SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

DoubleTree by Hilton Atlantic Beach Oceanfront
Atlantic Beach, NC

December 8, 2016

SUMMARY MINUTES

Committee Members:

Mel Bell, Chair	Tim Griner
Doug Haymans, Vice Chair	Dr. Wilson Laney
Anna Beckwith	Ben Hartig
Zack Bowen	Robert Beal
Mark Brown	

Council Members:

Dr. Michelle Duval	Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips	Lt. Tara Pray
Chester Brewer	Dr. Roy Crabtree
Chris Conklin	

Council Staff:

Gregg Waugh	John Hadley
John Carmichael	Kim Iverson
Myra Brouwer	Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Dr. Chip Collier	Roger Pugliese
Mike Collins	Amber Von Harten
Dr. Mike Errigo	Kimberly Cole

Observers/Participants:

Erica Burgess	Dr. Erik Williams
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith	Aydan Rios
Monica Smit-Brunello	Dale Diaz
Dr. Jack McGovern	Mike Cahall
Rick DeVictor	Ken Brennan
Dr. Jessica Stephen	Eric Fitzpatrick

Additional Observers/Participants attached.

The Data Collection Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the DoubleTree by Hilton Atlantic Beach Oceanfront, Atlantic Beach, North Carolina, Thursday afternoon, December 8, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: Let's go ahead and call the Data Collection Committee to order. The first item of business would be Approval of the Agenda. We've got a pretty full agenda, including four or five presentations and then a potential final action on an amendment, and so any changes to the agenda? Seeing none, any objection to approval of the agenda? Seeing no objection, then the agenda is approved.

The next item of business is Approval of the Minutes from the September 15 meeting. Are there any changes to the minutes from the September 15 meeting? Seeing no changes, then the minutes will stand approved. That takes us to our first item on the actual agenda, which would be probably a quick brief from Jack McGovern on the Bycatch Reporting Amendment. Related to that is the Status Update on the Bycatch Reduction Rule.

DR. MCGOVERN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That rule, as you know, hasn't been released yet. It is expected to be released anytime, and the rule clarifies the procedures for documenting or reviewing SBRM, and so it has relevance, but I expect that it will be released before March, and I will be prepared to give a presentation on the final rule and how it compares to what was in the proposed rule, or somebody from Headquarters might do it, too.

MR. BELL: All right. Any questions for Jack about that? It's pretty straightforward. Hopefully we will have something in March to move forward on. Let's move on to our second item, but I don't see Bonnie. Bonnie was going to make a presentation on implementation progress, and so maybe we could skip to the next item. There she is. Come on, Bonnie.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Just to be clear, Attachment 1 was to be the proposed rule, since that didn't publish. You don't have an Attachment 1, and so you don't need to search for it. Maybe the next meeting we will have Attachment 1.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you very much. I love a splashy entrance. Today, what we're going to do is talk a little bit about where we are on the voluntary e-reporting implementation for commercial vessels, and all of these slides will look familiar to you, and so they're essentially the same bullets showing you where we've made progress and where we're ahead and where we're behind, and we remain very excited about being able to get this system stood up so that vessels, before any regulations are cut making this mandatory, that if a vessel decides that they would like to choose to submit their reports electronically, they've got the mechanism to do that.

It was also wonderful to hear this system reiterated by one of the most ardent proponents of that, and that is our past council member, Jack, saying that he is tapping his toe waiting for this, and we've heard that from others as well. On this slide, you will see a combination of blue and red, and the red are areas where we reported from the last meeting, and the report on this meeting is showing delays. Everything in blue, we're on time on. Everything in red, we are somewhat behind on.

What we have here first is the estimated time required to have electronic logbooks in production, and what we're looking at right now is about seven months. We're behind in some tasks, about a

month to two months, and what we're going to do is go through in more detail in the following slides, but we finalized the variables, and we need to make the infrastructure changes in collaboration with ACCSP. They've been great partners on this, but we are a little bit behind on that.

We also need to make some infrastructure changes at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center that kind of dovetail off of those and modifications to applications at both shops and then, ultimately, modify the third-party electronic logbook software, the actual entry system, to deliver the data to SAFIS.

Finalizing variables to be collected, all of these things have been completed. We can just go ahead and go to the next slide, and where we are on this is the infrastructure changes needed at ACCSP, and you can see that we're a little bit behind on getting these done. This has been occurring over these last few months, September to December, and I guess, rather than going into detail, since you've seen all of these before, I will wait until we get into some of the bigger delays and go into more detail on those.

We're talking about the infrastructure changes needed at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and we are about four months to complete this. We're looking at October to January. I think that's about a month off from the last time, and we've actually gotten some FIS funding secured to carry out these tasks, and, essentially, the tasks are to develop these user account systems and develop the software to extract the eTrips data from SAFIS and get it to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center and then develop the software to integrate the data with the paper logbooks, because, remember, if this is voluntary, people are going to be reporting in both ways, and we want those ways to talk with each other and don't want to be sending nasty-grams or late memos to people when, in fact, they actually chose to report by a different method.

The software changes needed by ACCSP, we needed to add some additional variables in the ACCSP system, and, again, we're looking at October to December, and so we're hopefully nearly done with those. We need to add Southeast variables to the tablet, to the actual app. That's November to January, and then we need to modify, to allow the vendors to submit data into the eTrips, and, again, that is scheduled now for January to February.

The software changes at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and we talked about this last time, the biggest one is to develop the portal to allow those no-fish reports to be submitted, and now we're looking at November to January. I think we're about a month behind on that. Again, we got the funding from FIS to be able to do that, and, again, those no-trip reports are equally as important as the trip reports, because it helps us differentiate between a vessel that did not fish versus a vessel that is simply late in submitting their report, and so it's pretty crucial. Then the other thing is to develop a portal to allow the fishers to review their submissions and identify data that they're not comfortable with and make those corrections.

In summary, this is where we are in getting this work done. We have been working, again, very closely with ACCSP. They're working on loading the Southeast permits and granting account access to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center staff. I think we're working very smoothly together. That is my report, and I guess I would just open it to any questions or comments.

MR. CAHALL: First of all, I want to extend my thanks to Bonnie and her folks, because we have been working very closely together, and, in fact, we had Dave Gloeckner up visiting us earlier this week, where we sat down and -- I was nodding my head, because we actually sat down and established the accounts that are required for your folks to access the data.

I also want to emphasize right now there is some reporting that is getting through to your folks already, because we do have some limited data coming in for -- I believe it's for South Carolina. The pathways exist, but I think that we're looking more at automating the existing pathways and making it smoother and making it work better.

The other thing is the single impediment right now we have for bringing in your permits is working up a deal with GARFO. There are some issues with the way that system is configured. When we originally built the system, there were only federal permits from the Northeast Region in it, and so it isn't designed to pull permits specifically for GARFO, and so it would suddenly pull your permits and their permits and start accounting for -- It was an interesting discussion that I had with them, and so the real impediment for getting your permits right now isn't you. It's we have to make a deal with GARFO.

We also have some issues to resolve with assignment of responsibility for multiple-permitted vessels, and so there's a couple of -- There's not technical impediments right now, but it's mostly political, but, yes, it's been a great experience, and we're really enjoying working with your folks.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Fishermen will be able to review their own data that they have put into the system? That's a yes. Then my question is, on identifying suspect data, is the data going to be locked at some point? I assume it would be, and so how would a fisherman -- Maybe you don't have this worked out, but how would a fisherman, if they saw some data that was suspect, what kind of thing do they have to go through to resolve their suspicions?

DR. PONWITH: That's a really good question, and I know it's a big issue, both on the federal side and on the state side, of when you lock those data, because you do have to ultimately do that, and I can check with our folks. My suspicion is that, once it's sent, it is locked. Then there is some sort of way to audit and make modifications, but I want to say that carefully, because I don't know that for sure. What I will do is touch base with my colleagues and get back to you.

MR. CAHALL: I can comment how it's working right now in the SAFIS side. The SAFIS system, regardless of your method of data entry, all of the users who provide information to it have online accounts. Many don't care, obviously, and so they're not aware, but, those that do, at any time up to ninety days, I believe, they can log in and make adjustments to their landings.

Now, the way that the system works in the background, and I don't want to glaze people over, but we maintain two copies of the data. There is an as-submitted copy, which is only adjusted by the folks submitting the data, and then there is a working copy. That is the copy that is used by folks that are doing auditing, and that's the copy that we ask folks to use to report from. For example, if you're doing quota compliance monitoring, we want them to use the audited copy, as opposed to the as-submitted. Any time a dealer, for example, or at this point also a harvester or permit holder, reports a change, it will update the as-submitted copy and stamps that it's been updated in the before and after image. Then it reloads the audited version to look again like the as-submitted copy.

If there was something suspicious in the as-submitted data, it would be trapped in the audit, and so we've already made some provisions for that in the existing system, and we haven't actually worked out the details yet with our folks of exactly how they want all of that to work, but it has worked pretty well, and you catch bad guys every once in a while that way.

DR. DUVAL: I am not on the committee, but just a question for Mike. You mentioned that, in terms of the permits, it's really more of an issue with GARFO, because we have -- I'm assuming it's because of multiple-permitted vessels and that's the sort of political issue, in terms of assigning responsibility. I pick up on that only because it's definitely an issue for North Carolina, because we're right smack in the middle of the overlap, and I know it has caused us issues before when we're trying to separate out black sea bass landings, et cetera, et cetera.

MR. CAHALL: I think I can explain it a little bit. The way that SAFIS works is that it assigns a partner identifier to the account that you're logged into. If, for example, you are a Northeast dealer, it, by default, says I'm a GARFO dealer. The way the system behaves is specified by what the permit is, and the record is stamped with the identifier, the partner identifier, that is associated with that permit.

Because of the way the system is designed, the record itself is only stamped with the identifier of the participant, the person or the individual. Going through the filter of the permits, it tells you what permits these people have. That means that if you have a multiple-permitted dealer, and let's just say that you have one that's permitted in Rhode Island and also GARFO, GARFO can go in and look through their permits and get the guy, and Rhode Island can go in and look through their permits and also get that information.

The trip reporting system works the same way, but the question is going to be how are we going to handle vessels that have potentially different and also potentially conflicting permits, because we have actually three federal entities that are permitting. We have both of the regions and we have Highly Migratory Species, and so the tricky bit is going to be working through how will SERO know whose records they should be looking at and how will GARFO know and how will HMS know, and I don't think it's -- It's not a tricky issue, per se, but we need to sit down and make sure that everybody clearly understands how it works. In the meantime, we have loaded a number of Southeast vessels, so that we can collect the current data, and Dave does the permit matching in the background. after he recovers the data.

MR. BELL: Any other questions for Bonnie related to the current logbook efforts? Okay. Seeing none, then we'll move along. Mike is already up here, and so he is going to basically run through his presentation, which is going to cover a number of their programs. As you will see, Mike is a tremendous resource.

MR. CAHALL: We created this presentation in response to a number of different requests, to kind of clarify what's going on, in terms of electronic reporting on the Atlantic coast, because there is so much activity. I had my staff folks go out and do some digging, and they've talked to a lot of your folks out in the field also, and so we have a much better picture, essentially, of what's going on.

Obviously we have the why's. Why is electronic reporting so popular? Why are we hearing so much effort in going in that direction? The reasons, I think, are generally pretty well understood. It reduces the human error, especially when you're trying to transcribe codes or whatever, and you have better legibility. The documents that we used to get on paper, or still do sometimes, that have had sort of a rough life trying to get to you, and they could be crumpled or they could have fish guts on them or whatever. Also, if you get real-time data, it reduces your recall bias, so that the reporting requirements that are less than a week, typically folks are pretty good at remembering what's going on, and, of course, it increases the timeliness of the submission and the response.

Essentially, the way that our systems are set up and the way that most of the electronic reporting systems that are in use are set up is the data are generally made available almost immediately. In our SAFIS system, some of our end users, which include both of the Science Centers and the Regions, have real-time access to the SAFIS database and are able to recover data instantly. If a dealer has reported or a trip report is recorded, it's immediately available in the database and they can get it.

Also, of course, the in-season datasets are a lot more complete, and we are able to answer questions a lot more effectively. Of course, the post-season data, which is part of the annual compilation that we do and provide data for fisheries of the U.S., we're able to provide that a lot more rapidly.

We're also being put under a certain amount of stress, in the sense that, in the Northeast, the Northeast stock assessment processes are trying to get started earlier in the year every year, and they are now asking for complete data for prior years as early as February and March. We can't make February yet. We are shooting now to get things out by mid-March or the first of April.

Who is doing the electronic reporting? It's commercial dealers and, right now, the vast majority of federal dealers are reporting electronically. Commercial fishermen is a much smaller set, along with the for-hire captains. Biological samplers, there are some existing electronic biological sampling systems. We are not currently connected to any of those, and also the at-sea observer systems. There are several of those. There's a new one that is being developed by the Northeast Center, and that's the one that we're looking at potentially integrating into SAFIS.

Dealer reporting, electronic reporting for dealers has been ongoing for quite some time. The earliest large-scale implementation was in the Northeast Region in May of 2004. It has steadily expanded. At this point, electronic reporting is 100 percent in place for federal dealers on the Atlantic Coast. They report in through any one of a number of different mechanisms, but all federal dealers on the Atlantic Coast are required to report electronically.

In the states, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Delaware are requiring electronic reporting for their dealers. There is still systems in Maine, Massachusetts, Maryland, and Virginia.

North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, obviously we are working with as many of those states that will talk to us to try to get that moved forward a little bit more, although some states, for example in Maryland, are working on some internal solutions that also will be electronic, and that furthers our mission, in terms of providing more flexibility for our system. As you can see from the chart, really almost the entire coast, the majority of landings now, and I'm going to

go out on a limb and say probably 70 to 80 percent of dealer-based landings, are reported electronically.

For trip reporting, it's much more of a patchwork. There were almost no electronic reporting systems at the beginning of the 21st century. Florida did have some electronic limited reporting. As you can see, it has expanded steadily over time. We do have only one mandatory electronic trip reporting system at this time that we support, and that's the eTrips mobile tool that is deployed in Rhode Island.

The eTrips tool is available in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey, and that's the online version. Many of our states are taking advantage of the database system and using the system as a data-entry tool, and so they may have a data-entry clerk and some voluntary folks out in the field reporting using the online version, but the online version doesn't meet the Northeast requirement to have the trip report completed prior to the vessel reaching the dock.

The e-1ticket system, which mirrors the single-ticket system that's in use commonly in the Southeast is deployed in South Carolina and Georgia, and there are other electronic reporting tools, as I alluded to before, in Maryland. Virginia has one for their watermen, and North Carolina has a bluefin-based tool, as does Florida.

Here is a summary of the federal vessel trip reporting. Right now, GARFO will accept electronic VTRs, but the vast majority of them are paper. They are submitted at least weekly by most of their captains and then scanned. Those scans are then read and keyed into a database system, and so there is a delay on most of the GARFO VTRs of generally at least two weeks, and sometimes a little bit longer.

There are a few authorized electronic applications, and they use an API or a flat file transfer system that was developed by GARFO, and one of those happens to be the SAFIS eTrips tool, which was certified towards the end of last year, along with the others that you see listed there. FLDRs is one of their own systems and FACTS and the Ecotrust Canada and the Dynamic Data Tool. The Northeast permits, you can see, are in the upper-right-hand corner. It's quite a long list of species.

The Southeast, right now, it's almost entirely paper. There are a small group of electronic VTRs that are being received through the e-1ticket system. Where we have a handful of Northeast and Southeast-permitted vessels that are reporting electronically, Dave Gloeckner and his folks are retrieving those data and manually, I believe, matching them to the permit records in the Southeast.

In terms of the state trip reporting, I think something that we have to make sure everyone is clear on is the states do not permit vessels. They permit individuals. This causes all kinds of problems when we go looking at the differences between what's going on in the states and what's going on with federal fisheries, and so the frequency of reporting is dependent on the state, the species, and the season, and so it's, of course, obviously going to vary monthly and it's going to vary by each of the states.

Generally, it's trip-level. Generally, it has at least a monthly requirement. There are some states that require reporting more frequently, most often for quota-monitored species. I think you could probably imagine what that looks like, and most of the electronic reporting is done through our

eTrips tool, the online version of our eTrips tool. Maryland has a tool that they call FACTS, which we are also receiving data from. There are paper trip tickets mostly in Virginia, with a very small electronic harvesting component, and Maine. Then, in the Southeast, again, the dealers report all of the data, and so they have that e-1ticket model, and some of them are electronic, but not all.

Then in the for-hire, it's even more mixed, because of course you have the mix of MRIP, where there continues to be the for-hire survey, which will not be going anyway anytime soon. We have HMS, which, of course, reports the swordfish and billfish and bluefin tuna, and their system is electronic. GARFO, which requires paper or electronic VTRs, and they are also surveyed through MRIP, and so have many of the GARFO-permitted captains in the unfortunate position of submitting electronic or paper VTRs and still being surveyed. Then, of course, MRIP, at the end of the year, will incorporate the VTR data into calculating their effort estimates. Then the Southeast has the headboat survey, and they have charter vessel data that they're getting through MRIP.

State for-hire reporting varies very widely. There is no mandatory reporting in many states. You can see the list there. There is some paper or electronic reporting in Connecticut, New York, Maryland, and Virginia for striped bass and in South Carolina. It's only paper reporting in New Jersey, and the only state that has mandatory electronic trip reporting in the for-hire fishery is Rhode Island. They were also the first state to mandate electronic dealer reporting. Little Rhode Island has led the charge, in a number of ways. We have learned a lot of lessons from those. For those who know Rick Bellavance, he is one of the big reasons that we have this going in Rhode Island right now.

This is just a little bit of a slide scale that shows you the kinds of efforts that are ongoing. Don't go over the details too much, but I think the main point here is to show that there are a lot of different efforts that are going on, new ones and old ones and ongoing ones. Right now, there are a number of pilots also running.

There is a pilot that is sponsored by the council here that is doing a for-hire pilot that includes data validation, and that's also causing some excitement in the MRIP program as well, because the validation component is likely to be an automated APAIS intercept. That is very exciting, because we may be able to leverage that technology and move it across to use it for the APAIS intercepts, which will greatly speed the processing of those data, and so we may be able to get a twofer for that one, to validate the trip reporting and automate the APAIS reporting, and so I'm crossing my fingers on that one.

(There is a gap in the audio recording.)
(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. BELL: We are going to reconvene or start here after the technical break that we just took. Everybody take a seat. We are going to resume where we left off with Mike, if you can remember where you left off.

MR. CAHALL: We support the new initiatives. Some are done by the program and many are done by partners. In fact, the Southeast Pilot Project is the result of an ACCSP program. We also do data collection. To borrow a phrase from Dr. Ponwith, we are the catcher's mitt for a lot of the data that's being submitted right now through the SAFIS dealer reporting, eDR, which is the online

component, and eDR/mobile, which is the tablet-based program that is currently deployed in a couple of states in the Northeast Region, and, finally, the file Upload, which is very important and used by the large-scale dealers.

There is near universal use in federal reporting now on the Atlantic coast, and I know that that has greatly facilitated trying to perform effective management in the commercial fisheries. It's also in use in many of the states, with the notable exception of a few states that don't have dealer reporting or have their own systems, like North Carolina. It serves as a collection point and home for the HMS eDealer system, which is a combination of a data collection system -- eDealer aggregates all HMS landings from Texas to Maine, and it allows for data entry of a small subset of dealers that are not covered by the SAFIS system.

We also manage the SAFIS trip reporting system, which is eTrips and eTrips Mobile. There is also an eTrips Upload component as well, which is in use by many of the states. As I said earlier, the mobile tool has been approved for use with GARFO VTRs, and we do have a subset of for-hire fishermen, mostly right now in Rhode Island, who are submitting trip reports that we are transmitting to GARFO.

For SAFIS dealer reporting, the eDR system, as I said, is a conventional online interface. It's very flexible. It's designed to be agency aware, so that if you're in Rhode Island that it will give you a certain set of species and landing conditions. If you're a federal dealer, it will provide you with the list that's required for federal reporting. It is aware of your location, and so it will provide you with ports that proximate to where you are or vessels that are registered in the state that you're in.

The eDR Mobile tool, which is a tablet-based interface that also is swipe card compatible, which means that, for jurisdictions that choose to issue harvester cards, which definitely identify the harvesters, the system could read that card and provide the harvester and vessel and permit information to the application via the swipe card. It's also used in Maine, in a much more tightly controlled, almost a pilot program, where, for the first time ever, SAFIS is managing compliance in real time.

For example, if you are trying to buy elvers and the dealer has already purchased their quota or you have harvested your quota, it will shut you off. It won't allow you to complete that transaction. If the dealer is out of compliance with reporting, it won't allow the transaction to be completed until the dealer brings themselves into compliance. SAFIS has never been programmed to function that way before, but it was quite a challenge getting that thing to work, but it seems to be working at this point, and also it triggered a lot of food for thought in our redesign, which I will discuss in a few more minutes.

The SAFIS eDR Upload uses the upload capabilities from other systems, and this is primarily very large dealers, dealers who have internal systems that they use to manage their purchasing and their transactions. There is the capability to output data into a standardized format. This system was actually written primarily by Holly McBride in the Northeast Science Center.

Then the dealer reporting methods, here is a track of last year's traffic. We uploaded slightly over 500,000 dealer reports. 135,000 were manually entered online and 233,000, roughly, came in across the Bluefin Tool, which is in use by a lot of the federal dealers, and also by North Carolina and some of the other states. Finally, the file Upload, which is used by very large dealers. The

largest of these dealers is in New York City, but, as you can see, the majority of the data that comes into SAFIS comes in through third-party applications rather than our online tools.

For trip reporting, we have SAFIS Online, which is the eTrips tool. It's been in production for over a decade, but it's used primarily for the states, and it's used mostly as a data-entry tool, and so they were using SAFIS dealer reporting and trip reporting as their de facto databases for those. In many agencies, especially in places like Massachusetts, they've developed quite a suite of stuff that is based on those tools. It's very flexible, again, and agency aware. It knows what vessel you are associated with. If you have logged in as a harvester, it maintains your history, and it knows your more recent catches. It can automatically populate a lot of the things, based on your previous history and your favorites.

It's in voluntary use by a lot of harvesters. The folks who are savvy and would prefer to do online data entry can. Again, there is no mandatory requirement for this e-reporting in any place but Rhode Island. Then SAFIS Upload, which is eTrips Upload, and eTrips can accept a standardized format, and a lot of folks have written small applications that allow them to output data into that format and then upload it into the system, through a file upload interface.

The SAFIS eTrips Mobile, I have devoted the most space here, because it has generated the most buzz. It allows users to complete and submit trip reports on a mobile device, and it works on any tablet. We designed the system so that it will work on iOS, which is Apple, Android, and Windows tablets. Because they work on Windows tablets, on Windows 10, that also means they will run on any Windows 10 platform, and so it will run as an app on a Windows 10 desktop or on a Windows 10 laptop as well.

It satisfies the federal VTR reporting requirements in the Greater Atlantic Region, which was authorized towards the end of last years. Users may still need to report, unfortunately, to some of their states. Some states have not yet been able to access the system and pull the data back. We are actively working with those that do not, so that we can eliminate that duplicative reporting as quickly as we can.

It's capable of performing commercial or for-hire recording, in the way that ACCSP standards are set up, and some of you participated in that. The for-hire and commercial standards are very similar. The data structures that we use to collect them are the same, and so literally the same table collects a commercial trip that collects a for-hire trip, but it just has a different flag that identifies whether it's a commercial or a for-hire trip. The data requirements are slightly different, and the data describers tend to be a little bit more generic in the for-hire fisheries, where we may have more markets and grades and dispositions available to a commercial trip than we would for a for-hire trip.

It will input landing data into SAFIS in real time. Basically, you push the button, it uploads, and it's in the system. Then it's immediately available actually to you, because you can log in to the online system, if you wish, and recover the data, or the folks that are responsible for management have access to the data immediately.

We don't have anywhere near as much trip volume as we do dealer report volume. The online tool, so far this year, we have recovered a total of a little over 100,000 rows. I expect this to explode. Don't worry. We have plenty of disk storage. About 50,000 online reports. These are,

again, mostly from the Northeast states. The eTrips Upload system, again, is mostly from the Northeast states, about 62,000, and then the Mobile tool, which is coming in from Rhode Island, is roughly 1,200 so far this year.

MR. HAYMANS: There is plenty of disk space, but, if this were to be coast-wide, Southeast-wide, and everybody is entering data within a couple of hour timeframe, do you have plenty of bandwidth coming in?

MR. CAHALL: We're upgrading to 20BASE-T in about two weeks. We are ready. I am expecting it. We also do data warehousing. All of the dealer and trip reporting feeds, we have them established from all of our program partners, and the SAFIS data are made available through our data warehouse query system in near real time. We will do an overnight process and post those data into a specific area in our data warehouse. Those are mostly used by our state partners to do quota and compliance monitoring.

We do have also some limited biological data, and we're expanding that as we sit here. In fact, I heard a deal being made yesterday to get TIP data, which made me very encouraged. Data distribution, we do a lot of direct systems, and so the GARFO and the Northeast Science Center and the Southeast Science Center have direct pipes into the system, and they run routine overnight batch pulls. For example, the Science Center recreates their aggregate dataset overnight using our data, and so they will do an overnight pull, run some batch jobs, and that's the data distribution that they do.

We have a bunch of those, some of them for states and some of them for the federal agencies. We have a lot of people that are dependent on our data, and the partners do use our query interface for quota and compliance monitoring, as I said, and there is a near real-time feed from SAFIS to that. Some partners do want to have direct access, and we do have some limited query capabilities against the live SAFIS system. We try to limit that, because it can negatively impact on the SAFIS system's ability to respond, and so we try to get folks to use the datasets that we aggregate for them overnight. We just built a new query interface, which was deployed about two weeks ago, and we will -- It includes prior year data, all the way back to the 1950s for some specific species.

Where are we going? Much tighter integration with the Regions and Science Centers. We're in the process, right now, of working directly with GARFO and the Northeast Science Center. We are literally integrating what we do. We will likely be managing most of the data collection on their behalf, within the next couple two or three years, and we will likely be migrating their vessel trip reporting system to the rebuilt eVTR system that we are likely to do as part of the SAFIS effort.

We're also working with the Southeast folks to have a similar arrangement. It's a little bit -- We have a less formal working relationship with the Southeast than we do with the Northeast, in the sense that we have bi-weekly meetings with all of the GARFO people, and it feels very formal and all of that, and I actually would just as soon talk to Steve.

Electronic trip reporting, obviously, will expand. We have the ongoing pilots that we're aware of, and we know that there's mandatory reporting in some select fisheries next year. The Mid-Atlantic, I think, has just passed their framework, and we know that you guys are working on one, and we're looking at it.

The SAFIS system is going to be rebuilt into an integrated reporting system. That's a bit of a challenge, because, while everybody talks about integrated reporting, nobody quite understands what it means, and so we're going to be putting together a workgroup to try and come up with a clean definition, so that we can integrate that into the new system. We will also be adding additional biological and at-sea bycatch monitoring modules into the SAFIS system.

These are intended to create that integrated dataset, so that all of the different components are automatically matched to one another, so that you have a trip that has an observer trip that's automatically associated with it that automatically associates to a dealer report and then potentially automatically associates with any samples that were taken as a consequence of that report. The system will be designed to do that, and it looks like we're going to get FIS money to do it. We just had that discussion earlier this week.

Of course, we are planning for mandatory trip reporting, and these are all questions that I think you probably have heard in one way or another from someone. We need to work out the roles and responsibilities, and so where do the regional councils and state agencies -- Where do you guys all fit into what's going on? Who is going to do training and support?

We're going to be conducting some outreach and training. ACCSP requested and had approved, through its coordinating council process, about $100,000 to set up a help desk that will be a universal SAFIS help desk. It will be designed to receive any call about electronic reporting and direct it to the appropriate state or federal person and also to provide support for the tablet-based tools, and so we're going to do some focused efforts. We will do workshops and we will have webinars, and we're working on videos to train folks on how to use the tools. Then, of course, provide ongoing technical support for the help desk and also to make sure that the software is working correctly.

In the Northeast, we've started to talk to the port agents. They're going to be, once again, sort of the front line of support. Although right now we don't know that the New England Council is going to be mandating electronic trip reporting, I can't imagine that it's not on somebody's mind somewhere and that, sooner or later, that's likely to happen as well, and so we really want to make sure that we're positioned to be able to support that.

We will provide eTrips and Mobile outreach and technical support to our users. We are already planning, in conjunction with the Mid-Atlantic Council, a series of in-person training workshops and webinars. There will be a twenty-four-hour help desk as soon as I have my funding. We have a contract already with Harbor Lights to do that, and we will be providing resources on our website, which includes frequently asked questions, a decision tree about, hey, this doesn't work and who do I call or where do I go, and also a number of different video tutorials. Any questions?

MR. BELL: Are there any questions for Mike? That's a lot to cover, but he touched on a whole bunch of different things, and you can see the applicability to being able to move along here with our for-hire amendment. Any specific questions right now?

MR. HARTIG: Right now, I've got about an eight-foot-high pile of logbooks that I have at home. I don't want to give you all of that information, but what I do want to know is that, in the future, can I access -- Over time, will I be able to access all of that data that I put into the system?

MR. CAHALL: You're talking about historic data, right, data that's already been submitted?

MR. HARTIG: Yes. I'm talking about electronic logbooks that I sent to you.

MR. CAHALL: You would be able to access them. The exact working relationship between us and the Southeast is TBD, but the database, the SAFIS database, is available. In order for you to submit data to us and for us to give data to them, you have to -- The system creates an account for you, and so we have it in the repository. You're able to recover that.

You're able to retrieve that data, but the tricky bit with this particular issue is do you get your own data or do you get the data that's been audited and corrected, if needed? Those are some questions that we have to work through, but the short answer is that it's intended to be a universal tool. You have an account, and you can log into the online anytime you want to and pull back the data that you've submitted, if you wish.

MR. BELL: Any other questions for Mike right now?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just something I was thinking about. When the council, in the past, has done limited-access programs, for example, and they have said, for the commercial sector anyway, they've said you can enter into this limited access program if you have X amount of catch during these years. The way you demonstrate that catch is by the logbook reports that you filed with the National Marine Fisheries Service, and I forget the language that was used, but there are opportunities to use your state logbook program, if there is one, but primarily the NMFS-reported catch is what you have to live with or die by, so to speak.

My question is really, and you don't have to answer it, but I guess it's food for thought. If these programs come up again in a future limited access and a fisherman wants to show that he had that certain amount of catch that will allow him or her to get that permit, I was just thinking of which set of data will be used, and I think it may not be any different than what's done now with the logbook reports, except that there probably were paper ones that could be reproduced or something like that, and so it's just kind of thinking into the future on how we're going to verify the data and all that sort of thing. Not necessarily verify it, but use it, at least for limited-access kinds of programs.

MR. CAHALL: I can comment to that, and the solution we recommend is that whatever adjustments are made to data, whatever corrections are made, are fed back, so that it's a closed loop. That way, all of the datasets are the same. That's how it's working right now with GARFO. The dealer-reporting database is the raw data that's used by GARFO.

They manage that on their own behalf. We are serving it out to them, but so that any corrections they made are made to that dataset, and then it cascades out to everybody else. That is the recommended course, so that we don't get out of sync, and we haven't even started to talk to Dave yet of exactly his ETL is going to work and all of that, but part of those discussions will be that we really would want any changes fed back into the system, so that they stay in sync.

MR. BELL: Mike is not going anywhere. I would suggest that -- We've got two more presentations, and then we need to have some discussion of the for-hire amendment, and so if we

could go ahead and move to the next presentation, which would be Mike. This is going to be an application project, a specific project presentation, from Mike Errigo on electronic charter vessel reporting, on a specific project that we've got ongoing.

DR. ERRIGO: Hi, everyone. I just want to give you a brief update on what's going on. There are a bunch of screenshots in this presentation, and I'm going to run through them a bit quickly, so that we don't take up too much time. It is the afternoon, and we had a pretty big lunch.

Just as a reminder, there were four components to our pilot project. There is the actual electronic logbook, which is eTrips Mobile, and there is the tool for dockside validation, and so that's a tablet-based program. There is the electronic measuring boards, which will both be paired with the dockside validation software and the eTrips Mobile software, and then the phone application for law enforcement to check reporting compliance of if somebody is intercepted on the dock.

Progress that's been made on eTrips Mobile is quite a lot, actually. Pretty much all of the software development is completed. There are three new economic fields that have been added, and I will show you a picture of those. A new mapping feature has been added, similar to the one in the headboat logbook. It's Google Maps-based.

A lot of the data has been geared specifically for for-hire, and so, depending on the type of trip that you choose when you log into the app, it will give you a certain set of gears and dispositions and even target species and things like that for for-hire trips. The species, areas fished, and vessels have all been added for the South Atlantic. In this particular study, the participants who were in the study, their vessels have been added to the program.

So far, thirty-six trip reports have been submitted using the mobile app. Nine of them are from state representatives who were learning and also teaching their fishermen how to use the software. Seventeen were submitted by captains themselves, and some of those are fake trip reports of them trying to learn how to use it, and some of them, from what we've heard, are real trip reports. Then there were ten incomplete reports, and that was due to a software conflict that was resolved early on.

We have twenty-four total participants currently enlisted. Some are volunteers who are providing their own tablets and equipment. Fran Karp has been visiting captains and providing the one-on-one training, setting them up with their tablets and getting them set up with their accounts at SAFIS, and the final visits are happening in Florida this week and next. Also, it should be noted that the council has provided three extra tablets to extend coverage of this pilot down into the Florida Keys. This is just a list of the participants and the states that they're from. You guys can, if you're interested, look through that, but I'm not going to go through that.

MR. HARTIG: Mike, can I ask a question? When you talk about tablets, are you talking about tablets specifically to enter these, that are designed to just do this, or are you talking about tablets that you personally own that could be modified to do this?

DR. ERRIGO: You can use any tablet. The tablets that the council provided were iPads. We got OtterBoxes for them, to encase the tablet, to protect it from water and dropping and things like that. There are small subset of ruggedized tablets, which are waterproof, shockproof tablets, the tablet itself, and so we're testing to see if a regular like iPad in an OtterBox would be just as good

as a ruggedized tablet, because the ruggedized tablets are significantly more expensive, but that's part of the pilot testing procedure.

This is a screenshot of the favorites window, which is what you get when you first log in. Before you can start a new trip to log, captains need to set up their favorites, and what is selected now is species. What you do is you go to the species tab, and you would scroll down through and you would say, okay, I want to have -- Let's say I want to have all the federally-managed species in my favorites, and so black sea bass and gag and red grouper. You would select all of those, and then they would be in a quick drop-down menu when you go to log your trip, but you have access to all the species in the list, in case you encounter something odd or that you usually don't encounter.

It's the same with gears, except, when you go to gears, there is actually two different lists. There is a commercial list, which has like gillnets and trawls and traps and all kinds of stuff, and then there is the for-hire list of gears, which is much more pared down. It's hook-and-line and troll and things like that.

Waters fished is still there. That's just like areas in the ocean, these blocks. We are discussing now whether that's necessary, given the fact that we have maps that you can click on where you are. There are ports, where you leave and come back to, and disposition, and I will show you what the dispositions are. Then you choose your license and your vessel. If you are going to sell anything, you can also choose dealer, if you're dually-permitted, but that's more for commercial.

We now have target species in there. That was added, and these are groups. It's not like I'm going out targeting red grouper today, but you would choose groupers. I am going grouper fishing or I'm going snapper fishing or I'm going drum fishing or dolphin fishing. Here is an example of gears, and here are dispositions, and I will show you what the list is. These are actually commercial dispositions, and so that means you sold your catch to be canned as pet food.

Here is the gears that we have in there right now, and these are the dispositions. One thing I wanted to note is there is a whole bunch of dispositions having to do with discards, and so you can say that I discarded ten black sea bass, and that was because they were too small. They were discarded due to regulations, too small, or I discarded a cobia because the quota was filled, which means we hit the bag limit for the trip. You could say you discarded five red snapper because there is no retention of red snapper. You can put down why you discarded them. That's what the dispositions are for.

I have this up here to remind me to say that, for this program, we are only using the Southeast federal licenses. A lot of the guys and girls in the program right now, the participants, have state licenses that are in there, but we're asking them to please only choose the federal license, because you can actually set up different gears and dispositions and the whole nine-yards for federal licenses and state licenses and things like that, and so you can tailor it to which license you choose.

Here are the economic fields which were added. It's fuel used in gallons, fuel price, how much per gallon, and how much you charged for the trip. This is what the effort page looks like when you're first setting it up. You choose whether it's state or federal waters, and then you choose waters fished. For example, this is North Carolina. It's Area 700-41, which is Topsail Sound. We're discussing whether we need to still have this or not.

You choose your gear, how many gears you have, time that it started, and then you click on "location", which is latitude and longitude, and this comes up. It's a Google Map. You can scroll around, and you can zoom in and out. We're working on putting in a grid system and maybe some contour lines to help you identify where you are, and so a lot of work has been done on the electronic logbook.

The law enforcement tool, we have not begun work on that yet. That will start after we get the logbook pilot really going and after we have made more progress on the validation app. Now, for the dockside intercept and validation app, we have made quite a bit of progress on that very recently, in fact, and it's moving along very rapidly. We are working in collaboration with MRIP. Tom Sminkey, in particular, has been very, very helpful.

Apparently MRIP has tried to turn the APAIS intercept into a tablet, into an electronic form, in the past, and it didn't really work out so well for them, which was great, because we got to learn a lot from what happened the first time around. Fran and her team are very excited about getting started.

We had a lot of discussions about should we design it to be for validating specifically logbooks written out by captains or should it be trip-based and we should design it that way, or should we design it as an electronic version of the APAIS survey, which is angler-based? We decided, after talking with Tom, that MRIP has been contemplating going to a trip-based survey rather than an angler-based survey, which is how we do most of our analyses anyway, but, with all the changes coming right now, especially with the effort survey, they're not going to do that for quite some time, and so we said, then let's -- This app will be adaptable, and so they said, let's develop it as an angler survey and then make it flexible, so that we can transition it to a trip-based survey, if we need to do that.

There is currently a skeleton version of the app in place, and so this is -- If you bring up the assignments page, this is the details. It tells you about your assignment and the date and this and that. Then you go in and the interviewer would fill it out before they started their first assignment. What kind of site group is it, what state and county, where are you, what's the site number, and all of this and that. You fill out the details about the site, and you can even put why you left. You reached the end of your time to be there or the site closed, or you can even say things about pressure was too low or whatever it is.

We talked also a lot, for this one, about how to set it up. There's a lot of space on the page, and there is one question per page. We decided that was probably the best way to go. It's simple, it's easy, the buttons are big, and you hit the thing, you hit the next arrow, and it goes to the next one. It also makes navigation easier, and I will show you about that.

Up here, there is groups and anglers. Group is basically a trip. At each assignment, you can have multiple groups, and so let's say there is five. That means, if it's charters, you have five charter trips that you interviewed, and then each group has however many anglers. The first one had four, the second one had six, and the third one had three. You can switch back and forth between anglers very quickly. You just hit the "angler" button up here, and then you can choose which angler. It will take you to that angler and wherever you left off in your interview.

Also, there is a navigation bar here on the left, this green bar. People have said that not only do they jump from angler to angler when they're interviewing, but they often will jump around in the interview, from a question at the top to a question at the bottom to another question at the top, depending on what the person says while they're talking. This bar, you just run your finger along the bar, and it will give you an indication of which question it is you need to go to. That's why, if there's one question on a page, it's easy to find where you need to go. It also works in portrait format as well as landscape, and so you can hold it either way and it should work.

We're also working on ways to allow the interviewer to put in notes, either recording their voice or having some kind of stylus and being able to write and capture handwriting, because they said that's essential. They said that's why the last tablet app failed, because they couldn't find a good way to capture their handwritten notes, and so we are looking for a way to do that.

Down here, at the bottom, you see the little window. If you hit that, it brings up a menu. Under there, there's like a microphone and a little pen, and you can choose whether you want to write or type or record your voice. None of this has been implemented yet. These are just ideas, and so we've made quite a lot of progress so far.

MR. BELL: Thank you. Keep in mind, as we move into discussion of the for-hire amendment, we're setting up a program that is based on weekly reporting, going online, but we've always said, as technology develops and programs are available -- Some of our folks that we've talked to have an interest in using this type of technology, and so the system would be capable of eventually accepting data from a tablet or any other technologies that are developed or program, and so that's why this type of thing is -- It's good to see this is going on and that we're making progress. The last little piece there was really more related to just the survey or the MRIP, but the first part is more related to that, but any questions for Mike about this right now?

DR. ERRIGO: Just to that one part that you were talking about, about how people were talking about using like an online portal, like the headboat does, this is the eTrips Mobile app, which Mike Cahall was talking about, which sends data into the SAFIS system. There is an online portal version of eTrips which you can log into. Each one of these participants has a login, and you can enter it online. All of the data can go to one place, and you can log in online or you can use a tablet version. All the same information is collected.

DR. DUVAL: Because this is SAFIS eTrips Mobile, I think I recall Mike saying that it will work on a Windows 10 tablet. Since I am getting a new Windows 10 tablet for work, I was wondering if I could get this application put on my tablet. As we roll this out and move forward and outreach is going to be a huge part of this, and as a state agency representative on the council, I would like to be conversant in this, so that, when stakeholders come to me and they have questions, I can answer those appropriately.

I know we have -- We're going to be talking about this as we get into the amendment, but I would love to be able to do that, and we have a few special statutory challenges in North Carolina that I've talked about before with regard to state logbooks, but, as the state's representative on the council, I can certainly be involved in any federal effort.

DR. ERRIGO: Just to the Windows 10 thing, the final products, I think, will definitely be on the Windows 10. I am not sure if the test application is ready for Windows 10 yet, but I will find out,

because I would also like to run it on my Windows 10 tablet, if that's possible. I would like to see if there's any differences, but I will find out make sure. The idea is, in the end, it will be available on all platforms.

MR. BELL: That was the idea with this, is to make sure that we can receive data eventually from a variety of areas that people are comfortable with.

DR. MCGOVERN: Do you need a Wi-Fi connection to transmit the data?

DR. ERRIGO: To transmit, you need to connect to the internet somehow, whether it's Wi-Fi or if you have a phone-enabled tablet, but you don't need -- It doesn't need to be connected to the internet or any kind of service to log your trip or be out on the water. If you have the auto-log feature on, it needs a GPS signal, which you should be able to get pretty much anywhere.

MR. BELL: Any other questions right now for Mike? We've got one more presentation and then some discussion. All right. This Mike is not going anywhere either. There's a lot of Mike's around here. Ken Brennan is going to give us a presentation on the existing headboat program. Remember that, as we started into developing this amendment, we kept referring to just like the headboat program, just like the headboat program, and so the amendment that we'll be discussing today is basically an expansion of our current effort, effectively. Right now, he is getting data from headboats, and we're going to add charterboats, and the idea is that we have one program in place to get data from all the for-hire sector. We've talked about Ken and the program a lot, but we've never actually, I don't think, heard from him, or at least not recently. Ken, take it away when you're ready.

MR. BRENNAN: Thanks, Mel. I would like to thank you for inviting me here today. I am Ken Brennan, and I coordinate the Southeast Region Headboat Survey. It's based here in Beaufort, North Carolina, and it's administered by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. I was asked to basically give an update of our electronic reporting system and also the outreach efforts that we use to support that program.

The headboat survey began in January of 2013. Since then, it has collected over 96,000 trip reports electronically from the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico through our eLog system. Generally speaking, the feedback has been positive. We've gotten good responses. There were a few hiccups in the beginning, but we're running smoothly now, and this little table shows you the total trips submitted by year since 2013. As you can see, the totals are fairly consistent. It's a partial year in 2016. That gives you an idea of how many trip reports we're collecting annually.

This is a look at the number of trip reports by month for the South Atlantic that have been submitted electronically for 2015 and part of 2016. Again, you can see it's consistent. It shows the seasonality of the fishery, and it's a good check every now and then to see if this is matching up fairly closely, and so this is on a monthly basis.

After nearly four years of electronic reporting, what are the benefits we realized? Because of the regulatory change to weekly reporting and electronic reporting, we have reduced recall bias. There has been a cost savings, due to the reduced handling associated with paper. It has also increased the efficiency of data processing significantly, and it has improved our QA/QC procedures. The

reporting platform has default parameters and range limits set on the back-end, and this limits errors, data entry errors or erroneous errors, by the person entering the data.

It has also improved compliance. Because we have better monitoring capabilities now, we're able to determine if a trip report is late and act on those much quicker compared to paper. As you have heard, whenever ER is discussed, timeliness is one of the main goals that is highlighted, and, as far as the headboat survey, we are now able to produce wave estimates and not just annual estimates.

Also, our annual estimates are available much sooner, currently between two and three months after the fishing year ends. Then, finally, our electronic reporting system has enabled us to more effectively monitor quotas, ACLs, and it has even allowed us to support testing IFQ projects, where daily monitoring was required. That's basically a brief overview of the electronic reporting program for the headboat survey. Before I go into this next part of the presentation, outreach, are there any questions?

MR. BROWN: Ken, how much faster has it sped up at the end of the year? Rather than having paper to electronic, how much quicker were you able to produce the information on an annual basis?

MR. BRENNAN: We ranged anywhere from April to June in the early 2000s, and we started to chip away at that and chip away, and we made it to March, after the fishing year, and now we're into February, and so, realistically, if we stick with the wave estimates, it would be forty-five days after the end of the wave, but we're able to turn that data around a lot quicker with electronic reporting.

MR. BROWN: Are you making any adjustments to the map on the --

MR. BRENNAN: Actually, in the outreach portion, I'm going to mention that, which I appreciate.

MR. BELL: Any questions about the basic program at this point?

MR. HARTIG: Do you remember how many vessels, approximately, this was based on, Ken?

MR. BRENNAN: We currently have seventy-five in the survey right now in the South Atlantic, and it has averaged between seventy and seventy-five over the past several years.

MR. BELL: Okay. Let's go ahead.

MR. BRENNAN: Okay. I was also asked to discuss outreach, and so I would like to talk a little bit about our efforts. When I think of outreach, I consider it in two categories, pre-implementation and post-implementation. As far as pre-implementation, we were fortunate to have an established logbook program in place, so we weren't starting from scratch when we implemented electronic reporting.

The captains were already familiar with reporting, but we did want to take the opportunity to emphasize, again, the importance of the data that they provide. At this stage, you're basically, with a program, trying to encourage participation and buy-in. That's how we look at pre-

implementation. Another goal was to increase the compliance and the efficiency within the survey, using electronic reporting.

Then, post-implementation, when I refer to this, I mean after ER is implemented. Outreach and communication is still very important. Without this, captains may become complacent when it comes to reporting, and this would definitely impact your compliance. This requires constant monitoring and communication, and I really can't emphasize this enough. This is constant effort.

These are some outreach steps we took during pre-implementation. From 2009 to 2010, we conducted our first pilot project to test electronic reporting. This is when we initially started to get the word out about ER. In Phase II, we actually implemented the electronic reporting system, which included sending out two outreach letters to notify the captains of the change to electronic reporting.

Then the software developer, Bluefin Data, contacted each owner and captain to set up login and vessel accounts, two months prior to going live. They also provided one-on-one instruction and support, along with training videos. We also had help, through Fishery Bulletins and council communications. These were a big help to get the word out.

This is a screenshot of our login page for the headboat eLog. As you can see, there is help right up front for the captains on how to get registered or, if they need support, we basically offer 24/7 support on the system. Bluefin has been good about following up with captains, if they have problems, and so we have really been pleased with the level of the support we've been able to provide.

This is another screenshot. The training videos are available on the webpage, over there on the dashboard. The video is getting started and then some other instructional videos, and there were some initial problems with getting captains set up and started, but most of these were associated with the mobile app. Just the nuances with installing the mobile app created a couple of problems, but everything is running smoothly, as of now, and we're pleased, to this point.

The outreach efforts, I would like to go over some of these post-implementation outreach efforts a little. As I mentioned, these are equally important, we think, post-implementation, as a stage, when the system is up and running and we're now monitoring and trying to maintain cooperation and compliance. These are our current compliance measures that involve good communication with the captain.

A week past due, our port agents are contacting the vessels and attempting to reconcile those late trip reports. Two weeks past due, the vessel is sent an automated email reminder. Then, when we get out to three weeks past due, the delinquent vessels are sent warning letters and the Permit Office is notified to place that vessel's permit on hold. During this whole process, the port agent continues efforts to reconcile those late trip reports, and so they're very important in this process. Then, finally, OLE is notified if we're just not making any headway and we're having ongoing problems with the vessel.

This slide shows why this communication is so important. If there is any lapse in reporting, there would be a cumulative effect on compliance over time. That's why we put so much effort into reconciling those late trip reports as soon as possible, and we estimate this monitoring and outreach

requires about 25 to 30 percent of Headboat Survey staff time, and so it's a huge investment, but it's a necessary task, in order to track down each of those trip reports.

I would like to finish up this presentation with what future outreach efforts we're making. Improved communication whenever possible, we always try to communicate with our captains or staff, whoever is handling those trip reports, and we're working to include late trip report alerts that are sent out to vessel eLog accounts. We're also working on a direct messaging system through the eLog between captains and owners and the Headboat Survey staff.

We also will be providing an annual report to captains and owners participating in the survey, so they can see where their data is going and what it's showing, and we're very excited about this. It's an opportunity to give something back to the captains and something they can have in their hands and see where their efforts are going.

Finally, it's important to continue to address captains and owners input and requests for eLog updates and improvements. An example of this is something Mark brought up. The Google Maps are going to be updated on the eLog, and we thank captains like Mark for his input and feedback. We're always open to improving the system, and we consider outreach as a two-way street, and we welcome input from the captains, always. That's all I have as far as this presentation.

MR. BELL: Okay. Any questions for Ken? I know the last part, the outreach, is going to be crucial to us getting anything new onboard.

DR. PONWITH: Less a question than an observation. 25 to 30 percent of Ken's staff time is spent chasing down late logbooks or reports, rather, and those reports are really crucial now for being able to generate those landings. In ballpark terms, the headboat fleet is an order of magnitude smaller than the charter fleet, and so, as we think about going electronic for the for-hire, that's an interesting statistic to keep in our minds, and it would be, I think, valuable to spend some time thinking about is there some way, in the design, we could find a way to have those reports tumbling in, as opposed to having to be pulled in, because every second of time not spent chasing a late report can be spent innovating and making things better and generating value-added materials. It's a difficult challenge, but I think, collectively, if we can have that in the back of our minds at this stage of the charter/for-hire, it's helpful to get it right at the onset.

MR. BOWEN: Thanks, Bonnie, for that little insight. Ken, I know this is probably anecdotal on your part, but do you think limited entry would help with the late reporting?

MR. BRENNAN: I can only speak of our experience in the Gulf of Mexico. Our reporting compliance is generally better in the Gulf of Mexico.

MR. BOWEN: You think that's because of the limited entry program?

MR. BRENNAN: I think that's one factor.

MR. BOWEN: Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Ken. You said, if the reports are three weeks past due, vessels are sent a warning letter and the vessel permit renewal is placed on hold with the Permits Office, but, I mean,

since it's an open-access permit, how is that -- I guess you could place that particular permit on hold, but the permit is issued to the vessel, and so, if an owner's spouse or business partner or something wants to just take out a new permit for that vessel, they could do it, right? I just wanted to make sure that I was understanding that correctly. You can place a permit on hold, but --

MR. BRENNAN: It's only urgent until that permit is up for renewal, as far as the captain. That's when it becomes obvious to the captain that he needs to reconcile those reports, but we have learned that, if you address this early and often with the captain, you don't necessarily have to get to that point. You can get those reconciled sooner, but it does require a lot of effort.

MR. HAYMANS: Have there been any monetary fines levied against any of the late reports?

MR. BRENNAN: I guess in the most egregious cases there would be, but Monica could probably address that.

MR. HAYMANS: But, to your knowledge, there hasn't been any to this point?

MR. BRENNAN: We haven't been involved in any. I know South Carolina has monetary fines for non-reporting, but, as far as the Headboat Survey, we haven't been involved in any cases where they were issued.

MR. BELL: Speaking of that, we're maintaining a system of a little over 500 licensed for-hire vessels, and it's time intensive, but it's like Ken said. You kind of work with them and work with them, and it gets better over time. I think people begin to understand it over time, and hopefully you never have to use the stick, if you have a fine of some type or penalty, but what we've noticed over time, and we've been doing it -- Ours is not electronic.

It's paper-based, but we've been doing it for over twenty years, and it's something that just generally takes a little time to grow into and for people to get used to, but I think we're in a slightly more advantageous point, in that I think the fishermen -- We have heard from them, and we heard from yesterday, and those that really want this, they realize that they're not satisfied, perhaps, with the quality of data that we're using and they would like something better. Here is an opportunity for them to participate in an actual data collection that they can have, perhaps, a little more confidence in, because they've got ownership, but it will take time to get it up and running and all the bugs worked through.

MR. BREWER: You mentioned something about it only becomes critical right before it's time to renew their licenses or permits?

MR. BRENNAN: That's the point when the leverage is at its greatest.

MR. BREWER: Right, but do have situations where you're getting the required information, like in a one-year block, right before it's time to renew?

MR. BRENNAN: Not in recent years, no. We have in the past, and we don't use data that is submitted two months after the fact. We don't use that data.

MR. WAUGH: Thanks, Ken, for that presentation. Can the captains submit their data on the way back? Can they do it with a tablet?

MR. BRENNAN: Yes, they can enter it. The platform is there. Then, when they get cellphone service, it will transmit, and so it will store it. You can actually the enter the trip, and it will be pending until you get it within the cellphone range.

MR. BROWN: I was going to bring that up, because, a lot of times, on the way in, rather than having to wait until after the trip is over, I can go ahead and enter it, and you can do actually multiple trips and enter them at one time, because it saves all the information, but, also, I wanted to thank you too for getting the port agents up to speed on checking behind, to make sure that everything is in order, because I think that was a good move too, to get them incorporated into making sure that everybody is online with what they're doing.

MR. BRENNAN: They're a critical part of this. We have weekly headboat activity reports, where they're entering their observations and any information on vessel activity. We enter that into our Oracle system, and then we merge that with our reported trips. If there is mismatches, then we're looking into those trips as being late, or we're checking into them to see if they were actually made.

MR. BOWEN: This is actually the program that I was talking about earlier in the week, when I spoke of it. I am not going to call his name, even though he probably wouldn't mind, and, if he can figure this out, the headboat at my dock -- If the owner/operator of this vessel can figure this out and express to me how easy it is for him to work with it, then anybody ought to be able to do it. He likes it, and he has nothing but good things to say about it.

MR. BRENNAN: Well, thank you.

MR. BELL: We've got Ken here as a resource for questions, and what I would like to do is try to go ahead and move into the next item, which is discussion of the actual amendment that we're going to consider.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We've got a little bit more presentation here.

MR. BELL: I'm sorry.

MR. BRENNAN: This kind of came in late-breaking, but we wanted to try and fit it in while Beaufort staff was able to attend the meeting, and I would like to introduce this report that I mentioned in the previous presentation, and I would also like to thank Rusty again for some of the great pictures he has provided all of us.

I want to start kind of in reverse of what you normally would do. I want to start by acknowledging the authors of the report, and so this report is a collaboration between headboat captains that provided the information from their trips through our logbook program, and it also includes efforts from our port agents, who are on the front lines of data collection, and Headboat Survey staff and others involved in the survey, and I would also like to thank Erik Williams and Todd Kellison for their input and guidance, but I would especially like to thank Kelly Fitzpatrick and Eric Fitzpatrick for creating the software program language that generates the structure and summary statistics

presented in the report, and Eric is present to answer any technical questions about the formatting and the information in the report.

The purpose of the report is a quick reference of the headboat fishery in the South Atlantic, primarily to show trends in species over the past five to ten years, and our intended audiences are the headboat operators, the councils, SEDAR participants, and any other data users interested in this information. The most recent draft version of the report includes 2015 data, and the main reason we're introducing it today is to solicit feedback on the formatting and the content from you.

The report will start with an introduction with general information about the survey, which includes metadata and also relevant information that may have influenced the behavior of the fishery for the current year, such as hurricanes or any other events, like regulations, that may have impacted the headboat fishery. The report will include summary tables of historical landings by species, in number and weight, effort, angler days from 1981 to present, summary of dockside sampling totals, and then I think our feature item is a species summary, which is one page per species, with the top twenty-eight federally-managed species.

These are the species we're proposing to include in the report, in alphabetical order and not priority, and other species can be added if requested. The species were chosen from a list provided by the stock prioritization report and where adequate data was available. If anybody feels strongly that another species should be on there, we will certainly check and see if we have adequate data and include that.

For the purpose of introducing this report, we chose to use spottail pinfish, so as not to distract the discussion with a particular federally-managed species. These are actual spottail pinfish data. As you can see from Table 1, we have ten years of estimated landings, in number and weight and pounds, and Table 2 shows number of discards by region. We combined Georgia and northeast Florida, for confidentiality reasons, and I also want to point out that these asterisks represent a number or a statistic that is confidential. The code was written to identify and replace confidential data with these asterisks, where there was less than three vessels that contributed to that data.

This next table is a summary of dockside sampling, including the number of lengths and weights from the most recent year, along with average length and weight of the species by subregion. This table also includes five and ten-year averages for the entire South Atlantic, for comparison. Finally, this graph shows trends in CPUE for the species for the entire South Atlantic over the time period, and this graph, as you can see, is very informative and shows any possible trends that may be occurring, but what I also would like to point out about this graph is the CPUE values aren't standardized. For that and multiple reasons, the CPUE trends should not be used to make direct inferences about changes in abundance, and so it's basically just giving you an idea of what trends are happening with CPUE.

This slide shows how the graphs and tables will be presented, on a single page, and we feel this format makes referencing the different species quick and easy, and so it will be a single page per species. You just leaf through and take a look and get some general information pretty quick. Any of this formatting is up for suggestions or comments. Any feedback, like I said, is welcome. Eric and myself are here to address any questions or comments, and I would also like to mention that the feedback would be incorporated in the next draft version and presented at the March council

meeting, with an annual release date of May of the following year. In this case, next May would include 2016 data.

MR. BELL: So, as far as our feedback, what is kind of the drop-dead date on that?

MR. BRENNAN: Eric, did you want to comment on that?

MR. FITZPATRICK: (Mr. Fitzpatrick's comment is not audible on the recording.)

MR. BELL: Okay, but, I guess, right now, is there any specifically that stands out that you want to provide comment on at this point? If not, we've got a little time between now and March.

DR. DUVAL: I like it all on one page, all those tables on one page. I think that's awesome, really. Just being able to flip through the species and not have to have the information for one species spread across multiple pages, I really like that.

MR. BRENNAN: Yes, and it looks good as one document, too. You can leaf through it quickly and go right to the species you're interested in.

DR. DUVAL: Yay.

MR. BRENNAN: A large-print version for some us would be great. I don't know if you can pull that off, but, Ben.

MR. HARTIG: As we get closer to this rumble-strip approach, this is something we can put in, but how hard would it be to standardize the CPUEs to something we could actually use?

MR. BRENNAN: That would be an Eric question.

MR. FITZPATRICK: The much more fitting place for a standardized index development would be a SEDAR. This is just a raw data summary. The way this is set up is to just present the information. We're set up, in the Southeast, to discuss it as a group. There's a lot of decisions that would be made for a standardized index and, as the one that wrote this code, even one of the personnel that generates the GLM at a SEDAR, it needs to be done at that facility or that body.

MR. BELL: Okay. Any other questions or comments at this point?

MR. CARMICHAEL: We had looked at this and passed around a document to you guys for some suggested content, and it's very similar to what I see here, which is encouraging. I think we had a little more of trying to bring in some of the socioeconomic information, and it considered more like, given the full time series, particularly maybe like the effort and stuff upfront. I like how you guys are doing the single page of the species. That's what we were thinking as well.

I think one thing the council members should think about is how you feel about like the seeing ten years of data and such at a time. If you're comfortable with that, I think it gives you a nice, efficient way to show you what's going on recently. Then, when you're in a management plan and an assessment, of course, you're going to see the full time series, but this might be a pretty good

compromise, and I'm encouraged by seeing the CPUE. That was probably more than we could have expected to maybe see.

MR. BELL: Process-wise, if we have suggestions or anything, should we maybe go to you and then between now and the first part of the year, if you think of something, we'll just kind of centralize the input to John. Then John can give Ken and Eric some feedback and roll from there. Does that sound good?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Sounds good.

MR. BELL: Okay. Anything else related to this right now? I really appreciate you guys being here, and this is great. Okay. We have one last agenda item, just a tiny one, which would be moving forward with final approval on our amendment that we've been working on for quite some time now. I will let -- John, did you want to provide a little input upfront or Gregg? As John gets this sort of teed up here, Gregg had a couple of things that he wanted to discuss.

MR. WAUGH: Thank you, Mel. I have had two phone conferences with Dave Van Voorhees and Gordon Colvin and MRIP and Bonnie from the Center to talk about how we implement this, and I just wanted to raise some of the concerns that they raised, so you're aware of it, and some of the questions that they had in how we've addressed those.

One of the first things I wanted they wanted to make sure is to manage expectations and make sure people understand that the MRIP numbers are still going to be the official numbers. Of course, that is right, and we have added discussion in Chapter 1 of the document, and this is Attachment 5. It's the charter boat amendment. On pages 5 and 6, we've got a description there that outlines how the recreational sector is monitored now and how it will be monitored.

Before the logbook can become an MRIP-certified methodology -- We're implementing it in federal waters. It's in place in South Carolina state waters, and we would need the other partner states to adopt the same regulations for state waters. Then we would need to run a program for two to three years to compare the two, so that you can calibrate your historical data. Then we could talk about does this become the MRIP-certified methodology. We assured them that we would make sure you all understood that and the public understands that, and that's reflected in the document.

They were also concerned about validation, and there is project with the State of South Carolina and MRIP looking at validation. Mike E. sits on that for our staff, and our pilot that's ongoing will be able to make any necessary adjustments that come out of that to facilitate validation. In addition, we're going to encourage as many captains as possible to submit their reports before hitting the dock, because that will help with validation, and we've heard that some of them will do that.

Timing was another issue, and I outlined our intent, and this is something you all will go over in a minute, but the council's intent, thus far, has been to approve the document here and look at mid-2017 for approval and then have voluntary data collection for the balance of the year, and that will let the system scale up. We've got a proposal in for the electronic monitoring and electronic reporting that would do outreach, and that would give a chance for that to kick in, with a help desk, and really facilitate implementation of this.

Then, starting January 1, 2018, to have the reporting become mandatory, and they expressed concern, and it's certainly understandable, that they might not have the full system ready to go at that point, and I think what I tried to explain to them, and I think helps alleviate some of the concern, is that we will be delivering, through the pilot, a system that can provide the data. It's a system, and we would hope that it would be certified as a system to meet these reporting requirements, and those data, as you heard earlier, go straight into SAFIS.

As it was pointed out, the Center already has protocols written for pulling that data out, and so, as far as the data being collected and going into a safe repository and the Center having access to it, all of that will be available, but certainly it will take them time to get the associated programs up and running, and certainly that can take place after the landings become mandatory. I think we have to step back sometimes and remember that, if you make something mandatory, 60 to 70 percent of the people are going to do it and follow the regulations, and so we'll get a lot of data, and we can fine-tune that over time.

One other concern was how this effort fits in with the regional priorities. There is a Gulf and an Atlantic regional priority system being looked at for how electronic reporting is handled, and the Atlantic one is being developed through ACCSP, and Jeff White is heading that up, and I talked with Jeff. They're completing that report. It will go to the Recreational Technical Committee in December or January and then to MRIP. Their two highest priorities, and not in order, but their two high priorities are to move MRIP from every two months to monthly, and then the second priority is to implement the for-hire logbook reporting.

We feel we have it covered there, and so I think we've covered all the bases, but I would just make sure that you look at the material in that Chapter 1, in Section 1.8 and 1.9 and 1.10, because we have laid out the long-term, and we think that will address the expectations that people have.

It makes it clear what the timing is that the council is looking at, and it makes it clear that MRIP are still the numbers, but we have to figure out -- The one area that was sort of left for some future work is we have to figure out how we can use the logbook data to inform our determination of how the landings are compared to the ACL using MRIP, because, as you heard earlier today with cobia, there is lots of issues with those cobia MRIP numbers.

If we had some charter boat numbers, that may help with the comparison, so that, when we're talking about looking at where we are with respect to an ACL, we can use those charter boat numbers, the for-hire numbers, to inform the determination, but still the official numbers are going to be MRIP for a number of years, until this program gets fully implemented and you run your calibration and then the determination is made as to which system them becomes the MRIP-certified system for for-hire data. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Gregg.

DR. CRABTREE: Gregg, the voluntary period, you said I think six months?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, the idea is, whenever the amendment is approved, to just make it voluntary landings, voluntary reporting, for the balance of the year.

DR. CRABTREE: Right, and I was thinking that the voluntary period would start when we actually published a final rule, because, presumably, the software and all would be there then, and then we would delay the effective date of the final rule for six months or something like that, because I'm guessing there are some people that are going to need time to buy something to report on and all of that, but, if we gave six months, that would give people a chance to do outreach and feel their way through it, if that seems reasonable.

MR. WAUGH: I think that would work fine. What would be best is if the end of that six months was on or around January 1, 2018, but I think, even if it lags over some, I don't think that's a big deal, because I think it's more important to get the system up and going and collecting the data.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, and I had one other question about this, Mel, that I don't know where the best place to ask it is, and so I will go ahead, if you would like. The Gulf is working on a reporting requirement as well, which is trip-level reporting, and so we're going to have vessels in the Keys that are going to have both permits, a Gulf permit and a South Atlantic permit, and then we've got vessels in the Mid that are going to have our permits, but they're already reporting into the vessel trip requirement.

Now, as the rule is written now, if you have our permit, you have to report, and so the question I have is -- That's a problem, because, if we require them to report into both systems, we're going to have to deal with double counting, aside from the fact that the fishermen aren't going to be happy that they're having to report twice, and so do we want to put something in here that specifies if, for example, you have the Gulf permit and the South Atlantic permit that you only report into one system, and do the vessels up in the Mid, who are in the vessel trip reporting, just -- If so, we need to come up with some sort of exemption in our regulatory language that addresses that, and that's not in there at the moment, I don't believe.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We talked about that this morning, and we have some language that hopefully can be a statement that will clarify the council's intent for dealing with that, and so if you want to wait until we come up to that, it's on my list of things to raise.

MR. BELL: We're not ahead of you, but we already thought of that. Michelle, did you have something to add to that right now? We were going to get to that.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, and just a couple of things. I absolutely agree with and support having some either -- Whether it's a delayed effective date or voluntary reporting, whichever way it works best for the Fisheries Service. I know that you all delayed the effective date when we went to electronic dealer reporting by four months, in order to give folks time to get up to speed with any equipment they might need and whatever.

If the system is ready at that point, I would hope that folks who wanted to start using it and were ready to start using it could start using it voluntarily. I think that's what Gregg is getting at, giving people that opportunity to do so. Whether it's the final rule publishes and it's a delayed effective date by six months or it publishes and it's effective, but with a proviso that there is a voluntary period, so that folks can work the kinks out of the system and we have that time for outreach, whichever way it works better for you all, but I just want to make sure that that six-month buffer period is there.

Then the other thing, to Roy's question, is the Mid-Atlantic Council voted in August for final approval on their electronic reporting amendment, and so it might not be bad to take a look at whatever their codified text is. I know the Northeast has often been ahead of us on these sorts of things. We actually kind of waited so that we could try to do this in sync, but that didn't happen, and so, anyhow, they presumably have a proposed rule, or, if it's not yet been published as a proposed rule, they do have codified text that is moving through the system, and so it might be good to look at that and see how that is structured.

MR. BELL: Okay. I know Anna had a question and then Zack.

MS. BECKWITH: Right, and I was just going to state my personal preference, for what it's worth, to have the effective date no earlier than the January 1 of 2018, which is what some of the guys have sort of heard that we're talking about. It's out there. It's probably not worth being wishy-washy for a month or two, if it's earlier than -- They sort of know when it's coming.

If the system is not ready and it requires an additional delay, then that's sort of one thing, but this sort of floating six months from when it hits the Federal Register, the final rule, I think it would likely go better if we just have the one date, where everyone knows it's January 1, 2018 is the mandatory reporting, and clearly the system, if it's available beforehand, we can say, here, it's available to you guys to start downloading and playing with and being educated on, but I would encourage us, because, as soon as we vote this up, we lose power on how this is going to go, and so I would encourage us to make it January 1 of 2018.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Anna. Zack, you have something? Then I'm going to let John get back to it.

MR. BOWEN: Yes, sir, and I will be frank. Thank you. You brought up a point about the dual-permitted vessels. Has the situation of where those fish will be reported, as far as their MRIP, since that's going to be the numbers we're going by -- Like the boats in the Keys, if they are dual-permitted and we have mandatory reporting on this side, but they don't on that side, and so they're fishing over there, but -- Where will the fish be counted, I guess is what I'm asking. Has that been addressed?

DR. CRABTREE: In the electronic reporting scenario, apparently they have some language to address that. With MRIP, as far as I know, that's not an issue at this point. To Anna's point, I don't think you have to worry about this rule being effective prior to January 1, 2018. I suspect it will be further out than that, but I don't know, but the timing of all of that is going to depend on how long it takes to put the system together.

MR. BELL: Okay. Thanks. We'll let John kind of run us through some things here, but go ahead, Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: Just one point. At the end there, to put the system together, I think it's important for people to understand that a system will be available for collecting the data and receiving the data. The part that needs to be worked on is then how you analyze that data, but that certainly doesn't preclude starting to report and have the data going in.

MR. BELL: Thanks. Okay, John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: If you look on your PDF of the document, this is page 13, where it has suggested timing. What I have added here on my motions page is to say is this acceptable to everyone, and it says no earlier than January 1, 2018, and at least six months after the final rule. What we have in the document says January 1, 2018, but is there any fear that that might end -- That the final rule may publish sometime such that that would not be six months, if it published late in 2017, because Anna mentioned having at least six months, and others have brought that up.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, I personally think that this will not be effective January 1, 2018, because I don't believe this rule will be published six months ahead of January 1, 2018. We have a new administration coming in, and there is a lot of discussion of a moratorium on regulations and all kinds of things, and so it's difficult to predict, but just the time it takes us to process a plan amendment and get rules published, under normal circumstances, is at least six months, and this one is going to be more complicated than most.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So, if we were to say at least six months after the final rule and no earlier than January 1, 2018 for implementation, it would be fine?

MR. BELL: That's acceptable? Okay.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The next item is on page 22, and there is a number of changes in the wording of the alternatives, and this was suggested after the review for the codified text and the IPT going through the documents.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: John, would you tell me which section you're in and if you're talking about the PDF?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I am in the alternatives, and I think it's Section 22, and it's PDF page 22.

MR. BELL: In the document itself, it's document page 9.

MR. CARMICHAEL: At the bottom of the page, it's page 9, but, if you're following along in your Attachment 5 PDF, this is on page 22. This is the language for Preferred Alternative 2, and there is a couple of issues you see highlighted. First of all, is there was use of a "/", and it was pointed out that "/" don't mean "and", and so we're suggesting replacing the "/" with the word "and".

Also, in here, if you see it, it says to report all fish harvested and discarded on all trips, regardless of where harvested. Well, it was noticed that, up here, you said "harvested and discarded", and here it just says "harvested". We want to take that "harvested" out of there and say "regardless of where the fish were caught", because catch is harvest and discards. That makes it all-inclusive.

Those changes are global, and so you notice that those changes go through all of these alternatives here. The other item is there was -- I think that's all that there is there. We have two wording changes, to replace the "/" and to replace the "harvested". If we go over here, we have a motion for you to consider, and maybe someone would read that, in the interest of efficiency.

It says to move to incorporate the three suggested wording changes to the Action 1 alternatives by replacing "/" with "and" and replacing "harvested" with "the fish were caught" in the area description and striking the parenthetical "current headboat requirements", which was in there.

This is the one that came up last with the codified stuff, after Attachment 5 was prepared, because there was some confusion about what the actual current headboat requirements were and what aspects of this were identical to those. Since that was a parenthetical and just for informational purposes, we just strike that out of the alternative, and it keeps anyone from getting confused.

MR. BELL: Is everybody clear on that? Okay.

DR. DUVAL: I so move.

MR. BELL: I have a motion.

DR. DUVAL: Wait. I'm not on the committee.

MR. BROWN: **So moved.**

MR. BELL: Mark has made the motion. Do I have a second? Wilson seconds. I can read that, if that would be good. **It's move to incorporate the three suggested wording changes to the Action 1 alternatives by replacing "/" with "and", replacing "harvested" with "the fish were caught" in the area description, and striking the parenthetical "current headboat requirements".** Is there any further discussion of the motion? **Any opposition to the motion? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: The next item is we go down to page 24 and just the highlighted section here in the write-up. This highlighted piece is just some different information about submitting the required information and putting responsibility on the permit holders and acknowledging the open-access permit situation and what could happen if a vessel is non-compliant. There's no motion required here, but just highlighting this.

MR. BELL: Okay. It's just for clarification.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We have an additional wording change on page 27. This is under Action 2. It's more of the "and" and "/" in here, and so we had the same thing, and this is referring to the hardware/software. The motion here is similar. This is dealing with "and" and "/".

MR. BELL: This is just like before, and so if someone would like to make that motion.

DR. LANEY: **I would move to incorporate the suggested wording change for Action 2, Alternatives 2 and 3, to replace "/" with "and".**

MR. BELL: Thank you for reading that. Mark seconds it. Any further discussion of that? **Any opposition to that motion? The motion carries.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: The next wording change will be down on page 30.

MR. BELL: This is going to look similar or identical.

MR. CARMICHAEL: This is similar, but there's another issue here with location and manually entering the information, because it just used to read "report location electronically by latitude and longitude" and what they've asked is for "report location fished by manually entering latitude and longitude", because they either can manually type latitude and longitude into the boxes in whatever app -- In the headboat now, they have an app and they can type them in, or they can click on the map, as Mike illustrated the type of map that they have.

This just clarifies it for what it is, and then, down here, we have the "electronic chart", versus, before, it said "headboat chart", and so it just, again, adds clarity and cleans up the wording on those things. The potential motion is here.

MR. BROWN: Did we ever clarify the boxes, the size of the boxes? Has all of that been ironed out?

MR. CARMICHAEL: We're asking for latitude and longitude, and so the boxes don't play into it.

MR. BROWN: Okay.

MR. BELL: There will be a chart that you can click on, just like you're clicking on now.

DR. ERRIGO: I just had a quick question. It doesn't sound like it to me, but this wouldn't preclude somebody from, let's say, using the eTrips Mobile app's ability to track your trip using your GPS, which means you don't need to actually input your location. You could turn it on, and it will record your location every two minutes, I think, as you go, and it also records the location of every fish that you log.

MR. BELL: That would be sort of the equivalent of putting in the latitude and longitude, but you're not doing it. It's doing it for you.

DR. ERRIGO: Right, but it says "manually".

MR. CARMICHAEL: I don't think we want to get folks confused here, because that would be set-level type of information, and what we're talking about is the trip-level information, and so the individual, even if they had that turned on, they're going to have to make a decision about which individual latitude and longitude point do I select to indicate where my trip occurred when I report under this thing, unless the Center comes up with some way that they could take all of that individual information and tracks and all of that and use it, but they still -- What this is saying is you're going to have to enter a latitude and a longitude.

DR. ERRIGO: You can do that, even if you're tracking your trip, and that's fine.

MR. BELL: Okay, and so that will work. Would someone like to make this motion?

MR. BROWN: **I make that motion.**

MR. BELL: All right. Would somebody like to second it from the committee? Wilson. I will read it, just to be clear. **It's move to incorporate the suggested wording changes for Action 3, Alternative 2, to replace "/" with "and", clarify reporting is for fishing location, and clarify how location is entered.** Any further discussion of that motion? **Any opposition to the motion? The motion carries.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: The final items that I have here are following our discussions this morning with the issues like Roy mentioned about the reporting of duplicate reporting, and we had another issue with the codified text.

If you will notice, they pulled some language in there about requiring vessels who fish in state waters to report, and that's because of a vagary of how the rules were written at the time with the headboats and concern about ensuring compliance, but we want to make sure that it's clear that that's not the council's intent to affect those vessels, but also that it is the council's intent that all charter vessels do have to report, all permitted charter vessels report, and so a couple of statements here that I think I will just read and make sure that people agree that this captures the council's intent, and we'll get this in the report, so it's documented.

That is the council's intent is that all charter vessels with a South Atlantic fishery for-hire permit will report all trips and all effort, regardless of where the trips take place. It is not the council's intent for vessels without South Atlantic for-hire permits to be required to report under this amendment. We're just noting that there is language in the codified text addressing headboat reporting in vessels without permits landing snapper grouper in state waters is not applicable to the actions in this amendment. Hopefully that clarifies that issue and makes it clear to the rule writers how this should go.

MR. BELL: Jessica, does that make you feel better?

MS. MCCAWLEY: I think so. The first bullet, you mean a South Atlantic fishery federal for-hire permit. Okay.

DR. DUVAL: Are we going to see the codified text?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: To that point, the codified text that I think was sent out -- Pardon me?

MR. BELL: It's Attachment 6.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Okay. It is pretty much accurate, but it's got some of these -- I like John's word of "vagaries". It's got some language in it that makes you -- When you read it, you can think that, even if you don't have a federal permit and you fish in state waters, you have to report, and that's not what you all could do, or the Fisheries Service could do, and it's not what you intended. Since that came up at the last minute, I thought that, rather than send you then more codified text, we would wait to make sure that that was your intent, and the intent of what John just read, and then there will be revised codified text that I think, Michelle, you as Chair will have to re-deem, but it shouldn't be much different from this, but we just wanted to make sure we captured the accurate statements.

MR. BELL: Right, and so we wanted to make sure that we had this on the record what our actual intent was. Then the idea was, when we get to the part about re-deeming the codified text, that's when that would occur.

MR. HAYMANS: In essence, after the validation period or whatnot, this is removing those for-hire charter fishermen out of MRIP. That's why they would report -- If they're federally-permitted, they're going to report wherever they fish, because their state landings wouldn't be picked up anywhere else, right? That's why we're requiring them to report.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Potentially, somewhere down the road, yes, we hope that this is certified and it stands for MRIP and so, yes, that could happen.

MR. BELL: But it's not a full, complete system at this point to replace MRIP. There are other steps involved down the road.

DR. DUVAL: Just, in terms of the other regions, I mean, there is text on PDF page 27, at the very bottom, that says that there are vessels located in the Greater Atlantic Region, Virginia to Maine, which possess South Atlantic for-hire permits that are not currently selected by the SRD to report under the Southeast Region Headboat Electronic Logbook, because these vessels hold permits that require them to report all fishing activity and catch through the Greater Atlantic Region VTR system. There is that language in there that addresses a little bit the issue of dual reporting.

MR. BELL: Yes, ma'am. Again, following up on that and to Roy's point and all, that's where we were coming to this, was the next item.

MS. MCCAWLEY: Can you scroll back up to those three bullets? That third bullet, can someone explain a little bit more about what that means, the headboat one?

MR. CARMICHAEL: It means exactly that language that's in the headboat codified text that implies that headboats in state waters have to report.

MR. BELL: You can read it that way.

MR. CARMICHAEL: It can be read that way, and we want to make sure that we're not trying to say anything about state vessels in state waters.

MR. BELL: Okay. Let's look at this then, and this kind of addresses the point that Roy brought up and what Michelle was just talking about.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The next item is this duplicate reporting, and we have certainly talked about this every time, that the council's intent is not to require duplicate reporting. The challenge that that creates is that, when you have vessels with multiple permits, and we know that there are vessels that have South Atlantic fishery permits and Gulf fishery permits, and we know there's vessels that have South Atlantic Southeast permits and have Northeast VTR permits. We know that those exist, and so somebody has to blink and decide who is going to accept the other guy's permits.

What this does is set up and clarify the council's intent that the South Atlantic Council is willing to be the one that blinks and accepts the reports of other areas, such as GARFO and such as the Gulf, that may have more stringent permit reporting than what ours do, and so keep in mind this is requiring reporting on a weekly basis. The GARFO is going to -- I think they're daily, and, if I'm not mistaken, it's even before they hit the dock. Tony is nodding. Thank you, Tony.

They're going to report before they hit the dock, and the Gulf is looking at daily reports as well, and so all of those are more stringent than what the South Atlantic is proposing. We have some clarifying language here is say the council's intent is to accept, in fulfillment of the actions in this amendment, reports submitted other permits a vessel may possess when the reporting requirements of those other permits are more stringent than the requirements for the South Atlantic charter/for-hire permit, and that means our dolphin wahoo, snapper grouper, and CMP.

The data for those reports meet the core data elements identified by the South Atlantic Council and are available to the Southeast Center, as required, to meet assessment needs and ACL monitoring requirements. Examples, as I said, are the GARFO VTR system, South Carolina DNR's reporting, and actions under consideration by the Gulf Council that require more frequent reporting than the weekly, as preferred by the South Atlantic. Hopefully that makes it clear that the South Atlantic is willing to yield to these others if they're more stringent.

DR. PONWITH: Something that just came to my mind is, is there anything -- Is there any language in this amendment that conflicts with a current requirement to submit data to the MRIP process? I am talking for federally-permitted charter/for-hire vessels, once this goes in, is there anything in here that confounds MRIP's ability to -- Again, the whole notion is that, the day this goes live, MRIP doesn't go away for those federally-permitted vessels, because you still have to do the validation of the methodology, and you still need to do the calibration of those two systems against one another.

MR. BELL: Correct. To my knowledge, there is nothing in there that basically turns anything off for MRIP, because the idea is you're going to have to bring this system up and they're going to have to run parallel, but that's a good point to make sure we're clear on.

DR. PONWITH: In other words, when you're talking about duplication, you're talking about duplicative reporting region-to-region and not process-to-process.

MR. BELL: Right. Not MRIP requirements. That is just to make sure we've got, in the record, that that is our intent and that's where we're going. We don't have to approve that or anything, for the wording.

MR. CARMICHAEL: One last item that came up had to do with multiday did-not-fish reports, and Rick pointed out that the commercial files up to ninety days, and I'm not sure in the headboat -- Ken, can they file a multiday -- Is it ninety days?

MR. BRENNAN: It's a month.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Ken clarified that within the headboat they can file for thirty days, a month, that they, in advance, did not fish, because we know, in some cases, people may go on vacation or pull their boat out of the water or go somewhere else and fish, and so it just frees them from having

to deal with each week. They could file ahead, and so I guess the question is, is the council content with allowing multi-day did-not-fish reports to be filed in advance? If so, you might want to say whether you're comfortable with ninety days or thirty days. Maybe thirty days, as is used with the headboats.

MR. BELL: Any thoughts on that? For consistency, as we've been trying to do, if thirty days is what we're using right now for headboats, that would make sense, to continue to use thirty days for that.

MS. BECKWITH: I guess I'm fine with thirty days. I would be okay with a little bit longer, but, if you guys want to keep it consistent, I can live with thirty days.

MR. BELL: Okay. Any other thoughts on that? No real strong feelings? I think it would make sense to just keep going the way we're going with the thirty days, and we'll be consistent with the program that is already in existence. Some people are used to that already as well.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I believe that brings up to the final motion to approve the amendment, if there's no other discussion.

MR. BELL: Any other discussion before this point? This is the final motion here. It seems like it's taken a while to get here. Would someone like to make this motion?

MR. BROWN: **So moved.**

MR. BELL: Is there a second from somebody? Wilson. Let's go ahead and read it into the record.

MR. CARMICHAEL: **The motion is to move to approve the for-hire electronic reporting amendment for formal secretarial review and deem the codified text as necessary and appropriate. Give staff editorial license to make any necessary editorial changes to the document and codified text and give the Council Chair authority to approve the revisions and re-deem the codified text.**

MR. BELL: Any further discussion? **Any objection to that motion? Seeing none, that motion passes.** Thank you.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: This is related to this, and it's really something that Jessica brought up too. There were instances, I believe, in the past in which the Headboat Survey was picking up headboats that did not have a federal permit, necessarily, and they were fishing in state waters and they reported. I know how important reporting is to this council, and so I would suggest that the state reps might think about whether they are then picking up that information from headboats that only fish in state waters, because the federal Headboat Survey won't be picking it up, and so it's just something I am throwing out there for people to think about.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Monica. Okay. Any further business to come before the committee? I appreciate all of our guests being here and providing input. That's it then. I will adjourn the Data Collection Committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on December 8, 2016.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By
Amanda Thomas
January 3, 2017

2016 - 2017 COMMITTEES

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION
Chester Brewer, Chair
Mark Brown, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Michelle Duval
Ben Hartig
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

CITIZEN SCIENCE
Chris Conklin, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Michelle Duval
Tim Griner
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact:
Amber Von Harten/John Carmichael

DATA COLLECTION
Mel Bell, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Anna Beckwith
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Tim Griner
Wilson Laney
Ben Hartig
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: John Carmichael

DOLPHIN WAHOO
Anna Beckwith, Chair
Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Chris Conklin
Roy Crabtree
Tim Griner
Jessica McCawley
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Tony DiLernia/Dewey Hemilright
New England Liaison, Rick Bellavance
Staff contact: John Hadley

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE
Michelle Duval, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair
Chris Conklin
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

GOLDEN CRAB
Ben Hartig, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Tim Griner
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

HABITAT PROTECTION AND ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT
Doug Haymans, Co-Chair
Wilson Laney, Co-Chair
Mel Bell
Chester Brewer
Tim Griner
LT Tara Pray
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Chip Collier – Coral/CEBA

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES
Anna Beckwith, Chair
Mark Brown, Vice-Chair
Ben Hartig
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: John Hadley

(Continued)

2016 - 2017 COMMITTEES (continued)

INFORMATION & EDUCATION
Mark Brown, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice-Chair
Chester Brewer
Michelle Duval
LT Tara Pray
Staff contact: Amber Von Harten

LAW ENFORCEMENT
Mel Bell, Chair
Anna Beckwith, Vice-Chair
Ben Hartig
Doug Haymans
LT Tara Pray
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

MACKEREL COBIA
Ben Hartig, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice-Chair
Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Mark Brown
Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Rob O'Reilly
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Dewey Hemilright/
Tony DiLernia
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

PERSONNEL
Jessica McCawley, Chair
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair
Mel Bell
Doug Haymans
Charlie Phillips
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

PROTECTED RESOURCES
Wilson Laney, Chair
Jessica McCawley, Vice-Chair
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Michelle Duval
LT Tara Pray
Staff contact: Chip Collier

SSC SELECTION
Charlie Phillips, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice-Chair
Chris Conklin
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SEDAR
Michelle Duval, Chair
Charlie Phillips, Vice-Chair
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SHRIMP
Charlie Phillips, Chair
Mel Bell, Vice-Chair
Roy Crabtree
Tim Griner
Doug Haymans
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Chip Collier

(Continued)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 - 2017 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

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

Tim Griner
4446 Woodlark Lane
Charlotte, NC 28211
980/722-0918 (ph)
timgrinersafmc@gmail.com

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

(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

✓ LT Tara Pray
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
Miami, FL 33131
305/415-6765 (ph)
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

Erica Burgess
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Monica Smit-Brenello
Dr. Jack McGovern
Rick DeVictor
Jessica Stephens
Erik Williams
Kyn Rios

Dale Diaz
Mike Cahill
Ken Brennan
↳ Erie Fitzpatrik

7

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director
Gregg T. Waugh
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

Deputy Director – Science & Statistics
John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director - Management
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
brian.cheuvront@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist
Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Public Information Officer
Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Financial Secretary
Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator
Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants
Julie O'Dell
Julie.Odell@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist
Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist
Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Administrative Officer
Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist
Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist
Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

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

Fishery Economist
John Hadley
John.hadley@safmc.net

Dec 8, 2016

Full Name	Email
Dean Foster	dfoster@pewtrusts.org
Rusty Hudson	DSF2009@aol.com
david bush	davidbush@ncfish.org
Steve Poland	steve.poland@ncdenr.gov
Bill Gorham	getbowedup40@gmail.com
rich malinowski	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Abeels	Holly	habeels@ufl.edu
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Baker	Scott	bakers@uncw.edu
Bell	Mel	bellm@dnr.sc.gov
Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov
Blow	Wes	wesamy2000@cox.net
Bowen	Zack	fishzack@comcast.net
Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net
Brown	Mark	capt.markbrown@comcast.net
Bush	David	davidbush@bcfish.org
Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Cheshire	Rob	rob.cheshire@noaa.gov
Cimino	Joe	joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.gov
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
Conklin	Chris	conklinsafmc@gmail.com
Crosson	Scott	scott.crosson@noaa.gov
DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Diaz	Dale	Saltwaterlife@live.com
Dunmire	Leda	ldunmire@pewtrusts.org
Dutka-Gianelli	Jynessa	jdgianelli@ufl.edu
Errigo	Mike	mike.errigo@safmc.net
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Estes	Jim	jim.estes@myfwc.com
Foster	Dean	dfoster@pewtrusts.org
Franco	Dawn	dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov
Geer	Patrick	pat.geer@dnr.state.ga.us
Gerhart	Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Godwin	Joelle	joelle.godwin@noaa.gov
Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov
Guyas	Martha	martha.guyas@myfwc.com
Hanson	Chad	chanson@pewtrusts.org
Hartig	Ben	mackattackben@att.net
Helies	Frank	frank.helies@noaa.gov
Hemilright	Dewey	fvtarbaby@embarqmail.com
Henninger	Heidi	heidi@olrac.com
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
Jiorle	Ryan	ryan.jiorle@mrc.virginia.gov
Kalinowsky	Chris	Chris.Kalinowsky@dnr.ga.gov
Klibansky	Nikolai	nikolai.klibansky@noaa.gov

Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov
Laks	Ira	captaindrifter@bellsouth.net
Larkin	Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa.gov
Lupton	Dee	dee.lupton@ncdenr.gov
MacLauchlin	Bill	billmac@adtrends.com
Mahood	Bob	rmahood@mindspring.com
Malinowski	Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
McCoy	Sherri	sherrim@wildoceanmarket.com
McPherson	Matthew	matthew.mcpherson@noaa.gov
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net
Package-Ward	Christina	christina.package-ward@noaa.gov
Player	David	playerd@dnr.sc.gov
Pulver	Jeff	Jeff.Pulver@noaa.gov
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Ralston	Kellie	kralston@asafishing.org
Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Schwaab	Alexandra	alexandra.schwaab@accsp.org
Sedberry	George	george.sedberry@noaa.gov
Shipley	Krista	krista.shipley@myfwc.com
Stephen	Jessica	jessica.stephen@noaa.gov
Surrency	Ron	captronacc@gmail.com
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
Walia	Matt	matthew.walia@noaa.gov
Waters	James	jwaters8@gmail.com
Waugh	Gregg	gregg.waugh@safmc.net
White	Holly	holly.white@ncdenr.gov
Wyatt	Elizabeth	elizabeth.wyatt@accsp.org
brewer	chester	wcblaw@aol.com
holiman	stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov
pugliese	roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
shertzer	kyle	kyle.shertzer@noaa.gov
vara	mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov