makes charter boats and headboats similar, and it clarifies the timing and what's meant by the reporting.

MR. BELL: So this is just clarification of timing?

MR. COX: **I move under Action 2, Alternative 2, that we accept the IPT recommended modifications.**

MR. BELL: We have a motion. Zack seconds that. Any discussion of the motion? It's just a clarification thing on timing again. Is everybody clear? **Any objection to the motion? Seeing none, that motion passes.** That takes you to Action 3.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Action 3 will be next. There is some modifications in the clarification of what it's doing there. We moved that text down and there were no action requirement changes there. Then we get down into the timing. The timing that was in place was to review here, approve for formal review in June, and then send for review in June.

The question is to keep the current timing or to delay final approval until the September meeting. Part of that was to get agreement on the Atlantic Coast-Wide Minimum Data Elements, and clarify, while the intent is to have the reporting requirements effective January 2017, recognize there may be a need to delay full implementation until later in 2017.

The most important thing, obviously, being do you need formal approval in June, and, given that we just talked about clarifying data elements, that may be a bit more difficult, and we need to work with all those other entities to settle this one-report type of thing that having more time may help us.

MR. BELL: Also keep in mind that, in discussions with had with the Law Enforcement AP, there was a lot of discussion about sort of the administrative process that occurs and you either reported or you didn't report, and then the handoff eventually to law enforcement. We were talking about hopefully bringing the LEAP in some time around June, or before June, to try to really work closely with them.

I can tell you, from personal experience, that handoff from administration to enforcement is critical, and the process has to be agreed upon and worked out in detail, and that can take a little bit of time. For these different reasons, I don't think we're ready to necessarily go with final approval in June, myself.

MR. BOWEN: Also, we had some public comments yesterday from Leda that were great comments, and we do need to address some of those issues that she brought up. If you're looking for a motion -- I am for this amendment. I think it's great, and I'm looking forward to the implementation, but I concur with you, Mr. Chairman, that I don't think we're ready at this time.

MR. BELL: I agree, and I will note that Leda's comments were right on in terms of the outreach component in some of those as well. There are many moving parts to this, and I think it is extremely important that when we're ready to go live that we've got it all lined up just right.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You may want to add an action that modifies frameworks that currently don't allow framework action to change reporting requirements. I just took a quick look. This amendment modifies Snapper Grouper, Dolphin Wahoo, and Coastal Migratory Pelagics. Of the three, I think Coastal Migratory Pelagics is the only one that I've found that you can do via framework for reporting and monitoring requirements, and so I would think reporting requirements -- It just depends on how broadly you want to structure reporting requirements, but I would be glad

to work with staff to figure out if we want to add a framework action here, so that if the Center potentially, assuming this all happens, needs to change their data element requests and the council would need to weigh in on that, that you could do that quickly.

MR. BELL: We could do that without completely derailing -- It's not like adding a whole other action for something.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It's another action, I would think, and I'll take a look at what's in here already and see if maybe we can work it in some alternatives, but I think usually framework actions are separate actions.

MR. BELL: Thank you. If you would, that would be great.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Do we need a motion that says add an action to make the data elements as framework or is it okay in the discussion that we had that you all want to specify them and that making that as a framework action would address it?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Would you ask -- I didn't hear the latter part of your question. I heard the first part.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I guess I was thinking we would come back in June with potential minimum data elements and included in that would be also whether or not those would be framework. You don't have an action now which specifies minimum data elements in any way.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Right, and so I think we could approach it that way, as long as everybody is of the understanding that it might need to become an action, a framework action.

MR. BELL: At this point, it's just kind of direction to staff to work with Monica to develop or figure this out?

MR. CARMICHAEL: That's my direction, and the IPT will talk about it. We'll work with Monica. In June, we'll come with either some approach or an action written out that specifies the elements and says that they would consider whether or not they're framework.

DR. LANEY: Monica, I am still a little fuzzy on the appendix versus main text part. Would the core elements have to go in the main text of the document and then anything else that you might ever want to include via framework action would be put in an appendix? I guess that's a detail that staff and you can work out, but, just for my clarification, is that the way it would work?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think that's something that we'll figure out in the IPT process.

MR. BELL: Then are we good right now?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think we need a motion that delays the approval until the September meeting, at least.

MR. BELL: You're absolutely right. A motion to delay the approval at least until the September meeting.

MR. BOWEN: **I would be inclined to make the motion to delay final approval until at least the September meeting, to obtain agreement on Atlantic Coast-Wide Minimum Data Elements.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: To obtain final approval on what? To obtain approval on data elements? Is that what you said?

MR. BOWEN: Yes, sir.

MR. BELL: It's more than just that though. I think you could just cut it off.

MR. BOWEN: If I don't need to put that in there, I don't have to.

MR. BELL: Why don't we just cut it off after "September"?

MR. BOWEN: **Perfect.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: Are you happy with that?

MR. BOWEN: **Move to delay final approval until at least September. Yes, sir.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: So the motion is move to delay final approval until at least September.

MR. BELL: Chris seconds. Does everybody understand what we're doing? It's making sure, again, we've got some very key things worked out. **Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion passes.** Anything else?

MR. CARMICHAEL: That's the end of the decision document.

MR. BELL: Okay. Again, as I mentioned, as we get into this -- The law enforcement discussion was a big eye-opener for me at this meeting. I'm glad they were here and we were able to talk about some of this, and we really didn't have NOAA OLE present, necessarily, and so that piece really needs to occur, and so I think it's really critical that we make sure -- Again, when we go for implementation eventually, we've got to have this right. Any other discussion of the document right now? I've got one more agenda item.

MR. CARMICHAEL: To that point, some of us have to run out of here for a call in a few minutes. What the Chairman just suggested is that we do the Citizens Science Blueprint at full council. Then we can move in -- We will have to end the webinar, just so people on the webinar understand. They're going to do a demo which will interrupt the webinar, but the folks here will see -- It will interrupt it here, but it will still be active, in terms of still being up for you that are out there, and we're going to try to set it up so you can hear, but you just won't necessarily be able to see.

Anyway, the point is we will break and allow Fran to come up and do her demo of the electronic reporting application that is the core of the South Atlantic's project with ACCSP on that, and then come back in the morning at full council and take up all of this. Citizen Science Program will become a full council action, and I will let her tell you what time to be here for that.

DR. DUVAL: I appreciate all of the conversation we've had, and I apologize that we're a little bit behind schedule. I don't think it could be helped, but we will start at 8:30 with the Snapper Grouper Committee Report. I still think that we will be able to finish up by like 12:30. I know that Leann has to leave early, and so we'll get her liaison report before we move into the other committee reports, but then I think we can finish up Citizen Science when we get to the Data Collection portion of our agenda tomorrow at full council, and so 8:30 tomorrow morning. Thank you very much for your work.

MR. BELL: Great. Thanks.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned on March 10, 2016.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
March 25, 2015

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COMMITTEES

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Chester Brewer, Chair
Mark Brown, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CATCH SHARES

Jack Cox, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Ben Hartig
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact:
Kari MacLauchlin / Brian Cheuvront

DATA COLLECTION

✓ Mel Bell, Chair
✓ Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
✓ Anna Beckwith
✓ Mark Brown
✓ Chris Conklin
✓ Jack Cox
✓ Wilson Laney
✓ Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh- **JOHN CARMICHAEL**
✓ **ZACK BOWEN**

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Zack Bowen, Vice-Chair
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Tony DiLernia/Dewey
Hemilright
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

**HABITAT PROTECTION AND
ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT**

Doug Haymans, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Jack Cox
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
LTJG Tara Pray
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Chip Collier - CEBA

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

Michelle Duval, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Ben Hartig
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Bob Mahood

GOLDEN CRAB

Ben Hartig, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Jack Cox, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

(Continued)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

COUNCIL CHAIR

Dr. Michelle Duval
NC Division of Marine Fisheries
3441 Arendell Street
(PO Box 769)
✓ Morehead City, NC 28557
252/808-8011 (ph);
252/726-0254 (f)
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

VICE-CHAIR

Charlie Phillips
Phillips Seafood/Sapelo Sea Farms
1418 Sapelo Avenue, N.E.
Townsend, GA 31331
912/832-4423 (ph); 912/832-6228 (f)
Ga_capt@yahoo.com

Robert E. Beal
Executive Director
Atlantic States Marine Fisheries
Commission
1050 N. Highland St., Suite 200 A-N
Arlington, VA 20001
703/842-0740 (ph); 703/842-0741 (f)
rbeal@asmfc.org

Anna Beckwith
1907 Paulette Road
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/671-3474 (ph)
AnnaBarriosBeckwith@gmail.com

Mel Bell
S.C. Dept. of Natural Resources
Marine Resources Division
P.O. Box 12559
(217 Ft. Johnson Road)
Charleston, SC 29422-2559
843/953-9007 (ph)
843/953-9159 (fax)
bellm@dnr.sc.gov

Zack Bowen
P.O. Box 30825
Savannah, GA 31410
912/398-3733 (ph)
fishzack@comcast.net

✓ W. Chester Brewer
250 Australian Ave. South
Suite 1400
West Palm Beach, FL 33408
561/655-4777 (ph)
WCBLAW@aol.com

Mark Brown
3642 Pandora Drive
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29466
843/881-9735 (ph); 843/881-4446 (f)
capt.markbrown@comcast.net

Chris Conklin
P.O. Box 972
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576
843/543-3833
conklinsafmc@gmail.com

Jack Cox
2010 Bridges Street
Morehead City, NC 28557
252/728-9548
Dayboat1965@gmail.com

✓ Dr. Roy Crabtree
Regional Administrator
NOAA Fisheries, Southeast Region
263 13th Avenue South
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
727/824-5301 (ph); 727/824-5320 (f)
roy.crabtree@noaa.gov

✓ Ben Hartig
9277 Sharon Street
Hobe Sound, FL 33455
772/546-1541 (ph)
mackattackben@att.net

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (continued)

Doug Haymans
Coastal Resources Division
GA Dept. of Natural Resources
One Conservation Way, Suite 300
Brunswick, GA 31520-8687
912/264-7218 (ph); 912/262-2318 (f)
doughaymans@gmail.com

Dr. Wilson Laney
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
South Atlantic Fisheries Coordinator
P.O. Box 33683
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617
(110 Brooks Ave
237 David Clark Laboratories,
NCSU Campus
Raleigh, NC 27695-7617)
919/515-5019 (ph)
919/515-4415 (f)
Wilson_Laney@fws.gov

Jessica McCawley
Florida Fish and Wildlife
Conservation Commission
2590 Executive Center Circle E.,
Suite 201
Tallahassee, FL 32301
850/487-0554 (ph); 850/487-4847(f)
jessica.mccawley@myfwc.com

✓ LTJG Tara Pray
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
tara.c.pray@uscg.mil

Deirdre Warner-Kramer
Office of Marine Conservation
OES/OMC
2201 C Street, N.W.
Department of State, Room 5806
Washington, DC 20520
202/647-3228 (ph); 202/736-7350 (f)
Warner-KramerDM@state.gov

LEANN BOSARGE
DR. BONNIE POWITH
DR. JACK MCGOVERN
FRANCINE KARP
MIKE CAHALL
ROBERT OLSEN
ROBERT BOYLES
KARLA GORE
DR. MIKE LARKIN
ERIKA BURGESS
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
DEWEY HEMILRIGHT
AMY DUKES

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

✓ Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist

✓ Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**

Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Biologist**

Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

✓ **Fisheries Social Scientist**

Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**

Chip Collier
Chip.Collier@safmc.net

✓ **Staff Economist**

Dr. Brian Chevront
brian.chevront@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

Dr. Julie Neer - julie.neer@safmc.net
Julia Byrd - julia.byrd@safmc.net

✓ **Administrative Officer**

Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

✓ **Purchasing & Grants**

Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net



**South Atlantic Fishery Management Council –
March 2016 Council Meeting
Jekyll Island, GA**

Date: Thursday, March 10, 2016

Committee: Data Collection

PLEASE SIGN IN -

In order to have a record of your attendance at each meeting and your name included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown above.

Name:	Mailing Address/E-mail: <i>(If your information is currently on file, please check the box.)</i>	How do you participate in South Atlantic fisheries? <i>(Check all that apply)</i>	
Bob Grimes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/> Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <i>Describe</i>	
Ryan Howard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File Fishmeryan@gmail.com 113 Sunset Blvd Savannah	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/> Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <i>Describe</i>	
Leticia Dunmore	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/> Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <i>Describe</i>	
Ian LAKS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/> Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <i>Describe</i>	
Bryan Fleuch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File 755 B	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/> Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <i>Describe</i>	
Deidra Jeffcoat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> NGO <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/> Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>	
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <i>Describe</i>	

**South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
Charleston, SC 29405**



**South Atlantic Fishery Management Council –
March 2016 Council Meeting
Jekyll Island, GA**

Date: Thursday, March 10, 2016

Committee: Data Collection

PLEASE SIGN IN -

In order to have a record of your attendance at each meeting and your name included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown above.

Name:	Mailing Address/E-mail: <i>(If your information is currently on file, please check the box.)</i>	How do you participate in South Atlantic fisheries? <i>(Check all that apply)</i>	
DICK BRAME	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/ For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
Kathy Knowlton	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/ For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <i>Other</i> _____ <i>Describe</i>
Krista Shipley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/ For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
Lora Clarke	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/ For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
Amy Dukes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/ For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>
Robert Olson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/ For-hire <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other _____ <i>Describe</i>

**South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201
Charleston, SC 29405**

THUR 10 MAR 16

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Abeels	Holly	habeels@ufl.edu
Alvarado	Nicolas	Nicolas.Alvarado@noaa.gov
Amick	Steve	steveamicks@sol.com
Anderson	Joshua	joshuamarlinanderson1@hotmail.com
Austin	Anthony	redress@ec.rr.com
Avery	Mike	mike@averys.net
Bademan	Martha	martha.bademan@myfwc.com
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Ballenger	Joey	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov
Batsavage	Chris	Chris.Batsavage@ncdenr.gov
Beal	Bob	rbeal@asmfc.org
Bell	Alex	alex@alexbelllaw.com
Bonura	Vincent	SailRaiser25C@aol.com
Bransom	William	Will.Bransom@gmail.com
Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Brogan	Gib	gbrogan@oceana.org
Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Carithers	Graham	graham.carithers@dnr.ga.gov
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Defilippi	Julie	julie.defilippi@accsp.org
Errigo	Mike	mike.errigo@safmc.net
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Franco	Dawn	dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov
French	Jonathan	french60wasp@gmail.com
GORHAM	WILLAM	billsreoservice@gmail.com
Gerhart	Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Gillingham	Lewis	lewis.gillingham@mrc.virginia.gov
Hadley	John	john.hadley@ncdenr.gov
Hesselman	Don	don.hesselman@ncdenr.gov
Hudson	Russell	DSF2009@aol.com
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net

Jiorle	Ryan	ryan.jiorle@mrc.virginia.gov
Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov
MacLauchlin	Kari	kari.maclauchlin@samfc.net
MacLauchlin	Bill	billmac@charter.net
Mahood	Bob	robert.mahood@safmc.net
Mahood	Bob	rmahood@mindspring.com
Malinowski	Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
Markwith	Anne	anne.markwith@ncdenr.gov
McHan	Chris	cmchan@gmri.org
McPherson	Matthew	matthew.mcpherson@noaa.gov
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net
Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net
O'Reilly	Rob	rob.oreilly@mrc.virginia.gov
Oremland	Laura	Laura.Oremland@noaa.gov
Ottavi	Raymond	rjottavi@hotmail.com
POWELL	GARY	garyp6910@gmail.com
Pearson	Kathleen	kathleen@vagentlemen.com
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Rawls	Kathy	kathy.rawls@ncdenr.gov
Sedberry	George	george.sedberry@noaa.gov
Smith	Cindy	cindy.smith@dnr.ga.gov
Stafford	Pete	spstafford@gmail.com
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
blow	wes	wesamy2000@cox.net
brouwer	myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net
cimino	joe	joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.gov
holiman	stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov
pugliese	roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net
rindone	ryan	ryan.rindone@gulfcouncil.org
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
shepard	nathan	ballinimpression@yahoo.com
smart	tracey	smartt@dnr.sc.gov

spain

bill

bill@harborlightsoftware.com