

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

**Marina Inn at Grande Dunes
Myrtle Beach, SC**

September 15, 2016

SUMMARY MINUTES

Dara Collection Committee:

Mel Bell, Chair
Tim Griner
Dr. Wilson Laney
Mark Brown
Zack Bowen

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

Council Members:

Dr. Michelle Duval
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Jessica McCawley

Chester Brewer
Ben Hartig
LTJG Amy Hockenberry

Council Staff:

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

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

Observers/Participants:

Dr. David Gloeckner
Dewey Hemilright
Erika Burgess
Nik Mehta
Monica Smit-Brunello
Amy Dukes

Dr. Jack McGovern
Leann Bosarge
Rick DeVictor
Jocelyn D'Ambrosio
Dr. Marcel Reichert
ASAC Jeff Radonski

Additional Observers Attached

The Data Collection Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Mariana Inn at Grande Dunes, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, Thursday afternoon, September 15, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: I am going to call the Data Collection Committee to order. The first item here is Approval of the Agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? Seeing no changes to the agenda, then the agenda will stand as is. The next item is Approval of the Minutes from the June 2016 Meeting. Were there any changes, corrections, or edits to the June 2016 minutes? Seeing none, then the June 2016 minutes will stand approved.

That takes us to our first item on the actual agenda, which will go really quickly, I think, which was an Update on the Bycatch Reporting Amendment, and, Jack, do you want to just tell us where we are with that right now? What Jack will tell us really quickly is what we need to know about the SBRM rule, particularly related to this.

DR. MCGOVERN: The SBRM proposed rule published in February, February 25, 2016, and the comment period ended on April 25, and we thought that the final rule might be published by now, and I was going to give an update on that final rule if it was published, but it has not, and the rule defines -- Just a little background on it is it defines what SBRM means, and it provides guidance on factors that should be considered when establishing or revising SBRMs, and that rule, they are reviewing it now. I think it's likely to publish maybe this month, towards the end of this month. In December, I can provide an overview of that final rule. I would be happy to do that.

MR. BELL: That makes sense then that we would pick that up again in December. One item I had here is I think at the last meeting that you all had discussed, and it was related to this, was renaming CE-BA 3 to something that made more sense, and it was suggested by staff that we rename any such amendment the Bycatch Reporting Amendment. I don't know if we need to officially adopt that as a name. If someone would like to make a motion to do that, we can officially change the name or have some discussion about the name, if someone has a better idea.

Really quickly, and I should have done this right off the get-go, but on the committee is myself, Doug Haymans, Anna Beckwith, Zack Bowen, Mark Brown, Chris Conklin, Tim Griner, Wilson Laney, Charlie Phillips, and Bob Beal. Those are the committee members right now, and so if one of you all would like to make a motion.

MS. BECKWITH: **I move to change the name of CE-BA 3 to Bycatch Reporting Amendment.**

MR. BELL: Charlie seconds that. Any discussion of that? It's a very original name. I think it kind of cuts right to the chase. **Any objection to that motion and that name? Seeing none, then that motion passes, and I will read it.** The motion is move to change the name of CE-BA 3 to Bycatch Reporting Amendment. That was approved.

I think that's all. There was no really other discussion related to that, and we were already looking for, at the next meeting in December, getting some information on costs associated with reporting options, and so that will be part of the December meeting as well. Given that, if there's no other discussion of the first item, we will move to the second item, which would be commercial logbook electronic reporting. There were a couple of presentations that Bonnie was going to give, and I believe Dave Gloeckner will be giving those.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We've got Dave Gloeckner on the webinar to give this.

MR. BELL: Okay. Whenever Dave is ready, we can do that.

DR. GLOECKNER: Hopefully this won't be too long, but I guess we had a request from the council to address what the costs of our pilot electronic reporting, for electronic logbooks and how much our costs were for the equipment and the software. We have put some prices together for you.

MR. BELL: This is Attachment 2, for everybody.

DR. GLOECKNER: I don't know if everybody knows who I am. I am Dave Gloeckner, and I'm with the Fisheries Statistics Division down at Miami, and so I run the logbook program as well as the ACL monitoring and our landings information. Some of the things we will cover is the hardware costs for our pilot and then we will cover some current costs for primary devices and some supporting devices. We will cover software costs, an estimate of the total costs per vessel, including laptops and tablets and iPads. Then we will cover data transmission and the total costs summary.

For our primary hardware costs, for the pilot, we used Dell Latitudes, which are \$300 to \$400 apiece, and Apple iPad2, at about \$210. Some comparable hardware ranges from \$270 through \$1,200, depending on how much you would want to spend. Some of those include Hewlett Packard laptops, an ASUS laptop, iPadPro, a Latitude 15, or even a Panasonic Toughbook. Those are costs if they were purchased today.

For the supporting hardware we used in the pilot, we did use a GPS receiver at \$30 and a GPS navigator unit at \$72. We used a USB booster extension at \$10 and various wiring, Velcro, external charging outlets and that type of stuff. That could range from \$10 to \$30.

For total hardware costs per vessel, we were looking at around \$1,380 for using a Dell Latitude and around \$679 for an iPad2. The iPad utilizes internal GPS, and so we didn't have to do any wiring for those. Laptops can be wired to existing onboard chart plotters or GPS, but there may be additional installation costs. During the pilot, we had our own marine technician, just to get us through the pilot, but we probably won't have that available to us. Pilot iPads were distributed with a \$50 waterproof case, to try to keep them intact during the pilot project. Those are just some things to consider. Any questions?

MR. BELL: Not yet.

DR. GLOECKNER: As far as some of the software, we had third parties providing the logbook software, meaning that the Center did not do the programming to develop the software. We had ACCSP with their eTrips application and then Electronic Edge and Olrac with their logbook applications. The licensing fees vary by vendor. Even the cost structure varies by vendor, as to whether they're going to charge on a per-trip basis or if it's going to be an annual charge. For the licensing costs we're going to present here, they reflect estimates provided to the Center, and we also used current market options. Most offered discounted licensing costs for bulk purchases.

If we look at the hardware and software for laptops, we're looking at yearly license fees of zero for ACCSP up to \$1,300 for the yearly licenses. The hardware is maybe around \$400, resulting in a total cost of \$400 to \$1,700 per vessel. If we go for a higher-end laptop, it ends up being \$1,380 to \$2,680 per vessel.

If we look at the iPads, or a tablet in general, the ones we used in the pilot utilized the eTrips application, which was a zero cost. The eLog reports were generated on the iPad and submitted directly over a cellular network. The only issue with eTrips right now is that it doesn't meet our current logbook standards, but we're working with ACCSP to get those up to speed.

For data transmission, during the pilot, nearly all the logbooks were submitted through a Wi-Fi or physically connecting to the network. They can also be submitted through a cell network, and, when Wi-Fi is not available at the dock, the trip reports can be saved to a portable hard drive and transmitted through a home computer. Any questions on that?

MR. BELL: Not yet.

DR. GLOECKNER: Then moving along. In summary, we had costs in the first year, depending on the laptop you had or the iPad, that could range from a little over \$3,000 to around \$400 for the low-quality laptop. The second year, we're looking at costs of zero to \$1,300. That's also very dependent on what hardware you choose. We also included a CLS America application on here as well, as I think they plan on working with us to develop an option, and so that's just something to consider. Are there questions?

MR. BELL: Anything yet? We've got a couple of questions from Doug and then Michelle.

MR. HAYMANS: I guess I am not totally clear on annual costs of software. So there is -- We could be anywhere from free software to \$760 in software, just for folks uploading the data?

DR. GLOECKNER: It's for people actually recording the data at sea, yes. It just depends on the bells and whistles that you like with the software. ACCSP has a no-cost version. If you would like some additional information, like the ability to analyze your own catch data, then you may choose one of the other options, like Olrac or Electronic Edge. They offer those capabilities.

MR. HAYMANS: I guess what would it take to tune up ACCSP's platform to be able to use it in any way that we need it?

DR. GLOECKNER: With them, it's just a matter of they don't collect any economic variables right now. They need to add those into their software, as well as the set level for some gears is not turned on yet, and so I will kind of be covering some of that in the next presentation, but we are working with ACCSP to try to get those changes in place.

DR. DUVAL: Dave, my question was kind of similar to Doug's. I think, in terms of the other vendors that were used and the discounted licensing costs for bulk purchases, did they give you information on what those bulk costs might be, to make it as cheap as possible? If we were to look at requiring an entire fleet to use a particular type of software, would that bring the cost down enough or do you have a sense of how much that might bring the cost down?

DR. GLOECKNER: I guess, like most vendors, they don't want to share their business practices with us too much, but it just depends on how many vessels would be participating. The more vessels that participate, the larger the percent discount that they would give us, and so it would really take having some ballpark idea of how many vessels we're talking about before they would really start considering how much they would lower the price, because that might be something we just have to continue to work with them on. It's not a very satisfactory answer, but that's what we've got right now.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Dave, I was wondering, is one of the reasons that they would do that is because they have to build some infrastructure to collect the exact data we need and transfer the data over to you, and so they would like to know sort of how much they're getting into overall, and, if they get a lot of vessels, they share that cost across a lot of vessels?

DR. GLOECKNER: I think that's the gist of it, yes. They're going to have to make some changes to the current software, and they want to know that they're going to get something in return.

MR. BELL: Any other questions right now? Okay. We can move along. That was the end of that one. Any final questions on that particular presentation from Dave?

DR. DUVAL: Thanks, Dave. Just one more question. I guess did you all have any -- I mean, I understand that the ACCSP eTrips didn't meet the reporting standards that you all have in terms of all the data elements that you want to collect, and I know you're working with them on that. I guess, beyond those elements, did you all have a sense of how well any of these vendors met your needs, in terms of maybe ease of moving the data from the vendor's server to ACCSP or to you guys? I guess maybe I'm just asking if you have an opinion on how well the different software met your needs.

DR. GLOECKNER: I think, in general, all the vendors we worked with had the capacity to move the data. We may have had some issues with some hardware that may have prevented some of that, but I think that could have been overcome. I think what we have planned is to work with ACCSP, so that any outside vendor, any of the other third-party vendors, and using API to import their data into eTrips at ACCSP, and so I don't think that would be much of an issue, as long as everybody is willing to work in that direction.

MR. BELL: Any other questions for Dave right now related to this presentation? Dave, if you're ready, we can go to the next one. You're going to cover that as well, I assume.

DR. GLOECKNER: Sure.

MR. CARMICHAEL: This is Attachment 3.

DR. GLOECKNER: We did get a question a while ago about voluntary e-reporting, and so have been working with ACCSP a little bit on that, to see what it would take to implement voluntary reporting. As far as an estimated time required, we're looking, I think, at about six months, depending on if everything goes smoothly or not, and so we've got some required tasks that we have to execute in order for that to happen. Like I said in the last presentation, we need to finalize the variables that are needed by the SEFSC. I think we're very, very close on that. We actually

know what variables we're going to collect, but it's a matter of getting it into a format so that we can transmit it to ACCSP.

There needs to be some infrastructure changes at ACCSP. I think Mike had planned on doing that in August through October. There also needs to be some changes here at the Center, and so we plan on doing that in October through December. We have some funding in place to work on that. We also need modifications to the ACCSP and Southeast Center applications. We plan on doing that in October through January. Then, as mentioned, we will try to modify the API at ACCSP so the third-party vendors can deliver that data into the eTrips and SAFIS. We plan on doing that December to January.

As far as finalizing the variables, we have got select trip, catch, and effort variables to be collected. We have done that. We've made sure we know what we want collected. Then we have to ensure that they are compatible with the variables in the Northeast, and we have worked with the Northeast to do that, and that's completed. Then we worked with the Social Science Branch here at the Center to determine which economic variables we're going to collect on the e-logbook, and so we've done that. Then we need to verify that ACCSP can handle additional variables, and Mike has promised me that that can happen. Now it's a matter of determining the format and acceptable ranges for the variables, and we are working on that right now.

The changes needed in ACCSP are we will need to set up Southeast Center accounts so that my folks can manage the system in SAFIS. That's in progress. We also need to set up access to the SERO permit information, and so that's also in progress. Then we need to develop the tool within SAFIS to track permits as they move from vessel to vessel, and that's still in progress.

We also need to develop Southeast list tables to support our own species, ports, and gears. Right now, it's geared mostly towards the Northeast, and so most of what they have is Virginia north, and so we think that will probably take about three months, and hopefully we will have that completed in October.

What we need to do down here at the Center is develop a user account system in eTrips. We are planning on basing that on the operator card, which is how the Northeast works theirs. That way, we can stay consistent and don't require big changes at ACCSP. We also want to develop software to extract eTrips data from SAFIS and pass it to our logbook database here at the Center. We also need to develop software to integrate eTrips data with our paper logbooks, and we think this will probably take around three months to complete. We plan on working on that from October to December. We have got FIS funding secured to carry this out.

The software changes we need from ACCSP are they need to add the Southeast variables to eTrips. Mike plans on doing this in September, and the ACCSP staff will complete that. Adding the Southeast variables to the tablet we think will take place in October to November, but this needs to be contracted out, and so we needed to identify funding. We think that we may be able to add this on to the charter e-log changes for the South Atlantic Council's pilot. We also need to modify the API to allow other vendors to submit data to eTrips, and so we think this will be completed December to January, and ACCSP staff will complete that.

Changes we need to make here are we actually have to develop a portal to allow the no-fishing reports to be submitted. With our FIS funds, we're planning on doing that in October through

December. We also want to develop a portal to allow fishers to review their own data and identify any data that looks like it needs to be corrected, and so plan on doing this November to January, and we have FIS funds on contract to do that.

In summary, we are working on finalizing the variables. The infrastructure changes needed at ACCSP are being worked on. The infrastructure changes here, we will work on, starting in October, and the modifications to the ACCSP and Southeast Center applications will begin in October, and the modifications to the API for ACCSP will begin in December. I think that's it.

MR. BELL: I've got a real quick question. Are there any particular challenges you foresee that might kind of throw you off schedule, or is everything looking pretty good? Is there anything that stands out as a possible challenge for timing?

DR. GLOECKNER: A lot of this is based on staff time, ACCSP staff time and some of my own staff time. I think that's a possible hurdle that we need to get over, and so that could impact our timeline a little bit, but my discussions with Mike Cahall seem to indicate that he thought that we could get this done in the timeline that we have proposed.

MR. BELL: Okay, and I really do appreciate you guys working together on this. This is obviously a lot of coordination and a lot of detail and a lot of moving parts, but it's really encouraging to see you moving along there with a time table and everything. We've got a few questions.

MR. BROWN: Dave, this is Mark Brown. I've got a question for you. I didn't see any discussion on the location. I know you're still working on the infrastructure, but I'm doing three separate reporting projects right now, and one of the biggest things that I've noticed is that there's differences in each one of the mapping and location charting plots. That seems like there needs to be some focus on that too, so that we know whether or not we're going to be actually reporting this in the ten-by-ten grids or by lat/long or what is the exact way of measurement. So far, the one that I've seen that looks the best to me is the South Carolina charter logbook, and their charting locator has grids, and it also has some reference to offshore reefs and depth contour.

DR. GLOECKNER: I think that, for those gears, that will end up being a sub-trip, which is probably going to be hook-and-line especially, that we may go to a grid system, or we may allow the software to actually collect the lat and long and roll it up to a grid when it submits. For longlines, there is already a requirement for lat and long in the pelagic longline fishery, and we are going to stick to that if we're going to set-level reporting for longline.

MR. BELL: Just for clarification, what you're kind of talking about, Mark, is the for-hire charter. This is the commercial piece, but you still have to have a mechanism to report somehow.

MR. BROWN: Yes, I hear you, but I was just wondering if there was just going to be some simplified way to develop a universal type of geographic chart or something, where it's easy to use for everybody for these different programs.

MR. BELL: Right. Everybody is out in the same ocean on the same bottom, and that makes sense. I follow you.

DR. GLOECKNER: I think we have been talking with headboat a little bit about their smaller grids, and we will probably continue those discussions all through the development, until we arrive at something that we call can live with that we're going to roll up to a grid system.

DR. DUVAL: Dave, I know it said, under the infrastructure changes needed at the Center, that you guys need to develop a user account system in eTrips based on the operator card, and so that means that all commercial fishermen will need to get an operator card, and am I assuming that right?

DR. GLOECKNER: I think that's the way we're going to head. That way, we can manage their individual user accounts based on an operator card.

DR. DUVAL: Right now, the Northeast operator cards have a number associated with them, and is that correct? I don't know if our operator cards do. I don't think they do.

DR. GLOECKNER: I don't think they do, but that's something I have to discuss with the Regional Office, if we want to make a change or if it's even required that we make a change. As long as there is an identifier in the database for it, then we can use it. As long as that individual has a primary key associated with them, then our database could have them be an individual within our database.

MR. BELL: One thing, just for everybody, is operator cards is something we spent some time in the Law Enforcement AP and Committee meeting talking about, and we'll have some further discussion of that, but, Monica, did you want to weigh in?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: The ones in the Southeast do not currently have a number, but we've been talking about perhaps putting a number on them, and I don't think that would be onerous.

MR. HARTIG: To that point, to this discussion, why you were using them, it says it facilitates a digital signature. There is no signature area on this card, and so --

MR. BREWER: It's digital.

MR. HARTIG: That's right. Sorry.

MR. BELL: Just a little bit more on operator cards, because we didn't do the Law Enforcement Committee, but the Law Enforcement AP is going to be doing a little bit more kind of looking into the utility of the operator cards and the practical applications and perhaps needs for standardization across the board and stuff, and so we may be hearing some more back from the Law Enforcement AP related to what kind of they come up with, in terms of what would be most useful from an enforcement standard. Of course, that would then tie into some discussions here, but the topic of operator cards is not going away any time real soon. We will have some further discussion of that in December.

DR. DUVAL: I think, just a follow-up to that, and, Dave, definitely correct me if I'm wrong, but, by using the operator card and having this digital signature, it means that an individual fisherman would be able to, once these user accounts are set up, track his or her landings and information within the system, and so, regardless of whether you have sold a vessel or acquired a permit, it

will allow you to follow your data at the level of individual rather than the level of the vessel or the permit, and that's why an operator card would be used.

DR. GLOECKNER: Yes, that's the plan.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks. I just wanted to make sure I was understanding it right. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Any other questions for Dave right now about this? Dewey.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you. Dave, I am presently one of probably a hundred longline boats that have a vessel monitoring system through CLS, and, in looking at this, would the modified ACCSP API for third-party e-logbook software to deliver to SAFIS, would that be something that they would be doing, and are you all working with them to give a format of what the potential format would be looked at that I would report from them?

DR. GLOECKNER: So far, CLS has just voiced interest in working with us on our standards. I don't think they have been in contact with us recently, but that's the direction we would like to go, is to deliver our standards to them as well, so they can take a look at it and decide if they're going to participate or not. If so, then I think CLS could deliver this, in one way or another, through that API.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Because there are some vessels that have -- Well, we already have them aboard our boats for pelagic longline fishing, the electronic way of reporting or vessel monitoring system, and it seems to be pretty easy, and it seems to work pretty good, and so any way that they could help facilitate that with the system we already have would be greatly appreciated from, I'm sure, the pelagic longline industry.

DR. GLOECKNER: We'll keep that in mind, and we have been planning on working with them during this development.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: Thank you.

MR. BELL: One of the challenges, I guess, that you see here is that, as we cross regions or we cross fisheries or we cross these different boundaries, it would be nice if there was sort of a universal consistency in everything for the fishermen, but that's, I guess, the perfect world at some point that we're striving for, but there are a number of these kinds of boundary-related challenges, I think. Any other questions for Dave right now?

DR. DUVAL: Not a question, but just a comment, just adding my appreciation, Dave, for all the work that you guys are doing and ACCSP is doing. It's great to see this update. I know this is something that quite a few fishermen have been interested in for a while, and so it's nice to see that it's coming to fruition soon, and I know it's a lot of moving parts and balancing a lot of different things on top of other duties, and so I just wanted to express my appreciation for everybody who is involved in this.

DR. GLOECKNER: Thanks, Michelle. We appreciate it. One point I did want to make clear is I know there is a lot of different reporting requirements along the whole coast, and there is a lot of multiple reporting that has to go on right now, but that is one of the reasons we are trying to use

ACCSP, so that one report will satisfy all of those requirements. That's why we've been working directly with the Northeast and ACCSP, to try to standardize this, as well as the pelagic longline program as well.

MR. BELL: That is much appreciated.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Dave, I was just going to say that definitely our next topic is the charter reporting, and it's good to see that you guys have talked some about how that could fit into this, and I just really appreciate the thoroughness of this presentation. We have had a sense at recent meetings that there is a lot going on between you guys and ACCSP and the vendors to get this in place, and it's good to see all the steps that have to be done and what the plan is, and I will just sort of, I guess, give you a little heads-up that we probably would really appreciate seeing this in December with additional boxes checked off and see where things stand on all of this to-do list and task list that you guys have put together, and I really appreciate it.

DR. GLOECKNER: I sure hope so.

MR. BELL: Monica, have you got a question?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Not a question, but a thanks to Dave and the Center for checking with our office ahead of time to make sure that voluntary reporting would cover these individuals for their current reporting requirements, so we were able to work that out, and that was great.

MR. BELL: Again, just lots of thanks, Dave. We appreciate all you guys are doing to pull this together. Any other final questions or comments related to this? All right. Seeing none, then we will move along in the agenda.

DR. GLOECKNER: All right. You all have a good day.

MR. BELL: All right. You too, and thank you. That takes us to the For-Hire Reporting Amendment, and you guys had some discussion of this back in June, and I apologize for not being there. Well, I was there, virtually, to some degree, and I do appreciate Doug jumping in and moving things along for me as the Vice Chair. I think John is going to -- If you want to look at some things, that's Attachment 4, I think, in your binder is the actual reporting amendment itself. Are you going to walk us through some --

MR. CARMICHAEL: No, I actually wasn't at this point. We're looking at final approval in December. We have this version out for you. It's been through a pretty thorough review of the IPT. There is still a few things yet to do. Legal staff and Monica are reviewing that now, and so they may have some comments.

There is a few appendices to be worked out, and there is a few other detail sections to be worked out, but certainly the discussion of the alternatives we believe is pretty darned close to where it needs to be for your approval in December, and I also appreciate you all taking a look at Chapter 5, which becomes the council's conclusions. You have made suggestions, and you have reached some decisions along the way, potential decisions to be considered in that, and so that just clarifies your intent on various things.

In this document, that's particularly important, because you know the council is laying forth the authority to collect this information, but then the Center has to go through and the agency has to do all of the details of how this information is collected, and so there is things in there about the variables, and there is things in there about what the council hopes will happen and expects to happen within this data collection program.

A lot of it is the kind of stuff we just talked about here with Dave, certainly the idea that there is one report that stands to fill all the different reporting needs that we have, and so I think, looking at that end, if you have comments, get them back to us at the IPT, so we can make sure that we've addressed all the concerns and we think that we have a document that will be in good shape come December.

MR. BELL: Okay. That will move us along, but are there any things that you guys kind of felt you left hanging that we may need to discuss now as a committee? Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Surprise, surprise. During the Law Enforcement Committee, we would have probably brought this up, but, when we had our joint AP and committee, one of the discussions came around to enforcement of logbook and late reporting and how the summary of penalties sort of comes into play with open access versus limited entry, and that's a protracted discussion that's not appropriate right now, but one of the suggestions that was made during that committee, by me actually, was, in order to take late reporting kind of out of the enforcement realm and put it into the administrative realm, would it be possible to add into this amendment the idea that after say ninety days that your late logbook reports would simply not be accepted.

When you reapplied for your permit the following year, your application would be considered incomplete, and it would not be able to be completed if your reports had been more than say ninety days late, and my thought to that was we keep trying to figure out how to make this really enforceable and to put the onerous on law enforcement and all of the process that it takes to get to a penalty, and certainly we found that permit sanctions are not likely to occur for late reporting and what would be another method to achieve the goal of forcing these guys to really take this seriously, and that was just one thought I would like to throw out for a touch of discussion.

MR. BELL: All right. That's perhaps more of a legal thing or something that Monica could weigh in on, but, Chester, do you have a point to make towards that?

MR. BREWER: Following up on the question, I've been talking with Leann over here about exactly the same thing, and the Gulf Council is also in the process of doing electronic reporting for their charter boats, and they had -- The Gulf Commission came out with a study that actually I asked if it could be circulated, which dealt with enforcement, exactly what you're talking about, Anna, and they had certain recommendations.

Correct me if I'm wrong, Leann, but the enforcement procedures that were set forth in that study, and it's a peer-reviewed study, are now being incorporated into their electronic logbook reporting amendment, and it might be a real good place to look, to see what they have done, and also take a look at the recommendations of that study and report. What they found is they were faced with a situation where people were not reporting, and they would come right up to the time for their permit to be renewed and they would dump twelve months of documents or data at that time, so that they could get renewed. That data was found to be useless, worthless, and so, while the

compulsory reporting components -- Yes, they did report, but the timeliness of the reporting was a terrible problem, and so they came up with some suggestions and ways to improve the timeliness and enforce the timeliness of the reporting, and, again, am I doing pretty good?

MS. BOSARGE: Pretty good, yes.

MR. BREWER: We might take a look at that, and I do think that in this amendment, as it goes forward, enforcement procedures or methods or whatever really should be incorporated into this thing, because, if you don't have effective enforcement, you're not going to get the effective data.

MR. BELL: Right, and we've been talking about that all along, and we've heard that quite often from the public, that's basically if you're going to have this requirement in place, then you need to be able to make sure you can make it happen. Particularly what we hear from them, I think, is that the guys that are likely to do it and abide by the law want to make sure that everybody abides by the law and it's an even playing field, and I certainly understand that desire.

We deal with this same issue with our reporting systems at the state level, and we have mechanisms in place to provide a stick, if necessary, to get compliance, but we face the same issue related to what happens at the end of the year if an individual may owe you some data. Well, your only mechanism at that point is to just say we're not going to issue you a new permit until you hand us the data, and then they hand us whatever, but I guess my question would be, is that something that we can include in this as a condition, or is that kind of stepping beyond our boundaries in terms of what we can incorporate into this as far as requirements? Have we kind of strayed off from what we're actually capable of doing? Is that something you could help with, Monica?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Anna, your comment, or your suggestion, would be after four months, approximately, that the person would not be able to renew their permit?

MS. BECKWITH: The way it was explained to us is late reporting -- As Mel just said, when you go to renew your permit, if you don't have your reporting in, then your permit cannot be renewed until you provide the data. My thought was, in order to keep it away from the enforcement process and to keep it in the administrative process, it would be to say after three or four months of late information, that information is no longer valid. It's not accepted. When you go to renew your permit, it shows up that your reporting was later than say four months, and so then that permit is administratively not renewable, and it's out of the enforcement realm.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: To that then, what I was able to -- Doug Haymans had asked me some questions this summer in an email, and it covers a little bit of this. I have found out that for-hire permits in the South Atlantic -- You know they're open access, and you know they have reporting requirements. At the time of the renewal, and I am putting air-quotes around renewal, of a for-hire permit, which is an administrative action, the permit holder must have completed all of his or her reporting requirements or the renewal, again, application will be considered incomplete and the permit won't be renewed.

It's really kind of a business practice that SERO has, the Permits Office, of treating an open-access permit as being able to be renewed, and that means they renew it if it's been expired less than twelve months. After that, the permit is not renewed, but it's possible that a new permit will be issued, and so, kind of working that through, if someone -- I think it's entirely possible that if

someone has a permit that's open access and they didn't report on time, and, thirteen months later, that individual comes in and says I want to fish, and so I want a permit, it's probably possible they would issue that individual a new permit, because of this twelve-month business practice of the fact that it's an open-access permit and for twelve months we will allow you to come in and update your logbooks and renew it.

I don't know that there's anything right now to prevent them, at the thirteen-month mark, from not issuing a new permit to this person, but let me add one more thing. That's the way I think it happens, but if you wanted to put forward some sort of action, an alternative or whatever, we would be able to investigate and flesh that out more thoroughly, to make sure that what I just told you is entirely accurate, but I'm pretty sure it's accurate.

MS. BECKWITH: I agree with you that that's how it work, but, for one season, for one fishing season, they would not have a permit, because the permit would be incomplete for a twelve-month period from that renewal, and so you would have one fishing season where you were not legally permitted, and I think that would be something that the guides might try and avoid, if they knew that that was going to happen to them, and it might give them more of an incentive to report on time if they knew if their stuff was late for four months that they would not be able to renew that permit. That permit would be considered incomplete for twelve months, and so they would have to wait until that application was, whatever the term is, kind of tossed away or whatever, if it's considered abandoned, before they could reapply for another open-access permit.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That's what happens now, right? In the process I just described, they would not be able to get that renewed if they didn't hand in their logbooks, and so, for a twelve-month period, essentially they're not legal to fish. They don't have a permit.

MS. BECKWITH: The distinction that I am trying to make is that, right now, they can come in, and, at the day that they renew, they can provide their late reports. What I am trying to make the distinction of is if any late report is later than four months, then they would not be permitted to give that information. It would not be accepted, and so it's a distinction.

MR. BELL: Let me jump in here for a second. I've got five people that want to weigh in, but sort of the slight cognitive disconnect here is maybe that the system is about acquiring data, and we would be saying, no, we're not taking your data, because it's late. Therefore, we're not going to allow you to participate, but I understand the problem is that what happens sometimes is they may wait until the very last second. In order to get their permit, they hand you data, and, whether or not they're accurate or useful, it's still data, and so the system is designed to get data. They're wanting to give you the data, even if it's late, but we're saying that, no, you can't give us the data, and, because you can't give us the data, you're now not eligible to participate.

DR. DUVAL: I'm not on your committee, but I understand what Anna is trying to do. It's trying to get people to get their information in earlier, as opposed to waiting until the end to do something like that. The technical subcommittee recommendations, which is part of Appendix E in the full document, in terms of compliance, states that the principal objective is to encourage compliance without issuing fines and/or penalties and recommended accountability measures and reporting requirements, similar to those implemented for commercial dealers in the region, whereby, if you fail to submit your reports, then you're not eligible to purchase those fish. The idea would be, if you fail to submit your reports, then you wouldn't be eligible to take people out on a trip.

I have read through the entire document. There's only a couple little changes I need to get to John. I think it's really very close to being complete, but I don't know if we have that particular piece in there about whether or not you would be eligible to take people out on a trip if you have failed to submit your reports, and I am pretty sure we put that in the headboat reporting amendment as well.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We have the delinquent reporting requirements that are in place, and it says that, that, if your report is delinquent, then you are prohibited from going out and harvesting or possessing the species. What it doesn't make clear in there is what the reporting period is and when exactly you say, okay, this report is delinquent.

DR. DUVAL: So you're saying that's already in the regulations?

MR. CARMICHAEL: My understanding is it's already in the regulations about delinquent reporting, and it goes back to the headboat. What this amendment makes clear is that its intent is to maintain all of the provisions relating to delinquent reporting that are in place.

MS. BECKWITH: During the LE AP meeting, what was explained to us was that, even though that's in the regulations, that's still an enforcement action, and, in order to enforce that, you have to make a case that shows that the report is late and that the charter vessel was actually out on a trip while the reports were late, and so it's actually very difficult to enforce. Again, the goal would be, if we want to make this enforceable, to make something that doesn't require the enforcement commitment and resources.

MR. BELL: John is right that that's in there, but what Anna is saying is the practical application of that in real time is next to zero.

MR. BREWER: Along the same lines, if I understand what the Gulf is doing, they do have required reporting. If you don't report -- Is it a weekly basis?

MS. BOSARGE: Ours is set up right now with a preferred of daily.

MR. BREWER: If you don't report daily, then I'm assuming that you get some sort of warning or no? I don't mean to put you on the spot.

MS. BOSARGE: No, that's okay, but I'm not sure exactly how your system is going to be set up, but we're also weighing possible VMS-type systems on the boats, and so we will have that enforcement tool, and I don't know if you all are considering that or not, so that enforcement can possibly see that that boat has left the dock the next day, although they have not reported, and so there's a little bit of a check-and-balance there, and I'm not sure -- Plus, we have a hail-in and a hail-out as well.

MR. BELL: That's a slightly different kind of reality from where we are right now.

MR. BREWER: What I was going to say is if you have the administrative -- I did read the minutes from the Law Enforcement AP and the comments that came from law enforcement about how difficult it was to make a case so that you actually take away somebody's permit. From what I read of that, they don't have the time to do that.

I think the alternative is that, and I don't know that it has to be daily, but maybe weekly. If you haven't turned your report in, your license, your permit, lapses, and, until you come into compliance, you are lapsed. That would be you've got a database. Right now, you would have a database, real time, of who has reported and who has not, and law enforcement could access that database. If they pull somebody over and check the database, and, if they're not supposed to be fishing, they get cited, and I think that would be one way of having effective, low-cost enforcement.

MR. BELL: Right, and what John pointed out is that actually exists in the regulations at this point, where if you fail to report on that weekly basis then you can't participate, but it's the communication and real-time follow-through with that that's difficult.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I believe there's also efforts underway within the pilot study to make the information on whether or not someone reported available to law enforcement when they were to stop somebody, which, to me, there is either two ways. You either go the Gulf route and you have VMS and hailing and all of that, so you know who can be out there and whether or not somebody went out there and they hadn't filed their reports, because you have the records that they were out there, or you have the law enforcement have the ability to check someone and know if they filed their reports as of the prior Tuesday. The app is looking into that, and that, to me, seems to be a critical part of this.

We're going to hear about the pilot, and Amy Dukes is here from South Carolina, and she has vast experience on this, and a lot of this was discussed at public hearings. One thing I also want to bring up is remember that we have the provision for someone to file that they did not fish, and we've got to be careful that we don't end up making incentives for a person to say at eighty-nine days -- File that they didn't fish for the last eighty-nine days, and so I'm going to submit that out there. I never got stopped by law enforcement in that eighty-nine days, and I never bothered to file any reports, and they could just do that to avoid losing their permit for the next twelve months.

I think we have to consider the ways that these pieces might come together, and also don't lose track of, at the end of the day, we have to get the data, and that's something that Amy and I have talked about within the South Carolina program. They've grappled with it, because we do want the data, and we've got to be careful not to do something where we tell somebody, well, administratively, we're not going to accept your data, because then that's going to create a huge problem. If we have something like that, it's likely that the agency is going to have issues with it, and getting this program to stand in for the existing MRIP program is going to be a huge problem, because you're telling people that we're not going to collect your data.

MR. BELL: Roy, did you have something to that specifically?

DR. CRABTREE: A lot of it John covered. The problem right now is I don't think there's any capability for the Coast Guard or anyone to tell if someone is up to speed on their logbooks or not. I don't think we have anything in place that tracks any of that on this, and then you know someone could probably set their computer up so that it automatically generated a report and mailed it in without them doing anything, and you don't want that to happen either. I guess if someone just automatically sent in did not fish reports and we happened to catch them and they are fishing, and if we had all this set up so they could put two and two together, then we might have a report.

If you set it up where they just send in reports that report fishing activity, but it's just made up, then it's not clear to me how we would determine that, and so there's a lot that goes into this, and we're a long way, I think, from figuring it out, but my understanding is they are working on some of these apps to enable some of these things to happen. With Anna's thing, there are lots of ways with open-access permits to game the system, potentially. If we don't issue the permit to one guy, then someone else gets it and puts it on the boat, and so there are lots of things that can happen, I think.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Back to Anna's original question, I think you probably could do some sort of -- It's not an enforcement action, but it's a more administrative action, where, if they fail to report after X number of times, or four months, for example, it would make it non-renewable, and we could look at something like that, and I think that then keeps it out of the enforcement realm, so you're not going over there, but you're making it more administrative, a condition of the permit, a condition of renewing the permit. Now, as to your question as to whether, if you put that in here, how much would it slow the document down and that sort of thing, I am not sure, but we could work on it if you want us to.

MR. HEMILRIGHT: I am not part of this committee, but, listening to the conversations about reporting and equity and different things I heard about the commercial part, I will probably give the best recollection of probably a fisherman in the pelagic longline industry that has the most strenuous reporting requirements there is.

We have to report within seven days. If you don't send your logbooks within seven days, which actually happened to me on the bluefin tuna amendment, where I didn't take an observer back in 2008 and I sent my logbooks in past the seven-day period, but I avoided the bluefin, but it was taken, to where I couldn't fish in my area off of North Carolina for five months. How you affect people to report is you take the permits. They don't get to go fishing or you fine them. A little bit of that attention will start cleaning up some of the playing field that you're sitting there going back and forth on how to do something.

You give them a two-week reporting time. If, after that time, they don't report or send a no-fishing report in or something, after a couple of times, administratively, somebody sends out and says, hey, you know what, we're referring you to law enforcement, since you didn't report, and maybe they do or don't. I suspect that all for-hire permit people have a website. If they don't report for ninety days of no fishing, you go on their website, and if you see them putting fish on that day, you go talk to them.

If you're going to give them a permit, basically they really don't have to report. A commercial guy has got to go unload his catch to a dealer, and then he's got to report. I've got a vessel monitoring system that knows where I'm at all times, and it has to stay on, because I have a pelagic longline permit, whether I'm doing that or not, and so, until you put some teeth in your regulations, it's pretty useless. Save your breath. That's how you're going to fix something.

MR. HAYMANS: This falling way down the list of speakers, it's a bummer, because you want to talk about something three speakers ago, but a couple of things. I am not so much in favor of Anna's suggestion about not allowing the submission over time and to points that others have made. I have asked the question a couple of times on the record, and Amy tried to help me with it. Rick and Amy tried to help me with it in the past couple of weeks, and that's looking at the

percentage of landings over a reported time, and what I've got to at this point is that two weeks in the South Carolina pilot study -- Correct me if I'm wrong, Amy, but it's roughly 89 percent of the people have reported by two weeks.

That other 10 percent, what percentage of landings does that other 10 percent make up in the for-hire? That's where my question has always been, can we get to that number, because it may be that that 10 percent are the zero guys, the no-fishing guys, and they're just late, and we may be discussing something that doesn't need to be there, and so I still ask that question, of if we can get there, but the reason I raised my hand, Monica, was I caught two words that you said that really perked my ears, and that was in reference to the Permit Office. You said "business practices".

To me, business practices says that there is some room for improvement of business practices without legislation or without rulemaking, and so I guess I would ask, are there improvements within the business practices of the Permits Office that could be done to notify late reports or to suspend a license for whatever -- Are there things that can be done, short of rulemaking, within those business practices?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You're right that business practices can always be improved, and I'm not sure of the history as to why this particular business practice came about, although I am going to guess that because we allow one year for renewal of most of the other permits, limited-access type of permits, they put in this one-year business practice here, too. I think that we would have to think about, under the Administrative Procedures Act, if there is some due process here that individuals have because they have been receiving these permits in the same way year after year, and so we would have to address that and look into that, but, sure, it's probably possible for it to change. I can't guarantee you a yes until we look into all of it, but, yes, I'm sure we can, and I'm not sure what kind of process that would take.

MR. HAYMANS: I would think the effort that we could put into that process, from your standpoint, from staff's standpoint, would be minimal compared to the bloodshed we might be about to impart with limited entry from the council and from the public, and so I would love to hear a thorough sort of examination of what we can change from the business practices.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: There has to be reason to change it as well, right, and so, if you have -
- Your limited-access permits have a year basically to renew and then a year to theoretically get their logbooks in within that timeframe, and then you're going to be treating this group of people who are open access -- There are reasons you didn't restrict it. I am just throwing these things out as things that we should and probably will have to look at to determine to change a business practice in this way, what are the reasons behind it.

MR. HAYMANS: Sure, and I wouldn't suggest that we would do it for one group. I would think that that business practice of allowing a year to get the reports in would need to change across the board. If that is indeed the practice, and we have reporting requirements of either a week or a month, allowing someone to go a year and not turn them in, that's a practice that we shouldn't be following.

MR. BELL: Keep in mind there already exists a program in place for the headboats for weekly reporting. What we're trying to do is bring 2,000 more individuals or permits into this world of weekly reporting that already exists, with the issues associated with timeliness and all right now,

and so -- I fully understand there are always things you can do to improve within the existing authorities you have, and that always is worth looking at, but, right now, that may be kind of a little bit into the weeds for where we need to be right this second.

MR. BOWEN: I totally agree with Doug, in the fact that twelve months seems like an awful long time, but, getting back to what I originally wanted to say, it's that this whole topic of conversation does nothing but strengthen the argument for limited entry. We're putting the cart before the horse if all of these are going to continue to be open-access permits.

MR. BROWN: I guess this may be kind of a unique situation, because there is not that many headboats in the Southeast, and so I've got a -- I do electronic reporting for the headboats, and we have port samplers that are required to come around and check our catches on a random basis, but they have also been -- They've had duties turned over to the port samplers to check our electronic logbooks too, to make sure that we're up-to-date, and so occasionally I will get a phone call from my port sampler to ask me a question about my report that he has gone over, you know whether I logged it correctly or turned it in in a timely manner or something like that, and so our port samplers are also coming behind us to make sure that we are doing it in a timely manner.

MR. CONKLIN: The commercial permits, if you don't report, it's twelve months that they're transferable or renewable, and I think you have another twelve months after that to put the permit on a boat, but that was a long time ago. I was way down the list, and so I don't know if it pertains to anything we're talking about now.

MS. BECKWITH: Just to Zack's point, they were very clear at that LE AP meeting that non-reporting is an enforcement issue and it is treated the same for limited-entry or open-access, and so the permit potentially being incomplete might a little bit more enforceable for limited-entry, but the non-reporting aspect is treated exactly the same for an open-access and a limited-entry permit.

MR. BOWEN: I like your word "a little bit".

MR. BELL: All right. Let's have that discussion later. Obviously we have hit an issue here, and we spent time discussing this at the LE AP and committee meeting. If you're going to have a system -- There already is a system in place to deal with the current reporting, and so if we're saying that we feel that's inadequate or can be tweaked or -- I guess the question is are there things that we would want to try to incorporate into this amendment to improve that?

I think there's a lot of detail involved in this, and I think we can simply set up the requirement that there be weekly reporting, and that's how that is accomplished or enforced or how the agency kind of deals with that, and that's maybe kind of beyond the discussion we want to have right now. Monica, do you have something you want to add to that?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: No, but I guess I would just like to hear from you all what you would like to do. If you want to add it into this amendment, we can look at that and do it. I'm not sure how quickly it can get done, but, on the other hand, if you want it in there, we'll get it done as quickly as possible.

DR. CRABTREE: The things that we'll have to weigh out are our capabilities to do all of this and do all the notifications and tracking and everything. With computers, a lot of it maybe can be

automatic and set up, but even that requires software development and all of that, but I think, if you want to really flesh all these things out, I could go back and get with our permits shop and try to figure out, as much as we can, what the options would be, but likely then we would come back in December and be talking about options and things, and that probably means final action is pushed off a meeting anyway.

It may mean that the implementation of this takes longer, because we've got to develop additional rule language that we don't have now and don't know what it's going to be, and then I don't know how long it would take to put all the software pieces down so that -- With law enforcement, for example, being able to tell if logbooks are delinquent or not, that's got to go to all the states who have JEAs and everyone else, and so there's just a lot of pieces there, and I don't know how long it would take or what the cost would be of it.

MR. BELL: Right, and let me just tell you, from my experience at the state level in dealing with this, whether it's our commercial or our for-hire side of the house, we had to sit down -- My office is kind of the equivalent of the Science Center, in terms of we collect the data, if you will, and we track who is on time and not on time and delinquent. It took us quite a while, working very closely with our own agency law enforcement, to work out processes where we were comfortable in the tracking and comfortable to the point where I communicate directly through staff with law enforcement and say these twenty individuals are indeed delinquent and then, in accordance with the law, go do what needs to be done.

There are a lot of checks and things that need to be made. I can tell you that you do not want to pass information to law enforcement and tell them to take action and then realize that, oops, there's been a mistake in the data and an officer writes a bad ticket or an officer has an encounter with someone who is supposedly delinquent and, what do you know, they're not. It's a very detailed process that needs to be worked out.

Then I will tell you that South Carolina is on a monthly system, and so we are working in slow motion compared to what we're discussing here on a weekly or even like a daily type of system, but, when you go to a weekly system, it just speeds things up, and you have to make sure that when someone appears not to have reported that they indeed haven't reported and there is a way to double-check that. You communicate that to law enforcement at some point, when you want them to take action or you're asking them to take action. It's a lot more difficult than you might imagine when you get into the details of this, and that's why I don't see us kind of being able to solve all of that right now.

It's obvious, from our meeting with the Law Enforcement AP and Committee, that NOAA OLE and NOAA legal and the Science Center need to have an ability to sit down and figure out -- Plus the permitting piece of this. They all need to be able to communicate within the context of the agency there to make sure they've got these details worked out, and I don't see us being able to prescribe that degree of detail in what we do. We have indeed established a desire for weekly reporting. How that's worked out behind the screen, so to speak, is going to be a lot of communication that's going to have to occur within NOAA. Chester, did you have a question or a comment?

MR. BREWER: Given what you just said, I yield.

DR. DUVAL: I'm not on the committee, but just kind of backing up to the big picture, we're scheduled to take final action on this in December. I would encourage us to stay on that timeframe. The Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council took final action on their EVTR amendment at their meeting in August. Their reporting requirements are actually going to be forty-eight hours after the end of a trip, and so a little bit more stringent.

I think, in order to sync up -- I would like to be able to see as much synchronization in the implementation as possible of those two things, particularly for fishermen who hold permits in multiple regions. In North Carolina, we have many charter captains who hold both Northeast and Southeast Region permits, and so I am sensitive to that, and I'm also sensitive to the fact that we're going to need to do a lot of outreach with fishermen on this and demonstrate to them the benefits of this.

I think, to address some folks' questions and concerns about how can we get people to report or how can we improve our tracking of compliance, I think, as the electronic systems come online, and Amy is going to tell us a little bit about what's going on with the pilot project, that we can start pulling some of those things into this and you can develop those scripts that can scan quickly whether or not permit holders have submitted their reports.

We have something like that that we do with our dealers in North Carolina. Granted, there are many fewer dealers than these permit holders, and so I think, just backing up and looking at the big picture, I would encourage us to stay on the timeframe of approving this in December, and so, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BELL: Thank you. I think that's good advice, and so what I would like to do is -- Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: John, have you looked carefully at what the Mid is doing and how their requirements -- Have you talked to the Mid staff, council staff, about what they're doing and how they're handling a lot of these things?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I have looked at what they have, and you have their plan in Attachment 5, what they're planning for their program, and I've looked a lot at what they call their vessel trip reports, which they collect now, and there is details about that in the plan in there. They have one report that covers all of their sectors, commercial and for-hire and all that, and they're just making that system over into an electronic program.

DR. CRABTREE: What do they do about delinquent reports?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I'm not as clear what they do on that. One thing I was thinking though, with all this discussion, is another point that came up in the hearings from the for-hire guys. They were saying there should be consistency in how delinquency is handled between commercial and recreational, and I really think that in the discussions -- It needs to be incentivized, as much as possible, as opposed to penalized, because we've got to get the data and we need to get them to do that.

It seems to me, given what Michelle said and the nature of this issue and the experience of the states and the experience in other regions, that it makes sense that, once we get this thing in place and we get a sense of how big the problem is with non-reporting and what nature it is and how the

existing penalties are being applied and all of that kind of stuff, then maybe we look at some overall amendment that really addresses that and we can explore what's happening and really get the facts before us, because I don't think any of us really have a sense of what the issues are now.

There is the ability that the agency can take away permits, but I don't think they do it in the for-hire, because someone could just go get another permit, but they have the ability now. They have the ability to take someone's permit, and they have the requirement that you can't fish if you're delinquent.

We're going to have a requirement that if you don't report by Tuesday that you're delinquent, but we need to figure out how you go about giving everybody the tools they need to deal with that, and I think, until we get this in place and get a better handle of the program and what it's like and what its capabilities are and how well these apps work that let the law enforcement people get out there -- I think everybody is grappling with these issues around the country and dealing with that, and we just may not be at a point of putting in a solution at this time that's going to solve this problem, because it's just too interconnected to so much other stuff and far too complicated for a simple solution, it seems.

MR. BELL: I think we all understand the challenge, and a lot of good discussion, but I think, like Michelle was saying, I think we really need to focus on the carrot side of this. The carrot is this is about better data, more timely data. The things that we've heard the fishermen tell us the data need to be better, the data need to be better, and so let's focus on what this can do for the improvements. Then the stick, so to speak, will follow. We will work on that, but we're kind of spending a lot of time sort of talking about the stick at this point, and I would rather talk about the carrot.

Moving off of that particular aspect, are there any other things within the document right now that stand out or anything left hanging from the June meeting that we need to look at? Again, I would encourage you to get into the document itself in detail, in its current form, and then input could be provided straight to John, if you find something that needs to be tweaked or changed or addressed. Then we can pick that up hopefully in December, and, as Michelle said, just keep the process on track, time-wise. Anything else right now? Then we mentioned to also take a look at the Mid-Atlantic's document that you have. That might cause you to think of something that could be tweaked or improved. Where does that take us?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think that brings us up to Mike Errigo and the presentation on our pilot study.

MR. BELL: Are you ready, Mike?

MR. CARMICHAEL: It's Attachment 6.

MR. BELL: We skipped the Law Enforcement Committee, but we had the Law Enforcement Committee discussion anyway, and so that worked out well.

DR. DUVAL: Here is your carrot. If we move efficiently through the rest of the agenda, you might get the rest of your Law Enforcement Committee discussion anyway today.

MR. BELL: Okay.

DR. ERRIGO: Hi, everyone. I'm just going to give you a brief update on where we are with the pilot project, and also I want to let you know that Francine Karp is here. She is our representative from Harbor Light who is helping us work on all the software development of the eTrips mobile app for the for-hire sector. We've made a lot of progress with it so far.

Real quick, and I will just give you a brief overview of the project, there were four components to the project. There is the catch and effort tablet app software, the eTrips software, which is being modified now to fit the needs of the South Atlantic. In the middle of that, in fact, I was just drafting an email to some of the ACCSP people about what species need to be loaded in and things like that.

We are also working on developing a dockside reporting application to be used by the MRIP intercept people that would help us validate logbook reports, and so, right now, it's like a paper log that they use, and they write everything down. Then that has to be entered. It has to be keyed into a computer, and so we're going to see if it's possible for us to develop an application, a tablet-based application, that all the data can be entered in real time on a tablet. Therefore, we would skip the key-in process. That will hopefully make things a little easier.

The third component is electronic fish measuring boards, both to be used in conjunction with the for-hire logbooks on the boat and with the dockside intercept application for measuring lengths. The application on the for-hire boats, we're hoping a few of our captains will volunteer to take them out on some of their trips and measure discarded fish, so we'll actually get lengths of some of the discarded fish before they go overboard, which will be fantastic. Currently, we don't have any information like that. Then, of course, for the dockside intercepts, we're hoping it will make it a lot easier to get fish lengths, hopefully to get more fish lengths. The final component, and John mentioned it earlier, is a phone-based app for law enforcement to get updated information on if a captain is up-to-date on their reports, on their logbook reports.

This is just a nice little flowchart, and so here is the SAFIS and the license database, so the law enforcement app will talk with the license database. The dockside data collection app will upload information directly to SAFIS, and each of the states will be able to upload their logbooks directly, and so it all goes to a central location. All the data is QA/QC'd, and hopefully it should work smoothly when it all comes together, but we'll see. That's what the pilot is for, to work out all the kinks.

This is the basic timeline. The software implementation and programming and all of that was supposed to take place in the first four months. Month Number 1 turned out to be August, for the most part. That's when the money came through. Dockside validation software development and implementation is Months 5 through 8. The compliance software comes a little later. Then testing is supposed to start up -- We may not be able to get running with it until later this fall, maybe closer to the winter, and so we're probably not going to get a lot of real usable data until the spring fishery next year.

We may be able to get some good data from Florida. They still run a lot of trips over the winter, but further up north it gets a little dicey, and so we may have to wait until next spring to really start

data collection for a lot of the South Atlantic, just because of the timing of when the money came through.

Then there's a table that just says what's been completed and what is still in progress. We have all of our captains identified. We have got them all loaded into the SAFIS system with log-ins and user names. They have all gotten their tablets, if they were going to get tablets, and they have all gotten the apps, the software, and Francine has been going to visit captains, to get them set up and show them how to use the software. She was just in North Carolina, visiting those captains up there, and so she will continue to visit captains throughout this month.

Questionnaires, we sent out questionnaires to all the captains, to find out their level of tech savviness and how comfortable are they with the technology and things like that, and so we have done all of that. We have all of the equipment ordered, and I don't know if we've gotten all the boards yet, but that's all been ordered, all the measuring boards.

We're still working on setting up the eTrips app with South Atlantic-specific information and data, and so the species list, the target species, the disposition of your catch, all of those things, but we're close to finalizing all of that. That's pretty much where we are right now.

MR. BREWER: First of all, Mike, thank you for doing this. I think this is pretty exciting stuff. You mentioned in here about creating a -- I guess you would almost say it's an interface between law enforcement, particularly the state officers, and the database, as to who is reporting what and that kind of thing. That's great. Where are you in the development of that particular app?

DR. ERRIGO: That hasn't been started yet. The first portion is to get the logbook app and the dockside intercept app online. Then the law enforcement app will come after that, and so that was always slated to be later in the year-long project.

MR. BREWER: Just a follow-up question. Do you foresee any difficulties in putting together that app for law enforcement?

DR. ERRIGO: From what I heard, the reason why they put it further into the project is because it was an easier problem to tackle than setting up the eTrips and setting up especially the dockside intercept app. That one is probably going to be the most difficult. eTrips, it's already developed, but it just needs to be tweaked. The dockside intercept app has to be written from the ground up, and that one -- There has already been attempts to develop one, and so that's a difficult one, but the law enforcement app, from what I understand, should not be terribly difficult to set up, but there will probably be one for each of the states.

It will be state-specific, depending on where the law enforcement is, and so they just have to have an app that works with each of the state systems. Then the logbook, when you submit your reports, both the state and the federal government will know that you submitted your report, and it should be in real time.

MR. BREWER: Great. Thank you.

MR. BELL: Keep in mind we're looking at using technology to accommodate some of this in a different way. It might work for some people, whereas the overall system will still accommodate

the reporting mechanisms via going home to your computer, if you're operating out of a smaller boat or whatever, and so it's good, in that we're having options available for people to use. Any other questions for Mike?

DR. ERRIGO: If you wanted to know how many participants from each of the states, there are five participants from North Carolina and one volunteer, four from South Carolina and two volunteers, two from Georgia and two volunteers, and six from Florida. There are six from Florida and an additional two in the Keys. We wanted to make sure we got representation from the Florida Keys, just so you guys know.

MR. BELL: Great. Any other questions or comments right now? Things are moving along and that's good. Mark, are you working on this or are you one of the participants? All right. He is tech-savvy, too. Any other questions for Mike right now?

DR. DUVAL: Mike, because the funding didn't come in until August 1, you said that really it's going to be spring before we're actually going to be able to collect some data? I understand that Francine has been visiting with captains in North Carolina to kind of give them some training on the software and everything.

DR. ERRIGO: What I mean is if guys are going to be taking trips in like October or November and December, we will get data from then, but I think that the bulk of the data, when you have a lot of trips going on in a week and filling your charter boat up, when it's really busy, that's what we're really interested to see is, when it's really busy, how does it work?

If you have like two or three people on a charter boat and it's like the only charter you have in a week, I'm sure you can work around almost anything, but when you've got charters booked every single day and six people on each charter, then we want to know how -- I think most of that will come when the weather is nicer and more fisheries are open and things like that, and so that's all that I meant, but we will start collecting data as soon as everything is ready to go.

MR. BELL: Good deal. Any other questions? All right. Thanks, Mike. We appreciate it. Amy, are you ready to roll?

MS. DUKES: Sure.

MR. BELL: Okay. Amy Dukes from my staff -- As you know, South Carolina has had a logbook program in place since 1993. Amy is going to give us a little brief on what we're doing in South Carolina right now with validation of our system, and I will just let her talk. Thanks.

MS. DUKES: Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. Again, I'm Amy Dukes, and I work for the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources, and I oversee our Fisheries Statistics Section. Just real quick, I applaud you for having intricate conversations at this table with respect to combining management and law enforcement. It is a huge undertaking. I am going to completely step back and talk about just the data now, how can we actually get the data to be better.

I would like to recognize my coauthors, Eric Hiltz and Brad Floyd, who also work for the department, and Geoff White with ACCSP. The South Carolina ACCSP For-Hire Logbook

Validation Pilot Project is actually funded through MRIP funds, and I would like to recognize the cosponsors of that, which are Dave Van Voorhees at the Fisheries Statistics Division at NOAA as well as Mike Cahall, the Director of ACCSP.

Just a little background about the for-hire logbook validation pilot study. The initial project design was actually one that was going to be conducted in North Carolina with the Department of Marine Fisheries, but, unfortunately, the forward progression to institute a logbook has hit a speed bump.

DR. DUVAL: It's called a statute that says thou shalt not and so, yes.

MR. BELL: That's a big bump.

MS. DUKES: So it stopped, and so there was a little bit of a southern migration to South Carolina. NMFS approached SC DNR to shift the logbook validation project from North Carolina to South Carolina in late 2015, to basically test a survey design that combines the data collected through the state's mandatory logbook reporting program to the data collected through the MRIP Access Point Angler Intercept Survey. It kind of made sense to actually move the project to South Carolina. We have an existing logbook data collection program for trip-level data with our for-hire fisheries, and we have since 1993. The trip-level data actually collects things like number of fishermen, hours fished, species that were retained and their estimated pounds and species that were released by catch numbers.

The state already has sufficient regulatory authority to manage and require this trip-level data, and then, just to kind of showcase what we've been doing, in January of 2016, we released an electronic version, a tool per se, to move away from the paper logbooks if charter boat captains wanted to. Bluefin Data created that software. It's very similar to that of the headboat survey.

The actual data collections are looking for catch and effort validation in a capture/recapture approach, meaning that the APAIS captures the catch data during the angler intercept, and then it is recaptured through the logbook, and so we're actually looking for matches there. How this project kind of fits into what the council is doing is, number one, it complements the for-hire logbook, the eTrips logbook, that Mike just commented on and that Fran has been working so hard on. A lot of the core variables that we are collecting match the proposed amendment core variables that you guys are requiring, and then our ultimate goal is to provide input and possible recommendations to the council, based on the project results.

Here is the actual project objective. It's to have the South Carolina DNR for-hire logbook accepted by the National Marine Fisheries Service MRIP Program as a viable data collection effort and then to use the catch and effort data to derive recreational for-hire catch and effort estimates in South Carolina.

This is very much a partner project. We are going to work closely with National Marine Fisheries Service MRIP staff to ensure that the validation methodology developed during the course of this project meets their data requirements. Of course, we want to meet and achieve an MRIP certification for this type of data collection, but, ultimately, it's about data sharing.

We want to ensure that other groups that are conducting similar projects know about what's going on with our project, and, actually, there has been a series of conference calls over the last several

months with state agency and federal agency folks and even council staff to talk about this project from the very beginning, so they can talk about the actual data collection methods, how we're going to move forward with analyzing that data, but, ultimately, the goal of this project would be to create a new standardized validation and adjustment program for logbook reporting of catch and effort.

This will aid in generating better estimates for charter vessels. What's really cool is, if we do reach an MRIP certification, I think that this might provide the foundation for other states to potentially implement a logbook, because it would provide them the justification to begin one. They have to know that data being collected in a logbook is going to be used in a positive light.

I'm not going to read through these goals and objectives, but on the screen are the Fisheries Statistics Section for DNR objectives, as well as the ACCSP mission. I know everyone in this room shares the same thoughts and feelings that I have, and that is that the goals and objectives of all of our agencies and this project that we're currently doing all overlap. We're all about the data. We want to improve data, and it's an amazing opportunity for us to work with our constituents to make a difference, as long as they understand the need and the desire for complete, accurate, and timely data.

Jumping into a little bit more about the project description, ultimately, it's to determine how well data collected during an intercept survey matches that that's coming back to us on a logbook. First, we actually had to create a matching algorithm, which Eric Hiltz, the Database Manager at DNR, created. We are going to be reviewing and evaluating some of our older data, back from 2013 to 2015. We've already done that with our first run, but we did all of that in-house at DNR. Eric and I are not statisticians, and so we've had to include some other people that are a little bit smarter than us.

The next thing that we're trying to do is actually match the actual data, and so there are three steps in matching the data, and we call these the match matrix procedures. The first thing we need to do is match vessels, and so the vessel data is collected at the intercept and vessel data is collected on the logbook. We're trying to just simply match vessels, and hopefully this will get a little easier as the vessel directory for MRIP continues to progress and get better.

The second level tier that we're actually trying to match on is the trip header, the date the trip occurred on, the time the trip occurred, the start date, the number of anglers, and the hours. Then the last thing we're then matching up, through another series of the algorithm, is the catch data, the reported data on the logbook versus the observed data during the intercept, not only the actual fish they saw, but the fish that they heard about, that were released, and so we're looking at Type A, Type B1, and Type B2 fish here.

For each of these match matrix, we need to establish a weight, meaning how important is it that the two data sources completely match 100 percent? There needs to be 100 percent match. Vessel data has to match. Trip data, could the fisherman have written down the 8th of September instead of the 9th of September? Yes, and let's go to the next level and see if the catch data matches up, and so we've had to establish these weights on how important it is for the data to match up.

The first thing that we saw, in reviewing some of the preexisting data, was that we don't have enough APAIS intercepts to match the logbook data, and so the first thing that we did for this pilot

study is doubled the number of charter assignments given to the state for a length of time in 2016, and I will get into that in a little bit. Then, ultimately, now that we've increased the number of intercepts, hopefully we'll be able to match additional intercept data to logbook data, and we're going to repeat this same process in 2016 with our data.

Not to overwhelm you, but I want to shout out to Eric. Eric has worked really, really hard on this project for the State of South Carolina, and this is the actual -- It's a portion. It's a little under half of the actual R-script matching algorithm that he wrote. I want this to showcase the magnitude the variables and then how complex it is to have those shared variables match up when trying to look at APAIS intercept data to logbook data. It's not as easy as one would think.

Again, Eric and I are not true statisticians, and Brad as well is not a true statistician, and so we have contracted, through ACCSP and ASMFC, two department of statistics professors at Colorado State University. These two individuals have been working with MRIP staff over a number of years on several other projects with great success, and their insight and expertise is absolutely going to be valuable as we complete this process. They have been hired to basically evaluate the survey design and provide a statistical review back to us.

On the table in front of you are the eight tasks that are associated with this particular project. Only really one has been completed. Although we started this discussion back in late 2015, the sampling and the actual contracts were just signed in the last several weeks. First things first is we are providing trip-level data to these two statisticians, and so we wanted to make sure that confidentiality is maintained. South Carolina DNR has a nondisclosure form that was signed by the two individuals that were hired as well as the ACCSP standard confidentiality forms. Any summary data from this project will be aggregated so that confidentiality is maintained, and that's the only complete status.

Everything else is sort of ongoing. The double assignments within the APAIS charter mode started in May, and that will continue through the end of October, and the data is now in the hands of the statisticians, to help provide some information back to us. One caveat I will say is that we started the review in 2013, as the initial year to start performing these match matrixes. That was the first year that South Carolina became the contracting agency to conduct the APAIS survey, and, subsequently, also, when the APAIS survey methodology changed and transitioned from MRFSS to MRIP, and so it was kind of really good timing overall.

Just to give you guys kind of a sense of budget, to do the add-on assignments within the State of South Carolina and to pay the consultants for their time, this budget is roughly \$67,000, and it's split pretty evenly between the add-on assignment charges for SC DNR as well as the consultants' time.

I kind of wanted to give you a snapshot of what has been occurring already in 2016, and this has more to do with the additional add-on assignments in charter mode, and so we don't do sampling in Wave 1, which are the months of January and February. We start in March, but remember that the add-on assignments didn't start until May. I want to focus in on the month of August, and so, in charter mode, CH charter mode, we typically only have about eleven assignments. With the doubling of assignments, we actually increased it to twenty. During those twenty site assignments, meaning an actual intercept, a staff member was at a site. During those twenty sites, 106 individual charter intercepts were obtained, meaning they spoke to 106 actual participants on a charter vessel.

I want to highlight that we didn't do anything to private mode, but we had twenty assignments in August for private mode, but, during those private mode assignments, because of the new mixed-mode flexibility in the APAIS sampling design, a staff member can actually intercept a charter boat during a private recreational sampling assignment, and we were able to obtain nineteen additional charter intercepts, which we would not have been able to get if we hadn't developed this mixed mode, and so kudos for mixed mode. Bringing that all together, in the month of August, we have intercepted 125 charter anglers, which is a huge advancement and about double what we saw this time last year.

Kind of where we are now, next steps, again, we're in the process of completing our APAIS sampling, and the consultants have the data, where they're going to be comparing and analyzing. First things first, is Eric wants to make sure that the matching algorithm that he wrote works, that he wrote it correctly. He spent weeks and weeks doing that, and so the statisticians are going to look at that. We have already started to match the APAIS intercepts with logbook data. We want to see kind of what their thought process is. We have set some of the standard metric values, and we want to make sure they are good with them, make sure they're good with the weighted fields.

Flagship species is kind of an interesting one. If you have an intercept and you get a guy from Ohio and he is super stoked, because he released a toadfish, just out of his mind excited. He writes it down, the intercept, and the port agent writes it down on the logbook, and I don't see toadfish. We've got to figure out if we need to match species level for every single species, or do we need to focus these matching efforts on species of concern, species that are currently regulated and managed by the state and/or the feds.

We need to make sure that we're adequately sampling through the APAIS survey, in order to intercept enough charter anglers to justify matching to a logbook, but, ultimately, we hope that this project will help us to determine if logbook data can drive better for-hire estimates. Can you compare a captain logbook and validate it against an intercept to an individual angler? One data collection effort is the entire vessel and one data collection effort is one individual.

Then, ultimately, we need to make sure that all of this can come down to an MRIP reporting deadline. There are guidelines that say that the data has to be out by a specific time after the data was collected. We need to make sure that we can meet some of those timelines. It is ultimately our intent, my intent, all of our intent, to lessen the burden on fishermen while achieving maximum results, and, by sharing what we're learning in this process, specifically working with ACCSP and council, we may be able to reduce the need for multiple surveys that cover the same fishing activity. You said it earlier, John. These guys are reporting to multiple groups the same information. We need to be able to pull all of this together into one pretty little picture for them.

I will take questions, but I wanted to make sure that I said that this is an amazing opportunity for us to provide outreach and education. That is, by far, one of the biggest attributes of my job. I talk, a lot, to a lot of people, but it seems to help. It builds a relationship. We have an old-school fishing mentality amongst a lot of our charter fishermen and our commercial fishermen, and they don't like change, but change is necessary. It is necessary to improve the data collections, but they need to recognize that the change comes with associated benefits that they're going to be able to see in the long run. With that, I will take any questions. This is an actual picture of the logbook and some of our staff actually out intercepting anglers.

MR. BELL: That's why it's a very good carrot. This is all about improving things for everybody. Any questions for Amy? This is still kind of early in the process here. We are literally just getting kicked off, but we are really positive about it.

MR. BOWEN: Amy, thank you for the presentation. I have been intrigued with South Carolina's logbook program for a long, long time. I think it's a good thing, and it's my opinion that I wish all the states had them already, but maybe we can move in that direction. One thing, and maybe you can clarify it, but, earlier in your presentation, you said something about validating the intercepts with what the electronic logbooks say, and can you maybe state that again?

MR. DUKES: Absolutely. The concept of the entire project is matching the APAIS intercept data that's collected dockside through a charter intercept. An APAIS sampler comes to the dock at the end of your trip and says, do you mind if I ask your anglers about their day of catch? They measure the fish, they ask questions about the fish, they physically see the fish, but they ask a series of questions. It's that data collection that is then compared to the logbook, and so it's a capture/recapture. The data is first captured dockside, as soon as your trip comes back, and then it's recaptured through the logbook that is then completed by the captain, sometimes the same day and sometimes a few days later. Then it's submitted to the state. We are comparing those two data sources.

MR. BOWEN: Right. Okay. What I have a little heartburn with, and it's definitely not with you or the state, but it's the number of intercepts, or lack thereof, and we have had some discussion at this meeting, and maybe the last one, the last couple, about getting those intercept numbers up, but I mean, as I touched on in the Cobia Mackerel Committee meeting, I have real heartburn that my MRIP numbers for my state for Wave 2 for cobia is zero, and the reason it is is because we didn't have any intercepts.

MS. DUKES: Right. They weren't intercepted.

MR. BOWEN: None, and so there's a little problem there.

MS. DUKES: That is a problem across the entire Atlantic States, and, fortunately, some states have recognized this and have found the funds to do add-on assignments, but some states are strapped and can't come up with the funds to do add-on assignments. I applaud North Carolina. The amount of add-ons that they do within the APAIS survey is phenomenal, and I wish we had the money to do that.

MR. BOWEN: Not by any means am I sitting here blaming my state. I think it's more about methodology at this stage, with the lack of number of intercepts, and I am not blaming my state or any state for the lack of intercepts. Again, it's the methodology.

MR. BELL: Let's let Michelle weigh in here a little bit on that.

DR. DUVAL: Thanks for the kudos, Amy. We have been very fortunate that that's been a long-standing priority for us that thankfully hasn't gotten whacked, but I think the other piece of Zack's concern is also those intercept assignments. I mean, it is a random draw, and so if your assignment happens to be at a location where cobia are not coming in there, then you're going to miss all the cobia that are coming in at another location, and so I mean that's also the nature of the survey

that's necessary for the statistical validity of it. I agree, and I understand that frustration on the part of anglers a lot.

MR. BELL: Any other questions for Amy?

MS. BOSARGE: I thought it was a very interesting presentation. Just out of curiosity, the intercepts that you were making, the men and women that did the intercepts, that actually completed them, did you have a mixture of biologists and mainly enforcement officers? I know you can have enforcement officers with biology backgrounds, but how did that work out, and did you see any issues with maybe the individuals that had less of a background in the biology side and having any issues with your data collection?

MS. DUKES: Certainly. South Carolina DNR staff actually conduct the APAIS survey in South Carolina, and our entire staff have biology backgrounds. They go through an extensive training in-house, and they follow the training that is required by MRIP and the APAIS survey itself, but they are very justified to be able to do those samplings. We don't send a staff member out to actually conduct a sample by themselves until we really feel that they are 100 percent onboard. We know how valuable this data collection is, and we don't take any risk there. They have all biology backgrounds.

MR. BELL: But these are not law enforcement officers. They are biologists.

MS. BOSARGE: Given the training and all that you do, and I am asking this question because there is some states that see certain things that we're looking at implementing on our side as maybe a headwind, but is it possible to train up law enforcement so that sometimes if they're doing -- The system that we're looking at, the law enforcement may have to meet some of these boats at the dock, but, at the same time, they may be capturing some biological information. Is it going to be a big hurdle? Do you really need that bachelor's degree in biology in order to capture the necessary information?

MS. DUKES: You're almost crossing data collection variables there. The one caveat that I will say is that the methodology approach for MRIP is strict. You follow an outlined interview from Step 1 to Step 23. You don't vary from it.

MR. BELL: Another thing to keep in mind too, I think, from our perspective, is that we're not enforcement. When our creel clerks, or our port agents, for that matter, interact with fishermen and they see things or there are things there that might be violations, we have no enforcement capability, and so we get good communication and we get data. Data is what we're about. The problem, perhaps, with an officer in that role is that, if an officer observes a violation or something, the officer has to enforce the law.

I can also just tell you, from our standpoint with our department, they are already overtaxed, and so it's kind of two different functions within our department, two separate divisions, but we have never utilized -- As far as I know, we have never utilized enforcement officers to do data collection. It's a completely different role for us. Any other questions for Amy? All right. Thank you. I really appreciate that and good job. We have got one last item on the agenda. We are going to have some discussion of citizen science, and Amber is going to take us through that.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We have been forging ahead with the Citizen Science Program to the best of our abilities, I would say. At one point, we thought we might get some money coming our way. That didn't come through, but we have worked up a proposal for the projects of what we want to do and for the program, and we have passed that up the chain, and Gregg has made that available to NMFS and to let them know that, if something should happen in the next budget or with the end of the year or what have you, that we are poised and really pretty much ready to go. One of the latest activities this summer, since our last meeting, was attending the IMCC, and so Amber was going to fill you guys in on what happened up there.

MS. VONHARTEN: Just real quickly, a group of us went up to the International Marine Conservation Congress up in Newfoundland, and so it was myself and Julia Byrd and Ben Hartig. Then Leda Dunmire and also Jennifer Shirk from Cornell, if you all remember her from the Citizen Science Workshop. We all went up there and first presented in a symposium on actionable science and developing partnerships to make those kinds of things happen. Leda and I gave a talk about the council's efforts to develop a program and kind of some of our lessons learned in moving forward to develop the program and some of the components that were needed to make that happen.

Then, while we were up there, we had an opportunity to actually conduct a focus group with some of the conference attendees, and this conference is very conservation oriented, and so there were a lot of folks from around the world there, working on different conservation issues. A third of the presentations at this conference were focused on citizen science, and so we were really fortunate to be able to connect with a lot of really key people in the field of citizen science, that are doing marine citizen science. There were not a whole lot of fisheries citizen science presentations, but some really key contacts there.

The aim of the focus group was to get some feedback on some of those components that are in our citizen science blueprint that we felt the council maybe doesn't have the most expertise in actually conducting, and that was working with volunteers, data management, project management, and then finance and sustainability, and so we conducted a focus group with about twenty-seven participants.

We were really pleased with that turnout, and we used our now infamous sticky wall to do some facilitated exercises and breakout groups with the folks there, and we got some really great feedback. That's what this attachment here is, Attachment 8. It's kind of a summary of some of the recommendations that we got from the group, and we were hoping to use these recommendations to help develop some of the objectives under the goals for the citizen science blueprint.

The way we kind of collated all this information together was, under each of those four programmatic components, we tried to theme some of the recommendations, and so you will see some of these common themes about building trust and project design, QA/QC, communication, incentives for participation by volunteers, and I am not going to go through all the different bullets, but there is some really great information here that I think is going to be really applicable as we move forward with kind of developing the more formalized plan for the program. I think that's about it.

MR. BELL: Gregg, did you have something?

MR. WAUGH: I would just like to relay that we received lots of positive comments about our team's performance at this conference. Leda also attended, and she said that she received a lot of positive feedback from how our team performed, and so Ben, Amber, and Julia and Leda put a lot of time and effort into what was presented, and so thanks to all of them. Our team shone brightly at that conference, and it really heightened what we're doing here.

As John mentioned, we thought we had a lead on some funds, and Headquarters and Roy and Jack in the Region, and Bonnie, of course, were very supportive of those efforts and did everything they could to try to rescue some of that money for us, but we were unsuccessful there, but they are very supportive of this program, and they have our proposal outlining how we would approach the first year of funding, and so we have asked them to -- If there any end-of-the-year funding or when we get into our next budget, assuming we have another budget at some point, that they keep us in mind and fairly high on that priority list. I know we raised the points with Sam here, but anytime anybody has the opportunity to raise that and keep that need there, I think we need to do that. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: As folks know, we also presented on this to the Council Coordination Committee Meeting back in February, and it was very well received, enthusiastically. There was lots of support there for a council taking this initiative and moving forward. Given what we're trying to do with this, in my conversations with staff, we felt it was time to actually form an actual council committee, and so a Citizen Science Committee, and so, in your committee priorities document that Gregg emailed around to all council members, I would just draw that to your attention, and so, folks who are interested in being members of that committee, please let us know.

I think we have sort of housed the citizen science effort here within the Data Collection Committee for the past year because it is focused on data collection, but I think there are some nuances of a citizen science program, I think mainly the benefits of building a relationship with our stakeholders, that probably it's about time it had its own committee, and so, again, I just want to make sure that we draw folks' attention to that as you are filling out your sheets and getting them to Gregg by the time we leave tomorrow. Thank you.

MR. BELL: All right. That was the last item on our agenda. Is there any other business to come before the Data Collection Committee at this time? I was just going to say that I would encourage you, as far as homework, to take a good look at the most recent version of the reporting amendment. If you find anything that needs to be pointed out, let John know, and we will hopefully be able to come back in December and have some last discussion on that and move to final approval. That's the goal. That's your assignment between now and then, I guess. Any other business? Seeing none, then I will adjourn the Data Collection Committee.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on September 15, 2016.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
October 12, 2016

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COMMITTEES

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

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

CATCH SHARES

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

DATA COLLECTION

- ✓ Mel Bell, Chair
- ✓ Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
- ✓ Anna Beckwith
- ✓ Zack Bowen
- ✓ Mark Brown
- ✓ Chris Conklin
- ✓ Wilson Laney
- ✓ Charlie Phillips
- Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
- Staff contact: John Carmichael

✓ **TIM GRINER**

DOLPHIN WAHOO

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Zack Bowen, Vice-Chair
Chester Brewer
Chris Conklin
Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Tony DiLernia/Dewey
Hemilright
New England Liaison, Frank Blount
Staff contact: John Hadley

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

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

GOLDEN CRAB

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

**HABITAT PROTECTION AND
ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT**

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

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Anna Beckwith, Chair
Zack Bowen
Chester Brewer
Mark Brown
Staff contact: John Hadley

(Continued)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

COUNCIL CHAIR

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

VICE-CHAIR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (continued)

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

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

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

~~LT Tara Pray~~ **LTJG HOCKENBERRY**
U.S. Coast Guard
909 SE 1st Ave.
✓ Miami, FL 33131
305/415-6765 (ph)
tara.c.pray@uscg.mil

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

DR. DAVID GLOECKNER
DR. JACK MCGOVERN
DEWEY HEMMILRIGHT
LEANN BOSARGE
ERIKA BURGESS
RICK DEVICTOR
NIK MEHTA
JOCELYN D'AMBROSIO
MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
DR. MARCEL REICHERT
AMY DUKES
ASAC JEFF RADONSKI

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

Executive Director

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

Deputy Director – Science & Statistics

✓ John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

Deputy Director - Management

✓ Dr. Brian Chevront
brian.chevront@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

Public Information Officer

✓ Kim Iverson
kim.iverson@safmc.net

Financial Secretary

Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

Fisheries Social Scientist

✓ Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator

Cindy Chaya
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

Purchasing & Grants

✓ Julie O'Dell
Julie.Odell@safmc.net

Fishery Scientist

✓ Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

Senior Fishery Biologist

✓ Roger Pugliese
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

Administrative Officer

✓ Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

Fishery Outreach Specialist

✓ Amber Von Harten
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

Fishery Biologist

✓ Dr. Mike Errigo
mike.errigo@safmc.net

SEDAR Coordinators

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

Fishery Economist

✓ John Hadley
John.hadley@safmc.net

Thursday 9/15/16

Last Name	First Name	Email Address
Ashton	Brandon	bcashton@gmail.com
Aspinwall	Alex	alex.aspinwall@mrc.virginia.gov
Austin	Anthony	redress@ec.rr.com
Bailey	Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov
Baker	Scott	bakers@uncw.edu
Bianchi	Alan	Alan.Bianchi@ncdenr.gov
Blow	Wes	wesamy2000@cox.net
Bonura	Vincent	SailRaiser25C@aol.com
Brame	Adam	adam.brame@noaa.gov
Brennan	Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Brouwer	Myra	myra.brouwer@safmc.net
Byrd	Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net
Cahall	Mike	mike.cahall@lpvrs.org
Clarke	Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
D'Ambrosio	Jocelyn	jocelyn.dambrosio@noaa.gov
Daniel	Jessica	jessidaniel44@gmail.com
DeVictor	Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov
Defilippi	Julie	julie.defilippi@accsp.org
DiJohnson	Alex	alex.dijohnson@accsp.org
DuBeck	Guy	guy.dubeck@noaa.gov
Dunmire	Leda	ldunmire@pewtrusts.org
Dutka-Gianelli	Jynessa	jdgianelli@ufl.edu
Erwin	Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com
Foster	Dean	dfoster@pewtrusts.org
Gerhart	Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov
Gloeckner	David	david.gloeckner@noaa.gov
Gore	Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov
Guyas	Martha	martha.guyas@myfwc.com
Hadley	John	john.hadley@safmc.net
Hanson	Chad	chanson@pewtrusts.org
Hartig	Ben	mackattackben@att.net
Helies	Frank	fchelies@verizon.net
Hemilright	Dewey	fvtarbaby@embarqmail.com
Henninger	Heidi	heidi@offshorelobster.org
Hudson	Rusty	DSF2009@aol.com
Iverson	Kim	kim.iverson@safmc.net
Jiorle	Ryan	ryan.jiorle@mrc.virginia.gov
Johnson	Denise	denise.johnson@noaa.gov
Kemp	Brian	kempbrian6971@gmail.com
Knowlton	Kathy	kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov
Laks	Ira	captaindrifter@att.net

Larkin	Michael	michael.larkin@noaa.gov
Lee	Jennifer	Jennifer.lee@noaa.gov
Levy	Mara	mara.levy@noaa.gov
MacLauchlin	Bill	billmac@charter.net
Markwith	Anne	anne.markwith@ncdenr.gov
Mehta	Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov
Merrifield	Jeanna	jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com
Mershon	Wayne	kenyonseafood@sc.rr.com
Neer	Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net
Oreilly	Rob	rob.oreilly@mrc.virginia.gov
Raine	Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov
Records	David	david.records@noaa.gov
Schwaab	Alexandra	alexandra.schwaab@accsp.org
Shipman	Susan	susanshipman@att.net
Spain	Bill	bill@harborlightsoftware.com
Swatzel	Tom	tom@swatzel.com
Takade-Heumacher	Helen	htakade@edf.org
Turner	Steve	steve.turner@noaa.gov
Walia	Matthew	matthew.walia@noaa.gov
White	Geoff	geoff.white@accsp.org
Wyatt	Elizabeth	elizabeth.wyatt@accsp.org
brewer	william	wcblaw@aol.com
bubley	walter	bubleyw@dnr.sc.gov
cimino	joe	joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.gov
colby	barrett	bcolby3@cfl.rr.com
holiman	stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov
holmes	karen	karen.holmes@accsp.org
malinowski	rich	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
pugliese	roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net
sandorf	scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov
vara	mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov

Timestamp	Full Name	Email	Mailing Address (If your address is already on file, just type "on file")	How do you participate in fisheries in the South Atlantic? (Check all that apply)
9/15/2016 8:02:02	Dean Foster	dfoster@pewtrusts.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/15/2016 8:03:19	Rusty Hudson	DSF2009@aol.com	on file	Fisheries Consultant
9/15/2016 8:03:57	Lora Clarke	lclarke@pewtrusts.org	on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/15/2016 8:13:22	Bill Kelly	fkcfat1@hotmail.com	On file	Commercial fishing representative
9/15/2016 8:35:44	david bush	davidbush@ncfish.org	on file	NCFA
9/15/2016 9:19:18	jack cox	dayboat1965@gmail.com	file	Seafood Dealer/Wholesaler/Retailer
9/15/2016 9:54:14	Robert Boyles	boylesr@dnr.sc.gov	on file	Government
9/15/2016 10:02:32	Russell Dunn	Russell.Dunn@noaa.gov	on file	NOAA Fisheries
9/15/2016 10:29:07	david westfall		3904 A Flagg St Murrells Inlet SC 29576	Commercial Fisherman
9/15/2016 17:05:42	Leda Dummire		on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/15/2016 17:05:59	Dick Brame		on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/15/2016 17:06:13	Allison Johnson		on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/15/2016 17:06:33	Rusty Hudson		on file	Commercial Fisherman, DSF
9/15/2016 17:06:53	Bill Gorham		on file	Charter/Headboat/For-hire
9/15/2016 17:08:09	Trip		on file	Non-Governmental Organization
9/15/2016 17:08:27	Dean Foster		on file	Non-Governmental Organization