SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

Sawgrass Marriott
Ponte Vedra Beach, FL

June 12, 2014

SUMMARY MINUTES

Dara Collection Committee:

Mel Bell, Chairman
Jack Cox
Dr. Wilson Laney
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Dr. Michelle Duval
Jessica McCawley

Council Members:

David Cupka
Zack Bowen
Lt. Morgan Fowler
Doug Haymans
Charlie Phillips
Ben Hartig
Anna Beckwith
Chris Conklin
John Jolley

Council Staff:

Bob Mahood
Mike Collins
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin
Kim Iverson
Julie O'Dell
Roger Pugliese
Gregg Waugh
John Carmichael
Amber Von Harten
Dr. Mike Errigo
Myra Brouwer
Dr. Brian Cheuvront

Observers/Participants:

Monica Smit-Brunello
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Phil Steele
Tracy Dunn
Dr. Jack McGovern
Leann Bosarge
Dr. Andy Strelcheck

Additional Observers Attached

The Data Collection Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Sawgrass Marriott, Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida, June 12, 2014, and was called to order at 3:25 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: We're going to call the meeting of the Data Collection Committee to order. The first item is the approval of the agenda. I'm going to make one little adjustment to the agenda. Item 6 and 7 on the agenda, we will flip. We will do 7 before 7; and that will enable Bonnie to do a quick presentation on the Logbook Pilot Study, which we can then talk about a little bit under Item 6.

Are there any other changes to the agenda? Seeing none; then the agenda will stand as slightly modified. Approval of the March 2014 minutes; are there any changes to the minutes from the March meeting? Seeing no changes, the minutes are adopted. That takes us to our first item on the agenda and that would be a quick discussion of the Joint Gulf and South Atlantic Council Generic Dealer Amendment status. Jack.

DR. McGOVERN: The Dealer Reporting Amendment will implement a generic dealer permit and it will require weekly electronic reporting. The Notice of Availability for the amendment published on December 19, 2013, and the comment period ended on February 18. The proposed rule published on January 2 and the comment period ended on February 3.

The final rule published on April 9 and the regulations are going to be effective on August 7. The other thing I wanted to mention going back to mackerel; I mentioned that Amendment 2A, the final rule was going to publish soon. It is going to publish on Monday and regulations are going to be effective on July 16.

MR. BELL: Any questions for Jack? Let's go to the next item, which would be the Electronic Technology Implementation Plan. There are three items that were in your briefing book associated with this. The middle one I think is a presentation that I believe Dr. Strelcheck is going to give at some point. Two of them are just for information and it will help us in our discussion.

I guess we found out about this back in December of 2013. There was some discussion of a regional electronic monitoring – well, the National Marine Fisheries Service is interested in having a plan of using EREM. We had a briefing back in December from George Lapointe, who is working that. Various things have happened since then.

This past January there was the Electronic Monitoring and Reporting Workshop out in Seattle. I attended that along with Michelle. We had some discussion of that at the last meeting and some of the things we got out of that. We had a little bit of discussion about just the general concept of electronic reporting and electronic monitoring at the last meeting and made a few points, which were captured in March in terms of how we might proceed particularly in our region.

One of the things that was obvious I think in all of this is that each region will be a little different in terms of how they move forward. Some regions are much farther along in terms of their implementation or use of electronic technologies; and for us we may find that there are certain

technologies that work better for us right now and that we're more ready for use or possible implementation; and then some things may just take a little longer, but each region will be different.

Part of what we'll discuss here will be in our Southeastern Region. The office is interested in input related to kind of where we are and where we're thinking we could go related to use of some of these technologies. We'll discuss this in a lot more detail. There will be opportunity for us to capture some things that we want to make sure that we have to give the National Marine Fisheries Service some feedback on the development of this implementation plan.

What we want to make sure is that they adequate input from us so we can craft this plan together. This will be an ongoing process for a little while. The idea I think is to have the plan completed by December, I believe, so we've got a fairly quick turnaround on some input here that they've asked for. With that we'll go right to Andy. The presentation I think you have in your briefing book is the one that you gave before or do you have a different one that you're going to use?

DR. STRELCHECK: Back in I guess September or October I was asked to serve on the steering committee for the Electronic Monitoring Workshop out in Seattle. That was kind of the precursor to a larger effort by the agency to develop these implementation plans. George Lapointe I know has come before you to discuss the implementation effort.

Now we're proceeding with development of that plan, and you have in your briefing book, as Mel mentioned, a letter from our agency asking for your input. I just wanted to briefly go through where we are at in the process, what input we're seeking from you and how you can obviously help in providing us with feedback.

As George has pointed out in previous presentations to you, we're seeing an increasing need for electronic reporting and monitoring; and that really pertains to the accuracy of data as well as the timeliness of data. This push for electronic reporting in particular in the Southeast Region is of interest.

The implementation plans are intended to serve as a roadmap; give us an operational strategy so that we can better tackle our priorities for implementing electronic reporting and electronic monitoring in the region; looking at it on a fishery-specific basis as well as within sectors and gear types; and give us an operational strategy to move forward with in order to implement these programs.

This is just a schematic of what is fairly straightforward; but the keys to success for the electronic monitoring and reporting implementation, this was something that came out of the workshop back in January. All of these pieces are going into this implementation plan. What we're looking for is why are you wanting to implement electronic monitoring and reporting; what are the objectives you're trying to accomplish that aren't being accomplished with existing data collection programs?

Getting input from you, the council, as well as stakeholders, scientists, in terms of what is needed to make these programs successful. The challenges, which I'll talk about as well on the next

slide, there are certainly a lot impediments to electronic monitoring and reporting; cost and infrastructure being one of the main impediments.

What are those challenges and how can we overcome some of those challenges? I think a lot of times we've failed with especially pilot studies is having both the process and timeline for implementation. If you have a successful pilot study or work that has been done; how do you then transition that into a real-time fishery monitoring program?

Then last but not least, the key component of this plan is going to be how do we go back and review progress made in terms of implementation of electronic monitoring and reporting in the Southeast Region? As I mentioned, key challenges are numerous. One of the questions that we have asked you, the council, to provide feedback on are what do you believe are the key challenges facing implementation. We will be interested very much in your feedback on that.

Certainly, from our standpoint, there are some obvious ones. I mentioned cost and infrastructure. There are impediments such as insufficient regulations or regulations that need to be modified in order to allow EMER in fisheries. We obviously manage a very large geographic area with very diverse fleets; so the size and extent fleets can be a challenge for electronic reporting and adequate validation of that data and timeliness of that data being submitted.

Any time you move to a new type of data collection program, you have to deal with the challenge of calibrating with old methods; and so that certainly is an issue for stock assessments and long-term time series for tracking trends in the fishery. And then multiple data collection partners; you have four states that sit on this council that all assist in data collection efforts both commercially and recreationally.

To implement electronic monitoring and reporting; we can do that at the council level and federal fisheries; but that's only one component of many of these fisheries that you manage. There are a lot of state fisheries that harvest species that you also manage that would also have to be incorporated or considered in these types of electronic reporting and monitoring programs.

Those are just some of the challenges; and I'm sure you guys probably have other challenges that you've thought of or that you'll want to provide input on. I think the key is not just identifying the challenges but ways we can overcome some of these challenges. The contents of the management plan; at this point we've just sketched out an outline for the plan.

That was part of the letter that was sent to you. What we're looking for is to walk people through the plan and start off with what is the agency's objectives for monitoring with council input on that, scientific input on that. What are our existing technological capabilities as well as new and emerging technologies; needed regulatory changes, which should be fairly straightforward.

And then some of the other things that I've talked about in terms of challenges, really start focusing in on those, challenges impeding implementation; how can we get beyond those challenges. From your standpoint what we will be very much interested in is a prioritized list of fisheries and sectors or gear types within those fisheries that you feel are most suitable for

electronic monitoring or electronic reporting; so that can help the agency and our budgeting process and our prioritization process of determining what is going to be most important for you to manage these federal fisheries.

And then one of the things that I think we've struggled with is identifying costs and infrastructure that's needed for these programs and doing a much better job of outlining those up front. Yes, it is dependent on the details of how the program is designed; but if we can get a general idea of how much they're going to cost and what that's going to represent for the agency's budget for implementation, then that can help us in terms of guiding priorities for long-term research and funding.

Then last, as I mentioned, process for evaluating the implementation plan itself; so that we don't want this to be a document that is written and is put on the shelf and has dust on it and never gets looked at again, but something that's brought out regularly and let's see how we're doing, what priorities have we accomplished, what do we still need to move forward and try to accomplish; and do we need to change or revise our implementation plan down the road.

Where we're at now; we're seeking input from all three of our councils in the Southeast Region. I had conference calls with each of the councils back in late April. George Lapointe was also involved in those conversations. We wanted to lay out at least our path forward and what we were thinking as an option to get your input.

The approach that we agreed to was to initially send letters out to each of the councils asking ten to twelve key questions that we're seeking input on; to then get that input directly back to us; and we've asked for that by the end of the month. From there we're going to compile that information from all the councils as well as internal discussions within the agency, the science center, the regional office; and we'll organize a planning committee that will be comprised of NMFS staff as well as council members and council staff to go over these recommendations and help formulate the implementation plan.

The implementation plan will be written by the National Marine Service staff; but there is going to be several opportunities for you to provide input on it down the road as well as this committee to continue to provide input. We discussed with Gregg and others having your advisory panels provide input; as well as once the draft plan is out for public input, for you to allow public input during council meetings.

We were concerned with trying to get input too early in the process without something people could react to; and so that's why we're designing it in the way that we provide an opportunity for you to give input, develop the draft plan, and then go out for public input to further refine the draft plan as it moves forward.

I'm not going to go through details here, but I outlined – I think there is eleven or twelve questions that were in the letter; and Gregg is going to talk a little bit more about this. Essentially the theme of the questions go back to the contents that I laid out in the plan: what are your primary objectives; where do you see deficiencies; what fisheries do you want to prioritize

in terms of electronic monitoring and reporting; challenges with those fisheries and how we might overcome them; any regulations that you see precluding implementation.

Then the last few questions focused more specifically on factors that you, the councils, see as most important for the use of EMER. From a standpoint of a fishermen, what is most important for implementing electronic monitoring and reporting; and when is it appropriate for vessel monitoring systems or on-board camera systems to be used. Lastly, you as the council, wanting NMFS to look back and review this implementation plan; what are the most important factors that you see in terms of reviewing implementation progress.

I'll end with the next steps, and I've largely outlined those already in the presentation. We're right now obtaining input from you. We're going to prepare a draft plan during late summer or early fall with the hope of having that draft plan completed and ready to be brought back to you at your September meeting. The committee that I had mentioned will be convened as needed throughout the late summer during development of this plan; and then it will go out for public input late in the year with finalization of the plan this December. With that I will take any questions.

MR. BELL: What I intend to do is we'll have a little time here for some – we'll go through some of these and kind of show you some of the thoughts we've collected. Does anybody have any questions for Andy right now about the process or where we're going with this; the desired outcome? Zack.

MR. BOWEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee, by the way, but I was kind of taking a few notes as I was listening. Early in your presentation you mentioned something about state waters fish and federal fish and fishing in state waters versus not. In my mind a simple question that could be or maybe should be on this reporting requirement would be distance offshore. It's a simple question and that would answer whether they were in state or federal waters, you know, greater than three miles or less than three miles.

DR. STRELCHECK: What I was really getting at there was more the differentiation between federally permitted vessels and those that are just licensed by the states and differences in data collection programs and ensuring that if you're going to implement an electronic monitoring or reporting program that it be comprehensive and cover the fishery as a whole; but it does go back to what your objectives are. Mike will, I'm sure, discuss this as well during the Charterboat Logbook Technical Subcommittee notes, because this was the topic that came up during that meeting.

DR. LANEY: Andy. I know the focus here is mostly on collecting fisheries data, but are you all interested in input back on using electronic technology for monitoring the fish as well? I'm thinking of all the BR2W receivers and acoustic tags and all that sort of thing or is that something that falls more in the realm of the science end of it or the fishery-independent realm maybe.

DR. STRELCHECK: Yes; the focus really is on fishery-depending monitoring more so than fishery-independent. Certainly, we would be happy to receive comments that you have on both, but the plan itself will focus on the fishery-dependent side.

MR. BELL: And that's how the meeting out in Seattle was set up and the focus is on that, which makes sense because that's enough in itself to kind of enough to chew on. Are there any other questions for Andy right now? Gregg, we could queue up the things that we have and just kind of go through them.

What I wanted to do was the timelines we're working with, we need to get the office some feedback on the letter. If you look at Attachment 2C in your briefing binder, that is the letter that Andy was talking about. The attachment in that is the regional implementation plan questions. Those were questions he was going through. Those are very good questions.

It is a good way to kind of frame all of this and try to capture input. Gregg has given some thought to this, Gregg and Roger – I know Michelle has provided input – so we've been kind of collecting input. I've jotted a few things down on another document. We want to spend a little time and allow you to talk about it right now or provide any input; plus if you want to give this a little bit of thought, we can basically receive – if you want to shoot me or Gregg some feedback, if you want to kind of structure it around sort of answering the questions, that may be one way to do it; or if you just kind of have some thoughts about it that you just want to sort free-flow, that's all right as well.

We would definitely want to capture any input from the council regarding how we might proceed – you know, what would work for us in our region. The big thing here to keep in mind is these plans will be tailored for the specific regions; and we are the folks that understand our fisheries, understand our fishermen, understand the limitations, the challenges and all these sorts of things; so we need to make sure we do a good job of capturing all that and provide some good feedback to the regional office. Gregg, do you want go through that a little bit?

MR. WAUGH: Yes; and we will circulate this. We wanted to run through this quickly and just get any initial thoughts you all had; but what they'll do is compile this, send it out and probably need to get comments back some time by the end of next week; so that then we can draft up a letter and get it into Andy and those by the end of the month.

The first item was reporting and our council indicated their preference for focusing in on reporting. We do have a few items to suggest under monitoring because that's a big key item; and we didn't want to miss an opportunity for some suggested areas where we might be able to take advantage of some opportunities for monitoring.

In terms of dealer reporting, we have weekly electronic reporting will be fully implemented in August. There are still delays in having the weekly updated landings available to the public for their use in planning trips; so perhaps a solution we could explore would be to have the raw weekly data fed to ACCSP and made available to the public via the ACCSP Website.

The official numbers would continue to be the numbers on the NMFS Website; but this would provide more timely and useful updates to the public. We'd like to explore including more specific catch location information into the reporting requirements. Remember from last night the discussion about rock shrimp.

There is a little more detail that the fishermen report; but when they go in and give the information to the dealer, it is like just a large area and it is not useful when we get into looking at area-based management. You will see some similarities with some of the fishery-dependent monitoring. For headboats weekly electronic reporting is fully implemented.

The goal is to have monthly landings available on the NMFS Website that would make the data more useful for the public. It would be more helpful if the landings were updated weekly to better track recreational landings and to make the landings available to the public for their use in planning trips. Again, we could explore the opportunity to make the raw data available on the ACCSP Website – the official numbers would continue to be the NMFS Website – and exploring including more specific catch location information into the reporting requirements.

The headboat grids are smaller than the commercial grids, but they're still not as refined as would be helpful for area-based management. Then we're talking about charterboat reporting. Our council's intent thus far has been to apply the same reporting requirements that currently exist for headboats to charterboats. The intent would be that the data follow the same route and timing as shown above for headboats; and again including more specific catch location information.

Commercial logbook reporting; we want to report electronically with the same one-button submittal as we talk about under Item 5 below; and again including more specific catch location information on the reporting requirements. The statistical grids; we've discussed this for years and years. They're just not at all useful for our area-based management.

They weren't when we did the original MPAs and they haven't been since. Item 5 is simplification of reporting. We want to avoid any redundancy; and so for dealer, headboat and charterboat reporting should be done in a way such that the individual submitting the data hits one send button and simultaneously it goes to the state, ACCSP and NMFS. That should be totally transparent to the individual supplying the data.

One, explore logbook reporting for the private recreational sector; explore having a sample of vessels by sector provide real-time bycatch reporting – this could be video monitoring on-board electronic logbooks, and we'll hear a presentation from Bonnie in a little bit on where we are with the on-board electronic logbook. Certainly, this is by no means a limited list. There is more that could be added; but that's what we've drawn up for discussion now on reporting. Do you want to stop there before we go on to monitoring or just go right through?

MR. BELL: Well, we could have a couple of questions on that or comments. Well, I'll tell you what, go through the whole thing first.

MR. WAUGH: The next section deals with monitoring; and some of this you heard again from rock shrimp. The industry has expressed a willingness to work cooperatively with scientists on documenting their fishery. We'd like to explore methods for the industry to provide catch information by trawl to be linked to the VMS data.

You heard this again last night. They feel that where they're trawling now, that's where the bulk of their catch comes from. We don't have any way to verify that; so they're willing to work to come up with some way that as they pull up a trawl, they can provide an estimate of what they have harvested in that trawl and that can be keyed into the VMS track information.

This would document the industry's production by area that would be very helpful in area-based management. This is an opportunity that gets to something that Wilson was talking about; investigate the possible use of environmental monitoring on trawls to link fishing effort and catch with environmental conditions to provide a better understanding of catch associated with habitat and environment.

So there is an opportunity here to make use of the new technology; and this is something Roger has been keeping up with this technology. In the golden crab fishery, that industry also – and you heard this again today – has expressed a willingness to work cooperatively with scientists on documenting their fishery.

If you remember, one of the issues we had, we looked at having VMS on board the vessels. There is difficulty in that there is a big difference in the golden crab fishery on where the vessel is and where the trap is. The more important item is where the trap is; so we want to explore placing electronic pingers on traps to document where the gear is fishing. This information would be compared to where the vessel is located perhaps with VMS or some other way to provide vessel location to better understand how that fishery operates.

Explore methods for the industry to provide catch information by trap haul to be linked to the trap location data, similar to what we talked about with rock shrimp. This would document the industry's production by area and again very helpful when you talk about looking at area-based management.

As we talked about with the rock shrimp trawls, investigate possible use of environmental monitoring on the traps. Those I think are two that are pretty straightforward. The other ideas are for you think about; and certainly these industries have not come forward and expressed any willingness. These are new ideas.

Black sea bass traps; we obviously have a lot of concern about potential protected resource interactions; so we could explore placing electronic pingers on the traps or on the buoy gear and explore the use of VMS or some other way to provide vessel location information to better understand how the fishery operates.

Snapper grouper longline vessels; explore placing electronic pingers on longlines and explore use of VMS or some other way to provide vessel location; again to document where these gears

are, where they're fishing. That would be helpful with quota monitoring and any potential interactions with endangered or threatened species.

Royal red shrimp and calico scallops; this gets a little farther out there because we don't have FMPs for these species, but they're subject to some of our regulations. Both of these fisheries use trawl gear. They're subject to the council's HAPC gear limitations and prohibition on possession of coral; so explore placing electronic pingers on royal red shrimp trawls to document where the gear is fishing.

They fish in extremely deep water; and again there is a big difference in where the vessel is and where that trawl is. Explore methods for these industries to provide catch information by trawl similar to what we were talking about with rock shrimp. Explore use of hydraulic pressure transducers to indicate when the hydraulic equipment, the trawl, and anchor winches are operating.

That's something that could apply to the rock shrimp industry as well. Explore providing vessels conducting fishery-independent survey technology, fixed system, AUVR, or BCDDs, et cetera to conduct benthic mapping, acoustic monitoring and collection of oceanographic data.

We understand it is focused on fishery-dependent data; but we've got these platforms out there and we need to work smart at getting equipment on them and take advantage of that opportunity to collect some of the data that Wilson was talking about.

Explore providing vessels of opportunity, including commercial and recreational vessels, the technology to do benthic mapping. Certainly, there are a lot of other possibilities. That what is we've put together so far for your consideration.

MR BELL: One thing to keep in mind in fall of this is this is technology. It is a tool. The tool will not force itself upon us or drive the needs. Our use of the tool, our use of the technology should be focused on solving problems, realizing where some of our gaps are related to collecting data and how can this technology help us.

Think of it in a sense of where are the problem areas we might have related to fishery-dependent data collection and whether it is reporting or monitoring; and so how can these technologies help us achieve very clear objectives. Sometimes you can get kind of caught up in the technology and the next thing you know you're trying to push the technology in a little bit too far in terms of use and things.

Something that came up at the meeting in Seattle that really stuck in my mind; there was a gentleman from – I can't remember where he was from now, but he was from fisheries where they had used this stuff. He talked about the lure of the shiny baubles. You've got this technology and you're thinking, oohh, I can use that or we can apply that there; ooh, we can use that, but you have to be very careful in that, yes, that's cool and, yes, it is neat, but make sure you're focused on – and this was very clear at the meeting – the objectives.

It is all about what are your objectives for applying this technology; and just because it's the latest greatest gee whiz stuff, it may or may not be what you really need. That's the way we should approach I think in terms of collecting input and all is think of it in those terms; how can this technology help us to improve our data stream, data timeliness, accuracy, those sorts of things.

MR. HAYMANS: I was just going to say the EM and the ER are two drastically different things; and the ER seems to be the low-hanging fruit that we really ought to pursue wholeheartedly. We've got the dealers doing it, we've got the headboats doing it and we're talking about the charter guys and we ought to start exploring the recreational folks with logbooks in some way. That shiny bauble is the monitoring things; and that's where all the high costs have been and things like that. Again, I guess we have to discuss them together somewhat, but I'd really rather go to ER route first as much as possible before really delving into additional EM stuff.

MR. BELL: Yes; and I think we made that kind of clear at the last meeting, I thought, that in our particular region that is the low-hanging fruit and that is – even last night you heard folks talking about things that, well, perhaps the electronic reporting would be something that could help in terms of data from folks. I think you're right, but we should still ask ourselves what sorts of problems or issues might be addressable by use of EM. I think what we'll find is probably there would be immediate low-hanging fruit related to the reporting. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: One example of being on the brink of an actual success for the electronic monitoring side is the very first example in Gregg's white paper for electronic monitoring was looking at the rock shrimp fishery. Of course, we heard a great deal about that last night. One of the things we're doing in the Gulf right now that is playing out quite nicely – and it's not quite as sophisticated as what this is proposing, which would be able to give you landings by tow.

It's the next best thing and what it does is breaks down the effort into kind of spatial distribution of those tows. What it is are units like a simple GPS unit with a small – the equivalent of a small computer associated with it; small, compact. It has a small antenna and has a cellular capability. When you're far enough offshore that you can't reach a cell tower, then it stores the data on a storage unit of your choice. It can either be a little hard drive, a thumb drive, a card, whatever choice you want; and there are multiple choices.

Then it constantly is feeling for a cell tower; and as soon as it feels a cell tower, it uplinks those data in real time. It relies on an algorithm that differentiates between steaming versus drifting versus anchored versus actually towing, because tow speeds are unique enough typically when you're going at that speed, that's what you're doing.

What it enables you to do is be able to take a 22-day – I think what I heard last night was the typical trip is 22 days – take a 22-day trip and actually partition that into what percent of those 22 days was actually spent fishing and where was that fishing taking place in some pretty precise terms, giving you actual lines. That, again, it is not as valuable as saying on this tow I caught in my hold these shrimp, but it is probably the closest we have right now that we could actually do right now. It is something to think about and it is one example of an executable EM project.

MR. BELL: Yes; and I think that's a good point about the rock shrimp fishery. In our region, anyway, it is kind of the poster child for application of EM and an even potential combination of EM and ER. The things that they're doing in terms of staying out of areas couldn't be done without the application of that particular tool. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: To Doug's point; it is definite that our council's intent is that the electronic reporting is our highest priority; but there is obviously a lot of interest in electronic monitoring and should money become available, we don't want to miss that opportunity because we haven't put anything up there. I think in this letter we will make it clear that our council's interest is to take care of the electronic reporting first; and if there is allocation of monies, we want that taken care of first. Then if there are some additional resources, here is what we are interested in looking at for monitoring.

MS. BOSARGE: I was just going to chime in on what Bonnie said about the electronic reporting in the shrimp industry and the device that she is talking about. We've actually been carrying a similar device for over ten years now I think, Bonnie, that we've had the other one. It is just a newer update to it. We have tremendous buy-in from the industry.

It saved our industry on several occasions. We don't target snapper, but we just about got shut down for snapper in certain areas. That device and the data that it provided on our shrimp industry allowed us to show that we have reduced effort in such and such area, blah, blah, blah, so we could continue to shrimp there. I think that it is something that could be very beneficial over here in your area as well. I don't know if you have a commercial shrimp representative on your council, so I just wanted to chime in and say that it's a good thing over there.

MR. BELL: That's a very good point; and that just shows how the technology can be used to improve things for a particular fishery. Another thing to keep in mind and one of the sort of the challenges that we'll face is that the fishery has to be of a significant enough value and have the resources to be able to afford the technology.

Where you're more high-value or high-end fisheries, it might be easier in terms of using something like that because you could afford it perhaps; or, when we get into discussion of things like industry-sharing costs and those sorts of things, it might work. It is not necessarily going to work for every fishery, but in some them it is definitely – you know, there is potential. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I think Scott Baker presented that particular device that Leann is talking about. I think it was in its early stages at that point, but he made mention of that when he gave some presentations to the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel Meeting I think a couple of years ago. At least I know he has communicated that information to be as a peer-reviewed journal article on it.

MR. BELL: Another thing to think about is so one of our challenges – and we'll talk about this very briefly later – might be documentation of bycatch or something. There may be certain fisheries where EM and EM with ER is useful in documentation of bycatch; but again it won't work for every fishery necessarily or the costs would certainly be – could prove to be astronomical compared to the value of some fisheries.

We just kind of have to figure out again what works best for us, but I think we do need, as Gregg said, to certainly consider EM but ER being the low-hanging fruit; and I think that's probably where we'll have our greatest success and obvious application kind of moving into this. Are there other questions or comments? Zack.

MR. BOWEN: Again, I'm not on your committee;, but just for ideas, has somebody or can somebody kind of give me some ideas on validation? Don't get me wrong; I'm all for EM and ER; I'm actually for VMS. Can somebody give me some feedback on how we'd validate this data?

DR. STRELCHECK: Well, it certainly depends on whether you're talking electronic reporting or monitoring. Electronic reporting; logbooks keep coming up, electronic logbooks. There are numerous way that you set up validation for logbooks. One is dockside validation. Their trips are coming in and you're determining, okay, did the boat leave port or not leave port.

If it left port, did they submit a logbook on that day; did not submit a logbook for that trip; dockside comparisons with the actual trip reports themselves; so what did they report on the logbook versus what they didn't report on the logbook. In the Gulf of Mexico, where we have IFQ programs, catch share programs and we have a lot of validation tools in place to help with enforcement, where they actually have reporting prior to reaching port; so they actually submit a pre-landing report that indicates what they're landing, what quantity of fish.

It is not binding but at least gives enforcement and port agents a heads-up that this vessel is coming into a certain location and general idea of what fish and poundage is on board the vessel and an opportunity then for enforcement to meet them at the dock and inspect their catch. With electronic monitoring; the examples that we've worked on in the Gulf and South Atlantic have focused on camera systems on board snapper grouper and reef fish vessels.

The validations that take place are people reading those tapes at the end of a trip and looking to see how those catches compare to direct observations by people on board the vessel; and are the species accurately counted, are the species accurately identified. There is mixed success depending on what type of fisheries you're operating in and how clearly you can actually distinguish between species that are being brought up on board as well as where the cameras are positioned. That just gives you kind of some examples of ways that the data can be validated.

MR. COX: I've got three permits and about half a dozen fishermen that I help fill the logs out for them for reporting. I'm going to tell you something; it is so burdensome to do that and to go through those long forms and then the discard forms; and then if you miss one little thing on there, it goes to the science center and in two or three weeks you get it back and have to send it back.

Man, I'm so ready for something like this to come our way because there are so many chances for error. It takes time and effort to go to the post office and to put that in the mail and then it comes back. Then if you forget a month or you go to renew your permit, when you send your permit application in, then you realize, well, I've missed two or three months behind. I just think it's time for this.

MR. BELL: I think Jack is a perfect example; but as we get into this and we're able to talk to more folks about it, you'll see where there are ways where it can improve people's lives. You just think of the burdens that might take off of you if we can get a system that works and it increases efficiency and timeliness. That's where if we reach out and kind of get input from the fisheries, we may hear similar things like that as well. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: To Zack's point about validation; you will hear this in Mike's presentation on the technical subcommittee's work discussing charterboat reporting. Remember, we still need biological samples. We still need people to go down and look at the fish, measure the fish, take biological samples. That's another good way to have validation.

MR. BELL: Kind of using the letter, I had kind of thrown some bullets in there. It may be a little bit redundant from what we've covered, but again I was kind of focusing on either ER or EM. Obviously, in terms of objectives – and I would encourage you, if you'd like to provide input again to me or Gregg, if you want to use the letter and just kind of categorize things that way, that's great. If you want to provide input in any format, that's fine.

Under objectives, the idea with the objectives would be to improve timeliness, accuracy, efficiency, usefulness of the fishery-dependent data. There has to be some value in this. We're not just doing it for the sake of doing it or using cool technology. There has to be very clear objectives.

Since we, again, kind of understand where the problems or where deficiencies are in some of our fisheries or some of our reporting or data gaps, think in terms of how can we fix some of those areas and how can we fill gaps. Objectives are very important in all of this. Another objective; we have heard from various fishermen that they want to report to us electronically.

This will be a tough one to figure out, but we've heard over and over again from private boat anglers that they want to tell us stuff, they want to report to us. Now, of course, that's great; but as Roy pointed out last night in the conversation we had, okay, you have data to give us, but now we have to have a system in place to handle the data, to use the data, manage the data, so there are expenses associated with that.

I know in the Gulf they have this program down there, iSnapper I guess it is, and that's something that is kind of an iPhone-based reporting or something. There are different ways that we can respond to the request from fishermen. As Jack said, he can't wait for something to change in terms of improving his ability to report. We're hearing that from some folks.

Another thing is through use this you could perhaps improve public accessibility to data. It is simplification of reporting like for the for-hire or commercial sectors. Those are all things. There may be ways you can use EM and ER together to improve documentation if you can associate catch with location, like with rock shrimp or something; that might be an objective. We don't need to zip through all these. What I did was I went through each one of the questions and just kind of put some bullets there. I think we'll use the time to do all of that.

MR. WAUGH: What we will do is put together – and actually what we'll do is attach these to the committee report so that everybody gets that. You can have that and you can provide any comments back to us by next Friday; and then we'll incorporate them into the letter.

MR. BELL: Again, this number two, the deficiencies and limitations that were asked about; just give that some thought from the fisheries you're most familiar with or that you have a pretty good understanding; and where are the deficiencies or the things that we could help with, kind of approach it from that perspective. Okay, any other comments or questions right now?

Everybody kind of understands the direction we're going in? Again, the plan will be together by December, is that right, Andy? We're kind of on a relatively short time span, but there will be a lot of back and forth and interaction. As Andy explained the process, they want input and we'll be back and forth. I think this will be a good thing. Again, it will be customized for our region; and they'll do that for each of the regions. Anything else on this item?

MR. COX: Just real quick; this piece of equipment the fishermen are using in the Gulf; are they using like telephone app, are they using a computer; exactly what kind of equipment do they have?

DR. STRELCHECK: We have numerous pilot studies ongoing in the Gulf. The one that Mel mentioned is iSnapper application. It is either a Smartphone or a tablet app that fishermen can enter logbook data. It was being tested just to build the app and see how it's functional, see how easy it is to use on the water.

I believe the state of Alabama is now using that app for monitoring red snapper catches this particular year under a pilot study. The data itself, though, is not being used right now for monitoring landings. Then we have a headboat collaborative program that is ongoing; 17 of the 75 approximate headboats in the Gulf where they have vessel monitoring systems on board their vessels.

They're reporting the number of red snapper and gag that they land prior to landing; and then we're validating it dockside. They've essentially been allotted a certain portion of the quotas for those two species and have been exempted from the seasonal closures in order to test out this more flexible management system. Their vessel monitoring system is largely functioning as a mini-logbook with them able to report catches for those two species.

MR. BELL: Keep in mind we've talked about this before; but if you establish a system for data collection, if people want to give you data, it needs to be data that you fully intend to and can use. You never want to go out and collect a lot of data and then do nothing with it. That would not be a good thing; so it needs to have obvious application. It needs to be data that can be functional in terms of application towards stock assessments or some aspect of what you need done.

That will be part of the trick I think and the toughest nut to crack in that would probably be the private boat sector obviously. I think we can make fairly rapid progress in the for-hire sector and obviously with the commercial sector, but that will be a tough one, but I think it's a good

challenge. Okay, any other questions or anything about that? Andy, thanks a lot for that. All right, let's go to the next item.

MR. WAUGH: As you recall, CE-BA 3 just has bycatch and we've talked and we've asked NOAA GC to give us just an update on what is going on in the northeast. We had planned on scheduling someone from the council up there and/or NMFS to give us a presentation. This meeting was so jammed we've deferred that to September. Monica is going to sort of give us an update and then I'll outline a timing that we think – Monica, Jack and I discussed it what we think is a reasonable way to deal with this.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: That was a great presentation by Andy, which I would think there could be a lot of uses that might meet some objectives for a bycatch amendment, too. This was to summarize and just give you an update briefly on what is going on in the northeast. Jack and I have looked at two big amendments that are going on up there.

Jack is going to bring you up to speed on what we've discovered there; and that is for the Northeast Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology Amendment or the SBRM Amendment. Then I'll talk about another amendment they're working on and then we'll talk a little bit more, but I'll just hand the mike to Jack.

DR. McGOVERN: I talked to a guy in the northeast and also looked at this Northeast Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology Omnibus Amendment that is being developed by the Mid-Atlantic and the Northeast Fishery Management Councils and Doug Potts kind of updated me. He is the lead on this and updated me about what is going on.

This is an amendment that summarizes the Standardized Bycatch Reporting Methodology that is currently in place for all the fisheries up there. It determines that the processes in place need to be modified or supplemented. It estimates a level of observer coverage that's needed for each fishery up there based on attaining a performance standard, a CV performance standards of 30 percent for a species or species groups that are managed up there.

It identifies sources of funding for observer coverage. It prioritizes fisheries that are in need of observer coverage for standardized bycatch reporting methodology. Then one important thing I think that it does is that it provides a mechanism or some sort of process to allocate any existing observer funds among fisheries.

The idea is that in all years there might not be enough funds to achieve the performance standards needed for observer coverage for all the fisheries. There is sort of a formulaic approach that's devised in this amendment that would adjust coverage to meet some level of observer coverage for all the different fisheries and try to impact the effect on meeting CV performance standard for the fisheries.

There is like some minimal coverage that they're looking at so that all the fisheries get some sort of level of observer coverage. The other thing that this Omnibus Amendment does is it specifies that there will be an annual bycatch report and a three-year review process to determine how well the goals are being met for the different fisheries. This amendment was approved by both the

Mid-Atlantic and the New England Councils in April for review by the secretary. It has not been submitted yet, but I think they're anticipating it will be submitted some time this summer.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Another amendment that they're working on they call the Omnibus Industry-Funded Monitoring Amendment. Recall that I mentioned at the last meeting that there were at least three different actions in three different fishery management plan amendments that were disapproved by the Secretary of Commerce because they specified observer coverage that would be funded entirely by the Fishery Service.

In response to those disapprovals and also in response to lawsuits that they've had up there, they've developed the amendment Jack was just talking about and then this Omnibus Industry-Funded Monitoring Amendment, which they were on track at one point to hopefully take final action on around this time.

Looking at a letter that was sent by the Regional Administrator at the GARFO Office to the executive directors of the Mid-Atlantic and the New England Fishery Management Councils stating that they were going to push back that timeline by about six months because they received a lot of feedback from the members of the public as well as the councils, they wanted to spend a bit more time developing the amendment and figuring out how to structure it, how to pay for different things and to get more public input.

That is still working its way through. That is not just observers. I believe they're talking about potential cameras on vessels and how they're funding that and they're going to deal with all that information; so it is electronic in addition to I think some actions in terms of observers and how to fund them.

That's where those two amendments are; and then really we need to hear from you on how you want us to – you know, some of the next steps that you approach if you want an outline of a redrafted CE-BA 3 or what exactly you're looking for. As I mentioned before at the last meeting, I think that we have some bycatch measures in all the FMPs that need to be tightened up and reviewed. I guess we're looking forward to you right now in terms of where you would like to go with this.

MR. BELL: And remember we were kind of concerned if we went ahead and moved forward on CE-BA 3, we're obviously just going to run into a train wreck or be disapproved. The idea was to learn from what was going on a little farther up the coast and then kind of figure out, as Monica said, how to restructure CE-BA 3 for us to have the best chance of success when we finally do move forward with it.

MR. WAUGH: We also discussed timing and how do we deal with this; and obviously we're getting an update here at June; and we've deferred presentations from the councils and/or NMFS to our September meeting. It seems to us it would be good to have someone come down and give us a presentation on those so we understand all the details.

But then this also needs to be a part of our visioning process; and you all talked about that some on Monday morning. Certainly, if the expectation is for industry cost-sharing, then that affects

how you structure the industry and how you view the industry structure continuing such that they can afford to contribute towards funding. We have a meeting scheduled in mid-October to deal with that.

Our thought was to get that presentation at September and let you all work on your visioning in October and then come back at December and have some general discussion on an approach and perhaps even discussing a scoping document at that stage to approve in December that would then to out to the public in January.

Again, that would be very basic and talking about ideas that you all came up with in your visioning and what is likely required in terms of meeting the bycatch reporting requirements and this issue of industry funding and just go out to scoping and get comments. Then we'd flesh out the rest of our timing later this year as we look forward to laying our scope of work for 2015.

MR. BELL: Are there any comments on the timing; does that seem reasonable in terms of a timeline that we could accomplish? Monica, does that makes sense to you?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: It does to me.

MR. BELL: And Gregg mentioned this, having been to a few conferences and things where I've run into folks from Alaska, Pacific Northwest, Northeast and talked to them about their fisheries and how they kind of do things there. It is real obvious that in some of these other regions you have some really high-value fisheries and industry funding of things is a little easier for them than perhaps we might run into with some of our fisheries.

We're just going to have to work with what we have in our region, but that's what Gregg was getting at there, if some of these things was related to bycatch, documentation of bycatch, the use of technologies to document bycatch and that sort of thing, it can cost a little bit. Observers obviously cost a little bit, but a camera costs a lot as well because the camera can kind of take the place of the observer but not really because somebody still has to read the video, enter the data and those sorts of things.

At some point we're going to find ourselves talking about, okay, how do we pay for these things and in what industries is there the potential maybe for cost-sharing and that sort of thing. It is real obvious that we don't have some of the same magnitude fisheries in terms of the economics and all that you do in some of these other regions; but we'll just have to make the best out of what we've got and make it work. Any questions or comments related to moving forward with this?

DR. DUVAL: Just to say that I do think it is a really good idea to have someone from the northeast come down and give us a presentation on the SPRM. I know there has been probably varying levels of satisfaction with that approach in the northeast.

MR. BELL: Right; and again whatever we do needs to work for our fishermen, our fisheries, but it is good to understand what is being done in other areas so we can learn from that. Okay,

anything else on CE-BA 3 or moving forward? Okay, this is where we did the little switch. Bonnie, would you like to go ahead and give your couple of slides there?

DR. PONWITH: This is an overview of where we are on the region's commercial electronic logbook reporting pilot. Just to put us in context, the pilot program is in its initial stage right now. The goal of the pilot testing is to hire contractors to perform outreach and equipment installation, work with vendors on specifying the system requirements so that we can get the correct equipment, testing and modifying the available software for use for the region, doing the outreach to recruit fishers to participate in this and then testing the prototype so that we are ready to go on this.

This would be done in the Gulf and the South Atlantic with pelagic fisheries. The estimated duration of this stage of the project was to be 12 to 18 months. We started last fall. We hit a hiccup with the shutdown and then there were some contracting changes that threw a little bit of a delay into the work; but we're made some really good progress since the last time we talked.

Some of the things that we have made progress on; we've developed the data standards right now, and this has been done in consultation with the Northeast Region and HMS Logbook Staff. These are the standards that are going to have to be met by the vendors. We've conducted a search for an outreach specialist; and that specialist has been hired.

We're looking for a marine technician; and that person will be hired once we have our participants lined up. We're communicating with four vendors to identify those system requirements and the modification to those requirements. We have PCs and tablets that have already been purchased to be able to test the system prototypes.

We have selection criteria developed for ten vessels participating in the pilot. Once the prototype is established, what we're looking for is full-scale implementation of logbook reporting that could begin as early as 2016 or '17, depending upon budget allocation and other priorities that may be competing for those resources. That's kind of an overview of where we are on the project right now; and I just want to see if anybody has any questions.

MR. CONKLIN: I was interested in maybe trying to get a couple of the guys from my area to sign up to be a part of this of pilot program. How will fishermen go about getting in touch with for the application?

DR. PONWITH: I know that we're working on kind of a search image, what criteria would have to be met for someone to be a good candidate for participating in this. What I would say is if you have people that you think are interested, send those names to me and I will forward them to Steve Turner and let him know that these are people who are interested; and then it will be up to programmatically whether they meet the criteria or not.

MR. HAYMANS: Bonnie, how closely do the data standards that you have developed match the ACCSP's data standards?

DR. PONWITH: Well, these data standards are tailored specifically for this data collection. If you're looking philosophically, we are partners and collaborators with ACCSP and serve on those committees; and so from a philosophical level in terms of the data standards for QA-QC and things like that, I would say they're probably similar. When we're talking about data standards, I guess I would have to know which specific ones you're talking about to see if they're identical or not. I could ask them that question specifically.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, I guess just the fact that a lot of painstaking work went into developing every aspect of the ACCSP; and there continues to be issues with the National Marine Fisheries Service using the platform. I don't know what standards you've developed; but I know when you create a new system you have issues putting that data into ACCSP. Every chance I get, I'd like to mention the fact that NMFS needs to play with ACCSP.

DR. PONWITH: Yes; I'll make a note of that we're looking inner-operability that those data can go across and do that freely.

MR. BELL: Yes; I think that is an important point is in building this you don't want to have systems that don't match up. If you're going to go to the trouble to collect data, in a very simplistic world it all goes in the same way and is compatible; and it's just something to think about. I guess in constructing different platforms or whatever, you want to make sure that it is as compatible to some standard as possible. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: My comment was really more to the point Chris brought up. Bonnie and I had discussed this probably last year some time when we first started talking about the logbook pilot project. I had made the suggestion and sent that to Steve regarding criteria for participation. My concern is that in North Carolina we have fishermen who hold southeast permits, northeast permits and HMS permits; so they have VMS platforms on their boats.

These guys would be perfect guinea pigs; and they have requested to be guinea pigs for this. Just for Chris' knowledge; I did send an e-mail, as Bonnie had indicated, making those suggestions so that you're not having a tablet to report your commercial catches on one hand and then you're Dell HMS VMS Laptop that has every single USB port plugged up with a gob of like wax or something like that.

MR. BELL: Any other questions for Bonnie right now about – Bonnie, let me just make sure I understand. This system is an at-sea type reporting system – and we're going to talk in a little bit about other types of logbook things; but this one would be designed for at-sea use as opposed to back on the hill, right?

DR. PONWITH: Yes; it is my understanding that these are designed for at sea, yes.

MR. BELL: And that's an option; I've seen that in other fisheries in other places. I know Australia, New Zealand, there is some kind of cool stuff they do there where they can – it like almost real time or close to real-time reporting and real-time management decisions that they make about where to fish and those sorts of things. Any questions for Bonnie about the pilot project right now?

Again, you've pointed out the 2016/2017 timeframe and that's again pending funding or support, which we'll just see how that goes. Okay, let's move on to the next item, which would be the options paper, which would be Attachment 3 in your briefing binder. It is an option paper for commercial logbook reporting.

MR. WAUGH: At the March meeting the committee discussed this. They expressed an interest in future discussions about providing the opportunity for fishermen to report electronically in addition to using paper. You directed us to bring some options to you at this meeting. In terms of background, the council worked extensively on options for commercial logbook reporting in CE-BA 3 during 2011 and 2012.

This involved scoping meetings, public hearings, committee meetings, public input at council meetings, and council discussions. CE-BA 3; the council was scheduled to select preferred alternatives and approve the amendment for formal review at their December 2012 meeting. The intent was then it would be submitted in January 2013.

At the December meeting the committee discussed Action 2, which was commercial reporting, and approved a motion to remove Action 2 from CE-BA 3 and work with the Gulf Council on a joint amendment to address commercial logbook issues. We did that and that the March meeting we gave an update.

You directed us to continue working with the Gulf Council on developing this amendment, coordinate with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center on removal of several reporting items that was also a part of our CE-BA 3 deliberations; and that has been accomplished. Work with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center to develop a schedule of meetings/workgroups with commercial fishermen in the Gulf and South Atlantic to work on developing an electronic logbook.

I think that has sort of morphed into this pilot project. We came back at June and you got an update. We were directed to schedule a NMFS presentation on the details of the logbook at the September meeting; directed staff to work with Gulf staff and NMFS staff to plan for completion of the amendment and incorporate results from Year 1 of the pilot study; again, targeting regulations to be effective January 1, 2016.

Then at the September 2013 meeting council provided a brief overview of the NOAA Electronic Data Reporting Directive. That is the ET stuff that we talked about. Dr. Ponwith reviewed the status of the commercial electronic logbook project. You requested that the center provide updates at each council meeting on the progress of the commercial electronic logbook pilot study and directed staff to defer work on the amendment until the pilot was completed.

At that point we stopped work on any action to modify the commercial logbook reporting requirements. At the December meeting we got an update. At March the committee discussed the original intent of our work in CE-BA 3 was to provide fishermen the option of filing their form electronically, as Jack was talking about, or using the current paper logbook versus the current pilot study that is evaluating an on-vessel electronic logbook that would carry much higher costs and so forth.

Input from the Snapper Grouper Visioning Process indicated support for reporting electronically rather than paper. At that meeting you directed staff to provide some options; and so that's where we are now. In terms of the options – before I hit that, let me just touch quickly on Page 4 we have the information from CE-BA 3 as of November 26, 2012.

Just to refresh your mind on what we were looking at was requiring NMFS to develop a system for commercial permit holders to submit their logbook entries electronically via an electronic version of the logbook made available via computer or internet. Fishermen would be encouraged to submit their logbook reports electronically, but would be allowed to submit paper logbooks.

Commercial landings catch/effort data are to be submitted in accordance with ACCSP standards; require that logbooks, the landing and economics and bycatch be submitted within 21 days. There is information farther in here on Pages 10 and 14 that look at how late the reports are coming in. Initially we talked about requiring them seven days after the end of the trip; but as Ben has pointed out, some of this economic information that is required on the report the fishermen don't get until the fish are sold.

The way we ended up was at 21 days; and at that point the IPT was recommending having the seven days and the twenty-one days as subalternatives. Our other preferred alternative was to require no fishing forms be submitted at the same frequency, currently submitted monthly, via the same process and for all species as currently specified for snapper grouper species.

A fisherman would only be authorized to sell commercially harvested species if the fisherman's previous reports have been submitted by the fisherman and received by NMFS in a timely manner. Any delinquent reports would need to be submitted by the fisherman and received by NMFS before a fisherman could sell commercially harvested species from a federally permitted U.S. vessel.

That's where we were back in 2012. It basically tracks what we did on the dealer report and on the headboat; so it puts in some timing requirements and some teeth on the law enforcement side. You asked for options to consider how we get back on track with allowing the fishermen to report electronically.

One option would be to continue to wait for completion of the pilot project and hope that sufficient funds are available to implement the changes – was 2016; now it could be 2017. Another option would be to direct staff to work with ACCSP in developing a commercial logbook electronic data entry form.

The NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center would provide the data elements and participate in the development. The NMFS Southeast Regional Office would also participate and provide the linkage to the permits database. The intent under this options would be to basically track what we had talked about before in CE-BA 3.

We could apply for ACCSP funding to develop this system. The Mid-Atlantic Council has previously applied for ACCSP funding and received ACCSP funding; so this has happened before. The intent, again as we outlined before, would be one button would simultaneously send

the data to ACCSP, NMFS and the state as required. Those are the two sort of options that are laid out and we're looking for some guidance as to how you want to proceed from here. You're certainly free to suggest other alternatives.

MR. BELL: Right; so comments or discussion on those? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Gregg, Option 2 there, what kind of timeline are we talking on Option 2 with regarding to working with ACCSP? Is that a few months turnaround time for the entry platform and testing of that or is that a year?

MR. WAUGH: Well, we would have to initially check to see what the timing is on the proposal projects. I think it's pretty quick. A lot of this stuff is already out there in terms at least of framing the process. Then I would think you're looking at within a year to get this done; because the intent is, as Jack pointed out, the fishermen have to fill out these logbooks, send them in, and if something is missing they get them back.

So what we're talking about is basically just creating an online form that could do that; and it could also be set up to have a lot – with the fisherman's ID, it could pull up a lot of the background information so that you don't have to re-enter all of that stuff. Then they just fill in the information, hit the button and they're done. You'd need to have some verification of receipt so that the dealers get – the fishermen get a report back that it was received.

MR. HAYMANS: A quick follow-up to that; there are a small number of fishermen who don't have a computer and they still have the option to send in the paper forms?

MR. WAUGH: That's our intent thus far as you all have provided. Initially this would be to allow both, obviously, to encourage fishermen to use the electronic form. I think from the center's perspective the more you can get reporting electronic, the better, because then it eliminates their cost of data entry.

How we left it off was in recognition that some fishermen would not be able to take advantage of the electronic, to keep the provision for them to use paper. I would think as some point we'd want to move to all electronic, but at least initially it would maintain the current paper opportunity as well.

MR. BELL: And that is why I asked Bonnie; I wanted to make sure. Option 1 is basically a vessel-based system. Option 2 is a shore-based system, so it is a little bit apples and oranges a little. Option 1, well, that can obviously proceed. It is kind of a different technology and a different application. Option 2, we could move forward with something like that, and Option 1 rocks on at the same time. Are there other options, I guess, as well? Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: What would be beneficial is if I could consult quickly and clarify are Option 1 and Option 2 competing to do the exact same thing or is there something unique about 1 that gets you to the other – the notion of people using paper who would prefer to use electronic, Gregg is exactly right.

There are always going to be people who cling to paper; but for every one of those, there are probably more who would prefer to do this electronically where fields could be retained so that it limits redundancy and things like that. What I want to do is just make sure that those two options don't end up having some redundancy that does damage instead of good. I can probably try and slip a call off and be back quickly on that.

MR. BELL: It seemed to me the obvious difference is one is being vessel-based. Of course, it depends on the size of your vessel how easy that is to implement. The other is when you get up on the hill, you go to your computer and do it. You're right, the timeliness obviously with Option 1 would be closer to real time or something; but Option 2 would probably have a lot more utility in terms of reaching all the fisheries. We have some fisheries with smaller boats and those types of things as well. That would be fine if you want to check on that Bonnie. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: I don't know if you want to say there will be some overlap; but one of the benefits of an on-board electronic logbook is you can get detailed catch and discard information by area. That is the utility. But again this gets into visioning; is it your vision that every snapper grouper vessel will have an on-board electronic logbook? If it's not, then we need both.

The other part of this is we may be able to move quite quickly, if you give us the direction to move forward this, to having this software developed and made available such that the fishermen could begin taking advantage of electronic reporting much more quickly and much sooner than even the pilot study is finished.

DR. LANEY: Mr. Chairman, at the last ACCSP Coordinating Council Meeting in Alexandria, Rick Bellavance and Mike Cahall did a live demonstration for a notepad-based system that I think does a lot of what Option 2 would do there. I can't remember the details, but it is already in existence and it worked very well at least from the conference room there.

MR. BELL: There is stuff off the shelf sort of that you could apply or maybe use somebody else's.

DR. LANEY: Yes; I can go back and pull the agenda for that and provide the details to Gregg. I think Bob Mahood normally is at those meetings or John Carmichael; and I don't think either one of them was there for that meeting that time. I can get that information to you.

MR. BELL: Mike, you have something on that point?

DR. ERRIGO: Just real quick; at the technical subcommittee meeting that I attended, Mike Cahall was there. I'm actually going to talk a lot about this type of technology and stuff for charterboats. It is very similar to commercial vessels. Currently in existence they have web-based and apps and computer-based programs that are logbooks; and they're in use in other areas collecting logbook data for commercial vessels.

Mike Cahall was very emphatic about being able to very easily and very quickly modify them to collect whatever data that needs to be collected. He said you can get whatever you want; and

then the software will just send it. Then we package it however you want us to and then send it however you want us to send it and to whoever you want to send it to.

MR. BELL: Thanks for reminding me; Mike has a presentation he is going to give in a few minutes here. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, without getting in the weeds, it was really a point that Mike made; and that is that a lot of these applications are web-based so that you don't worry about whatever computer somebody is running. As long as you have access to the internet and you have either Explorer or whatever or Google or whatever, that you enter them; and so it doesn't matter the entry platform. It always goes to the internet and it is becoming more simple by the day.

MR. BELL: Yes; that's for sure. Okay, to specifically to address this; do we want to give some guidance here related to one of these options; and would we need to do that in the form motion, Gregg? Also, other options, anybody have any other real brainstorms here? Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, because I believe Option 2 is a fairly low-cost and pretty quick process, I would make a motion that we direct staff to work with ACCSP in developing a commercial logbook electronic data entry form with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center providing the data elements and participating in the development. The Southeast Regional Office would also participate and provide the linkage to the permits database.

MR. BELL: Right; but I need you to be on the committee. Wilson.

DR. LANEY: Doug and I seem to having mental lapses during this particular meeting; so I'll be happy to make that motion for you, Doug. **The motion is direct staff to work with the ACCSP in developing a commercial logbook electronic data entry form. The Southeast Fisheries Science Center would provide the data elements and participate in the development. The Southeast Regional Office would also participate and provide the linkage to the permits database.**

MR. BELL: Second by Jack. Discussion of the motion? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: So this is sort of the hopefully quicker item; and understanding from Bonnie's presentation that the electronic on-board logbook pilot, that full implementation would obviously be dependent on future funding. We may have a very successful pilot that participants are very excited about, but we may not necessarily have the funding to move it all the way through.

This would provide sort of a backstop in case that doesn't come to fruition. I guess the other comment I would make is I think we should have – I mean, it is clear from visioning that commercial fishermen are interested in electronic reporting. I think you're going to have different categories of folks who are going to want to have an app on their iPad and they're going to want to do something onboard.

They're going to want to be able to enter their bycatch while they're out at sea; and that's probably some of the folks who have already got VMS on their boats, they're participating in

some other fisheries that require some electronic monitoring. Then you also have the folks that it does refer to. There are a lot of fishermen out there still who don't have necessarily an internet connection; so this is maybe a soft way to encourage folks to come forward into the 21st Century.

MR. BELL: Right; I'm working on that myself, actually. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee; however, what are the additional costs once the pilot is done for NMFS program? They're not going to buy the laptops and the tablets for them; are they?

MR. BELL: Are you asking specifically to the pilot?

MR. HAYMANS: Well, no, beyond the pilot; once the pilot is completed, what are the additional costs to implement that?

DR. DUVAL: Well, I can think of one. Certainly, I'm thinking of like the backend infrastructure kinds of things that you want to make sure that your data transfer works.

MR. HAYMANS: Isn't that part of the pilot?

DR. DUVAL: So what we learned at our Electronic Reporting and Monitoring Workshop is that your pilot costs are not necessarily reflective of your full implementation costs. While you may have a small version of that during a pilot; that may not be reflective of full implementation. I don't know; I'm not trying to put words in Bonnie's mouth. I'm just postulating.

MR. BELL: And that's a good point to keep mind in all of this is there are hidden costs. There are costs behind the curtain that you don't think about necessarily and they can be rather significant. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: It is conceivable that – I mean, paper is clunky; you know, is clunky and it is expensive to handle. My expectation is that with a successful pilot and transitioning to full implementation of this; that we're going to gain some efficiencies not only in the timing of the arrival of those data but some efficiencies in not having to handle paper.

During that transition, there will be some additional costs not the least of which are the outreach. You have to socialize this with a fleet that has a huge gradient in the ability to handle this. There are some people who this is like falling off a log and it will be a really simple thing; and there are other people that it is going to take some – and so we're going to have to work with the communications folks here, with the council and port samplers and things like that to make that transition; and then also just making sure that the infrastructure for the ingest of this information and QA-QC and the export of it to the full suite of users is limber and working properly.

MR. COX: Bonnie, how long have we been doing the paper logbook reporting; now many years now?

DR. PONWITH: I do not know the answer to it, but it has been some time.

MR. COX: Well, I feel like it has been twenty-plus years; and you know something, it is 2014 and it is time to move on.

DR. DUVAL: I agree with Jack. I'm fully supportive of both of these options; and I would just note that is an option with the current electronic headboat reporting. There are tablets, there are phones, there are websites.

MR. WAUGH: There won't be any duplication here; because if we get to the point where someone has an on-board electronic logbook, they would be reporting that way. Others who don't have the on-board electronic logbook then could make use of the other system. There is no duplication at all.

MR. BELL: Yes, I viewed this as just an alternative method, depending whether you're on the vessel or you're back on the hill or whatever. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: I'm not on your committee, but to Jack's point we've got a technology. There is even internet in the local barbeque restaurant in Murrells Inlet now. If all the dealers were forced to have to get internet and hook up and do all our reporting online, I don't see why a fisherman can't do it. I deal with some of the most farthest from civilization people in the world; but they still have access to that kind of stuff, whether it is their wife has laptop.

MR. PHILLIPS: Do it for them.

MR. CONKLIN: Or I can do it for them; I do everything else for them, so I'll be glad to do that, too.

MR. BELL: The world is moving in that direction, you're absolutely right. Okay, is there any other discussion on the motion? **Any objection to the motion? Okay, seeing none, then the motion passes.** Were there any other options that we might consider? Phil.

MR. STEELE: What is your anticipated timeline for developing this program? Are we looking at getting cranking on this thing right away; is it six months down the road; what are your thoughts on this? I'm just looking at it from a workload.

MR. WAUGH: Contacting the ACCSP next week; and so we'd need a representative from the region and the center, if you guys could provide those to us. Should this get approved at the council level tomorrow; we would begin work on this next week with ACCSP; and then we'll have better idea of what the timing is.

It would be awfully nice if we could have this done so that starting next year fishermen could submit their logbooks electronically. We'll obviously need to get with Monica, but I don't see where we need to change anything in the regulations. This would just be a different way that they would provide what they're currently required to provide.

MR. BELL: I just viewed it as an alternative approach to kind of try to get something going here maybe a little quicker if we can. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Just off the top of my head, I think that snapper grouper was the only FMP that had electronic reporting if selected. I believe it was through the Dealer Reporting Amendment our office gave the ultimate advice that, no, it just couldn't be implemented by the center without further rulemaking and amendment and those sorts of things. That was for the dealers; so I'm thinking that if that was for the dealers, the same thing would hold true even more so for the commercial fishermen in that it might not be as simple a fix as Gregg is talking about; but I'll look into it further.

MR. WAUGH: Yes; and keep in mind we're not talking about requiring the fishermen. We're talking about giving them the opportunity instead of filling out a piece of paper, licking a stamp and sending an envelope, just do that same reporting electronically; and it is up to them. They can still lick a stamp and put it on there if they want to. This is just giving them another opportunity to provide the information. It is not changing what they provide at all.

MR. SMIT-BRUNELLO: And so I would think that the Paperwork Reduction Act and some other laws might come into play here, so I'll look at it further and see how that would work.

MR. BELL: Are there any other comments on this? We'll move to the next item; Mike.

DR. ERRIGO: I'm going to give you guys an update on the meeting in Tampa on the technical subcommittee for looking at charterboat logbooks that happened on May 28 and 29. I'm actually going to address a lot of these same kinds of questions with electronic logbooks and validation and all that kind of stuff. This is just a list of the participants who were there.

I'll go through some of this quickly. Some of the caveats; the presentation, because the council meeting was so soon after the meeting, does not reflect the consensus recommendations from the technical subcommittee quite yet. We didn't have the time to put the report together; so it is just my take on what was going on. We're actually looking at the summary report now and providing feedback; so that final report should be done pretty soon.

We're also going to be meeting again by conference call or maybe in person; and we'll have like the final reports on everything with hopefully lots more detail. By the December council meeting we should have the whole kit and caboodle. Here is the basic rundown of where the conversation went and the type of methodology that the group thought would be appropriate for a logbook program for charterboats.

With electronic logbooks; it would be a census, so everyone would be required to turn in their logbook or everyone would turn them in. There would be a procedure for adjusting for non-reporting or misreporting; so validation with an estimation procedure to try to correct for anyone who is not reporting. It would mandatory; everyone would be required to turn them in.

The logbooks would be on a daily trip level basis; so you'd have to have one report for each day or for each trip, including non-fishing reports. If you didn't go fishing; you still have to turn one

in. Initially they would be on a weekly basis – we felt that was a reasonable timeline – but that the system should be flexible enough to accommodate more frequent submissions if that became necessary.

There was some discussion about perhaps going to daily reporting for short periods of time, let's say, to track – in the Gulf they suggested during that short red snapper opening, they can go to like daily reporting to track the red snapper landings kind of thing; so we should be able to handle that. Validation and biological sampling will be a necessary part of this.

Although it is mandatory for everyone, there will be people who don't report and there will be people who report late. There is also to be problems with recall bias, inaccuracy in fish ID and those sorts of things. We need some way to validate our people going out when they say they're going out. Are they not going out when they say they're not going out and are they accurately reporting what they're catching?

There needs to be some type of validation that is going on as well as collection of biological samples for size and age comps, for assessments and for tracking trends over time, things like that. To validate effort and catch; we're just saying that has to be done dockside with some type of intercepts.

The type and intensity of the validation is going to depend on several factors. That would be the amount of compliance, the type of data that is collected in the logbook – so if you want to collect spatial data like where catch is collected type of stuff – depending on how detailed you want your data to be, your validation is going to have to be more intensive.

The frequency of the logbook submissions; the more frequent you require people to submit logbooks, the more intensively you'll have to sample for validation purposes. In terms of validation, the MRIP Charter Logbook Pilot Study that was just conducted in Florida and Texas we felt was a very good place to start building off of.

We also felt that this would be a great place to work with MRIP and perhaps outside contractors to help develop methodologies for validation, methodologies for estimation, using that validation to fill in the gaps and the holes, things like that. There is a typo here – some stuff is cut off – it is correct the logbook numbers for non-compliance and misreporting is what that should say, and estimates associated with variance in catch and effort for adjusting logbook data.

We will need to come up with statistical approaches for that and working with MRIP will be beneficial for us to do that, because they're used to doing that with their data now. That is a bit small to see, I'm sorry, but I'm trying to squeeze it on there. There are several questions in terms of data collection.

Should we do electronic versus paper? We really were focusing on electronic methods in this meeting. There are many programs that are currently available. There are web-based, Smartphone and tablet-based programs. Of course, web-based programs are land-based, but they don't have any limits on the data that can be entered; whereas, for a Smartphone, it is mobile and you can even report before you hit the dock.

However, the screen is small so it's hard to enter data, so you've got to be careful about how much data you ask somebody to enter on a Smartphone of what types of data you ask them to enter on the Smartphone. However, everybody has one. They're relatively cheap in comparison to some of the other methods; so that is one of the possibilities.

And tablets are kind of in between; they're mobile; they're less expensive. They're not quite as expensive but more expensive than Smartphones and they have less data entry limitations because they have larger screens and it's easier to type data in, but not quite as convenient as web-based applications.

There were some suggestions from the group. One was instead of developing a program that says, okay, everybody use this and you report your logbook information with this program; you can say, all right, let's come up with the data standards that a program needs to collect. You have to collect this information, this information, this information; and the program has to send the information in this format when you hit "send".

It has to have certain security standards to protect confidential data. Then you can allow programs to be developed, let's say, on the open market or by multiple entities as long as they meet all the standards. Then once the data is collected, it doesn't matter what you type it into as long as you get the data that you want.

It takes the burden off of state agencies or federal agencies in keeping up with the programs technologically over time or meeting the needs of individuals in different areas or boat sizes, things like that. This approach is currently being used in other places such as Australia. They use this approach with their logbooks from what Mike Cahall said.

And other markets such as VMS; there are many different types of VMS systems. As long as they meet the minimum standard requirements, it doesn't matter who made it or what it looks like as long as it pings at a certain rate and this and that and the other thing. Data storage and management; this is where ACCSP or GulfFIN would come in.

Here is the process they proposed and how it would work. All the raw logbook data would be collected by this app that you put in your logbook. You transmit it to ACCSP. They integrate it into one usable dataset, whoever the users are and however they need it, and then they push that back to the users; so they'll push all the North Carolina data back to North Carolina in a form that they can use it.

They'll push the whole South Atlantic back to NMFS in the appropriate format for them to be able to use it and so on. They said that's what they're for and they would be more than willing to do that. As long as the appropriate data standards are in place, which means as long as your logbook collects all the appropriate data, you can eliminate duplicative reporting.

Let's say you fish for HMS species; you have an HMS license and you have a federal license on your charterboat and this and that, as long as it collects all the pertinent information and you send

that into ACCSP, they can send it to HMS. They can send it to the federal government; they can send to the state where you're licenses; and you only had to fill out a single logbook report.

Calibration and implementation; the new program needs to be calibrated with the current MRIP Survey; so it needs to run side by side for several years in order to be able to calibrate it. If you don't calibrate, then you have two separate broken data series that don't link. That could be really bad for assessments; it could be really bad for tracking quotas and things like that.

You also don't know if there is a jump in landings or a drop in landings. You don't know if that's because you changed data collection methods or because something happened in the stock of what; so you need some way to calibrate the two. They need to run side by side. The group suggested that we need at least three years, hopefully more if we could swing it; but that's very expensive to run them side by side, and they realize that.

At this point we were just not thinking about money; money comes later; and I'll talk about budgetary concerns. It was suggested that we use MRIP and not the logbook during the calibration – during the side-by-side time because you don't know what the effect is of the logbook, you don't know how effective it is. Your compliance rate is going to start ramping up.

Also, the ACLs are in MRIP units or MRFSS units and not in logbook units; so you don't know how those two will mesh. In terms of program coordination, basically what we're looking at is these are going to have to be mostly state-run programs if you want to get all the charterboats in line. Most of the charterboats are state licensed.

I know in South Carolina it is probably about 25 percent of the charterboats are federally licensed and the rest are state licensed. If you want a full picture of what's going on, you need all the states on board. These are mostly going to be state-run programs, so they're going to have to have a lot of state involvement and it's going to be lot of interagency coordination that goes on. That's what this talks about.

Compliance is going to be one of the biggest challenges. We need buy-in so the first couple of years outreach and education is going to be a big problem. It is also going to be a huge cost. After that, enforcement will be a huge priority in order to keep compliance up. It needs teeth and it also needs to be in a timeline that is appropriate of submittal for your logbook.

If you have a weekly submission of logbooks, then you can't just say at the end of the year, well, you didn't turn in logbooks so we're not renew your permit because then somebody can just turn in all their logbooks; and I'm pretty sure that they're going to be mostly bogus.

Especially at a weekly rate, they're just going to make stuff up; so that's a pretty enforcement tool there. Timeline; if we want to have all the charterboats on a logbook program, we need all the states on board; and each state is at a different point in this process, so this could take quite a while. I know right now that South Carolina has monthly reporting schedules; and if we want to go to weekly, I know that regulatory and political processes can be rather long in certain states like South Carolina. It could take several years just to get everyone synced up.

If also talks about federal charters versus all charters. The biggest challenge on this slide would be discards. Unless we put observers or some type of electronic monitoring on charterboats, then basically discards are going to be self-reported, which they are currently in the MRIP Survey. Other than that, most of the other challenges can be dealt with, but they need to be dealt with in some fashion.

Budgetary considerations; large up-front costs; implementation and rollout; also side-by-side running of the two surveys – long-term; this one will probably have increased costs in the long run because we're not currently on a logbook system; so there will be maintenance and validation costs because we have to have validation of all the logbooks.

Keeping compliance up will be an increased cost especially on a weekly time-step for submitting logbooks; and also collecting dockside samples for ages and lengths and things like that. Things the council needs consider; even though logbooks are to be turned in on a weekly basis, there is currently a lag time that is given, a grace period from the end of the fishing week and then when we start enforcing, oh, gee, you didn't turn your logbook in.

Currently in the headboat it is one week; but they're looking to actually shorten that to be more in line with the commercial dealer reporting, which is only two days. The shorter that is the more you reduce recall bias and the more quickly the data can become available for use. Also, it would make things a lot if it was consistent across the board; 48 hours after the weekends you turn in your logbooks.

Consideration of reporting before you hit the dock makes validation much easier; but the problem is you have to track your compliance daily, which is more expensive. We were suggesting to make this possible like to expand to the future but not require it. Do you want to make electronic reporting mandatory or allow paper reporting? That was the one that we talked about.

Electronic reporting is best. Perhaps you want to roll it out and phase out paper over time; but it was strongly recommended that eventually we go fully electronic. Enforcement; I talked about that. The data collection tools; there are three possibilities that we talked I thought you guys would be interested in this. You can mandate a single tool to collect the data.

You go on line, you log in, you submit; or you go on your tablet and you submit. You can have a suite of tools. Okay, we have this internet site, this app and this phone app; and we check them out, they're good, you can use them, and that's it. You can publish minimum data standards and security standards and open it up for the market to develop whatever they want and just let the applications be developed on their own. It is actually the least costly and the easiest way to keep the technology up to date if you do it that way.

Then the ultimate use of the data; this guides validation, like how we do validation and things like that. One thing that people were asking about for consideration is was the council considering splitting up the for-hire sector. The only reason why they asked is because they want to know how rigorous validation need to be, how small do you need your CVs to be.

If you track the charterboats with a logbook and they have a nice tight CV and you really know what is going on, then all the for-hire sector will be on logbooks and you're tracking them real tight and you know what the landings are; and then you lump them with the private recreational, which has these random wild spikes here and there and it is all over the place, then they're still subject to those large PSEs and sudden closures because, oops, I had an intercept in Monroe County of a snowy grouper and, bam, we're closing the whole season down. That was something that we talked about as something to consider. That is all that I had. This is just a summary slide; so I could take questions.

MR. BELL: Keep in mind, as Doug mentioned, I think the for-hire sector in terms of implementation of some of this technology is sort of the low-hanging fruit; but even though it's the low-hanging fruit, there are a lot of details. There is a lot that goes into this. The group down there covered a tremendous amount of this. Are there any questions right now for Mike related to the meeting and what came out of it? What is the next step from your perspective?

DR. ERRIGO: Well, there are a lot of details to work out. We would need to know if the council wants to proceed with requiring logbooks or moving the charterboats from MRIP to logbooks. If they want to bring all charterboats into the logbook program, then they need to work very closely with all of the states and they need to let all the states what is going on. There are a lot more technical steps. There is a lot that needs to be done, but certainly we need to know what the council's intent is would be step one.

MR. BELL: Right; and there's a tremendous number of moving parts and technical details and things. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: And your direction to us thus far, as reflected in your intent that you gave us, is to have the charterboats report electronically with the same requirements that have headboats. This technical subcommittee will provide us a report in time for our December meeting; and I would think at that point then we would revisit this and see how we move forward. If you all want to carry out your intent and then go for electronic reporting on charterboats, then you would give us that direction at December. I think it would be premature to move any farther now until we get this report from the technical subcommittee.

DR. PONWITH: These are all really good points; and just one other thing that is really clear to me in seeing this and hearing the council speak is this is something is iterative and it really demands good communication in both directions because, honestly, what we're trying to do is measure something that you've created via the regulatory regime.

One of the things that this kind of system is really sensitive to is what you picture your regulatory philosophy for the charter fleet to look like going forward; so it is nicely linked with the visioning work from that standpoint. There are probably things we can learn from that, but things like what is more important for a charter fleet; is it a stable fishery where you know the beginning date and the ending date and you fish in between there; or is it more important to know today whether you're going to be able to fish tomorrow by having daily real time.

Thinking that through can go a long way to making sure that the folks that are putting sort of the creative horsepower into this kind of system ensures that system is designed to meet those regulatory regimes. That is why going back and forth, reporting on this and making sure that you're tracking and evolving in the same direction is really, really important; so you don't find yourself in a box canyon or a blind alley.

Then just secondarily; I've gotten feedback back and, yes, the standards that they're working on right now meet and exceed the ACCSP standards. It is designed for at-sea reporting and it will be reporting at sub-trip level so they can be reporting at set level or a trap set level; a more refined level than the current system.

MR. BELL: Thanks for checking on that. That's a very good point in terms of developing something like this, communication; close communication and having all the players involved as you go through this is essential. I appreciate the work of the subcommittee and, Mike, for you presenting this.

I can tell you also, again, it is harder than it looks; but from a state perspective, we've had a charterboat reporting logbook program in place since 1992. As Mike mentioned, most of our charterboats are not federally permitted boats. For a state to come in – and we're wanting to go in this direction because we've heard it from our fishermen is that they are wanting the option to do this or the ability to use these technologies and report in a simpler fashion in the minds. But, the whole state, you know, we'll have to bring our whole state along with it, and that will be a sales pitch in itself as well. That would be the same for any state that would be coming along with this.

MR. COX: I'm on the website here now and just looking; so we've got nine states in the northeast doing this already; is that right?

MR. BELL: We'll keep up with them. All right, anything else? I know that we've got a public hearing that we need to conduct here. Any other comments or questions related to this? Is there any other business for the committee? If there is no other business, then we will go ahead and adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 5:35 o'clock p.m., June 12, 2014.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.
July 7, 2014

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
2013 - 2014 Council Membership

COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

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

VICE-CHAIRMAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LT Morgan Fowler
U.S. Coast Guard
510 SW 11th Court
Fort Lauderdale FL 33315
morgan.m.fowler@uscg.mil

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

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

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

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

Jessica McCawley
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

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

MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO
LEEANN BOSARGE
PHIL STEELE
JACK MCGOVERN
BONNIE PONWITH
ANDY STRELCHECK
TRACY DUNN

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
2013-2014 Committees

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION
Doug Haymans, Chair
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
Ben Hartig
John Jolley
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

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

DATA COLLECTION
Mel Bell, Chair
Jack Cox
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

DOLPHIN WAHOO
Anna Beckwith, Chair
John Jolley, Vice-Chair
Zack Bowen
David Cupka
Doug Haymans
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT
Doug Haymans, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chris Conklin
Michelle Duval
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese- FEP
Anna Martin- CEBA

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

GOLDEN CRAB
David Cupka, Chair
Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair
Roy Crabtree
John Jolley
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

HABITAT & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
Wilson Laney, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chris Conklin
LT Morgan Fowler
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese
Anna Martin- Coral

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES
David Cupka, Chair
Anna Beckwith
Zack Bowen
John Jolley
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

INFORMATION & EDUCATION
Anna Beckwith, Chair
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Chris Conklin
LT Morgan Fowler
John Jolley
Staff contact: Amber Von Harten

KING & SPANISH MACKEREL
Ben Hartig, Chair
David Cupka, Vice-Chair
Anna Beckwith
Mel Bell
Zack Bowen
Jack Cox
Roy Crabtree
Michelle Duval
Doug Haymans
Jessica McCawley
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

(Continued)

LAW ENFORCEMENT
Mel Bell, Chair
Chris Conklin
Jack Cox
LT Morgan Fowler
Ben Hartig
Staff contact: Myra Brouwer

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

PROTECTED RESOURCES
David Cupka, Chair
Wilson Laney, Vice Chair
Anna Beckwith
Michelle Duval
LT Morgan Fowler
John Jolley
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

SCI. & STAT. SELECTION
Michelle Duval, Chair
Mel Bell
Roy Crabtree
Doug Haymans
John Jolley
Wilson Laney
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SEDAR
Ben Hartig, Chair
Zack Bowen
Jack Cox
Michelle Duval
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
Staff contact: John Carmichael

SHRIMP
Charlie Phillips, Chair
Mel Bell
Roy Crabtree
Wilson Laney
Jessica McCawley
Staff contact: Anna Martin

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council
Staff

Executive Director
Robert K. Mahood
robert.mahood@safmc.net

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

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

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

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

Fishery Scientist
Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

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

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

Staff Economist
Dr. Brian Cheuvront
brian.cheuvront@safmc.net

Science and Statistics Program Manager
John Carmichael
john.carmichael@safmc.net

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

Administrative Officer
Mike Collins
mika.collins@safmc.net

Financial Secretary
Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

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

Purchasing & Grants
Julie O'Dell
julie.odell@safmc.net

PLEASE SIGN IN

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

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Meeting

Data Collection Committee:

Thursday, June 12, 2014

NAME & SECTOR/ORGANIZATION:	AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER:	EMAIL ADDRESS:	MAILING ADDRESS:
Emily Helmick Pew		ehelmick@pewtrusts.org	
Rusty Hudson DSF ECFS	386-239-0948	dsf2009@aol.com	32120-9351
Susan Shipman	912-222-9206	susanshipman@att.net	
Ken Stump TOF/PCT	202-390-5520	kstump@oceanfdn.org	
Gib Brogan	508 545 0942	gbrogan@oceana.org	
Leda Dunmore		LDunmore@pewtrusts.org	

THRU JUNE 12, 2014

80	Takade-Heumacher, ...	htakade@edf.org	23376794 min
70	colby, barrett	bcolby3@cfl.rr.com	275 min
69	oliver, steven	steven73oliver@gmail.com	35 min
61	denes, james	jamesd156@yahoo.com	309 min
61	Brogan, Gib	gbrogan@oceana.org	94 min
60	Neer, Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net	-24829218 min
57	potts, douglas	douglas.potts@noaa.gov	34 min
50	Mehta, Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	506 min
45	Knowlton, Kathy	kathy.knowlton@gadnr.org	81 min
43	michie, kate	kate.michie@noaa.gov	515 min
41	holiman, stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa.gov	424 min
39	tishler, michelle	michelletishler@gmail.com...	79 min
38	Lamberte, Tony	tony.lamberte@noaa.gov	541 min
36	Records, David	david.records@noaa.gov	484 min
35	levy, mara	mara.levy@noaa.gov	7 min
32	gerhart, susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.gov	556 min
32	Durkee, Steve	steve.durkee@noaa.gov	340 min
30	DeVictor, Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.gov	477 min
28	Latanich, Katie	cal7@duke.edu	72 min
25	Bademan, Martha	martha.bademan@myfwc.com	519 min
25	Brennan, Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov	497 min
25	vara, mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov	518 min
24	DuBeck, Guy	guy.dubeck@noaa.gov	285 min
24	Crosson, Scott	scott.crosson@noaa.gov	155 min
24	Sedberry, George	george.sedberry@noaa.gov	486 min
24	Eich, Anne	annemarie.eich@noaa.gov	550 min
24	blough, heather	heather.blough@noaa.gov	89 min
23	Clemens, Anik	anik.clemens@noaa.gov	530 min

23	Brewster-Geisz, Ka...	karyl.brewster-geisz@noaa...	288 min
22	Gore, Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov	526 min
22	Bresnen, Anthony	anthony.bresnen@myfwc.com...	509 min
21	Lee, Jennifer	jennifer.lee@noaa.gov	535 min
21	Byrd, Julia	julia.byrd@safmc.net	453 min
21	Swatzel, Tom	tom@swatzel.com	63 min
21	Knowlton, Kathy	kathy.knowlton@gandr.org	59 min
21	sandorf, scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.gov	447 min
20	Ballenger, Joseph	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov	296 min
20	L, I	captaindrifter@bellsouth....	0 min
20	Pugliese, Roger	roger.pugliese@safmc.net	0 min