

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE**

**Hutchinson Island Marriott  
Stuart, FL**

**June 13, 2013**

### **SUMMARY MINUTES**

#### **Data Collection Committee:**

Dr. Michelle Duval, Chair  
Steve Amick  
Ben Hartig  
Charlie Phillips

Martha Bademan, Vice-Chair  
Tom Burgess  
Dr. Wilson Laney  
Tom Swatzel

#### **Council Members:**

David Cupka  
Dr. Roy Crabtree  
Doug Haymans

Mel Bell  
LCDR Scot Gibson  
John Jolley

#### **Council Staff:**

Bob Mahood  
Mike Collins  
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin  
Kim Iverson  
Julie O'Dell  
Anna Martin  
Myra Brouwer

Gregg Waugh  
John Carmichael  
Amber Von Harten  
Dr. Mike Errigo  
Roger Pugliese  
Dr. Brian Chevront

#### **Observers/Participants:**

Monica Smit-Brunello  
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith  
Lt. Morgan Fowler  
Beverly Sauls  
Otha Easley

Dr. Jack McGovern  
John Sanchez  
Jennifer Lee  
Gordon Colvin

Additional Observers Attached

The Data Collection Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Plantation Room of the Hutchinson Island Marriott, June 13, 2013, and was called to order at 3:45 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Michelle Duval.

DR. DUVAL: I am going to go ahead and call the Data Collection Committee of the South Atlantic Council to order. The first item on our agenda is approval of the agenda. Are there any modifications? Seeing none; the agenda stands approved. The next order of business is approval of our March 2013 minutes. Are there any modifications to the minutes? Seeing none; the minutes stand approved. We have a number of updates and I think Gregg is going to take us through those, and then we're going to have a presentation from Gordon Colvin and Beverly Sauls on the For-Hire Pilot Project that occurred in the Gulf. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: These are documents that we had submitted. The first one is the Joint Dealer Amendment. Remember, we approved this at our March meeting and Monica has an update on that amendment.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: We found some issues with the amendment again; and I'm sorry that they didn't come to light before. I need some discussion from the council on this, so I'll kind of lay it out here. As you know, dolphin and wahoo extends from your region up through Maine; and the Coastal Migratory Pelagic Plan extends to New York.

The Dealer Amendment required two things, I think; one, that everyone had to have a generic dealer permit; and then that permitted vessels were required to sell to permitted dealers. One of the problems with the amendment is that the council didn't address what happens to dealers north of North Carolina.

Do you want those individuals who deal with mackerel or deal with dolphin – well, deal with mackerel to get what I'm going to call a generic dealer permit; because, remember, this is through the Gulf and the South Atlantic. That didn't get addressed and therefore it is assumed that everyone up to New York who deals in mackerel would need a generic dealer permit.

If you didn't want that, then the document is silent to that. One problem is that we can add economic information and supplement the record that way, but there was no public hearings then held in the Mid-Atlantic Area regarding that requirement, and it could affect people. The other part is let's shift to dolphin and wahoo.

Remember, I said that goes up to Maine; but there is a current exception in the Dolphin Wahoo Plan that says if you are basically north of North Carolina and you have another federal dealer permit, then you don't need a specific dolphin wahoo dealer permit. That dealer permit exists right now, but it excepted out people north of North Carolina who already had federal dealer permits.

There are about I think 48 to 50 specific dolphin wahoo dealer permits that are issued north of North Carolina because those individuals don't have another federal dealer permit. The amendment was silent to that as well; and one would assume then if it was silent, then all those people also have to get the generic dealer permit.

My question to you – and I would like Gregg to talk a little bit and maybe Jack, too – is what did the council want to do. Did the council want to except out dealers north of North Carolina – and you will probably want Bonnie to weigh in, too – because the idea for this permit I believe was partially for quota monitoring as well as some other things that I think you wanted.

I have been kind of going back and forth a little bit with folks at the Center, well, how much coastal migratory pelagic species or dolphin wahoo is caught north of North Carolina and big of a deal is this? Gregg pulled out some table from Coastal Migratory Pelagic Amendment 18, I think, and showed me that there really isn't all that much catch that is north of North Carolina.

However, if you're going to monitor the quota, there is a portion of that catch that is north of North Carolina. That is the gist of the issue. Let me see if I missed anything else. No, that is pretty much it; and again none of us caught that beforehand and I wish we would have, but this is where we are now.

DR. DUVAL: I just have a couple of responses. First of all, aren't folks wishing to deal in bluefish required to have a northeast dealer's permit down here?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I don't know.

DR. DUVAL: I would assume that they are.

MR. WAUGH: Yes.

DR. DUVAL: And Gregg is saying yes. I would like input from the committee on this, but my assumption would be that anybody who desires to sell South Atlantic managed species, no matter where they are, we would want them to have that permit. Now, the exception in the Dolphin Wahoo Plan was something that I wasn't aware of as well in that if someone had another federal dealer permit, that they could sell dolphin wahoo, because we would capture all of their landings, particularly if they're in the northeast.

I certainly don't have problem maintaining that exception; but as you mentioned, there are other dealers who are required to specifically have a permit for that because they don't have any other federal dealer permit. I would say that was the intent; anybody who wants to sell South Atlantic managed species needs to have a permit.

I don't have a problem maintaining the exception for dolphin wahoo; but anyone who doesn't already have a federal permit in the northeast would be required to get one. Otherwise, it defeats the purpose of trying to accurately track your ACLs. Let's see what other folks around the table have to say. Gregg, if you have something you would like to add; that would be great.

MR. WAUGH: It is my understanding that dealers north – well, even some of the dealers in North Carolina, but north of that they're already reporting weekly. While the permit requirement is for certain species; my understanding is once you have that permit, then you have to report all species. When we were putting this amendment together, I guess we were focusing on plugging the hole which was down here and getting our dealers up on reporting weekly.

The idea in terms of hearings in the Mid-Atlantic and/or New England areas, the coastal migratory pelagics, it is a joint plan with the Gulf. The Mid-Atlantic has two seats on our Mackerel Committee, two voting seats on our Mackerel Committee, and so they participate that way. They have chosen in recent years to send one individual.

They have certainly been participating in the development by attending our meetings of the Joint Dealer Amendment. In addition, we send all our materials to the Mid-Atlantic and New England Councils. For dolphin and wahoo we have true lead for the Atlantic Coast. The New England and Mid-Atlantic Councils have voting seats on the committee level.

They have chosen in recent years, particularly New England not to attend and not to participate, but they do have that option. They have been apprised of what we have been doing. I don't recall this surfacing specifically about what we wanted to do with dealers up there; again because I think we were all focusing in moving to weekly reporting for the dealers in North Carolina and south.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, I guess just to the public hearing issue, I think the northeast went to electronic reporting back, was it like 2003 or something like that, weekly electronic reporting, I think. Were there any hearings held down this way? Certainly, if folks are required to have a permit to deal in bluefish, it affects more than just the folks in North Carolina where there is an overlap. It seems like it would be a waste of resources to conduct public hearings up there; I don't know.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, the Magnuson Act says that you should conduct public hearings at appropriate times and in appropriate locations in the geographical area concerned so as to allow all interested persons an opportunity to be heard in the development of fishery management plans and amendment to such plans.

It goes on a little bit more, which might be helpful. The term "geographical area concerned" may include an area under the authority of another council if the fish in the fishery concerned migrate into or occur in the area or if the matter that is being heard affect fishermen of that area, but not unless the other council is first consulted regarding hearings within that area.

Right now you don't have Mackerel Dealer Permit and you're going to be requiring people up there to potentially get one, right, and I don't know if some of those individuals already have a dealer permit or don't have a dealer permit. It is hard to say because we're not entirely sure, I don't think.

Not that I want this to affect your choice, but the idea is that the amendment has to be corrected, fixed, further developed, whatever, to discuss what you want to do. That is going to need to be done, and that will have to come back to you in September. If you want to extend the requirement like you say for quota monitoring and other purposes, everyone up through the area – for dolphin wahoo, that would be to Maine; for the Mid-Atlantic, it would be to New York – those councils meet. You could have a public hearing at that meeting by that council.

They could conduct it for you. I think that would probably be the best way to proceed to allow individuals in those areas to at least have some sort of voice during the development of the amendment. We have on occasion I think sent council staff up to other regions. I don't know that you need to do that here. It is a cost and expense that doesn't seem to be worth it since you've already got council staff up there who could conduct the hearings. Anyway, I wanted to lay this issue out for you.

DR. DUVAL: I've told you what I think or at least what I thought the committee's intent was with this Generic Dealer Amendment, which was anybody dealing in South Atlantic managed species be required to get that generic dealer permit. Again, I certainly don't have a problem maintaining that exception for dolphin wahoo that is currently in the plan. I guess I would look to Bonnie to say has that exception been working for you in terms of getting the landings information for those species?

DR. PONWITH: I can't provide a quantitative answer to that right now; with the exception, you mean? Yes, I can't quantify that off the top of my head. I can check.

DR. DUVAL: Anybody else on the committee have any thoughts? I know it has been a long day. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Well, my only thought is to concur with you. I think if we don't do this, it defeats the intent of the generic dealer permit.

DR. CRABTREE: I have looked at landings of some species, and the only one that shows very much is cobia. There are some cobia landings in Virginia. Now, I don't know that there are enough that it is not within the margin of error of what we're doing. King mackerel and Spanish mackerel, it is negligible.

I'm looking right now at the Mid-Atlantic Council's meeting schedule, and they do have a meeting in August. I don't know if we'd have to do one in New England if it sounds like we're not changing dolphin and wahoo because that is already set. If coastal pelagics just goes to New York, is that right, Gregg, which is Mid-Atlantic –

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

DR. CRABTREE: – so if we could do a hearing in conjunction with the Mid-Atlantic Council meeting, we could dispense with this in September, if you want to do that.

MR. WAUGH: Well, the Mid-Atlantic's area includes North Carolina and we have held a hearing in North Carolina; so haven't we taken care of that?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You know, Gregg, usually you're the guy who likes to make sure that all of those areas get covered in public hearings. Well, I think that probably not. I think that there are folks north of there who probably would never have expected, since this was a South – so far we have been having South Atlantic – it has been confined to South Atlantic meetings –

throw the Gulf out – South Atlantic meetings, so they probably weren't even paying attention to this.

MR. WAUGH: So if we've got an exception for dolphin wahoo, and presumably that was put in – we haven't heard of any problems from the Center in terms of tracking landings for dolphin and wahoo, so that is working. Why wouldn't we have that same exemption for coastal migratory pelagics?

Again, my understanding what we were focusing in was fixing the hole down here. The northeast is already on weekly electronic reporting and has been for years and years. What we're trying to do is – and presumably those landings – as I understand it, those landings are fed into the CLM Program in Miami; so we're already getting that data.

To me, it seems that if we reiterate that our intent is that – and the wording in the Dolphin Wahoo Plan, it states that it should be noted that dealers who already have federal dealer permits for other species in the Atlantic will not have to obtain separate permits. They will only be required to include dolphin and wahoo in the list of species on the permits. They would appear to cover it as long as NMFS doesn't need to have a separate accounting.

DR. DUVAL: But that appears to exempt everyone in the Atlantic from the language that you have read as opposed to exempting folks north of North Carolina.

MR. WAUGH: Well, you're right; it does just say the Atlantic; it should be noted that dealers who already have federal dealer permits for other species in the Atlantic will not have to obtain separate permits. You're right.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, part of the problem or not problem but that never got codified in the regulation, so it just one of those things that exists but –

DR. DUVAL: The exemption you mean never got codified?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: No, it is not in the regulation.

MR. WAUGH: Before we would go anywhere or do anything else, I still don't have a clear understanding what needs to be done to fix this. The council's intent I think has been clear from the get-go; we want weekly electronic dealer reporting. It is up to the region that issues the permits and the Center that is getting the data to figure out exactly what we have to do to plug this hole. I still don't understand what it is that is missing and what we need to do.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, what is missing is any sort of analysis or discussion what happens north or North Carolina. I don't think the amendment considers any impacts. There is no economic analysis really to those folks north of North Carolina. That needs to be added into the amendment.

If this exception continues for dolphin wahoo; then that should be made clear in the amendment as well; because with it being silent, then you have amended the Dolphin Wahoo Plan and that

exception goes out the window and everybody who deals in dolphin wahoo then has to have the generic dealer permit because you have amended the Dolphin Wahoo Plan and haven't carried through that exception in this amendment.

DR. CRABTREE: So, Monica, as it is written right now, the amendment would require everyone up there who deals in these species to have a dealer's permit, and the problem is we didn't do a public hearing>

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It requires it because it is silent to it, so you assume you mean the whole area that the fishery management plans cover, which is up to Maine for dolphin wahoo and up to New York for mackerel.

DR. CRABTREE: Well, it looks to me like if we want to require everyone out there to have these dealer permits, we're going to have to do a hearing. That is just how it is, I guess. If we want to exempt them, then I think we could just clarify that in the document, we wouldn't have to do the hearing, we would have to modify the document and maybe resubmit it.

I think the loss from what I can see from the landings I'm looking at is fairly minimal. Except with cobia, 4 or 5 percent of the ACL may come from north of North Carolina, and so we would probably have to expand the catches somehow to reflect that there are some catches north of there, I guess.

DR. DUVAL: I think if we can establish the same exemption for the species in the mackerel plan; in other words, as long as you have another federal dealer permit so that we're getting that landing stream – I realize it is minor with the exception of cobia, but I still think it is important for completeness of the data to get that. What I'm not clear on is if we provide that exemption; do we still need to have a hearing?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, right now there is no mackerel dealer permit; so I can't tell you who is affected in that area and who is not affected by this even if you add in the exception, the same dolphin wahoo exception. Adding that in, as Gregg suggested, that is fine. As long as it gets the Center and you the data that you need, I think that is fine to add the exception in. We can that in the amendment and write it up that way.

DR. LANEY: Well, my question is about snapper grouper. I remember that we had some discussion, and I think we even – didn't we extend the jurisdiction of the snapper grouper plan on up into Virginia waters? I know we had a lot of discussion about that. The issue of tracking those landings seems to me is one that is only going to become more and more prevalent as some of these species expand their range to the north.

I know we have already got snowy grouper and tilefish landings occurring in Virginia. I just wanted to point out that, too, that it is other species besides the coastal migratory pelagics and dolphin wahoo that we're talking about I think at least in the future.

MR. MAHOOD: Monica, one of the problems I have is we seem to have gotten ourselves in a Catch-22 down here. We go out of our way to go out and have public hearings, but in the other

part of the council world and the other NMFS regions, I know of some of them where you have got to go to the council meeting if you want to make public comment. I'm not understanding with North Carolina being part of the Mid-Atlantic, we have met in the Mid-Atlantic.

The question I really had was if the language in the amendment includes the whole Atlantic and makes it very clear that if somebody already has a permit they don't have to get a new one; can't we just adjust the rule?

MR. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And if that is what the amendment said, that would be fine, but the amendment doesn't say anything. It doesn't say anything as to – it really addresses the Gulf area and the South Atlantic area. It is silent as to anything north of that.

DR. DUVAL: Here is what I'm going to suggest, especially in light of what Wilson mentioned that we know that at least biologically the range of snapper grouper species is extending to the north. We know that there are landings of gray tile and snowy grouper up in Virginia. I say we just go ahead and do the required analyses, beef up the document, and just require anyone who is going to be selling species that are managed by the South Atlantic to have this generic dealer permit.

We can work with our Mid-Atlantic Council counterparts to I guess provide the revised document at – their council meeting is in August. I have no sense of whether or not the required analyses could be done by then, but just hold the hearing in conjunction with a Mid-Atlantic Council meeting, depending on where that is, and be done with it.

MR. WAUGH: I would not think there would be a lot of analyses to be done. Those guys are already reporting. The only impact would be is they would have to get this permit; so I would think from an economic standpoint that is relatively straightforward to include an estimate of the cost of the additional permit they would have to get.

DR. DUVAL: And also recognize that the northeast implemented their electronic dealer reporting a little bit differently than we did ours. We focused on reporting of federally managed species. For them, if you have a federal dealer permit, you're required to report all the species that you sell as a federal dealer, whether or not it is a federally managed or state-manage species. We are capturing all that information; but I think for completeness and any further actions we might want to consider, it is probably best to just go ahead and require it. That is my thought.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That's fine, but I think we would probably need a motion or two to make sure that you all know what you're deciding and that then staff would have a good idea of exactly what they're looking at.

DR. DUVAL: I guess we would need a motion from the committee to clarify that the generic dealer permit requirements apply to any dealer selling South Atlantic Council managed species – purchasing South Atlantic Council managed species. Martha.

MS. BADEMAN: I will make that motion.



DR. DUVAL: Is there a second; Dr. Laney. Discussion? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: So this means that if they have dolphin and wahoo permit, they will still have to get the coastal migratory pelagic permit?

DR. DUVAL: Well, remember that this dealer permit –

MR. HARTIG: It is a generic.

DR. DUVAL: It is a generic permit and it applies to all of our species; so for the price of one, you get it all; Gulf and South Atlantic. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I just want to be clear that exception that was in the Dolphin Wahoo Plan goes away; and anybody who deals in dolphin wahoo species will need to have a generic dealer permit?

DR. DUVAL: Since it was codified, anyway, I guess it is not too bad of a thing for the regulation writers to add that.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Okay, that's fine. Don't throw anything at me, but you may need a public hearing in the New England area because that permit goes up to Maine.

DR. DUVAL: We can do the same thing I think work with the New England Council staff and explain the situation and see if they would be willing to include this in their briefing materials in conjunction when they're having their public hearing.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I agree that can be done, and that is great. Okay, so I think we can deal with this now and then it will be brought back to you in September. Hopefully, we could get these public hearings and everything done before you see it at your September meeting. I don't know the New England Council's schedule.

I know that the Gulf Council – remember this is a joint amendment, anyway, so the Gulf meets in August. Now that we know your intent and we have a motion and the analysis can be done, I don't see an issue if we can get it done to present it to the Gulf in August. I think they will deal with it rather quickly because it really affects South Atlantic.

MR. WAUGH: And, Monica, please don't throw anything at me either, but now this is the second time. Have you all had sufficient time to give this a thorough review such that we have got all our bases covered this time around?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, you never know, but hopefully, yes.

**DR. DUVAL: Okay, the motion reads clarify that the generic dealer permit requirements apply to any dealer purchasing South Atlantic Council managed species. Any other discussion? Wilson.**

DR. LANEY: Monica, does that need to say any dealer north of North Carolina or are we good with it the way it is?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I think you're fine the way it is.

**DR. DUVAL: Any other discussion? Is there any objection to the motion? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. Roy.**

DR. CRABTREE: And then, Gregg, you guys will ask the Gulf Council to put this on their agenda at the August meeting.

DR. DUVAL: The next item on our agenda is a status update of the Joint Gulf and South Atlantic Council Generic For-Hire Reporting Amendment.

MR. WAUGH: We submitted the amendment for review on April 23<sup>rd</sup> and we're looking to see where that stands in the review process.

DR. McGOVERN: It is under review. You're talking about the For-Hire Amendment now? Yes, we hope to get that out in the next couple of weeks and hopefully it will be effective by the fall. I wanted to make one additional announcement not related to the For-Hire Amendment while I was here.

When we did the review of the snapper grouper landings on Tuesday, it was pointed out that the Jacks Complex was at 92 percent and that we requested projections from the science center. We got those projections and we are going to close the Jack Complex on Tuesday at 12:01 a.m. The Jack Complex includes almaco jack, banded rudderfish and lesser amberjack.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that update, Jack. Okay, I think we're ready to move on to our next agenda item, which is actually the presentation on the Electronic For-Hire Reporting Pilot Project in the Gulf. We have Gordon Colvin and Beverly Sauls here to help us with that.

MR. GORDON COLVIN: I want to thank the council for inviting us to make this presentation to you today. I think actually this presentation fulfills a long-standing promise that we made to Bob Mahood around the time this study was wrapping up that we would get here just as soon as we could after the final project report was completed and brief you on the results of this pilot project.

I'd like to offer a few comments by way of background to put this study in context. After I do that, Beverly Sauls is going to give you a presentation on the details of the pilot project and its findings. Then I'll come back and talk a little bit about what it might mean in the context of MRIP and looking forward.

I also want to just, on behalf of my colleague, Preston Pate – Press, as you may know, among the many things that he does, chairs the MRIP Operations Team, and it was under the Operations Team that this project was commissioned. Press was very anxious that we get to the South Atlantic Council as soon as possible to make the presentation and was very disappointed to learn

that would occur during this week of conflict between the two council meetings and that he wouldn't be here.

He is missing this with some regret; and on his behalf I also want to express our appreciation for the opportunity. As you know, the Marine Recreational Information Program, or MRIP, is developing and has been working to develop improved and new recreational fisheries catch-and-effort data collection methods that respond to and address the recommendations of the National Research Council's review of recreational surveys that was reported in 2006 and the requirements of the Magnuson-Stevens Amendments in that following year that directed the Fisheries Service to implement as many of those recommendations from the NRC Report as were feasible and practical to implement.

I want to just give you a little bit of overview about how MRIP works in this context. MRIP has four different major teams that work towards its goals. Of those four, the Operations Team is the one chaired by Press and is the team comprised of representatives from the NMFS Office of Science and Technology, our science centers' regional offices and our partner community councils and particularly state agencies as well as stakeholders that have worked to help us develop improved survey designs and methodologies.

After MRIP was established, its Operations Team reviewed the results of the NRC Report and developed priorities for exploration of new methods that would address those recommendations. Generally speaking, the overall process they followed was to begin with a detailed inventory and documentation of survey designs and methodologies in use; then to develop recommendations for new designs and new methodologies in that context that also were responsive to the NRC findings.

Having identified those possibilities, to then go ahead and pilot test them and get peer reviews done of the pilot test results. When we have completed pilot projects of new methods that appear to be feasible, that the findings support implementation, and the peer review confirms that support, there is a process for certification of those new methods that resolve the issues and are supported by peer review, and in effect certified methodologies go into a virtual toolbox and are available for use by NMFS and its partners for actual execution or funding.

Among the early projects that were done at the request of the Operations Team was a detailed documentation of for-hire survey designs around the country and recommended improvements to some of those designs and best practices for charter and partyboat survey methodologies. Immediately following the documentation was a consultant review or a group of expert consultants came in and gave us that advice.

The final reports for both the documentation and the consultant review and best practices recommendations have been available on our website for a couple of years now. In doing that, we worked with a subcommittee. The Operations Team convened a for-hire workgroup that was chaired by Beverly and did an great job in pulling together a great deal of work; and to some degree I think honestly perhaps a little bit under-appreciated and not sufficiently recognized the amount of work that they did in the documentation and consultant review.

But at any rate, it is important to note that the consultant affirmed the recommendation of the NRC Panel that if possible we should look to treating our party and charterboat fisheries, our for-hire fisheries more similarly to commercial fisheries in data collection and explore the feasibility of electronic trip reporting.

To that end, the workgroup recommended and the Operations Team agreed to proceed with a major pilot project to attempt to test a logbook design in the Gulf of Mexico, which led to the project that you're going to hear about in a few minutes. The workgroup created a project team – again, that project team was also chaired by Beverly – that developed a pilot project on trip-based logbook reporting with electronic reporting options in a series of phases.

The first phase was to consult with the regional partners and the industry to develop a survey design and a pilot study to test the feasibility of that design; to plan and procure services for conducting the pilot study and analyzing the results; to actually conduct the pilot study; analyze its results; produce the final report; to conduct a peer review and respond to the peer review findings. All that work has been completed and Beverly will report on it.

This project was a partnership involving the Florida Fish and Wildlife Institute, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, and the NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center and Southeast Regional Offices. I want to just acknowledge the project team members. In addition to Beverly, Stephanie Fried and Bridget Sirnak from the Research Institute; Page Campbell, Alice Best and Katie Doyle from Texas Parks and Wildlife; Greg Bray and Dave Donaldson from the Gulf States Commission; and Ken Brannon and Andy Strelcheck from NMFS.

The team did a great job. With that, I want to introduce Beverly, who is going to provide the technical report and then I'll come back and talk a little bit about how we think this fits into the context of MRIP moving forward.

MS. SAULS: You did such a good job of explaining how much work we've done, it makes me tired. I just wanted to mention, before I start this, that the final report for this pilot study is available now on the NOAA MRIP Website, [countmyfish.noaa.gov](http://countmyfish.noaa.gov). If you look under latest news, it is the first link where you can download the report. I'm very excited that report is finally finished and available.

The study design included two regions in the Gulf of Mexico; the Northern Panhandle Region of Florida, which is the large square across Florida's Panhandle. That was our largest geographic area. In each of the two regions, we chose all of the charter vessels that port in that area and that also possessed federal permits for reef fish or pelagics, or both.

I will explain why we chose those in the next slide. The smaller box over on the left-hand side in Texas is the Corpus Christi area. There were approximately 60 federally permitted charter vessels in that area that were selected for the study. The reason we chose the federally permitted charterboats was because there was existing authority in place already to require those vessels to report on a weekly basis. That was what we wanted to test was a weekly reporting system.

As the current authority existed, vessels, if they were selected to report, would be required to report for the fishing week, which went from Monday through Sunday; and then the reporting deadline was the following Sunday. They had seven days after the end of a fishing week to submit trip reports.

That is the authority we had and that is what we had to design the pilot study around. As Gordon mentioned, prior to designing the study, we also held a workshop in New Orleans to get stakeholder input, which included charter vessel captains from around the Gulf of Mexico as well as state and federal resource management agencies to get their guidance on how best to design the study.

Two of the most important things that we heard at that workshop were first that logbook data in the case of recreational fisheries such as the for-hire fishery is self-reported data, and there is not like a point of sale like there is for the commercial fishery. In order to evaluate how accurate and complete that self-reported data is, you need to validate it. If you need to validate it, then that data also needs to be validatable. If you can't validate it, then you shouldn't collect it.

Then the most important thing we heard from the fishermen, too, is to please keep it simple. Their reasoning was that if you make the reporting system so complicated that they couldn't accurately keep track of the information they had to report, then the information wouldn't be accurate or it wouldn't be timely.

That was good advice and that really gave us good guidance in our design. This is the reporting system that we developed, and you can see it is a pretty complicated system based on the flow chart with the vessel operators in the middle of all of this. It starts with their reporting. We contracted with Bluefin Data to develop a secure website where the vessel operators could go in weekly and enter their data and submit it in time for their reporting deadlines.

Now, in Florida we did have some vessels that were not able to report electronically. Some of them didn't have a computer or they didn't have internet or they weren't capable of reporting electronically. For those vessels we provided them with paper log sheets, which they turned in directly to the Florida Fish and Wildlife, and we entered those log sheets into Bluefin Data for them.

On the left-hand side, Bluefin Data is below there for the Gulf State Marine Fisheries Commission. They were responsible on a weekly basis for going into the Bluefin Data and downloading data and generating lists of who had submitted reports for that weekly deadline and which vessels were missing reports by the deadline.

That was a very important aspect of this design was to have timely tracking of the reporting so that we could do timely followup with the vessel operators to let them know that their reports were missing and to contact them so that they could get that data submitted as quickly as possible.

What Gulf States would do is send us the weekly reports. For the Florida vessels, they would come to us; and Texas Parks and Wildlife would get a report for the Texas vessels. We worked

directly with the industry partners, the participants in the study, to contact them and notify them of their missing reports.

At the end of the month, Gulf States would generate a second list, and that would be any vessels that still had outstanding weeks for any of the weeks during that month. At that point, when the states received that list, we would make personal contact with the vessel operators through a phone call to again let them know that those reports still had not been received and that we were waiting to receive those.

That was our last contact with them until their permits were up for renewal. As their permits were good for one year from the start of when they purchased the permit, so these permits were coming up for renewal all throughout the pilot study. As those permits came up for renewal, if they were missing reports from previous reporting weeks, there was flag placed on their permit so that the National Marine Fisheries Service would know to not renew that permit until their delinquent reports were submitted.

That was our enforcement mechanism for actually bringing boats that were not submitting trip reports into compliance over time. This is what our compliance looks like through the duration of the pilot study. It ran for one year, from September 2010 through August 2011; so with the first reporting week being on the first week of September in 2010 and the last reporting week being the last week of August 2011.

We ran reports like this cumulatively throughout the pilot study so that as time progressed throughout the one-year pilot, we could track of what our missing report rates were. There are two things going on in the figure. The blue line is Florida, and that middle section is the later weeks of the study. This report was generated in the first week of September.

As of the last reporting week, these were the vessels that were non-compliant and had not submitted a trip report for each week of the year. In Florida we had this sort of average running percentage for each week of around 12 percent missing reports for all the older weeks. What this was; these were vessels that were refusing to report for the duration of the study.

Their permits had not come up for renewal as of the end date, and they had not been brought into compliance. I think at the end of the study it was approximately 35 boats in Florida that still weren't participating. The orange line is Texas, and they have zero percent non-compliance. What that means is that over the course of the year, all 60 boats in Texas that were selected were actively reporting trips throughout each week of the study.

You can see in the most recent weeks where the uptick is both of those lines; that is reporting timeliness. Those are the boats that were cooperative in the study. They weren't refusing to submit weekly reports, but they were late submitting those reports. These were guys that we were calling after a week and after a month trying to encourage them to get those reports in on time. I just want to point there is kind of two things going on there.

There is the refusal rate and then there is a lag in the timeliness. Then we wanted to measure the accuracy and completeness of the reports that we were receiving. We relied on three separate

methodologies to look at this. The first validation method was for vessel activity status. This is to validate the completeness of effort reporting in the logbook study.

In the picture below you can see that there are a number of boats that are in the slip, but the one all the way on the end is an empty slip. We would then select sites and record the date and time that visited the site and which vessels were in the slip, which we would not expect to receive a logbook for, and which vessels were out of the slip.

If the vessel was out, we would then verify with someone on the dock whether it was out fishing on a charter trip or if it was out for some other reason. This just gives you a glimpse of the results of those validations. The dark gray bar is Florida and the light gray is Texas. The largest bars on the far left are trips that we verified the boat was out fishing and we also found that they had submitted a trip report, and that is 70 percent; so 70 percent of the trips that we validated we found a positive trip report for.

All the way on the far right are the refusals. Those are those boats in Florida that when we validated they were out fishing, we never received a trip report because they were refusing to participate for the duration of the study. Then the rest of these in the middle; these are boats that are cooperative. They're submitting trip reports but there are some inaccuracies in their reports. Sometimes they were submitting an inactivity report for a week and telling us that they hadn't fished – they weren't fishing for that entire week, but then we would go out and verify that they actually had fished at least on one day that we validated them.

Then some of them just didn't report for that week. They reported other weeks, but we never received trip reports for that particular week. Then sometimes boats had submitted trip reports for some days in the week but not the day that we verified they were out fishing. There were some inaccuracies and incompleteness in the reporting.

The next validation method that we used was a dockside validation of catch, which is pretty straightforward. We just randomly selected sites where the vessels were docked. As the boats came in from fishing trips on those days, we would intercept them and directly observe the fish that were harvested for that trip and then conduct an interview with the vessel operators.

The significance of this is that we're interviewing them immediately after the trip versus what they're later reporting to us up to a week after the fishing week on their logbook trip reports. When we interviewed them, we asked them how many fish were released on the trip that day, how many anglers they carried and how many hours they fished.

Those were the components we were trying to validate; so we could take this dockside information and then later compare it back to what they reported on their trip reports to see how similar or different they were. What we found is that on an individual trip basis, when you compared one dockside validation to that corresponding logbook trip report, they didn't closely match; but when you aggregated all of the logbook trip reports and the dockside samples, on average they were similar.

The reason for that is some of the vessels over-reported and some of them under-reported; and when you combined them all in aggregate, the averages were very similar. The significance of that I will talk about a little bit later, but what that means is that you can't have a very small validation program. You need a large enough dockside validate sample to accurately account for that.

The third validation method that we tried was an at-sea validation for catch. This relied on vessels cooperating with us and allowing a fishery observer to go on the boat. For the cooperative vessels, we randomly selected them each week and the observers would go out on the fishing trip with them and directly observe the discards.

We were already doing this in Florida as part of another study, but we also started it up in Texas for this pilot study. We were very pleasantly surprised with the success that we had getting that started very quickly for this pilot study over there. The sample sizes for this were smaller than the dockside because it required a sampler spending an entire day out on a trip just verifying one vessel.

It is a more expensive method, and we weren't able to sample as many trips this way. What we found was that there were some pretty significant differences in what people were reporting for discards on their logbooks versus what we were observing on these trips; and keeping in mind that these were the vessels that were cooperative and actually agreed to let an observer on their boat. I think that is indicative of some sort of recall issue with discards; where even if a vessel operator is trying in good faith to report this accurately, it is just maybe too much to keep up with.

One of the things we found, too, was that for the trips where we observed the species being discarded, a significant portion of the logbook trip reports were missing those species in their released catch reports. For some of the managed species, for red snapper it was about 20 percent of the trips and as much as 50 percent for – I think it was greater amberjack was up near 50; red grouper and gag were around 40 percent.

Again, just some sort of a recall issue there particularly with discards. That is kind of a summary of the results, real quick one, but based on the results we came up with a list of key findings and some recommendations that we think are useful for anyone considering a logbook approach in the future. The first has to do with reporting compliance and timeliness.

What we figured out very early in this pilot study is that stakeholder input is important, and I think we did a good job of that with our workshop that we held in New Orleans. What we weren't ready for was the outreach effort required at the startup to bring people into the study and get them compliant in their reporting.

We did a couple of public hearings prior to the reporting requirement; and we also sent them a certified letter so that we had documentation that they actually had received the notice that they were required to report. However, I think in the first five weeks of the study in Florida we still had about a hundred out of 350 vessels that had received their certified letter and still had not



contacted Bluefin Data to become registered to report nor had they contacted the state to get paper log sheets.

That sort of set off some alarms for us, and we had to scramble to really do an outreach to those vessels to make personal contact with them and kind of walk them through the process and to get them signed up. There were some issues early on, too, because the study started about six or seven months after the BP Oil Spill in the Gulf, and a lot of those boats were still out on the Vessels Opportunity Program helping with the recovery effort.

We had some issues at the startup trying to reach some of these boats. There were a lot of reasons behind it, but we were not expecting the degree of outreach that was required to fully bring people into this study and get it off the ground. That is something that I would encourage people to be aware of if it was to be implemented.

You also need to have a plan for a quick response if your early compliance is low. What we ended up doing was working with the Southeast Regional Administrator to send out a warning letter to some of the vessels that still – even after we had made personal contact they were not getting registered.

That did help and it brought a lot more boats into the study, but then in the end it came down to just a core group of boats that just were going to refuse this until they were forced to do it. As their permits came up for renewal, we saw sort of a slower decrease in this non-compliance rate over time. Also a very important recommendation from the study is that you have to have methods to quickly identify your missing and late reports and have timely follow-up procedures. We developed this multi-tiered approach to give vessel operators every opportunity to get those late reports in before an enforcement mechanism had to be resorted to. It really wasn't our goal to revoke or not renew someone's permit. We really just wanted to work cooperatively with people to receive the data in a timely manner.

Another things that we learned over the course of the study, we expected this type of effort to sort of decrease over time. As people became used to reporting on a weekly basis, we thought that there would be less late reports and we wouldn't have to do as much followup, but that wasn't the case.

It required a continuous effort over the duration of the one-year pilot study just to maintain the compliance and the timeliness that we had, and so that is something that would have to be planned for in the future for a long-term monitoring program. The study, as it was designed and tested, did not achieve a complete census.

Compliance would have continued to improve if it had run more than the course of a year as those last boats, their permits had to be renewed and they would have been brought into compliance. However, even if we had gotten a hundred percent compliance, we still would have to have validation to account for the incomplete or inaccurate reporting that we found through our validation program.

It would have helped if in the website application we had asked people to report during each day of a week whether they did or did not fish. If we received just one report for the week, then they were compliant, but that didn't give us any indication of whether they didn't fish the rest of the week or if they just simply didn't report for the rest of the week. That would have been helpful.

We, as a working group, didn't feel that daily reporting was necessary to produce good catch-and-effort statistics. Based on the manpower and the cost required just to maintain compliance and timely followup for a weekly reporting program, if you needed to have that on a daily basis, that would require much more manpower and much more cost; especially if you needed to certify for a 100 percent complete and accurate census at the individual vessel level, which can be done. It is done in British Columbia at a very high cost.

It can be done but it is an enormous effort and then an enormous cost, so you need to evaluate what the cost/benefits are of some of those types of reporting systems before you decide which way to go. Then we also didn't want to recommend decreasing the reporting frequency. Even though that would save in the cost, we felt that it would increase recall bias, which we did see even with weekly reporting some recall bias particularly for the discards.

It is not recommended that you go with less than weekly reporting. Again, just the reporting frequency and the level of accuracy that is needed should be considered both in terms of the cost and the benefits for implementing on a larger scale. We recommend weekly reporting combined with a daily reporting requirement as the most feasible method both in terms of cost and minimizing recall bias.

For the people who were submitting paper logbook reports, one of the things we found with that – we worked with Bluefin Data to develop a web tool so that there were error checks in that program, and it wouldn't allow a fisherman to submit a logbook if a field was missing or an illogical number was entered, but you couldn't do that on a paper report so it required a lot more followup on our part to check errors and make corrections on those before we entered them into the system.

A handful of the fishermen in the study also elected to use the I-snapper, which is an iPhone application, which is a great application. The fishermen really loved it because it allowed them more flexibility to record their data at sea as they were taking their trips. The problem at the startup was it was a very new program at the time, and they wanted to get the application out in time for this pilot study so we didn't have a lot time to work with them to get all the error checks in place that we did with Bluefin.

If you have an electronic reporting system without the error checks, it is just as labor-intensive as the paper log sheet because it requires a lot of followup with the vessel operators. Our recommendations are that electronic reporting is preferred if you can have these built-in quality control checks. It did save in terms of the costs and the amount of followup necessary.

If you have electronic reporting, it should also be flexible enough to allow for data entry at sea. Then the current legal authority that we had to enforce reporting requirements, while it was

adequate for bringing people into compliance gradually over the course of a one-year pilot, it was not useful for enforcing timely reporting.

The vessels that refused to report could continue to fish until their permits were up for renewal; and then in order to get their permit renewed, they had to submit all of those delinquent reports, and then they would get their permit renewed. That is fine, but that data is not particularly useful at that point because of the recall bias.

We recommend that timely reporting should also be a requirement and it should be enforceable. I'm not in favor of taking away permits, but some things that could be looked at are like a penalty like a ticket or a temporary suspension until those reports are received. We were encouraged with the high level of coverage in this Logbook Pilot Study.

About 70 percent of the validated trips actually had submitted trip reports through the system, which means that if you need to make inferences about the non-reporters, they're a minority of the people or a minority of the trips, so that was positive. However, we did find that self-reporting that was subject to some recall bias and inaccuracies.

Aggregated logbook data, on the other hand, was potentially useful for estimating total catch-per-unit effort and total harvest. You could potentially use the reports that you do receive to generate an estimate of your total catch and effort. We felt that monthly or bi-monthly estimates could be feasible, and bi-monthly is what the MRIP currently provides.

We have been working with a statistician to demonstrate the potential use of logbook data for estimating catch and effort. However, we also acknowledge that some further research would be necessary to account for what the basis is on those 30 percent of reports that we were trying to estimate for.

Again, because the individual logbook report and then the field validations were closely matched when you looked at them on a trip-by-trip basis, what that tells us is that a small validation monitoring program would not be sufficient, which again affects the cost of running a logbook program. Of the three methods that we tested, the effort validation was the least costly method. However, it only provides a validation for effort.

The dockside validation was of intermediate cost. However, it was not very effective for validating discarded catch. We were able to demonstrate the feasibility of an at-sea validation method, but it is more costly but provides very high-quality data and could potentially be used with a high enough sample size to develop an independent estimator for discards if it was determined that logbook reporting for discards is not feasible.

Validation methods are needed to account for the incomplete reporting. We recommended that for harvested catch you could use a combination of dockside and at-sea validation methods, and then for released catch you need to incorporate some sort of at-sea validation methodology for the discards in particular.

We did find that given adequate resources and long-term funding commitments, logbook reporting could be feasible for implementation on a larger scale. However, for Texas where we only looked at 60 vessels, we did see some issues there with the small sample size, so this may not be feasible for a number of vessels.

Regional implementation would also have to consider whether to include vessels without federal permits, which did not address in this study. There are issues of state authority to require reporting and then guide vessels which operate from trailers would be difficult to validate. Large-scale implementation also should be phased in. This is based again on that large start-up effort required to bring vessels into the study and reporting on a routine basis.

In summary, the Logbook Pilot Study that we tested, we did not achieve a complete census, but it could be improved with better enforcement authority. However, you would still need a validation program to account for your incomplete and inaccuracies in reporting. Estimating catch and effort from logbook data is feasible.

We had a high 70 percent reporting rate, and there was good agreement between aggregated logbook and validation samples; but implementation would require long-term investments to maintain reporting compliance and timeliness and to maintain a validation sample program. The next steps; we have worked with an MRIP consultant and he has demonstrated a potential method for using logbook data to estimate catch and effort.

That report has been provided to MRIP and it has received a good peer review. He is in the process of responding to that peer review. If estimation is a desired direction for MRIP, much more work would be needed, though, to develop those types of estimation methods. The contractor we worked with has done a nice job demonstrating it, but it would require a bit more work. Finally, I would just like to thank all the charter vessel operators and captains who participated in this. Really, the burden was on them to report every week to us. Again, that report is available on the NOAA Website. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: I would like to thank Beverly and I think Gordon has a few remarks and then we will go into some questions.

MR. COLVIN: I am going to abbreviate the summary that I have in the interest of time, and I will make my notes available to the committee. Just quickly, recall, please, that at the present time estimates of charterboat catch for the Atlantic Coast, including the South Atlantic Region, are generated by the two surveys undertaken primarily through the NMFS Office of Science and Technology; the For-Hire Telephone Survey that generates trip estimates by surveys of vessel operators and the Access Point Angler Intercept Survey that generates estimates of angler catch rates through intercepts of trips at dockside at their conclusion.

As I said, those surveys are undertaken via the Office of Science and Technology, working with our partners in the states of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida, and are consistent with the currently adopted standards for for-hire data collection, which we have all developed cooperatively through the Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program, which all of us are partners in and which was updated and reaffirmed about a year ago.

That is where we are; consideration moving forward of changes in our surveys to implement a logbook program for charterboats either as an attempt at a census, recognizing everything that we learned in the study about the challenges associated with that and the many things that would need to be addressed; or, to use logbook data in combination with validation data to generate an estimator of catch.

Either way would require us to undertake a new dialogue about the decisions that would need to be made moving forward. Our thinking for the time being is that given that we don't have a methodology that immediately emerges from this pilot study to achieve a successful census via a logbook program, we need to continue to pursue and explore the interest of our partners in moving in that direction and what the options might be.

If there is strong interest in any of our regions in moving towards a logbook program as an alternative to the current sample survey designs, the first step would be to convene a dialogue of every one of the regional partners involved; the states, individually and collectively; ACCSP; the councils; and the NMFS Region Fisheries Science Center; and Office of Science and Technology to assess our willingness and our capability to proceed in this regard.

Clearly, an important first step would be to develop an estimate of the cost and a very thorough examination of the implementation requirements, responsibilities and capabilities of everything from the enforcement side to the outreach to the validation and data management and handling that would be required. That is I think the next step in any instance.

Now, I would also point out that generally speaking this is not atypical of where we are in a lot of aspects of MRIP right now. A number of major pilot projects are wrapping up. We're getting to a point where we're looking at potential decisions to change methodologies. In some instances those are easier decisions to make than in others.

In many instances they're not decisions that NMFS can or should be making on its own but needs to make in conjunction with our partners. It is not a one-size-fits-all situation. Different regions will have different priorities, different needs and, frankly, different willingness and capability to provide resources to the changes that might be contemplated. To that end, our executive steering committee has identified the need to develop some guidance to the Service on how to approach this question of regional decision-making on both survey designs as well as standards for things like achieving improved levels of precision or timeliness.

We have tradeoffs that need to be evaluated in terms of how much we can invest in different kinds of improvements. They need to be evaluated on a region-by-region basis along with what methods work best. The executive steering committee has decided to conduct a workshop this summer. They will be getting together in July in Baltimore to try to give us some guidance about how these sorts of decisions ought to be addressed on a region-by-region basis.

I think the output from that workshop along with consideration of what we have learned in this study will help all of us going forward to sort out what the future might be for logbooks for charterboats and lots of other decisions that we will be facing, including paying to increase our

sampling to improve precision in some instances and the many other choices that we're facing looking forward. Thank you; and I will make those notes available to you.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you very much, Gordon and Beverly. We really appreciate your being here and being willing to address the committee so late in the date. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: I think this is a longer discussion for another day, but just really quickly I've got to say I'm neither surprised nor particularly discouraged by the results of this pilot study. Certainly, the outreach portion of it is critical. Captains are a riley bunch and it is really about knowing your audience.

I think I would be curious – and I will have to go back and read the study – on how the benefits of this were explained as a part of the outreach program. Certainly, being from the for-hire industry, there are oftentimes that we will get grad students and folks that come up and kind of hand us a survey and say, “You know, we really need you guys to give us all this information”; and I think is oftentimes that follow-up that is missing of how does this benefit us.

That is kind of a critical component. I don't know how much of that outreach at the beginning really framed the potential management benefits and changes to how ACLs and whatnot might be considered for that for-hire sector as a reason to be considering this in a pilot study. Again, this is probably a discussion for a different day. Thank you.

MS. SAULS: Yes, I will just real quickly note that the reason we chose the two areas that we did is those were areas where the captains were clamoring for a logbook reporting program. Obviously, the ones you hear from don't represent everybody. We have learned that quickly in Florida, but we did choose them because they were the two regions in the Gulf where we were getting the most requests for a logbook program.

MR. JOLLEY: I just want to say to Beverly and Gordon well-designed and I think well-executed and we learned a lot of things. I'd like to ask Beverly are you going to publish this? As you know, Dale Beaumarrriage and I would urge you to publish it because it helps everybody else coming along behind you, so we would encourage that.

I would agree with Anna; I am not discouraged, but I think it points out to all of us what a monster it is to get this recreational data and to get it accurately. I know a little something about it because I did it a long time ago.

MR. BURGESS: Thank you for that report. I just have a question about something, and I'm hoping I understood it correctly. It seemed like the decreased reporting frequency is not good and you're supportive of weekly reporting. If I understand correctly, a captain would fill out a form for each day that we went fishing during the week; and was I correct in that you wanted him to fill out another report when he did not fish during the week? Is that correct?

MS. SAULS: Not necessarily to fill out a report; but when they submitted their reports for that week, to confirm that they didn't fish on the days that there were no reports, so that could be a checkbox or something.

MR. BURGESS: Yes, and you felt that was important. I'm kind of thinking of a commercial logbook, and we have discussed things of more timely reporting on our no-fishing reports, and I was just wondering how you feel that is important to have that in there when they do not fish.

MS. SAULS: I didn't mention it, but we did require them, if they didn't fish for a whole week, to at least submit one report for the week saying, "I did not fish." We did have the negative fishing report in there. But within a week if they submitted one trip on Monday of that week and then no more trips for the rest of week, I didn't know if it was because they just didn't get around to submitting the rest of the trips or they didn't actually fish the other days that week. That was the problem with not having that confirmation.

MR. AMICK: Thank you very much for the report. It is an eye-opener of some of the problems we face in getting the data from the recreational sector. I have a headboat and report electronically, and I love it. I will just comment that one of the things I noticed was that it was easier to report daily than try to accumulate the data and report it once a week.

It was not a question of recall, but it was just as easy before you hit the dock to send it in. I think the biggest problem is the validation of seeing that the data is correct. My question is going through the pilot study; did you feel that the reporting was intentional where just some were reporting low landings or high landings or not fishing, or was it just hard for a busy boat captain to keep up accurately or was it intentional?

MS. SAULS: No; I really feel like the data we received was quality data that was received in good faith. I think if they were just making up numbers, we would have seen really big differences in the means even for validations. Because on average they were similar, there were some issues with maybe how accurately they recall it, but they at least recalling it similar to what we were seeing.

The fact that for 70 percent of the time when we were out there and they did a trip and then we got the report, it means to me that they weren't trying to not report. As I said earlier, there were a lot of captains in these two regions that wanted to do this; and so I think that the 70 percent of the reports we got were good-faith reports.

MR. AMICK: I just feel that there are possibilities in this iPhone. This little box right here, it is unreal. It makes it much more efficient and quicker than that paper reporting, and I think there is a promise there in the future to pursue when you're trying to develop a program for charters despite all the problems that we have seen in this pilot study. Thank you.

MR. HAYMANS: Madam Chair, a comment from the peanut gallery. Do you know the percentage of for-hire trips are actually in MRIP; the percentage of the trips where for-hire captains are used?

MS. SAULS: I'm not sure I understand the question.

MR. HAYMANS: The percent of for-hire vessels that are intercepted in the MRIP Program.

MS. SAULS: The question is what percent of the for-hire vessels are intercepted in the survey that is in place right now; the MRIP Program. For the for-hire telephone survey, I can tell that each week 10 percent of vessels are selected, but there is some non-response in that 10 percent sample. That 10 percent sample gets expanded to the rest of the fleet.

For the catch, I don't know. I would estimate 1 to 5 percent, maybe. For this study, it was close to 5 percent for the dockside validations. We were validating at the dock about 5 percent. It is probably pretty similar for MRIP. I think we do about the same number of assignments.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, I don't want to drag this very long. This is outside of this particular study, but just MRIP in general and some of the recalibrations that may be occurring; do you want to speak briefly to sort of the tweaking that is going to occur?

MR. COLVIN: With a focus on the South Atlantic Region and the Atlantic Coast in general, again our primary survey design is a two-part complementary survey where the Coastal Household Telephone Survey has been conducted for a number of years – I think most of you are aware of it – to get an estimate of trips based on telephone random calls to coastal county telephone numbers.

The Dockside Intercept Survey gets catch rate data for the charterboats in the South Atlantic, all for-hire in the rest of the Atlantic Coast and shore and private boat modes; and then these estimates of catch and catch per trip are combined through an estimation process to get estimates of total catch.

To date MRIP has addressed the primary or kind of the most urgent recommendation of the NRC Review to completely rework its estimation methodology; the equations we use to generate those catch estimates from those two separate datasets because the estimation method we used in the past was not an appropriate reflection of the actual sample design.

The new estimation method that has been used and is in use now is statistically appropriate and is appropriately utilized as the data that we collect. Related to that, the second thing that we've done is to address the actual design of the intercept survey itself. There are a number of elements to the intercept survey that introduced potential bias, and that has been addressed in a new intercept design that has been put in the field this year from Maine to Louisiana.

That is underway now. Essentially, those two changes addressed the primary concerns that we have had about the catch estimation part of the surveys in the past. On the telephone surveys, we have been doing a number of pilot projects basically since MRIP began of different ways of collecting trip data, looking at the use of angler registries and other modes besides telephone modes for collecting effort data.

Through this series of pilot projects, we have kind of narrowed down the options; and what we are now doing this year is conducting what we believe will be the final pilot test of an effort survey methodology that will be a dual-frame methodology where we are using – and it will be a mail survey. We will no longer be doing telephone surveys.



Nobody can do telephone surveys anymore. Response rates nationally to all kinds of telephone surveys are plummeting. They are no longer feasible, so we have moved to a mail survey and we're getting a very good response rate in our pilot projects to a mail-based survey. The sample frame is essentially a dual-frame mode where we are using as our primary sample frame a new comprehensive nation-wide data base of address information, which has only been available in the last few years, and it is getting a lot of use by survey managers.

Then we're matching the addresses that come out of the sample with the state license registries and we will over-sample where we get a cross match; and then ultimately we will have to reweight that data appropriately. What it does is it gives us a much more efficient result. It is much more highly efficient to emphasize that over-sampling on the overlap between the two frames.

We're pilot testing that this year in Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina and Florida. The results to date are extremely encouraging. We are getting response rates of upwards of 45 percent; whereas, we were almost down to 10 with the CHTS and dropping like a stone. We think we can achieve the same levels of timeliness and those sorts of performance things with it.

Right now looking forward, we're looking to making that plunge into the new effort survey design next year at the conclusion of this pilot project. There will be a midyear progress report on the effort pilot that will be enormously important in my opinion. There is still some other stuff that is hanging out there that we want to address.

There are a couple as yet insufficiently addressed sources of potential bias, including private access fishing. We have a pilot project that is wrapping up in Florida and North Carolina where we're trying to look at the differences in catch rates between private access and equivalent public access fishing sites to get a sense of what we may need to do. They're going forward.

As Beverly clearly pointed out in her presentation, we need to find ways to improve our estimates of discarded or released fish. Recall error is tough on that and it is encouraging that they were able to show us that at least with charterboats we can do more with sea sampling. They were able to do more with sea sampling in the Gulf than we have been able to elsewhere.

That is very encouraging, but we still have some real challenges I think in addressing improved rates for private boats. That will be ongoing for some time. Once we get past next year or we get into next year where we've made the big fundamental design changes, then the plan will be to work with our partners in the context of whatever guidance comes out of the workshop I spoke about to make investments in expanding our data collection program that addresses the regional standards.

The Atlantic Coast Region has established standards that call for us to generate preliminary estimates more frequently than we do now, which is I think most of you know is a two-month sample frame and preliminary estimates are available 90 days after the end of a two-month period. ACCSP is recommending moving to a one-month sample frame with shortening the post-frame estimate period down to as close as 30 days as possible for starters.

Also, there have been recommendations for expansion of survey coverage in this and in other regions. So having made the fundamental survey design changes, we will also be looking at next year at what is the best mix of investment of the funds that we have in expanding our data collection to address those needs.

The other big one is the precision of our estimates, sample size, how much data do we need to collect to generate how much of a bang in precision improvement. We have funded two projects actually that should be done this year – they're expected to be done this year – that will generate model-based advice to us; one on how different improvements in precision – this is an ACCSP Project.

They're doing it as an MRIP Project – what different standards for precision would achieve what different benefits in management and stock assessment decision-making that they expect will lead to recommended changes in the ACCSP precision standards. The other is essentially a model that will help us quantitatively evaluate the different tradeoffs in optimizing sample size to improve precision and then compare cost and timeliness of the estimates in a quantitative way so we can make an informed investment decision.

Having those tools available this year will help us next year when we look to invest. Now, all this is the Atlantic Coast. There are some guys out on the west coast that have some ideas about investment as well, and we have still got some tough decisions to make about where and how we invest the limited resources we have available. I hope that helps you and that gives you what you're looking for.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for that update, Gordon. Are there other questions of Gordon or Beverly at this point? I think we want to thank you guys for being here and given us a final report on the pilot project in the Gulf. I think from our perspective, we're definitely very interested in learning from the lessons that you guys have gotten out of this project.

And moving forward I think that is one of our next few agenda items is kind of looking at what the Gulf Council has done. They have clearly been interested in moving forward with electronic charterboat reporting there. I'm not sure they have made a lot of progress, but they have sort of a list of items that they would like to examine, including forming a workgroup, et cetera.

We have indicated our desire to them to cooperate on that and work with them on that, so obviously that means working you as you move forward. If there are no other questions for Gordon or Beverly, I think we will let them go and we will continue on with the business of the committee, so thank you, both.

The next item on our agenda is actually the Gulf Framework to implement for-hire reporting, so this is basically the Gulf's version of our Electronic Headboat Reporting Amendment. Gregg is going to quickly run us through that, but we actually need to approve this framework because this affects the Coastal Migratory Pelagics Plan. I think the end result is we're going to probably need to approve this for formal review and deem the codified text and all that sort of thing.

MR. WAUGH: Yes, that is correct. You had a preliminary version of their document as Attachment 5, and you were sent their latest version that is in their briefing book for them to approve next week. It was a document titled for their “Tab E-4, Draft Electronic Reporting for Headboats”, and that is the document. You also had the codified text that was sent to you.

I would just quickly look at what actions are included here. This basically tracks what we have proposed in our for-hire reporting in the South Atlantic only for headboats. It complements that. Their preferred is the same as ours – it is on Page 7; I have got it projected now – that weekly or intervals less than a week require that selected headboat vessels submit fishing records to the SRD weekly or intervals shorter than a week if notified by the SRD via electronic reporting – that is computer or internet. Weekly equals seven days after the end of each week Sunday.

Then we were able in ours to clarify that it was the intent – and the Gulf has done the same thing – that headboats that are in catastrophic conditions – when there are catastrophic conditions, paper reporting can be authorized. A notice will be published in the Federal Register. And then to address this issue of compliance, both in our amendment and in the Gulf’s, no-trip forms must be submitted at the same frequency via the same process and for the same species as specified trip forms.

A headboat owner or operator would only be authorized to harvest or possess Gulf reef fish or coastal migratory pelagic species if previous reports have been submitted by the headboat owner or operator and received by the National Marine Fisheries Service in a timely manner. Any delinquent reports would need to be submitted and received by NMFS before a headboat owner or operator could harvest or possess federally managed species from the EEZ or adjacent state waters.

If they don’t turn in their weekly report, then they’re out of compliance if they go fishing that following week. The reason we’re having to approve this again is because this amends the Mackerel Plan and Coastal Migratory Pelagics Plan, which we are a joint partner with. We need to approve that electronic reporting for headboats and then we will also need to approve the codified text.

DR. DUVAL: All right, are there any questions of Gregg; everybody understands what is going on here? Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Just in the case of the catastrophic conditions; you have a catastrophic condition, a notice will be published in the Federal Register; and then a paper logbook will be sent out to the for-hire boats to continue reporting? Is that how you see that?

MR. WAUGH: Yes; that is my understanding of how the regional office and center would handle that.

DR. DUVAL: At this point, I would entertain a motion from the committee if there are no other questions or comments on this to approve the Gulf Council’s Electronic Reporting for Headboats Amendment.

**MR. HARTIG:** So moved, Madam Chairman.

**DR. DUVAL:** There is a motion by Ben; second by Tom Burgess. Is there any discussion? We need to approve it for formal review, so the motion would read approve the Gulf Council's Electronic Reporting for Headboats Amendment for formal review. Motion by Ben; second by Tom. Discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. Next we would need like the same complicated motion to approve the codified text as necessary and appropriate and I guess give the Chair editorial license to redeem the codified text. Ben.

**MR. HARTIG:** Madam Chairman, I would make the motion to approve the codified text as necessary and appropriate and give the Gulf Council Chair authority to redeem the codified text.

**DR. DUVAL:** Motion by Ben; second by Tom Burgess. Discussion? Any objection? Seeing none; that motion stands approved. That takes us to our next agenda item, which is actually a Joint South Atlantic and Gulf Council Generic Commercial Logbook Reporting Amendment. Gregg is going to give us a bit of an update on where that stands.

**MR. WAUGH:** You directed us to work with the Gulf staff and the region to basically take what we had worked on for the Commercial Logbook Amendment and work together to produce a document. The IPT met on April 1<sup>st</sup>, and we ran into some divergent views on how we were to go forward.

It was our understanding that we would work from what we had put together in terms of alternatives, and it was the view of the Gulf Council staff and Gulf IPT members that we were starting over from ground zero and moving forward, basically looking at all sorts of alternatives. We then heard from the center that they would be implementing a pilot project to test new commercial electronic reporting in 2014, and they would not be ready to expand that and implement a commercial logbook reporting program until 2016.

The IPT discussed that some and then they requested direction from the councils – this is Attachment 6 in your materials – requested direction from councils on how to proceed. If we are to move forward, then we would need the following information from the center in order to continue with development of the amendment: reporting parameters for the commercial electronic reporting system; timeline; pilot project; description and timeline determined for further reporting frequency for all FMPs; list of modifications being made to current logbook this summer; and how the HMS Division will be affected.

That would need to be presented to the two councils. We also talked about how we might go forward with some of the paper logbooks requirements to implement some sort of compliance measure, but that is very difficult with paper. Basically, we are now coming back this week to us and next week to the Gulf Council to ask you how you want us to proceed.

**DR. DUVAL:** Bonnie, I was wondering if perhaps you can give us a few more details on this pilot program that the center is considering or is moving forward on.

DR. PONWITH: I don't have the detailed details in front of me on the pilot program, but what it does is it leverages progress that we have made in other regions, particularly the Northeast Region and tests that here in our area with our fleet. I think if you take a look at what we learned from the pilot study on the for-hire fleet, I think there is a lot that can be learned in the pilot study that will help get a full implementation off on a better foot.

The other thing is that a well-designed pilot can also build proof of concept which makes funding a fleet-wide electronic system better. It remains to be seen what the costs are going to be to go to the electronic reporting. There is the possibility that it will actually be more cost-effective, but there will be transition costs and those transition costs are something that we need to plan for.

DR. DUVAL: Just to remind the committee, the last version of this amendment that we saw basically included a preferred alternative that directed the science center to develop an electronic version of the logbook that would give the fishermen the option of filling out the logbook online. It was not a requirement at that point, recognizing that there is transition that needs to occur and it also considered different reporting timelines for the economic data versus your catch data in the logbook.

I guess, Bonnie, one of the things we talked about was basically working with commercial fishermen when considering development of this electronic logbook, and that was one of the things that we strongly encouraged the center to do. I guess it is my assumption and it is my hope that the details of the pilot program would include that kind of conversation with the industry, with like a focus group of commercial members of the fishing industry.

I guess my gear is just that a pilot would be developed and you would have something that was in kind of Beta form and it ends up not being – it ends up being less efficient for the industry to use. Obviously, whatever is created and tested, we want to make sure that it is as user-friendly as possible and is efficient as possible so that we have people like Steve Amick who is very happy with the electronic reporting for the headboat, that we have got that similar level of enthusiasm for this.

We have definitely heard comments even last night, you know, please, please, let's report electronically and obviously that can't happen overnight, but I think I myself – I don't know about other members of the committee – would love to hear some additional detail when you're able to provide that; maybe hopefully at the next meeting in September on the pilot.

I think at this point, as Gregg has indicated, staff needs a little bit of guidance from the committee with regard to where this goes. I think if we could see some of the details on the pilot study; that might help and have the opportunity to work with the science center and provide some input on that; that could help inform just the future timeline of this amendment.

I guess if the pilot study would start in 2014 and run 2014 and 2015, if we can kind of be working side by side during that time, that would allow for more timely implementation of whatever is the final product right away I think in 2016. Those are just my general thoughts and I would welcome any comments from the committee in that regard. I think this is something we

need to do and we need to do it sooner rather than later. I wish it could be sooner than 2016 I guess is my – it makes me a little sad. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: I think we all share that sentiment that we would like to see it sooner; but in reality what they're telling is this is going to be their timeline and that is what we're going to be bound to. I do think, as you suggested, that we should be working alongside them during this timeframe to have something to put in place as quickly as possible after that pilot is completed.

DR. DUVAL: Gregg, does this give you some direction that you're looking for. I think, Bonnie, we hope to, like I said, have some details of the pilot program for the next committee meeting in September and hopefully provide you with any feedback that helps you all move forward.

MR. WAUGH: And then you would give us additional guidance on timing then with sort of right now the ultimate being that we would have our amendment ready to implement whatever program that comes out of the pilot as of January 1, 2016.

MR. HARTIG: Bonnie, is there any thought being given in this pilot project of possibly looking at the grid structures? We have heard in a number of assessments they're not very useful for fine-scale resolution of where the landings are actually occurring and things of that nature. Have you talked about that; grid sizes for the commercial industry?

DR. PONWITH: My guess is that grid size is probably not a part of the pilot; but that doesn't mean that grid size isn't something we can talk about. With everything – granularity from a science perspective, the more refined the granularity, the happier we are, but you have to balance that with the implications for reporting. Sometimes if you ask for more out of system than you can get, what you get is not meaningful. It is like recall bias or that kind of thing, but it is a conversation we can certainly have.

MR. WAUGH: Certainly, during the public hearings on VMS, we heard repeatedly don't tell us you want better data for VMS; just get it at a more refined scale from the grids. You're not going to run into a problem from the fishermen in reporting at a finer scale, because that was one thing we heard over and over and over at those hearings; make the grids smaller, make the grids smaller.

DR. PONWITH: I think again I heard that, too, and I think the smaller grids is a good thing. Counterbalanced with that is when we go through the data and look at the data, a lot of times what we will find is a commercial vessel that will report a hundred percent of their catch in one grid over and over and over again. Of course, that can happen regardless of the size of the grid, but, yes, I think it is an important discussion.

MR. HARTIG: A hundred percent of my catches for the last 40 years have come from the same grid.

DR. PONWITH: There you go! No, I would agree; we heard this a lot during the VMS hearings that here is a solution to having finer-scale data, so I think it definitely needs to be part of that conversation. All right, is there anymore discussion on this particular agenda item?

Gregg, do you have what you need? Okay, moving on, the next agenda item is really more of an update; the Joint South Atlantic and Gulf Council Generic Charterboat Reporting Amendment.

If you recall, back in December we reviewed the Gulf Council's actions as regards charterboat reporting. That is included in the overview and the Gulf Council had made a number of motions to create a subcommittee, including a member of this council, HMS, the science center and MRIP to look at bringing back some information on electronic reporting for charterboats.

It is my understanding that this sort of ad hoc committee that the Gulf Council wanted to create has not been appointed. Basically, what we did was we indicated our willingness to work with the Gulf Council; and we said, yes, we're interested in electronic reporting for charterboats; we would want to move forward. We don't have anything to react to at this point so I guess just a sense from the committee that you all are still interested in doing this and moving forward and working with Gulf Council on items of this nature.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I know I am.

MR. WAUGH: I think part of it was waiting for this final report that was presented to the Gulf at their last meeting and we just got. I think we have the benefit of that now; and I think it is just to reiterate if you want us to continue to work with the Gulf, we will and presumably this will move forward.

DR. DUVAL: Well, I think that is probably certainly the case. It is one more piece of the puzzle. All right, the last item on our agenda is discussion of the sampling protocols. The science center actually underwent a program review I think just last week; and so this was an item that Ben had requested be put on the agenda. It was really a discussion of the sampling protocols, and I think Bonnie was going to provide some information on the sampling protocols that the science center has.

DR. PONWITH: Sampling protocols is a huge, huge, huge topic, and we spent a whole week on it last week talking about our data collection procedures and things that we can do to improve the quality of our data collections and also help us set priorities – input on setting priorities in terms of what changes to data collections can bring you the biggest bang for the buck.

What I did here was cribbed from the ACCSP Website a presentation that they put together for how they make decisions across the Atlantic Seaboard here on what stocks get sampled, where, and at what level. Of course, this is a group effort. It is a very highly participatory group effort in making these decisions, because naturally my priorities may differ from the Northeast Fisheries Science Center's priorities, which may differ from a state or an interstate commission.

This is a way to make those hard decisions on these coast-wide collaborative programs. What you will see is a really large, unwieldy spreadsheet in the next slide down below and it gets at how those decisions are made. I wonder if we might zoom on those headers. You will see down on the left-side are a list of species. You will see up in the right-hand corner that this represents the upper 25 percent of the matrix; so as unwieldy as this is, it actually only represents a quarter of the whole list.

DR. DUVAL: Bonnie, let me just interrupt really quickly for a moment. This presentation was e-mailed to folks earlier. I believe Mike e-mailed it around to everybody, so you should have this. Additionally, materials were also e-mailed out earlier. There is an Excel Spreadsheet that reflects 2011 ACCSP Priority Sampling Matrices as well. The title of it is “Bio-sample Decisions”, so that should help you find it.

DR. PONWITH: I’ll tell you what; if it is ungainly to try and expand that, let me just read some of them off to you so we don’t have to fuss. Again, on the left-side are a list of species; and going across the top as column headers are the fishery status, which is known or unknown; the most recent stock assessment year; the current or next stock assessment year; the priority council on a scale of one to five; the ASMFC priority; the state priority; NMFS priority; whether the fishery is managed; whether there have been significant changes in landings within in a 24-month period; whether there have been significant changes in management – I’m sorry, landings in a 24-month period; management in a 24-month period; and then some sort of a scale of the adequacy level of the sampling.

Then after that are stock resistance; the number of sampling strata; and the seasonality of the fishery. You can see this is a multi-faceted scoring mechanism. Based on those scores provided by each of the participants on this team who oversee the biological sampling, the different species along the left-hand column get a score.

When those scores are ranked from highest to the lowest, the top 25 percent of the matrix was determined as being fundable, because, of course, the bottom line is it is all about the money, and you can only spread the money as far as it will go. In biological sampling, you will learn that there is a diminishing return both if you sample below a certain level, the information you get doesn’t have any statistical meaning; and then as you sample more and more at higher levels, the content of information that you get from the next sample starts to fade.

So there is a sweet spot in there, and that is what they’re trying to do is reach that sweet spot. On the next slide you see this matrix again and across the top the adequacy; is it adequate or is it inadequate. And then along the left-hand side you see the average priority, and that is basically what block that score fell into.

You can see then that gives you four blocks; you know, it is high priority and adequate; high priority, inadequate, and so on. That again is just a visualization tool to help them make decisions. This is a tool for them to evaluate across a very complex number of criteria; a way to set priorities.

Once you set the priorities, you still have to set your sampling levels, and so we will go to the next slide. Biological sample sizes are selected via a mathematical process. For every species we have a series of strata; and these purposes, it is by quarter, by gear and by area, and this is for each of the species.

As you can imagine, depending upon the geographic distribution or the seasonality of the fishery, you can have many different combinations of these strata; and you need to have a sample size in



each of those cells that is adequate or else the money that you're putting into sampling may not be reaping the benefits that you need from it.

Ultimately the goal is to sample at a rate that enables the estimation of the desired parameter – in this case either length or age – with the level of precision you need to answer the questions that you're gathering these data for in the first place. We use math to help us kind of optimize; because if you sample high everywhere, you run out of money fast and a lower number of species are going to get sampled.

It is a matter of helping you to make decisions and helping us collectively make decisions about where that dotted line is drawn when you run out of money. The steps that are used to set the sample size – and I started out by putting the equations that we use, but the equations are messy and convolute, so instead opted especially this time of the day to go through it verbally. The first thing is to look at what sample size is needed to reach the level of precisions you think you need.

To do that, we go through a historic dataset for a given species and we decide what level of prevision we want and then back-calculate what sample size it takes to achieve that. That is based on the natural variability of the parameter you're measuring, either the age or the length. Now, when you do that, you end in a situation where sometimes the answer comes out that you actually need more samples than the number of fish that are actually landed in that cell, which is an impossibility.

Not even all the money in the world can get you more samples than the ones that are landed. What they did is created a mathematical process for scaling for those situations to make sure that the sample size within a strata are properly scaled for the number of fish that are actually being landed.

There are going to be circumstances where the sample sizes are extremely low and variance is extremely high. In those situations where you have sample size that needs to be high, they actually sample 100 percent of the landings unless in that cell the number of landings represents less than 5 percent of the total annual catch; in which case they don't sample any.

The purpose for that is that if you have an extremely low number of landings in there and you happen to get an anomalous fish in there that is really tiny or really huge, really young or really old, it can actually disproportionately influence the average length or average age. Those are the steps that are used to determine what the sampling size should be for our collective biological sampling along the coast, including the South Atlantic.

I guess what I will do stop there and ask if there are any questions. Let me show you – there is a result. When you apply those formulas that I opted not to show – I can give them to you if you want – when you apply those to a time series database – and this just happens to be vermilion snapper – this is what the decision looks like.

You will see that in cases where the landings are really low, they simply don't sample, and that is by design. Then you will have a situation where they will sample up to a hundred percent of

each cell. In this case, no matter how many fish are landed, they don't take more than 500 samples.

The reason is because that 500, when they went through and looked at the variance of the length data, no matter how much more you sample, you just don't get – you're in the asymptote; you just don't get that much better information by sampling more than 500, so that is where we quit. That is kind of what the decision plot looks like to help them make decisions about how much sampling they do where. That is the last slide, so at this point I would ask if there are questions.

MR. JOLLEY: Bonnie, I'm aware of some criticism that in our sampling program we aren't getting enough biological information specifically on age and growth to plug into these assessment models. I have seen it in 15 years at ACCSP, for example, most of the project proposals that come in deal very little with that age and growth and yet we have got people all over the Eastern Seaboard going out and getting information from the fisheries.

Of course, they aren't always biological cells that they get, but they emphasize in most cases catch and effort when they're collecting critical data as well. If this is true – and I know that some of the best data for these assessment models is age and growth – how do we improve gathering that data? Here we have got this great big program we have been designing for years with all these project proposals coming in from all over the place, and it seems to deemphasize the collection of biological information, and I am having a hard time understanding it.

DR. PONWITH: I would say there is never a lack of emphasis on age and growth data and fecundity data. Those biological parameters are absolutely essential in a Tier 1 stock assessment. I will say this. You heard today the notion of looking at electronic reporting for charter. You heard today how critical it was to have good dockside intercepts to validate those data.

That is all money that is going toward quantifying landings in the recreational. We're talking now about logbooks going electronic for the commercial, and again that has helped to quantify landings, to quantify discards. There is always this tradeoff. Are you mathematically better off getting better landings' data? Are you better off getting biological samples?

Are you better off getting both; but what if you don't have enough money, where do you trim? You're absolutely right; it is critical to have those data and the decision to get them always cost something else. Now, there are some stocks where we don't use age structure in the stock assessment, and it is because simply – usually it is because we don't have the data.

Again, that is always a decision of do you make the investment to convert to an age-structured stock assessment for this stock; and if the answer is yes, it comes at the expense of something else. I think there is no lack of interest in improving the biological samples. It is something we talked about at great length last week during our data review of how critical that work is; but again it is balancing when you do the sensitivity analysis, what do you gain if you improve that versus that and the decisions are never simple.

MR. HARTIG: This was great? This was a great explanation on how you do it; and then I would ask for Phase 2. What are the sampling targets for our assessed species and how well

were they met? That is a simple question. In this graph for vermilion, it says landings in numbers and targets. What are the targets specifically? Those top lines are the targets?

DR. PONWITH: No, the targets are on the left-hand side. Based on the mathematical formula that we used to look for the ideal, those are the targets. Those are not necessarily the actuals.

MR. HARTIG: Yes, that is what I was wondering. I was a little bit disappointed in the data review. There were a number of papers that talked about the TIP Sampling Program, and all of those reports had aggregated the numbers of otoliths collected. None of them separated them out by species, so we have no idea on how well we're achieving our sampling goals for any of our assessed species. That is really what I am interested in.

I am not interested in it just to say you didn't collect the necessary information we need to criticize the Center. What I am interested in going forward is trying to find a way that we actually collect the necessary samples that were set out in the protocol. That was the main thing. Basically, what I'd like to see from this is Next Step Two for the species that we have assessments for – and I am not going to go back in time, Bonnie.

Just for the next go-round and for between assessment sampling sizes; what are the sampling sizes for the species on the assessment list going forward? I think that would help me understand how well we are going to be able to do it. If we're not achieving those sample sizes, then let's cooperatively find a way to do it, possibly with industry's help in some kind of brainstorming cooperative research thing that we could put together.

That was the exercise that I wanted to see. Like I said, that was a great review that you put on last week. I was very impressed with the review, but the question I asked was kind of diminished in saying, "Well, that is not really as important in the assessment." Well, age structure is pretty important in an assessment, especially for the ones we do the age-structured assessment for.

For me, I would like to see going forward with actual numbers; and pick between sampling intervals, the last one we had and how well we were able to do. In order to make improvements we have to know and then we have to find ways to help you find the money or contribute money to make this happen, and resources.

DR. PONWITH: I don't have our actuals off the top of my head to be able to tell you, but I will tell you the very coarse answer to that question is in the ACCSP slide; and this is from 2013. That slide says biological review panel recommends species in the upper 25 percent of the priority matrix be considered for funding.

It doesn't even necessarily mean that they got funded. Those are the ones that are fair game; so 75 percent is a big number that is dancing below the dotted line. That would be like the second slide; the second ACCSP slide. Yes, and that one talks about it, too. Certainly, more data are usually better.

MR. HARTIG: Again, I'm sure we have good data for black sea bass. We have good independent sampling for black sea bass because their behavior allows them to go in the traps easily. We probably have actually some pretty good vermilion snapper as well. When you put those all together, if you want to look at some other species like gag, what kind of sampling – how well did we do with the sampling on gag?

What I took out of that data workshop was you showed the fishery-dependent information coming from the TIP sampling and then you showed the fishery-dependent coming from the recreational sampling, and you could hardly even see the recreational samples because the bar was so close to the line on the graph, but the commercial samples were significantly higher.

Given that the TIP sampling is so important in our dependent sampling for those species which we do not have the fishery-independent sampling program is not going to be appropriate for; king mackerel, Spanish mackerel, which are two species that have some of the highest landings in our management. I mean, they're two of the most important species we manage as far as biomass goes for what we catch.

For species like that, which don't have the independent sampling, especially, I would like to see how it was set out. I would like to see the real crux of – you know, the fishery is prosecuted primarily in North Carolina and Florida, so how many samples did we take out of North Carolina and how many did we take out of Florida, and do we try to collect any in between.

I know your TIP samplers are distributed over the entire region; but for some species the importance of sampling in specific regions is more important than maybe in South Carolina, for example. I see value in what you have done here and I really appreciate it; but carrying on – and NMFS used to do this. They used to give us sampling protocols that showed us the numbers by species that they were trying to collect.

DR. PONWITH: That is not – no.

MR. HARTIG: That is not a protocol?

DR. PONWITH: No.

MR. HARTIG: It is a part of the protocol.

DR. PONWITH: Sampling protocol is the procedure you use for setting up the sampling to guide how the sampling is carried out. What I hear is a call for an analysis of how close we came to – what the targets were and how close we came to meeting them for key species in the South Atlantic?

MR. HARTIG: Yes. So I was asking for the wrong thing all the time. I'm looking for the results of the protocol. I guess that is what I was asking for. I thought they were an integral part of a protocol in and of itself, but obviously I was wrong. Yes, the results that you get out of the protocols you have I think is important for us to see how well we're doing.

I asked this because I have attended assessments where we have tens of samples and the reviewers say, well, normally if I was looking at the numbers of species harvested, we would have in the thousands of species to look at – in the thousands of samples to look at. You hear those kinds of things.

Even though we were able to complete an assessment for cobia based on those low sample sizes doesn't mean that we shouldn't strive to get somewhere closer to the actual sampling numbers that come out of the protocols. That is really what I'm after, and you've got it.

DR. DUVAL: I guess that matrix that you showed, Bonnie, with the four different colored squares where there is the sweet spot and then there is the ugly spot; so this is from 2013, actually? It is disappointing to me to see the inadequate sample and low priority covering a number of South Atlantic Council species like snowy grouper and blueline tilefish and gray triggerfish and gag grouper.

I mean, gosh, I don't consider those at all unimportant species; and I know that in the broader context of overall ACCSP priorities, they may not necessarily rise to the top, but that is very disappointing. I think just looking at the matrix from the 2011 sampling targets, it is clearly overwhelmingly weighted towards northeast priorities.

There is a phase but I just won't say it on the record. I guess, Bonnie, just following up on what Ben was asking in terms of sampling targets, I guess it might be helpful – and, Ben, you correct me if this is something that you are or are not looking for, but maybe of those species that were assessed in – the South Atlantic species that were assessed in 2012 or 2013; what were the sampling targets and did we reach them. What were the final numbers; did we reach them; and then maybe another chart for the species that are coming up for a 2014 assessment, what are the sampling targets. Well, they would have finished those last year.

But I just looking at those species that we have on our assessment schedule; what are those sampling targets; and are we on trajectory to meet them. I know that is kind of tough for you to sort of project out like that. Like Ben said, I think that information helps us to determine where are the problems to that?

We can help you get the data that you need to feed into those assessments. I think it is part of sort of a creative thinking process that has to go forward as your budget is squeezed and other budgets are squeezed as well. I know at the ASMFC level there are compliance requirements for the states to meet certain sampling targets for certain species.

Like weakfish, I think it is X number of samples per ton of fish. I say it is a compliance requirement in that the Secretary of Commerce can find a state out of compliance if you don't meet those requirements. Does that always happen? No, not necessarily because there may be extenuating circumstances whereby the hundred pound commercial trip limit on weakfish is just prohibiting you from getting the necessary commercial samples that you need. I think that might be a useful thing. Ben, correct me if I'm wrong.

MR. CARMICHAEL: If I could comment on a couple of things; it is interesting with the ACCSP priorities, because everybody here, you have a state biologist who contributes to those scores, and it important that they pay a lot of attention to those and think about the South Atlantic needs.

I think it would be for especially the state council members to maybe find out who that is and talk to them about how important some of these stocks are. I have been dealing with this since the beginning, and it is a frustrating fact to see so many stocks that we know in this region are important that don't rise up very high on that list quite often.

Part of it is just because maybe in terms of poundage and other things and the criteria that Bonnie showed some of our stocks maybe don't come up as much. It is something that the state people in particular, you have an opportunity to maybe elevate those priorities. Most of the assessments we do have an accounting of the sampling that has gone on for that species.

It is usually something that is even weighed in terms of the CVs and the uncertainties. I was just checking to verify; in the black sea bass update we just got they showed the number of trips that were sampled, and that is important because there is a big difference within a fishery like this between a trip and a length.

You can sample a thousand lengths from – you know, a handful of trips in one area might not mean the same as if you sampled a handful of lengths from a thousand trips. It is usually more important especially in our fishery where what sort of really matters is what the particular person did and where they went, so it is important to have a lot of trips covered.

They evaluate sampling based on the number of trips as opposed to, say, the number of individual fish encountered because that is much more reflective of how well you're doing to sample the fishery and really get the variability that exists across the species. It was in the hundreds for across the board for most of the things on black sea bass, several hundreds, two or three hundreds of trips.

In the SAFE Report we include an accounting of the total number of lengths and otoliths that are measured through the center that has been take through TIP. Now, that doesn't get into other sources. It is just from TIP because the center is able to provide us with that. If you're interested, we could probably get that in terms of individual species. Maybe for a number of the key species that are pretty important, I think we could add that in the SAFE Report tables.

I just looked at that and in 2011 there were 20,000 lengths, 10,000 otoliths and like 2,000 trips through TIP. That is another important thing is that one of the progressions over time, especially with those of us in the southeast that are contributing to these ACCSP priorities, is maintaining the focus on trips, especially in things like the snapper grouper; because it is not a single-species fishery; at least the hook-and-line component in a lot of cases.

The black sea bass pot is fairly well a single-species fishery, but a lot of that has come down from the northeast, as Michelle mentioned, and with sampling targets initially where from the

northeast they used to have sampling targets about so many lengths for a hundred metric tons. A hundred metric tons is really not a good criteria for us with the size of our fisheries.

Some of this stuff is kind of our region's needs versus the rest of the area and we're kind of different in a lot of ways, and the single-species sampling targets are problematic because TIP doesn't really sample that way necessarily because you want them to know what came in on that trip. You don't want a guy to go to the fish house and think, okay, I've got to get 50 samples of snowy grouper this month to round out my targets and miss a really good trip that would give us good information.

DR. DUVAL: So that matrix of sampling targets from 2011 that was send around to the committee; those are based on individual lengths or are those trips?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Those are typically the number of lengths they want to get in a month in a cell of some sort based on area and gear.

MR. JOLLEY: Just quickly to that point, John, Dick Stone and myself and Bill Beaumarriage have been ringing that bell at ACCSP on the biology and getting this stuff. I don't know where the bias or influence comes in, but you have touched base on a lot of it, but I think it comes it come from higher up.

From the state level, at least from our perspective, we were ringing that bell and saying we need some more biological stuff into these project proposals; why doesn't it show up? And it does show up sometimes, but it just seems like it is a very disproportionate relation to the catch data. I understand it from Bonnie's point of view, you know, cost and you have to make evaluations.

MR. HARTIG: John, we have this discussion at the data workshop level about the trips and how in Florida with the loss of the fish houses and these satellite operations we have now and the fact that most of the time we're unloading probably between nine and eleven at night. Those trip samples are going away unless we revise the schedule of the sampler to the time when we're actually landing. That would help tremendously if you want to get that important trip level sampling.

I understand that a bit; I know that is a big part of it, but that is the crux. Mostly now, in the last six or seven years everything is already graded and in vats and gone to the fish house and the sampler goes to the fish house and has no trip level intercepts. It is all just based on what is the total amount of fish at the fish house for that day.

I guess you could broaden your trip to include a multi-number – well, you know the number of people who had landings and you know their landings. I don't know how that would work, but I have certainly been one – I have been with the sampler in our area trying to get her to come at an hour where we're actually there to get the samples. It is difficult.

She just got married and you're asking to take her away from her husband on the evenings when she is supposed to be home cooking dinner and things of that nature. (Laughter) No, no, at least in that situation. I mean that was something that she was really into. I'm not saying this across

the board. In that case that was one of her priorities that she wanted to be home at that time to do that.

I think going forward if we want to have those, that we should just reevaluate the timing of the sampling and try and do that. I think it would work quite well. It is a little bit more difficult collecting otoliths at night. The light needed is – but that can be overcome with some good lighting because I have done that before and I know it is harder to do at night, but that can be overcome with some really good lighting. That is something we should consider. That is why we're having these discussions is to try and make our sampling better so we can get the best information for the assessments we can. That is just what I'm trying to do.

MR. JOLLEY: They say better samples for better data for better management.

DR. DUVAL: Are there any other questions or discussion about this particular agenda item, the sampling targets and whatnot. I'm sure there will be more information forthcoming as more of this review process comes forward. I think certainly, as John has indicated, it is important for the states to communicate with the folks who are sitting on the ACCSP Biological Review Committee and press upon them the importance of these species so that they can be moved up in those tiers a bit. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: Well, I'm going to make this kind of in the form of a motion because I think it is that important, but I don't want the wording in this motion to be so detailed that we don't go through and get down to what we really want to ask Bonnie for.

**I would just provide a motion that says that the council write a letter to the Center requesting sample sizes for individual species that are assessed in the South Atlantic.** That is general, but specifically I think we can get down to the right wording to the Center.

DR. DUVAL: There is a motion by Ben; seconded by John Jolley. The motion reads the council write a letter to the Science Center requesting sample sizes for individual species that are assessed in the South Atlantic. Is there any discussion on that? Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: And, Ben, your intent there would be the sample sizes and what has been achieved?

MR. HARTIG: Yes; that is why I didn't want to have it – but thanks for that.

MR. CARMICHAEL: And do you number of lengths, number of otoliths and number of trips?

MR. HARTIG: Yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Commercial and recreational and headboat – say MRIP, headboat, commercial?

MR. HARTIG: Well, is the center responsible for the MRIP Sampling Protocols?



DR. PONWITH: I think it would be good to just step back a second before you start fleshing out and make sure that what you ask for is getting after what you're interested in. If the question is are the biological sampling efforts in the South Atlantic meeting the requirements for an effective stock assessment, if that is the question, then we can help you tailor what information we think we should give you to get at that question.

It almost seems better to ask the question – for example, this data call today, if you ask the question first, it will help us figure out what data illustrate the best the answer to that question as opposed to say give me this data point.

That helps us to help you better. Maybe the thing to do is to pose what the question is and then in your motion – and this is just a suggestion; I'm not the boss of you, of course – that work the science center to flesh out the steps or the information that would best address the question.

DR. DUVAL: So would you want to add that as like intent; the intent is to work with the science center to best determine the information that is being requested?

MR. HARTIG: That is fine as long as we get what we want.

DR. DUVAL: Well, no, that is why I'm asking.

MR. HARTIG: That is what I'm afraid of if we end up going to the science center and it said, well, this is what we can provide to you; and then we don't get what we originally asked for, that is going to be disappointing.

DR. PONWITH: Well, if you're worried about getting what you want, then tell us exactly what you want. My fear is what you're asking for may not – I want to make sure what you're asking for connects to the question you're trying to answer; because then it is a giant, bring me a rock. We want to be careful about that.

DR. DUVAL: Ben, is it along the lines of what I had posed to Bonnie earlier; what are your targets for those assessed species in numbers and what were the numbers that were actually achieved?

MR. HARTIG: Yes, that is exactly what I want to see. Like I said, we didn't have to have the specific wording. The wording is just to go to the science center with this information and maybe we can work together collaboratively after we ask the question about what she can provide.

DR. DUVAL: So perhaps the intent is to have the targets and what was achieved.

MR. CARMICHAEL: You focused on assessed stock. There are some stocks that are priorities and upcoming and planned to be assessed. Would you be interested in those because that could help influence your prioritization of what is to be assessed and how over the next couple of years.

I am thinking in particular of there are about 20 stocks that are identified as priorities in the research plan that we approved earlier in the week. Many of those stocks, maybe five years ago, I had provided the steering committee a summary of the number of lengths and otoliths from TIP for those as a way to help guide priorities as well. Maybe you would want –

MR. HARTIG: And now you're getting at exactly what I had – you know, the wheels are turning and exactly what I was trying to do. I have asked this before. I have asked for the concept before that we have some way of prioritizing the species that the council wants to see assessed based on the number of samples we have; because if we have enough number of samples, why go ahead with a priority assessment for that stock?

Then if you don't, then you try and make the necessary adjustments to collect the necessary data you need to do the assessment. Now, I know that is over a long timeframe, but I think there can be adjustments made in relatively short timeframes to hit a particular species maybe a little harder to see what is happening in the cohorts in that fishery at that time in a snapshot. I've had conversations with other assessment scientists that at times you may want to do that, but I don't know if Bonnie agrees with that or not. That is just other conversations.

DR. DUVAL: Bonnie, do you have any thoughts on that?

DR. PONWITH: I'm typing an e-mail giving my people a heads-up that this is coming, and I missed the crux of the question.

DR. DUVAL: I think Ben was – John had asked the question of would you be interested in those basically 20 priority stocks that are contained within the research plan that we approved earlier this week. Some of those are actually on the assessment list as upcoming for assessments and some are not; and Ben's point is that if we knew, okay, here was the targeted number of samples and here is what has actually been achieved; is it actually enough to do an assessment, that it might inform the council's decision or input that we give to our SEDAR Committee meetings, to the science center, to the SEDAR Steering Committee with regard to upcoming assessment priorities.

In other words, it doesn't make sense – if we know that there are not enough samples, then it doesn't make sense to go through all the effort to put together a benchmark assessment if we're there in terms of the sampling targets.

DR. PONWITH: That is kind of a roundabout way of getting to that; I mean, another way of getting to that might be to ask the center to list the species that are managed with some metric of how assessable it is based on the data that are available, the biological samples that are available, what stage of being read and interpreted those biological samples are, and we could create a list of criteria, just like we saw a list of criteria there, and say this stock is immediately and exquisitely assessable; this stock, there is no hope; and here are the ones that are in between.

We have a very coarse list right now that we use in the center so that when you folks deliberate what stocks do you want to be next, we can answer the mail, yes, we'd like that done, too, but

the data don't exist, so that we can actually stop a discussion before we get into a situation where it is on the schedule and we realize, oh, oh, that is not an assessable stock.

If that is the goal, that may be a holistic way of doing it than just looking at how many otoliths have been cut for that species. It is a little more – it answers the mail more completely than just the number of otoliths.

MR. HARTIG: Both would be great, basically. I want to know the sample sizes. Not, like I said, to criticize you, but this goes back to uncertainties in assessments. I have to commend the Southeast Fisheries Science Center assessment analysts for their mathematical wizardry that they have been able to perform of some of these assessments with tens of samples to actually get it through review.

It has been incredible. Cobia was amazing with the tens of samples, that they actually got it through the review. Having said that, that doesn't ever give the center any impetus to really collect the necessary data in my opinion that meets the sampling numbers that come of the protocols. If you continually are able to do assessments with less and less data, the uncertainties in those assessments are paid for by the fishermen.

Uncertainty equates to dollars that comes out of an assessment in landings that you forego because of the uncertainties in the assessment. The farther you get away from the number of samples that your protocol says you should collect, the more uncertainty you have and the less certain the assessment is, so that equates into less numbers of fish coming out of the assessment and less money for both the enjoyment of the recreational and money for the commercial. There are significant costs to uncertainties and that is something that we need to address going forward.

DR. DUVAL: Okay, the hour is getting late. What I'm hearing is that Ben would still like to see the target sample sizes as well as what has been achieved for those species; but I think, Bonnie, we would be interested in seeing what are the other metrics that you all use to form your rough analysis of whether a stock is ready for an assessment.

**Are there any other comments or questions or discussion on this? We need to approve this motion? Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; that motion stands approved.** Is there any other business to come before the committee? Seeing none, Mr. Chairman, the Data Collection Committee is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 6:32 o'clock p.m., June 13, 2013.)

Certified By: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Transcribed By:  
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.  
July 15, 2013

# South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

## 2012-2013 Committees

### DATA COLLECTION

Michelle Duval, Chair  
Jessica McCawley, Vice Chair  
Steve Amick  
Tom Burgess  
Ben Hartig  
Wilson Laney  
Charlie Phillips  
Tom Swatzel  
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

MARTHA  
BACEMAN

### ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Doug Haymans, Chair  
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair  
Steve Amick  
Mel Bell  
Tom Burgess  
John Jolley  
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

### CATCH SHARES

Ben Hartig, Chair  
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair  
Mel Bell  
Tom Burgess  
David Cupka  
Michelle Duval  
Doug Haymans  
Jessica McCawley  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Staff contact:  
Kari MacLauchlin / Brian Cheuvront

### DOLPHIN WAHOO

Tom Swatzel, Chair  
John Jolley, Vice Chair  
Steve Amick  
Anna Beckwith  
Doug Haymans  
Wilson Laney  
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate  
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

### ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

Doug Haymans, Chair  
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Tom Burgess  
Roy Crabtree  
David Cupka  
Ben Hartig  
Wilson Laney  
Jessica McCawley  
Charlie Phillips  
Tom Swatzel  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP  
Anna Martin- CEBA

### EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

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

### GOLDEN CRAB

David Cupka, Chair  
Charlie Phillips, Vice Chair  
Michelle Duval  
Ben Hartig  
John Jolley  
Wilson Laney  
Jessica McCawley  
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

### HABITAT & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Tom Burgess, Chair  
Wilson Laney  
Jessica McCawley  
Charlie Phillips  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese  
Anna Martin- Coral

### HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

John Jolley, Chair  
David Cupka, Vice Chair  
Steve Amick  
Anna Beckwith  
Tom Swatzel  
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

### INFORMATION & EDUCATION

John Jolley, Chair  
Tom Burgess, Vice Chair  
Steve Amick  
Mel Bell  
Wilson Laney  
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

### KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

Ben Hartig, Chair  
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair  
Steve Amick  
Anna Beckwith  
Mel Bell  
David Cupka  
Doug Haymans  
Jessica McCawley  
Charlie Phillips  
Tom Swatzel  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate  
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

### LAW ENFORCEMENT

Mel Bell, Chair  
Tom Burgess, Vice Chair  
David Cupka  
Scot Gibson  
Doug Haymans  
Jessica McCawley  
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

### PERSONNEL

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

### PROTECTED RESOURCES

David Cupka, Chair  
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Michelle Duval  
John Jolley  
Charlie Phillips  
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese

### SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

Michelle Duval, Chair  
Doug Haymans, Vice Chair  
Mel Bell  
Roy Crabtree  
John Jolley  
Wilson Laney  
Staff contact: John Carmichael

# South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2012 - 2013 Council Membership

## COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

**David M. Cupka**  
P.O. Box 12753  
Charleston, SC 29422  
843/795-8591 (hm)  
843/870-5495 (cell)  
palmettobooks@bellsouth.net

## VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

**Steve Amick**  
6902 Sandnettles Drive  
Savannah, GA 31410  
912/429-3537 (ph)  
912/898-0361 (f)  
SteveAmicks@aol.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

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

**Tom Burgess**  
P.O. Box 33  
Sneads Ferry, NC 28460  
910/327-3528  
tburgess@embarqmail.com

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

**Dr. Michelle Duval**  
NC Division of Marine Fisheries  
3441 Arendell St.  
PO Box 769  
Morehead City, NC 28557  
252/726-7021 (ph); 252/726-0254 (f)  
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov

**LCDR Scot Gibson**  
U.S. Coast Guard  
Brickell Plaza Federal Building  
909 S.E. First Avenue  
Room 876/ DRE  
Miami, FL 33131-3050  
305/415-6768 (ph)  
305/415-6791 (f)  
Mario.g.gil@uscg.mil

**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

**John W. Jolley**  
4925 Pine Tree Drive  
Boynton Beach, FL 33436  
561/732-4530 (ph)  
jolleyjw@yahoo.com

**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

**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**  
Director,  
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

**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

**Charles 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

**Tom Swatzel**  
P.O. Box 1311  
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576  
843/222-7456 (ph)  
tom@swatzel.com

BEVERLY SIMS

GORDON COLVIN

JACK MCGOWAN

MONICA SMIT-BANKHEAD

JOHN SANCHEZ

JENNIFER LEE

LT MORGAN FOWLER

BONNIE POWWITA

OTHA GASLEY

# South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

## Executive Director

Robert K. Mahood  
robert.mahood@safmc.net

## Deputy Executive Director

Gregg T. Waugh  
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

---

## Public Information Officer

Kim Iverson  
kim.iverson@safmc.net

## Fishery Outreach Specialist

Amber Von Harten  
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

## Senior Fishery Biologist

Roger Pugliese  
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

## Fishery Scientist

Myra Brouwer  
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

## Coral Reef Scientist

Anna Martin  
anna.martin@safmc.net

## Fishery Biologist

Dr. Mike Errigo  
mike.errigo@safmc.net

## Fisheries Social Scientist

Dr. Kari MacLauchlin  
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

## Staff Economist

Dr. Brian Chevront  
brian.chevront@safmc.net

## Science and Statistics Program Manager

John Carmichael  
john.carmichael@safmc.net

## SEDAR Coordinators

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

## SEDAR Admin/Outreach

Andrea Grabman  
andrea.grabman@safmc.net

## Administrative Officer

Mike Collins  
mike.collins@safmc.net

## Financial Secretary


Debra Buscher  
deb.buscher@safmc.net

## Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya  
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

## Purchasing & Grants

Julie O'Dell  
julie.odell@safmc.net

~~Beverly Santes~~  
~~Gordon Colvin~~ 

# PLEASE SIGN IN

So that we will have a record of your attendance at each meeting and so that your name may be included in the minutes, we ask that you sign this sheet for the meeting shown below.

## South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Meeting:

### Data Collection Committee

Thursday, June 13, 2013

3:00 P.M. to 5:00 P.M.

<u>NAME &amp; ORGANIZATION</u>	<u>AREA CODE &amp; PHONE NUMBER</u>	<u>EMAIL ADDRESS</u>	<u>P.O. BOX/STREET CITY, STATE &amp; ZIP</u>
Emily Helmick	501 670 2397	ehelmick@fmc.net	
Priscilla Johnson	857 386-239-0948	priscilla.johnson@aol.com	32120-9351
Lynn Case	843.819.8169	lcase@patriots.org	P.O. Box 609 Chas. SC 29402
David Newman	NPRC		

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council  
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suite 201  
North Charleston, SC 29405  
843-571-4366 or Toll Free 866/SAFMC-10

62	Bresnen, Anthony	<a href="mailto:anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com">anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com...</a>	255 min
56	DeLancey, Larry	<a href="mailto:delanceyl@dnr.sc.gov">delanceyl@dnr.sc.gov</a>	135 min
56	Malinowski, Rich	<a href="mailto:rich.malinowski@noaa.gov">rich.malinowski@noaa.gov</a>	172 min
53	Mehta, Nikhil	<a href="mailto:nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov">nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov</a>	323 min
53	MacLauchlin, Bill	<a href="mailto:billmac@charter.net">billmac@charter.net</a>	146 min
49	raine, karen	<a href="mailto:karen.raine@noaa.gov">karen.raine@noaa.gov</a>	424 min
49	holiman, stephen	<a href="mailto:stephen.holiman@noaa.gov">stephen.holiman@noaa.gov</a>	312 min
43	gerhart, susan	<a href="mailto:susan.gerhart@noaa.gov">susan.gerhart@noaa.gov</a>	35 min
41	brennan, kenneth	<a href="mailto:kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov">kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov</a>	287 min
40	steele, phil	<a href="mailto:phil.steele@noaa.gov">phil.steele@noaa.gov</a>	200 min
37	Powell, Jessica	<a href="mailto:jessy.r.powell@gmail.com">jessy.r.powell@gmail.com</a>	136 min
34	Clemens, Anik	<a href="mailto:anik.clemens@noaa.gov">anik.clemens@noaa.gov</a>	451 min
33	Helies, Frank	<a href="mailto:fchelies@verizon.net">fchelies@verizon.net</a>	111 min
31	Buckson, Bruce	<a href="mailto:bruce.buckson@noaa.gov">bruce.buckson@noaa.gov</a>	400 min
31	DeVictor, Rick	<a href="mailto:rick.devictor@noaa.gov">rick.devictor@noaa.gov</a>	357 min
31	Byrd, Julia	<a href="mailto:julia.byrd@safmc.net">julia.byrd@safmc.net</a>	448 min
30	c, m	<a href="mailto:mec181@yahoo.com">mec181@yahoo.com</a>	436 min
30	pugliese, roger	<a href="mailto:roger.pugliese@safmc.net">roger.pugliese@safmc.net</a>	264 min
29	sandorf, scott	<a href="mailto:scott.sandorf@noaa.gov">scott.sandorf@noaa.gov</a>	328 min
29	Neer, Julie	<a href="mailto:julie.neer@safmc.net">julie.neer@safmc.net</a>	333 min
29	Eich, Anne	<a href="mailto:annemarie.eich@noaa.gov">annemarie.eich@noaa.gov</a>	261 min
27	McCoy, Sherri	<a href="mailto:sherrim@wildoceanmarket.c...">sherrim@wildoceanmarket.c...</a>	332 min
27	michie, kate	<a href="mailto:kate.michie@noaa.gov">kate.michie@noaa.gov</a>	33 min
27	holland, jack	<a href="mailto:jack.holland@ncdenr.gov">jack.holland@ncdenr.gov</a>	29 min
27	Gore, Karla	<a href="mailto:karla.gore@noaa.gov">karla.gore@noaa.gov</a>	325 min
26	Mahood, Robert	<a href="mailto:robert.mahood@safmc.net">robert.mahood@safmc.net</a>	26 min
25	Stump, Ken	<a href="mailto:magpiewdc@gmail.com">magpiewdc@gmail.com</a>	205 min
24	Herndon, Andy	<a href="mailto:andrew.herndon@noaa.gov">andrew.herndon@noaa.gov</a>	150 min



23	g, a	<a href="mailto:andrea.grabman@safmc.net">andrea.grabman@safmc.net</a>	151 min
21	FARMER, NICK	<a href="mailto:nick.farmer@noaa.gov">nick.farmer@noaa.gov</a>	31 min