

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

**Hilton Cocoa Beach Oceanfront
Cocoa Beach, FL**

June 16, 2016

SUMMARY MINUTES

Dara Collection Committee:

Mel Bell, Chair (via webinar)
Jack Cox
Dr. Wilson Laney
Mark Brown
Zack Bowen

Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
Anna Beckwith
Chris Conklin (via webinar)
Charlie Phillips
Robert Beal

Council Members:

Dr. Michelle Duval
Dr. Roy Crabtree
Jessica McCawley

Chester Brewer
Ben Hartig

Council Staff:

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

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

Observers/Participants:

Nik Mehta
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith
Dr. Mike Larkin
Dr. Andy Strelcheck
Tracy Dunn
Jocelyn D'Ambrosio
Jim Estes
Capt. Mark Gordon

Erika Burgess
Rick DeVictor
Dr. Jack McGovern
Dr. Marcel Reichert
Jeff Radonski
Iris Lowery
Rob O'Reilly
John Sanchez

Additional Observers Attached

The Data Collection Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened at the Hilton Cocoa Beach Oceanfront, Cocoa Beach, Florida, Thursday morning, June 16, 2016, and was called to order by Chairman Doug Haymans.

MR. HAYMANS: The members of the committee are Anna Beckwith, Zack Bowen, Mark Brown, Chris Conklin, Jack Cox, Wilson Laney, Charlie Phillips, and Bob Beal, as well as Mel and myself. You have the agenda in front of you. Are there any additions or changes to the agenda? Seeing none, the agenda is approved. Are there any changes or additions to the minutes? Seeing none, the minutes are approved. Our first order of business, and hopefully before lunch, is take care of CE-BA 3. Chip is going to walk us through what we need to do with CE-BA 3.

MR. COLLIER: CE-BA 3 is trying to become the longest amendment possible, as far as time-wise. It's still out there. It has one action remaining, and it's regarding bycatch and discard data. The purpose for the action would be to improve bycatch discard data collection methods to better quantify all sources of fishing mortality in the South Atlantic. The need is to improve data collection that will allow for better quantification of the type and magnitude of bycatch, improve quality of stock assessments, and allow for better management measures that will reduce bycatch in the South Atlantic fisheries.

Within that, there is that one action and three alternatives. There is the no action alternative, which is currently the Atlantic Coast Cooperative Statistics Program release discard and protected species module for many of the fisheries, and I will have some tables that describe what current actions or what is currently in place for the different fisheries, for the different FMPs that we have.

Alternative 2 is to require vessels, commercial vessels, with an Atlantic dolphin wahoo, Spanish mackerel and king mackerel, and a gillnet permit also for the king mackerel, and then, for the for-hire vessels, a charter boat/headboat permit for dolphin wahoo as well as coastal migratory pelagics. Private recreational vessels fishing in the dolphin wahoo and coastal migratory pelagics in the EEZ, have those implement mandatory observer coverage, as described by the -- Sorry. I am skipping over one. Use observer coverage, logbooks, electronic logbooks, video monitoring, or any other method deemed necessary by the National Marine Fisheries Service.

Then Alternative 3 is to implement mandatory observer coverage, as described by ACCSP standards, and we specifically mentioned four different fisheries, which include the snapper grouper, coastal migratory pelagics, dolphin wahoo, and golden crab fisheries.

If you continue on into Table 1, those are commercial data reporting requirements and level of coverage for the South Atlantic fishery, and I have those separated out by the different FMPs. You can see, in the snapper grouper complex, there are current regulations that require observers. In the dolphin wahoo, coastal migratory pelagics, coral, sargassum, and spiny lobster, there is no requirements to carry observers.

There are requirements for the sargassum fishery, which has a 100 percent requirement, although no trips have been required since that regulation was put in place, and then the golden crab fishery, if selected, could require observers. There has been no selection of observer trips for that. Then the shrimp fishery does have an option for required observers in the South Atlantic. It's generally about 1 percent for the penaeid trips and then less than 1 percent for the rock shrimp trips.

Continuing on down from there is self-reported data systems. For the commercial fishery, it's 100 percent logbook for reporting landings, but, for discards, it is a supplemental. It's generally required for 20 percent, even though there is higher reporting than is required, and the same thing is required of the dolphin wahoo and also coastal migratory pelagics.

There is no reporting system defined for coral, and so there is no defined logbook or reporting system if there is bycatch in that fishery. The shrimp fishery, if requested by the SRD, can require reporting of bycatch. The sargassum fishery, it does not actually list bycatch, but it's not limited to the list. Within the golden crab fishery, they do require mandatory trip reporting, although only about 10 percent of the trips actually report discards. Then, for the spiny lobster, there is no federal reporting system defined. If you guys have any questions, please let me know.

Table 2 has the for-hire reporting requirements, and, of these, I will start off with the observers first. It's the headboats that are the only ones currently required to carry observers, if selected. Charter boats are not required to, and it's only for snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and coastal migratory pelagics that can actually require observers. The coral and sargassum and golden crab aren't a target for for-hire fisheries, and, for shrimp and spiny lobster, there is no requirement, although it's not likely that those are really big headboat or charter boat fisheries.

As for the level of coverage for observers, it's about 2 percent of the trips out of South Carolina to Florida, and I believe it was about 9 percent for trips off of North Carolina. Once again, it's zero percent coverage in the charter boat fishery for the snapper grouper, dolphin wahoo, and coastal migratory pelagics.

Going on down into the bycatch surveys, and this is when the interviews currently occur, and that's dockside interviews, it's about 8 percent of the trips from Georgia to Florida, 5 percent in South Carolina, and I believe it was around 17 percent of the headboat trips in North Carolina are actually interviewed for dockside surveys. Then I have numbers of trips for the charter boat fishery, and those are number of angler interviews, and it is averaged from 2004 to 2015. In the snapper grouper fishery, there is about 673 interviews with discards through the MRIP survey. If you want to get down to species-level data, that is provided in Appendix 1.

Then, going on to the dolphin wahoo, the same information is repeated, as far as the overall headboat data, but it's about forty-five charter boats are interviewed with dolphin wahoo discards from 2004 to 2015. Once again, in the coastal migratory pelagic, the data is the same. 8 percent of the trips are interviewed from Georgia to Florida, 5 percent from South Carolina, and 17 percent from North Carolina for the headboats. Then 116 charter interviews with discards.

For this, the coral, shrimp, and spiny lobster aren't sampled through MRIP, and so Florida has to do their own sampling program in order to get landings data for the spiny lobster fishery. It's not actually an interview target for other states, including Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina.

Going to the private recreational reporting requirements, MRIP is the primary sampling method for this. There is no observer coverage in the private recreational fishery, although the SRD can require logbooks for the snapper grouper fishery, and that's a monthly logbook for that. I won't go into all the details for the private recreational. All that information is provided in Table 3.

Table 4 has other reporting requirements, entanglement and stranding reports. Fishermen can call in strandings within the South Atlantic, and that information is provided in the table, as well as call-in reports. There are two fisheries in the South Atlantic that are Category 3 under the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and if it is -- I'm sorry. It's a Category 2. There are only two fisheries that are a Category 2, and that includes the black sea bass pot fishery and the king mackerel and Spanish mackerel gillnet fisheries. Those are Category 2, and so they have a higher level of reporting requirements under the Marine Mammal Protection Act, as opposed to the other fisheries in the South Atlantic.

Now comparing, in March, National Marine Fisheries Service gave workgroup recommendations on what could be considered for bycatch reporting, and I have those, compared to what is currently in CE-BA 3, as Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. We can go through those by fishery if you would like or you guys can just look at it and read it and synthesize it for yourself. I would leave that up to Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: In the essence of time, I think we can just read it ourselves and synthesize it. That takes you to the end of your part? Then CE-BA 3 has been around a long time. It's this one action, and we've heard NMFS's recommendations. I don't know, Chip, but is there anything that we need to -- I mean it was questioned about whether we wanted to kill CE-BA 3, because it's the one action. I don't know that I necessarily want to go there without Mel here, but is there anything else that the committee would like to address with CE-BA 3 or to state with CE-BA 3?

MR. BOWEN: You said there was talk about killing it, but you didn't want to do that with Mel not here? I can't hear.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes, as the Chair of the meeting, and Mel not here, I wouldn't want to take that -- Personally, I wouldn't want to take that action without him here.

MR. BOWEN: I agree.

DR. DUVAL: I am not on your committee, and I don't -- I mean I guess my question is we're still moving forward on a comprehensive standardized bycatch reporting methodology, right? I mean this is -- The recommendations in these tables, Table 5 and 6, come from that work, correct?

MR. HAYMANS: Yes.

DR. DUVAL: So is the discussion really why are we calling it CE-BA 3 when it really pertains to data collection and it's not a comprehensive -- I mean folks probably would not necessarily consider it a comprehensive ecosystem-based amendment if the single thing that we're dealing with in it would be more accurate accounting of bycatch.

MR. HAYMANS: Right, and it, of course, started with multiple actions. The only thing that's conceivably CE-BA is it crosses many fisheries, but, otherwise -- But we've had a report. I don't know that there's any action that we need to take here now. Chip, would you agree?

MR. COLLIER: The question is what would you guys like to see in September? Would you like it more formally fleshed out or do you want more details? Are there things that you would like excluded?

DR. DUVAL: Again, not on your committee, but I'm not sure I would want anything excluded in terms of the potential options under the different alternatives that you've laid out here in Tables 5, 6, and 7. I think all of those are probably necessary, to some extent, or something that we would like to strive for at the council to improve our bycatch reporting, and it seems to me like we need to continue moving this forward, in partnership with the agency, and so I wouldn't want to see anything removed at this point.

MR. HAYMANS: I guess I had a question for the Science Center. Alternative 3 is a money-hungry alternative. Has there been any progress towards additional funding for observer work?

DR. PONWITH: Generically, no. We continue to work on this, because it's certainly a high priority. I would say, generically, no, but we can use -- If there are special opportunities to put in for competitive funds, that is an avenue that remains open to us, which we do. Any chance we get to put in for competitive funds, we do. Then we have to wait to see what the outcome is.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you. Any other comments on CE-BA 3?

MR. HARTIG: You do have at least a couple of coastal migratory pelagic observer trips, because the trips that I was going to take snapper grouper fishing very quickly became coastal migratory pelagic trips, because, when we anchored up on the spots, the king mackerel were there. It went from snapper grouper to king mackerel. After two king mackerel trips, I didn't get selected anymore for snapper grouper trips.

MR. HAYMANS: Anyone else? Okay. Aside from the possible renaming of CE-BA 3, if that's appropriate, we will leave it here until there is additional action that needs to be taken on it.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Do you wish to think about renaming it?

MR. HAYMANS: Michelle had suggested that, just based on the fact that it's not really a comprehensive ecosystem plan.

DR. DUVAL: I mean I don't really care. If it's easier, for tracking purposes, to keep it named CE-BA 3 -- It might be a little more transparent to the public who is interested in bycatch reporting and tracking that this is what's in it, if it has a different name, but, quite frankly, that is you all's job to name it appropriately, so that it can be tracked.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Brian or Gregg, is there an opinion on this, or do you want to wait until September and have time to think about it, if there's any unforeseen consequences for doing this?

MR. WAUGH: No, I think Michelle is absolutely right. It would be a lot more clear to the public if this was titled some bycatch reporting methodology or something along those lines. We have efforts ongoing on ecosystem-based management, and this amendment doesn't really address that, and so I think it's misnamed now, and I don't see any downside from changing it.

MR. HAYMANS: So direction to staff would be to consider an appropriate name for this one action that's remaining, and we will see it again sometime in the future.

MR. COLLIER: Is there any direction to staff for certain things to be analyzed for the September meeting for you guys to consider? It's a pretty big laundry list of items to be describing, and helping us out and getting down that road would be beneficial, if there's certain things that you guys want to see.

DR. DUVAL: I am not on your committee, but I think, with the workgroup that the Regional Office, I think with the Science Center looking at standardized bycatch reporting methodology, is there not some information regarding costs of some of those techniques that could be pulled into the document? I don't know, and maybe Jack or Bonnie want to speak to this, because Jack gave an overview of this at our March meeting. Wasn't it March?

DR. MCGOVERN: I didn't provide any information on cost. I provided information on workgroup recommendations and also an overview of the SBRM proposed rule, and that provided guidelines for evaluating SBRMs, and so I think part of this is waiting on the outcome of that and the final rule for that, which is probably going to be published towards the end of the summer. If you remember, at the CCC meeting, they indicated they had like twenty-six comments that they are addressing right now for that.

DR. DUVAL: I think, if we're waiting on the final rule, probably the only things that could be brought into this are like costs of some of these things that are in here, if that's readily available. That might be able to be gleaned from other regions while we're waiting on the final rule.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes, and that's why I said see it sometime in the future, because I didn't know that we necessarily needed to see it in September.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Jack, you said the final rule is the end of the summer. Do you think we may have that in time for the September briefing book, that we could plan on having an update on it at that time?

DR. MCGOVERN: I think we might. It sounded like, at the CCC meeting, that we might see it in August or so, and so, if we have it, I will provide a summary of that at the September meeting.

MR. HAYMANS: So, if available, an update in September.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We will pencil that in for the September meeting, maybe to review the final rule and see then where we need to go from there.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay, and so we will consider that Agenda Item Number 1, and we will take a break in the Data Collection Committee, Madam Chair, for lunch, and we will reconvene at one o'clock with Item 2.

MR. HAYMANS: We will reconvene the Data Collection Committee, and we would like to welcome the illustrious true Chair of the Data Collection Committee, Mel Bell, who is listening via the wonders of technology. Hello, Mel. Are you there?

MR. BELL: Yes, and can you hear me?

MR. HAYMANS: You need to speak a little louder, Mel. We can't quite hear you.

MR. BELL: I will speak as loud as I dare.

MR. HAYMANS: Very good. Welcome, and I hope I do the rest of the committee justice for you, okay?

MR. BELL: Thanks. You're doing great.

MR. HAYMANS: All right. We will pick back up where we -- Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not on your committee, but just a couple of things. I would like to welcome our Mid-Atlantic Council liaison, Rob O'Reilly. Rob is the State of Virginia representative on the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and he braved all weather and travel forms last night to get in here today to be present for our Mackerel Committee. Then we also have our ASMFC liaison, Executive Director Bob Beal, and so I just wanted to welcome them both to the table and to our discussion and make sure everyone sitting around the table knew them.

Then the other thing I wanted to let folks know about is just, due to Rob's travel schedule, when we go into the Mackerel Committee, which starts at 3:30 on the agenda, the first thing we will pick up is actually cobia, once we go through our pro forma status of landings stuff. I'm looking over at our Mackerel Committee Chair over there to let him know as well, so that we can make sure we get through with the cobia discussion first thing under Mackerel, because Mr. O'Reilly has travel plans that are time sensitive. Back to you, Mr. Chairman. Sorry about that.

MR. HAYMANS: No, that's quite all right. I was remiss in that I should have done that myself, and so thank you very much. We are going to start with Agenda Item 2, an Update on the Findings of the Commercial Electronic Logbook Pilot Project, and I think Dr. Ponwith is going to deliver that for us.

DR. PONWITH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thanks for the opportunity to get you caught up on where we are on the commercial logbook pilot project. I want to thank colleagues at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, particularly Brett Pierce, for pulling these slides together. Again, many of these slides will be familiar. We have taken a cumulative approach to the information, and so I won't belabor the things that are old news.

We had very good participants involved in this across a breadth of gear types and across our geography in the South Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico, and we used information from them to help refine the software and refine the way the hardware works, to be able to collect this information. You can see we had six from the South Atlantic, two HMS vessels, and four from the Gulf.

We had several vendors participate in putting forward hardware and software to meet the specifications for this, and you can see that we have -- This is the list of things that we have accomplished. We have completed the data collection, and we have received feedback from both the fishermen and the vendors on this. The eReports were submitted in several different capacities. We have reclaimed the hardware. Some fishermen will retain the hardware for some additional testing, and then, finally, the catch and effort data collection standards have been finalized.

If we go to the next slide, you can see that where we are right now, this June to December, the second bullet, we're building storage infrastructure, so that the data collected can be accessible to fit into the current analysis methodology, and so we designed the location for these data in a way to accommodate the way the data are used and then build the quality control methods we need, which will mirror the way we QA/QC the current logbook validations.

Then, come January of 2017, we are able to receive eReports from the volunteer participants. I've got some additional slides on that that I can help walk you through where we are on that. The feedback that we've gotten has been extremely useful in refining, again, both the hardware and the software.

The perception of the logbook depends on the complexity of the data that are entered. The easier the data entry, the feedback is generally positive. When the data entry becomes more complex, for cases where we're doing set-by-set entry, then there were certainly a lot more feedback on those. The other thing that lent to the complexity of this is how species-rich the landings were. If they were targeting one species, it was easy. The more species they had, the more challenging it became, but, of course, those data are really invaluable.

Some findings from the pilot study, we used the feedback to facilitate changes in both the data collection and the data collection standards. For points that we could obtain from other sources, we will rely on those points, again, to make this as simple as possible. Again, most gear types can facilitate set-based reporting. This is going to be really important, because that helps us get CPUE by these sets, which gives us the ability to link CPUE with depth strata and things like that as they change over the course of a trip, and so this will be an unprecedented level of granularity in the data, which will be very helpful for us.

Hardware issues were a major concern. Again, the issue was for these smaller vessels with exposed cabins and how we managed weatherizing that equipment and safeguarding it from the trauma of life at sea. Then, also, we're looking at increases in quality and quantity of catch data above what we get using the current logbook methods.

Again, we're going to be able to get finer spatial scale and temporal scale on this logbook. The other thing that we will get is multiple fishing areas that can be determined by GPS coordinates and, so, again, just refine scale. It's really important when we start talking about what depth are these fish being caught at.

MR. HAYMANS: Excuse me, Bonnie, but is that large increase, is that quantifiable? I mean can you tell us the percent increase in the quantity of data?

DR. PONWITH: If you're looking at the spatial scale, right now, it's on the -- The spatial scale that we have is kind of on a trip-by-trip basis, where, for the logbook, they put where they were fishing, and it's a very coarse area. Picture the difference between having one data point for the trip versus having a data point for each set. For these trips that, again, depending on the gear and the type of species they're after, for these trips that go days, or in some cases weeks, it enables us to have a lot finer spatial scale and temporal scale in that.

One of the things that is included in this presentation that hasn't been in the presentations in the past is a look at sort of the economic aspects of the fleet, some economic characteristics of the fleet

that can help you sort of understand sort of what the fleet dynamics are and the composition of the fleet relative to potential costs of implementing electronic reporting on these vessels. We think it's an important consideration.

Here, on this slide, we've got some information about the fleet. 55 percent of the vessels in the commercial fleet right now had an estimated revenue above \$10,000, 26 percent of them had revenues above \$50,000, and 15 percent were above \$100,000. I've got another slide that helps you visualize this. The cost analysis on some of the economic data put the profit margin for the fleet at about 16 percent.

Looking now at this bar chart, that's an easier way for you to look at this, and speaking about the economics of the fleet, this is one thing that I did want to put to your attention as we contemplate shifting to electronic reporting for the commercial fleet, and that is the paper logbooks include economic questions.

Those economic questions are absolutely crucial for understanding the economic aspects of the management of the fishery and for management changes that the council would contemplate, and so this is a great opportunity for me to put that before the council. Right now, the testing that we've been doing has been really focused on electronic reporting of the catch. We are keenly interested in making sure that the economic data aspect that is currently captured on the paper log isn't lost when we shift to electronic.

There are going to be some interesting considerations for that. If, for example, the vessels are reporting at sea, that makes reporting revenue at sea a little bit more challenging, and I know we've talked about this even with the paper forms, of what is the due data for the revenue field on the economic component of the logbook, and so that's something that we're going to have to talk about.

Again, for the economic data, we don't need a census for that, but a well-designed, statistically-designed sample is adequate for that. We don't need a census for it, but we do need those data to be able to continue to provide that information to you when you are making these management decisions.

The other thing about the economic data is they are most valuable when they have context, and so we need to make sure that we have a way, however we shift, that we have a way to link that economic data to the actual vessel, so that the catch data, the effort data, the vessel data, and the economic data are all linked, to give the context we need for the economic data to be the most powerful.

This slide just kind of summarizes the profitability of the coastal commercial fleet. There is some commercial and charter overlap. About 12 percent of the vessels in the Southeast derive more than 50 percent of their income from charter fishing, and about 86 percent of 2014 trips had the owners onboard. We think that the fishermen would benefit from having an electronic log that can submit the required reports for both the commercial and the charter sectors, which is another consideration that we need to have as we design this.

Our outcome from the pilot is that electronic logs are a feasible option for both the Southeast and the HMS fisheries. We found a range of technological options that meet the specific requirements

of the fisheries and the vessels. That allows us to collect data at finer scales. The reports would be able to be submitted more timely and contain fewer errors, because we would be able to have validation fields in those electronic logbooks.

The last bullet is the electronic logbooks retain catch history and notes on conditions for specific trips. That actually could be quite valuable to the fishermen themselves, and so this we see as advantageous for not just the council, but also for the fishermen themselves. Then I would turn it over for questions.

MR. HAYMANS: I have one. Right now, this would be a voluntary eLog?

DR. PONWITH: There are two things that are happening. The Southeast Fisheries Science Center got resources to pilot what it would be like to shift from a paper log to an electronic log, and, if we were able to do that, what would we do to that logbook that would take full advantage of it being electronic? One example is shifting from putting one depth on your paper log versus being able to put depths for each of your sets and keep locations for each of your sets.

There is a second effort, and that's being done by ACCSP, and that's essentially creating an electronic version of the current logbook, so that if someone didn't want to do their current logbook on a piece of paper and wanted to submit it electronically, they could submit an exact clone of that paper logbook electronically. These things have been developed in tandem.

The ACCSP one is going quite a lot faster, because it's essentially an electronic version of the existing logbook, but what we're trying to do now is, in response to a request by the council, collaborate closely with ACCSP, so that, if indeed people wanted to voluntarily submit their data electronically, those data could be ingested into the existing database seamlessly, and so they're two separate things, but they're connected.

MR. HAYMANS: Right. No, I understand, but where I was going with the voluntary question was it's required reporting, I guess if selected, but -- Maybe that's wrong. If the voluntary nature of this means that the individuals, if they want to do that, use their own equipment and download an app, only to the point that we make it mandatory may there be any assistance, if possibly assistance comes along, but, right now, if it's a voluntary reporting, it's their own equipment with a downloadable app.

DR. PONWITH: Right. For the ACCSP thing, they are absolutely -- They are voluntary, and if they're submitting -- I guess I have to be sure. I am not sure whether they actually gave out hardware to help with it. For this, this would be something that's different enough that it would actually take, I think, amendments to be able to put it into action, because it is different from the current logbook.

MR. HAYMANS: Questions?

MR. COX: Bonnie, bear with me for a minute, because I am going to vent some frustrations. We started the program a little bit over a year ago, and we worked very well with Brett Pierce. He was very nice to work with. Two of my boats had the equipment. One of them had the laptop version and the other one had the tablet version, which we said early on that the tablet was the way to go, because it has the waterproof shield on it and stuff, but I don't know.

Something happened in the last eight months, where there was little communication with Fran, that was helping develop some software, and I haven't heard from Brett in quite a long time. I think back to February, where we were supposed to be able to voluntarily be able to submit logbook reports, and so there just hasn't been good communication in this whole program.

DR. PONWITH: I hear what you're saying, and before -- What I want to do is make sure that, when we talk about this, that we are talking about the correct thing, because the ACCSP one is essentially -- Instead of handing a piece of paper over, you hand electrons over. It has exactly the same information, or it hopefully will. There are just a few things that are missing from that project right now.

This project was a pilot project to test the hardware and the software, to give us a feel for whether this is feasible. The answer is coming back that, yes, it is feasible, but it's right now not -- Essentially, it's not an operational program at this point, and so we're at a point now where we need to make a decision of is this something we want to operationalize, and if the answer is yes, then what we would do is expand it, and, if regulations were required to be able put it into force, get those done.

MR. COX: No, I hear you. I think it's a great program. We're very eager to get underway with it. It just seems like we could have taken what the ACCSP had and kind of just fine-tuned it with what we want to do and already had something that would have been useful, without trying to develop something completely from you on our own. That's the feeling I got with it.

We had a presentation from Brett, and I think it might have been in December, and he said that sometime in February of this year, at the latest, that we were going to be able to voluntarily submit reports, which I don't know what happened there. We never heard anymore from it. I talked to my counterpart, Dewey, in the Mid-Atlantic that was also working with this program, and he got discouraged and just turned his equipment in, but there has been some frustration in it.

DR. PONWITH: I've got a couple more slides that deal with the voluntary program, and, again, we need to keep those two things separate. They're separate things, but I've got a couple of slides that we can put up and talk about that, but I think that John had some introductory conversation about that as well.

MR. CARMICHAEL: We will bring those up, but I just wanted to -- I noticed in the pilot, and what's intriguing is you're getting set-level information, and that is one of the biggest differences. The electronic reporting of the existing logbook is trip-level information, because that's what the logbook is, but it sounded like in, particularly the line fisheries, where you have a lot more stops, that it was difficult, and I guess I understand that, but it's somewhat disappointing, knowing how valuable that would ultimately be.

Area-based management and getting better information on discards and all that, we know we need set-level at some level of coverage in the fishery, and I wondered if you guys have thought yet any about is there some way that you could get a subset of set-level information from some of those more intensively-stopping type fisheries, maybe every fifth trip or every fifth stop or third stop or something, and have you thought about that some as a compromise to getting a little more detail?

DR. PONWITH: That certainly could be taken into consideration. What we were aiming for as a pilot gave us something better than we have right now, because how many times have we been plagued by questions of spatial resolution or temporal resolution, and so the intent of this was to go out and function at a set level, to see what it looked like and is it feasible. It's a feasibility study. If it comes back that, for gear types where you're doing a lot of stops and a lot of sets, that's certainly something that could be considered, and it's a just a tradeoff of we need the data, the data are helpful, but if the data are too onerous to collect that it actually frays the reliability of those data, then finding some middle ground is going to be helpful.

MR. CARMICHAEL: So do we have a sense of what the next steps are, in terms of what was the pilot and where sort of we go from here?

DR. PONWITH: I think the next steps are, first of all, to get the views of the council on the merits of going electronic, and we have two models right now. One is an electronic version of the existing logbook. That could be either voluntary or mandatory. The other version would be to have something that does enable you to have the spatial and temporal scale of this set-level approach. If the council is interested in proceeding on the latter, then it would be an issue of looking at what requirements, what regulatory requirements, that carries with it.

Then the second thing is, as is true of any new program, it's to look at what would be the costs of this and how would those costs be borne? What would be the costs to the agency of shifting from managing a paper program to managing an electronic program and what would be the costs to the fleet for doing this? I view those as kind of the next steps.

MR. COX: I will tell you that I'm certainly ready to get it going, and I will continue to work with the program, anything that I can do. I'm sorry I had to vent for just a minute, because I was ready to say it, but the tablets are the way to go. I think we've all kind of agreed on that. I know I've kind of shared that with Brett, and Dewey had the same thoughts. As far as costs go for hardware, you can buy those iPads pretty cheap now, and it doesn't take the most current one to use it, from what I understand.

MR. BOWEN: I was going to actually have Jack's sentiments. I think we need to get this going as quick as possible. As far as costs, I have a little trouble with us going through this pilot program and not having any sense of cost. I think that there should be some kind of estimate that we would know about now, since we've had that going on for two years.

DR. PONWITH: Cost is a big thing, because there is part of the cost to us and part of it to the fleet, and we can -- If the council is interested enough in this to want to contemplate going operational, we can go ahead and do a cost profile for this. In other words, what we think are the anticipated costs for the agency, based on what we learned on hardware and what we learned from software. Again, that was the notion of having multiple vendors, is we wouldn't be writing the software. We would put the requirements out to the industry and let them develop the software and then use market approaches to how they price that software.

MR. BOWEN: To that point, I am willing to make a motion that we recommend to the Science Center that they do a cost analysis and get this ball rolling as quick as we possibly can.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay, and that's in advance of starting a new amendment? That's for informational purposes, as an update at the next Data Collection meeting?

MR. BOWEN: Yes, sir.

MR. HAYMANS: Does it have to be a motion, John, or can it be direction to staff? Zack, does that capture your thoughts?

MR. BOWEN: I am trying to read it. Mr. Carmichael is straining my eyes with that smaller print. Yes, sir. That seems very feasible.

MR. HAYMANS: Is there a second? Jack seconds. Is there discussion?

MR. COX: Bonnie, I've got a question for you on this motion right here. From what I understand, we've already got a program in place, and so we don't have to get a cost analysis on the actual software, right? I think we had a presentation what that cost before.

DR. PONWITH: I am going to say maybe. I would have to go back and revisit that presentation, to find out whether that was the cost at the pilot scale or whether it was the cost prorated at an operational scale, but I will find that out, according to this, and then we'll get you some fresh information at the next council meeting.

MR. WAUGH: I think we might be making this a little more complex than it needs to be. There is a system operational now from North Carolina north that allows the reporting requirements of GARFO to be input through a tablet app. That's all available. What we were trying to accomplish was, as soon as possible, to allow our fishermen down here to report what's being required on the logbook via electronic means on a voluntary basis, because, to require them to report electronically, we have to do an amendment.

The way this is worded, to move to set-level information, we would have to do an amendment to require that level of detail, but that level of detail, as I understand it, is already being required in GARFO and the software is already up, running, and operational in the GARFO area to allow this, and so I'm not fully clear on the cost of what. The time to the fishermen, I think one of the things the council will have to evaluate, when we eventually do an amendment, is there is a lot less reporting burden the way the logbook is written now, the requirements.

If you go to set-specific, then you're dealing, on a bandit boat, of are you going to try to get information every time they stop and drop lines down and pull them back up? That's a set. Do we want to try and get that on 100 percent of vessels? I don't know that that's feasible, and so there's a lot of that detail that the council will have to sort out, but I think this is looking at the costs, and there doesn't need to be a cost in looking at a whole new system. We really need to look at what's operational in GARFO and how that meets the requirements down here.

MR. HAYMANS: Right, and I certainly, in this discussion, didn't hear anybody wanting to start a new amendment. It was looking at what the cost of equipment and/or acquisition of software would be in lieu of starting an amendment. At least I thought that's what I heard Zack say.

MR. BOWEN: Yes, sir. In no way do I want to put more workload on the council staff. They work too much already, and I used that because that's what Dr. Ponwith had said, that they needed to figure out the cost. Well, if we need to figure it out and they need a motion from us to do it, let's get it done. I mean it sounds simpler than I'm sure it is, but she used the word "costs" and so that's the reason I made that motion, but in no way, shape, or form did I want to draft another amendment or start work on another amendment, if at all possible.

MR. COX: Gregg, I appreciate that, and you're right. Let's make this thing as easy as possible, because we've already done a lot of work on it. If we can take what GARFO has got and let the Science Center in Miami work with it and fine-tune the information we want to put in it, man, that's going to help us so much with the data collection, because, when you day-boat fish, kind of like Ben and I do, and you're in and out maybe five or six times in a couple of weeks, and you don't have time -- We have had this discussion before, but, seven days later, to try to remember all of your discards and sitting there filling out that logbook, but you could have that waterproof tablet on your boat and you could be filling that thing out. As far as getting really good data, I mean let's just do this thing as simple and easy as possible, and I would almost say let's put a motion in place to take what GARFO has already got and incorporate what we want. I just want to get this thing underway is what I'm looking for here and not to delay it.

MR. HAYMANS: Perhaps, rather than an analysis of cost, we get a report back as to what the process costs fishermen fishing in the North Atlantic.

DR. PONWITH: Just for clarification, we weren't working in a vacuum. This whole pilot project was tailored off the GARFO system. Our first stop was to go somewhere that was a little farther ahead of us and grab what they have learned from their process and pilot it down here, but anytime you move from paper to something else, you want to make sure you're getting it right, because these data are crucial, and there are potential transition costs, both for the agency and for the fishermen.

MR. BEAL: Rob O'Reilly and I were just commenting that this is kind of déjà vu all over again. We had this exact same conversation at the Mid-Atlantic on Tuesday, and so I know how this one ends. I think there is also another factor that ACCSP has been trying to calculate or estimate, which is sort of a help desk. A lot of these things are new and different to some of the fishermen, and, for them to adopt them and sort of stay excited about them, they need active sort of technical expertise and technical help.

ACCSP is trying to figure out how they can have somebody available all the time and can quickly answer technical questions on how to use the app or my tablet is not communicating with the database and what's going on, and so I think that's another factor, or part of this, that needs to be calculated in here or at least included in this estimate, and a lot of those, as Gregg was saying, a lot of those estimates already exist in the Northeast, but I think it's important to make sure that the fishermen have the support they need. If they're willing to voluntarily do something new and different, we should give them all the help we can give them to make that happen.

MR. COX: Thank you for that, and so I think it was at our March meeting that Mike from ACCSP was here, and he put a program on showing us how that piece of equipment worked, and it looked a lot -- There was a lot of information there that we're looking for, but, as far as technical and

training fishermen, if you could take fishermen like me or Ben or people that can go ahead and -- We can connect with fishermen in the community. We already do that. When we get new pieces of electronics on the boat, a lot of times we go on another boat and show fishermen how to use it, and so we certainly don't need to send a technical team out to help other fishermen do it. Just train a few fishermen in the area and we can get it happening.

MR. HAYMANS: Train the trainer. Okay. We have a motion, and it's been modified slightly. Zack, does that fit your requirements?

MR. BOWEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I don't necessarily have requirements. **I would modify this motion to get the consensus of around the table what we're trying to get to, and so if we need to change it or reword it or amend it or move it or remove it or add it.**

MR. HAYMANS: Bonnie, based on what's on the screen, do you have a feel for what's being asked?

DR. PONWITH: I absolutely do, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay. Zack, will you read the motion, please?

MR. BOWEN: Yes, sir. **I move to recommend that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center conduct a cost analysis considering agency and fishermen costs on the set-level electronic reporting program developed through the pilot project.**

MR. HAYMANS: That was seconded by Jack. Is there any additional discussion? **Is there any opposition? Seeing none, the motion passes.**

DR. DUVAL: I had a question sort of tangential to what we were just discussing, but I just want to make sure that I understand the voluntary program that ACCSP had developed or is developing. That is operational right now? I think when we first started talking about this a couple of years ago, it was -- Ben's idea was that there would be some almost like a fillable PDF electronically online that fishermen could go to who wanted to not be saddled with the paper logbook forms, that they could fill out, and so that was my initial understanding of working with ACCSP to do that, but has that shifted to using eTRIPS now, and so the app that's been developed? I'm just looking for a little clarification on that, and so, Bonnie, I don't know if you can speak to that.

DR. PONWITH: I want to be careful about speaking authoritatively on the ACCSP program, because we're tracking it in parallel. We're looking at areas where it's similar, looking at areas where it's different, and, per the council's request, worked with ACCSP to begin the process of how we would ingest those data, so that if fishermen did choose to enter their data electronically instead of on the paper log, they could do that in lieu of instead of in addition to.

What I have are a couple of slides that may actually get to some of your questions, and then, if not, what I would do is defer to the ACCSP to answer more specific questions, because I just want to make sure we get that right.

MR. HAYMANS: Bonnie, before you start, let me just make sure, Mel, that you're still out there and you're okay.

MR. BELL: Yes, and, actually, I had my virtual hand up, and I don't know how that works, but I guess you didn't see it.

MR. HAYMANS: That's what we were checking on.

MR. BELL: I had a quick question related to costs, and I agree that we need to figure out what the actual impact on the fleet would be. On one of Bonnie's slides, it seemed to indicate that probably over 50 percent of the fleet had no reported income in 2014. I think that was Slide 9. I just wanted to make sure that I was understanding that correctly. Then, in Slide 8, there was a reference to cost analyses and profit margin. That Slide 9 there, is that correct? Where it says zero, that's that many vessels or folks had zero income reported?

DR. PONWITH: Yes, that's correct.

MR. BELL: Okay. That's kind of interesting. In terms of looking at -- Then, in Slide 8, there's a reference to a 16 percent profit margin. I guess that's average across the entire fleet? Is that what that is?

DR. PONWITH: Yes, that's correct.

MR. BELL: Okay, and so those are all things that you need to take into consideration of any additional costs to the fishermen related to electronics or maintaining electronics. That would all be useful, but, in terms of the direction you're proceeding and in terms of figuring out what things really cost in the real world, that makes perfect sense, and maybe Bonnie has got a couple of slides here, like she said, that would kind of help move this along, but thank you.

MR. PHILLIPS: To Mel's point, he mentioned that income was an average. Do you have the mean, because the average can be a whole lot different from the mean, where half of them is up and half of them is down.

DR. PONWITH: What I have with me today is what was on the slides, but, if you want additional information, we can look into that for you.

MS. BECKWITH: Just a quick clarification. On that slide showing the estimated revenue, is that for all commercial permits in the region or -- I don't see where that that is specified.

DR. PONWITH: This is poorly labeled, but my understanding is, yes, this is for commercial vessels in the region.

MR. HARTIG: I just wanted to clear up -- The revenue is total gross income or is it after expenses?

DR. PONWITH: Rather than spending the council time looking in the notes, let me take that question and I will get back to you.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, and you're welcome to start your SAFIS presentation when you're finished with your note.

DR. PONWITH: All right. SAFIS, we were asked to take a look at SAFIS, to determine what it would take to then be able to get the voluntary information collected by ACCSP through SAFIS and incorporate it into our system. Right now, we've got thirty-two trips that were submitted over a seven-month period. The gears that were used were hand line and trap. We had two vessels submit reports via eTRIPS. They were North-Carolina-based. Right now, one of our concerns is the eTRIPS doesn't capture all of the data that we are getting currently on the coastal logbook or the HMS logbook, and so that's something we would want to work with ACCSP to correct. We don't want to step backward and lose data fields.

If we go to the next slide, you can see the comparison. Right now, required by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center is the left box, and the right box are changes we would propose to the eTRIPS to make it comport with the current database, and so the first one is the operator name, which is required on the logbook, and we manage the operator user credentials to attach the operator to the trip records from eTRIPS, and so this gives us a more precise way to link those data and give them the context.

The second thing is the federal gear types. We ask for specific gear information, like hook types, bait types, bait used. On the current eTRIPS, it lacks some of the information that we need. Some of the gears are missing. Then, again, on the left side, you will see that the start and end set location is required. On this, eTRIPS records GPS location at the start of each effort, and so those are things that we are working -- We're in good communication with ACCSP and talking with them about.

I would add, and it's not on the slide, but I will add that GARFO, if I understand correctly, the system that's being used in North Carolina north lacks, again, that economic data that we require from a subset of our commercial participants, and I just want to make sure it's clear on the record that we just think that information is crucial, and I hope the council agrees with that. It's really important information, and whatever mechanism we use to shift from paper to electronic, be it voluntary or be it mandatory, that we take into consideration the importance of those economic data.

The next slide is a screenshot of the ACCSP software, and it just is an example of how it collects that information, and, again, I believe this is an example of how it asks for the start location, but there isn't a place for the end location, and I think that modification would be pretty simple, and it would certainly make the data a lot more powerful.

If we go to the next slide, the question is what would it take to be able to pull eTRIPS data into the Southeast Fisheries Science Center database, and these are the things that we see having to happen. We need to do the database link. We need the operator credentials management system, which is, again, one of the most important keys to making sense of those data, giving them context.

We have to figure out a way to submit no-fish reports to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Again, that helps us distinguish between vessels that didn't go fishing, by submitting a no-fish report, versus vessels that are delinquent in submitting their reports, and that distinction is very important. Then also the ability to do the extraction translation and load, which is one of their IT processes. That software needs to be developed, and, again, that pulls the logbook data from ACCSP in sort of a crosswalk table into the format and loads it into the Southeast Fisheries Science Center database. This is all doable. There is nothing in here that is a showstopper.

Those were the next steps. This is the proposed timeline for being able to accomplish this, and we think that we can work with ACCSP over the next six months and set up the data link by July, develop the ETL process to be able to move those data between August and September, develop the system to manage the operator user credentials over the next six months, and then develop the system to allow the no-fish reports between February of 2017 and April of 2017. That's kind of the timeline that we're looking at, collaborating with ACCSP, and I will turn it over for questions.

MR. COX: Bonnie, just a few questions on the commercial e-logbook. Just to get an idea of timing on it. When do you think some idea of a voluntary program would be ready to submit at that level, if a fisherman has his own tablet and wants to go ahead and download the information and do this on that voluntary basis? Then the other part of that question is when do you see us completely maybe phasing out of the paper logbooks and going on a mandatory basis of a program like this? What is your thinking on that?

DR. PONWITH: Using the ACCSP system, which is essentially an electronic version of the paper logbook, according to these next steps, if we finish that last step, which is the system to be able to accept the no-fishing reports, it would be by April of 2017. Again, the question of when do we move completely away from paper to electronic, my view is, if this is voluntary, then who knows. It really depends on the computer literacy of the fleet, and I'm sure there's a really steep gradient. There will be people who are ready to do this tomorrow, to be able to get rid of the paper, which is cumbersome, but, for every one there is like that, there will be people who have a strong preference for paper logs.

If it goes mandatory electronic, we could probably use how we conducted that process in the headboat fleet as a leading indicator. I mean they're different fleets. They fish differently, and the complexity of the software is different, but if we went mandatory, we would want to be able to include some very strong on-the-dock communication and education demo work that would have to be rolled into that, and so that's more difficult to say.

MR. COX: Just to follow up on it, I am pretty sure that we had talked about getting the discard data in that program as well. Am I right on that?

DR. PONWITH: Absolutely.

MR. HAYMANS: Any additional questions? John, I don't think there's any action we need to take on that end, and I think we're ready to move into for-hire. Thank you very much, Bonnie. Next, John is going to take us through the for-hire reporting amendment, the core data elements.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The next item is our for-hire reporting amendment. At the last meeting, you asked that we develop a list of core variables and bring them to you for consideration. I have done that. We have run these through the IPT, through the AP, through the SSC, as well as through state folks who are involved in the recreational data reporting programs within each state, and so there's been a lot of feedback on the variables that have been put together here as Attachment 2.

This is built off of the information that was in the amendment already. If you recall, we had the list of variables that's collected by the headboat electronic program, by the South Carolina program, and what we did as a first step on this was to look at what's common data collected between those two programs and then decide how that could fit into proposed core variables for

the charter boat amendment, to try and ensure that we get the information for both, because, if you recall, one of the goals of this is that a program like South Carolina's, which has been in place for many, many years, should be compatible with what we're ultimately doing, so that they're not having to go in and completely change their program to comply with this, and so that's why we've looked at both the headboat existing and the South Carolina for-hire.

The column here of proposed core variables is what is being suggested as the core, and the recommendation of the IPT has been that these shouldn't be an action in the amendment, but they should be specified in the amendment, in the discussion and in the text, but not as a specific action, because, if they were, then you would have to take an amendment if these needed to be changed at some point, and, with things in flux like they are, there may be some changes that you may wish to do more efficiently than that, and so I just wanted to point that out.

The core variables deal with effort information, understanding when the trip takes place, when it starts and when it ends, where it starts from and where it ends at, and this is a little different than the headboats. The headboats are big vessels and they don't move as much as say a charter boat, which may meet parties at -- If they're a small boat, they can meet parties at very different places on every trip, and they may not start and come back at the same place, and so that's kind of pulling some of the information from South Carolina that they have learned in dealing with a lot of these more mobile charter boat vessels that are different than the headboat vessels.

The identifiers, the vessel ID and the captain ID, effort, getting to know the number of fishermen and the number of crew, how it is that they are fishing, whether it's trolling, bottom, spear, et cetera. This is one of the issues, when you're dealing with trip-level information, as opposed to set-level information. That can be an issue, because a particular trip may include bottom fishing with bottom gear for snapper grouper species as well as trolling for pelagic species within the same trip, and so you give a fisherman kind of a challenge when he has to report a trip like that on a single data sheet.

One of the ways around this has been suggested, and it came up from the review we had of the variables as well as the public hearing, was to allow some sort of split-trip-type reporting, where one report could come in for two trips and they could report the area and gear and species when they were trolling separate from their area and gear and species when they were bottom fishing. It's just something to keep in mind, which is maybe a compromise to try and get that additional detail.

Trying to get information on the number of fishermen, the method, and the hours fished helps us know about the effective effort within that trip. Hours fished is important, because trips may have very different travel times, depending on the type of trip they're taking and that sort of thing. If you ever wanted to do CPUE analyses, and you know how much we rely on fishery-dependent data for CPUE, it's really important to know how much of that trip time was actually spent fishing time.

MR. HAYMANS: John, a quick question. If you were to split the trip based on method, are you saying that it essentially becomes two trips, even though it's the same trip?

MR. CARMICHAEL: No, I think it would be two reports with a single trip. You would have all the identifier information about his overall -- The captain and the people that were there and his

overall start and end time and place and date and all of that, but there might be effort component one that I bottom fished in this area and caught these species. In effort component two, I trolled in this area and caught those species.

It's electronic, and it would seem to me that it's just a way of bringing up another screen and another type of effort that's entered, and it probably would not be a major challenge, programming-wise, to allow them to do that, and I think the pilot that we have going on is following this same direction, where they can provide more set-level detail within a particular trip, and so it's certainly feasible.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you.

MS. BECKWITH: I like them. I think another way of doing that method would just also be setting a primary method and a secondary method, and you can sort of figure out what fish are being caught by what method, although they did say that they were catching red snapper while trolling yesterday in public comment. I think it's good. I think it makes sense. Everything is really clear. It's I think what the guys would expect to have to report on. It makes sense, and it's not over cumbersome at the moment, and so I'm okay with this.

I know that, at one point, when North Carolina was contemplating a state for-hire logbook, one of the ways that they had thought about dealing with the length of the trip was setting the start date and then actually have a dropdown menu or a checkbox that would have half-day or three-quarter-day or full-day, and so it would sort of -- If you think about the number of clicks that you would have to go through, instead of setting a start time or an end time, you can have a three-quarter-day or a full-day or an extended-full-day or a multi-day, at which point you would have to sort of pop up information about the start date or the end date. Instead of typing three things, you would click on one, but that's just an idea.

MR. COX: I have been focused so much on the commercial, and I have just a few questions on this for-hire. Is this something that, like the pilot program for the commercial guys, the for-hire guys are doing something at this time? Is that's what is going on here?

MR. CARMICHAEL: Yes, this is an amendment to require electronic reporting of the charter boat fishery. It's beyond pilot.

MR. HAYMANS: We moved into this three or four meetings ago.

MR. COX: No, I understand that, but have they started using it though? Are they familiar with the equipment or anything at that point?

MR. HAYMANS: No, and what we're looking at right now is what is going to be required of it, and so that's the phase we're in, is what elements we ask them for.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The council is cooperating -- We have a project through ACCSP, with some fishermen in each state that are doing essentially a pilot, similar to a lot of the software that's been used in the commercial fisheries, where some of them are getting familiar with that. Plus, we have all the fishermen in South Carolina who are very familiar with it, because they've been

doing this. Recall we saw the demo at the last meeting of their program. Those guys have all been doing this for many, many years.

MR. COX: There was a little bit of pushback in North Carolina. Is Florida receptive to this? How are things going in that state? I am just curious.

MR. HAYMANS: I would ask our Florida rep.

MS. MCCAWLEY: What was the question?

MR. COX: The question is, in Florida, for the for-hire reporting program, how are they receiving this? Is it something that they are willing to -- Is it coming along pretty good?

MS. MCCAWLEY: We have only, in our division, heard from a couple of people, and everybody that we've heard from, it's been positive, but that's more on the research side of things. It would have been a better question for Luiz, because it's his folks that are talking directly to them, but the few things that Erica and I have heard have been positive.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you. Mel, did you have a comment or a question?

MR. BELL: Yes, just a point about under South Carolina's current system. You notice we have a -- My data manager wanted me to point out that, if we simply rely on ten-by-ten-mile boxes, sometimes, particularly right along the coast, the box could overlap federal waters, state waters, and even possibly inshore waters, and so we use that for them to designate if it's a state-waters trip or an inshore trip or a federal-waters trip or I guess multiple, but it makes it a little easier for us when we sort data as far as trips.

A good example of that was in using our charter boat data and looking at cobia trips and cobia landings. It's real easy to sort by that locale, and so, if you didn't want to lose that sort of degree of specificity, if you just rely simply on the ten-by-ten box, you can do the ten-by-ten box and be in federal, state, or even inshore waters. I just wanted to make that point. Thanks.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Mel. John, I'm sorry for derailing. We were on method when I cut you off.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Thank you, Mel, too for clarifying the meaning of locale, and that is something we may wish to consider. We were trying to be as tight as we could in terms of what we require as core, and recognizing that the headboats are collecting some other stuff and South Carolina is collecting some other stuff, and the whole idea is that, if you have a program like South Carolina that collects more, that's great, but these are things that we want to make sure we get, but I think the point about locale and area is important to bring up, and that is the sort of next thing we were on, was depth.

We know that depth is very important to getting information on discard mortality, and so everyone agreed that we should have some information on depth, and we know it's a compromise, because of the nature of reporting on a trip for effort that may be widely scattered. The same goes for location. We settled on the ten-by-ten minimum because that's compatible with the South Carolina program, but, ultimately, ideally, there's probably some point in the future where we're doing far

more set-level electronic collecting of data and GPS things are entering that for us right away, but this is a good starting point.

Then we have the species. Of course we want to know the species, we want to know the number that are kept, the number that are released, and some information on what the trip may have been targeting at, and I think, much as Mel kind of mentioned with locale and understanding federal versus state, it can be useful to know what the intention of the trip was when you get into maybe trying to decide effective effort or are you looking at other aspects and characterizing the trips.

You will notice the South Carolina captures live and dead releases. The headboat program, in the electronic arena now, is collecting number released. One of the reasons for that is they have many, many people onboard, and they felt they got more accurate information if they focused on less information and less detailed information. Just knowing the number of releases is more accurate than trying to get mates and others to try to keep track of the many species they have, the many people onboard, and how many were dead versus alive, and so that was their conclusion.

Charter boats have a smaller number of people, and they may be able to do a better job on that, but I think, as Bonnie mentioned in her presentation, sometimes you can get more robust and accurate information if you ask for just a little bit less than if you try to ask for too much detail and you just end up getting something that's not as accurate, and so, at this point, we're recommending just getting the number of released fish and then relying on things like discard mortality rate dedicated studies, in which case you can convert that number released into the number that you think lived and the number that you think died.

I guess the final point of that too is that we know that delayed mortality is a big component. A lot of fish seemingly swim off, but then ultimately end up dying, and we learned that from our dedicated studies. Overall, we think, for this, in terms of what is truly core, is that we need to know the number of released, and we have other ways of getting at the further detail, in terms of how many are released dead or alive. That is the list of propose core variables that we have, Mr. Chair.

MR. HAYMANS: I was just looking over at the other considerations as part of that release information. It may include condition of release, whether it was vented or a descending device. That may even include whether there was a hook left or it may have other information along with it.

MR. CARMICHAEL: One of the things that's been discussed with regard to that, in a lot of instances, is that you can have a subset of people that are participating in this, which you try to get that detailed information from. Like Bonnie mentioned, there are things that you need a census on. We need a census on the catch and we need a census on the effort that's out there, but we may not need a census on some of these more detailed things, such as we could have some sort of add-on, where you ask for more information on releases from a fisherman.

You could do a subset where you ask them to tell you more about the depth and the condition of the fish that they released and what their usage was of things like descending devices, which then you could use that as a sample to explain your whole fishery, and believe that, by getting a sample of that, you're going to get more accurate information, because people aren't expected to give that to you for each and every trip that they take.

DR. PONWITH: Just a comment on the grid size for location. I talked to our folks on that, and that location is really, really pretty critical. On the headboat right now, they have e-logbook maps in the log. The logs are six-by-six-minute grids, which essentially represents a thirty-six-square-mile grid. When they report, they hit a single point within that grid, and that represents, ultimately, a lat/long by one minute, and so it's essentially a one-square-mile location, and so it's pretty precise, and we really like that. We like that level of precision, in terms of delivering some high-quality data.

When it comes to the economics, we already had a conversation of the economics on the commercial side, and the same thing is true for the recreational, and I'm really happy to see the fuel used and the price per gallon. I am happy to see the number of paying passengers and the number of crew.

The one add-on that would be enormously helpful, one of the most important parameters for economists, is getting a feel for what the charter fee is. The charter fee for the for-hire industry is the equivalent of the ex-vessel price for the landings on the commercial side. It's just a core economic element for that fleet in terms of being able to value that fishery to the coastal economy.

MR. HAYMANS: Isn't that sort of -- I won't say metadata, but isn't that something that you can find out without asking the fishermen to tell you how much he is charging? Isn't that a census or a survey of the businesses that are out there?

DR. PONWITH: Going back to the philosophy we talked about on the commercial fleet, you know, when you're reporting electronically, you want to keep it as simple as possible, get the data from other sources that you can, but this is what our economists are asking for. They are saying these data are available. The fact that they're asking for it on this form implies to me that this is a superior way of getting it than whatever way they might have now. I mean I can circle back and ask that question, but I sure would like to consider having it on the form.

MR. BOWEN: As far as that goes -- I mean I have a couple, if you will just have a little leeway with me. As far as the price per trip goes, I do feel like that's pretty important, because, again, to understand the business -- I'm in an area where I have to run forty miles to go catch a grouper, whereas Ira might be in an area where he has to run four, and so the difference in the price, because of difference in fuel and wear and tear on your motor and your gear, I think there's probably a big fluctuation in price in the geographical range of the South Atlantic. That's just my opinion, and so I do like the price being on there. I have a question about the ten-by-ten block. I kind of didn't understand Mel, because I'm hard of hearing, and is that ten-by-ten miles?

MR. HAYMANS: Yes, and Mel's point was a ten-by-ten block could stretch from the EEZ across state waters into inland state waters, and so Bonnie's point was, really, maybe we could get to a one-by-one and be much better.

MR. BOWEN: I agree with Bonnie on that as well. Then the next point I would like to bring up is, and I've seen it kind of with the MRIP sampling that is currently going on, as far as the species, but we need real specifics, I feel like, when it comes to species. For example, if I'm running a trip and a vermilion snapper comes across the rail, I tell the customer that's a nice snapper, which might be a mistake, because then they get their phone survey and they say, yes, we caught snappers.

Then we don't know if it's listed as red snapper or vermilion snapper or multiple species of snappers. I just think, when it comes to species on this form, we need real specifics.

MR. HAYMANS: Just remember in the phone survey that they're not asked about species.

MR. BOWEN: Whenever they get --

MR. HAYMANS: That's dockside.

MR. BOWEN: Exactly, and so I stand corrected, but anyway, I have tried to make that point that I think we need to be very specific in our species.

MR. CARMICHAEL: My understanding of this is it's like the headboat. It would be you and your mate completing this information and filling out this report. It wouldn't be as it is now, where say an MRIP sampler goes up to someone who came off of your vessel and asks them about that for catch rates, or at least how it used to be. You would be the one providing this information, and we think species means two species.

MR. BOWEN: Okay.

MR. HAYMANS: That means if you're at ALT and you catch a spottail bass, you can't write it down as a spottail bass. It has to be red drum, even though it's not a federally-managed species.

MR. COX: Bonnie, I want to just tell you what fishermen are saying on the dock, and don't take this the wrong way, but, in the real world, a fisherman doesn't feel like it's your business to know what they're charging for a trip. They don't feel like it's your business what they're paying for fuel. They call me, and these are the kinds of things, as a council member, that I try to deal with outside of the council table, but it's very important that we let these fishermen know the more information that we request from them, it's not going to be stuff that's going to come back and hurt them.

The fishermen in North Carolina feel like the more information that they tell you about what they're putting back in the water and what they're catching, it's going to ultimately put them out of business, and that's what Michelle and I heard at the meeting up there, and I know that's not true, but it's going to be very important to get the good data that you're requesting to make sure that we sent a white paper or something out exactly telling these folks what we're looking for and why.

DR. PONWITH: To that exact point, I really appreciate your comment, because I can just imagine, when you get to that level of information, that it feels darned nosy, but the fact of the matter is that I've actually sat at this council table and had the public come up in public testimony and chew us out because we had to borrow economic statistics from the Gulf of Mexico because we didn't have them, and I have an exact memory of that happening.

Those are the data, when we are looking at these amendments, to understand what are the implications of decision X. Those are the data that are used. Those data are worth their weight in gold in understanding are we making a good decision or are we not, and so I could not agree with you more that we've got some good, hard work to do to, in a unified voice, build a level of trust

for why we need these data and how crucial they are for the health of the industry to be willing to put that data forward accurately and timely.

MR. COX: Just to follow up, if we do that before we ask this information, it will go a lot smoother, and it will be much more well received.

MR. BOWEN: I mean this is a lot of information asked to people that have never had to do this before. I mean I hate to beat a dead horse, but this is a lot of information to ask, and we don't have any way to enforce it. I sure wish, looking back, hindsight is 20/20. I wish we would have had this presentation and this discussion before our limited entry vote yesterday, because how can you -- I mean if people are going to balk at this, then we have no way to enforce it, none. If they don't want to report and like to report, it's just -- It's good information and it's a lot of information, but I feel like we're going to have to have some way of getting the people onboard in it, and I don't want to beat them with a hammer, as it was used yesterday, but I mean just --

MR. HAYMANS: I will just say, if done correctly, once it's set up, roughly half of this is automated. You hit a button when you start and it's recording your time. You hit a button when you come back and it ends your time. It's logging your location and it's logging your depth. I mean there's a lot of it that's automated that takes the -- The main thing that I see is the captains being able to hit the species button and kept or released button, that sort of thing.

MR. BOWEN: To your point, Mr. Chairman, I am all for this. I think this is a great thing we're trying to do, and I support it 100 percent.

MS. BECKWITH: A couple of things. To your point, Doug, yes, but we also need to remember that we're setting this logbook up so some people can report after the trip and not during the trip. The core values, variables, definitely I would suggest we keep it to the things that we absolutely need to know and the other sort of economic and discard information we do on a, as John was suggesting, on an additional survey, a rotating survey of 10 percent or 15 percent of the fishery, so people don't feel like they are being overburdened, and that would reduce buy-in.

To Zack's point about the limited entry and to our previous conversations on compliance and putting teeth behind some of this stuff, at the appropriate time, I was going to bring up a suggestion that we add into the logbook amendment either -- Probably not in the form of an action, because it's too late for that, but certainly in the discussion and in the council conclusions that compliance on this logbook would be used as an eligibility requirement for the for-hire/charter limited entry, and I will make that in the form of a motion when the time is appropriate, but I feel that that would help to get buy-in from the industry much faster, because it will be the carrot, recognizing that it will be part of the eligibility requirement to get a limited entry permit, and so we'll talk about it further when it's appropriate.

DR. CRABTREE: The part I'm kind of struggling with is how we would validate what's reported, and maybe John can give me some input on it. They're reporting this stuff, and how do we know that they're reporting accurately? I ask because I sat in on a Gulf -- The Gulf is working on this too, and I sat in on a technical group meeting a week or so ago, and there was a lot made of a need for a hail-in/hail-out, so that you would know when a boat went out on a trip and when they were coming in, so that a port sampler could be at the dock and see what they actually brought in.

Then you could go back and compare what they saw with what they actually reported. I'm not sure if that could work with what we're doing, but, without that, it's not clear to me how -- How do you have some independent validation of what they're reporting?

MR. CARMICHAEL: What are you concerned with the validation on, of like the information, say what they caught or that they they actually reported when they went fishing?

DR. CRABTREE: I am concerned do they even report when they go fishing or not, and how do you know that without some kind of hail-in and hail-out? Then, yes, how do you know they're reporting their catches accurately and aren't just --

MR. CARMICHAEL: I would say how do you know that for the headboat program? We have that now.

DR. CRABTREE: There is a lot of validation and a lot of work that's done to check all that in the headboat program, and it's expensive and it takes a lot of effort.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I would presume at some point there needs to be some sort of dockside on this, so that you're getting biological samples, you're getting lengths and information from these fish that's going to have to -- MRIP now has people that measure fish. This is going to have to have people that measure fish.

DR. CRABTREE: That's why I bring up the hail-in/hail-out thing, because I think that makes the dockside validation a lot more efficient, because you know when a boat is going out and when they're going to come in, so you know where you need to be if you want to intercept one of the boats.

MR. WAUGH: There is a current project with MRIP, ACCSP, and the State of South Carolina to develop the verification and validation methodology, and so once that -- The ACCSP pilot that we're working on is being done in conjunction with that, so that the methodology will be consistent with that validation methodology, with the ultimate goal that this charter boat logbook would be certified as being MRIP compatible, and so that's all being addressed.

DR. CRABTREE: If I could, what's the timing on that study?

MR. WAUGH: It's going on now. I don't know when that specific project is scheduled to end.

DR. CRABTREE: I guess what I'm getting at is are we going to have any of the results of that before we take final action on this, so that we make sure that there aren't key things that are needed for validation that we didn't include in this or would we have to come back after the fact and adjust the program, I guess?

MR. WAUGH: Well, as I mentioned, the project that we're working on, and we can make sure and verify that these core data elements are everything that are needed for that MRIP validation. We can do that and ensure that it is covered prior to the September meeting.

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, I think that would be a good idea.

DR. PONWITH: To that exact point, validation is certainly crucial, and we've talked about this a lot. We're getting into the electronic piece, because that is the piece that we need the regulation for to make it mandatory. The validation is the other half of the whole. Without validation, the electronic reporting isn't a program. The trick with the validation though is -- My understanding is, because we're using dockside intercepts to validate MRIP, the authority for gathering those data exists already, and so I'm not sure -- I mean we can look into that, and that's a good thing to do, to look into it to see whatever protocols we use from a science standpoint to validate these electronic reports that we have the authority to do, but I think the reason we're doing this in council and not in a science meeting is we need the regulations to make electronic reporting mandatory. I am worried about validation. It's crucial, but I don't think we need regulations from this council to be able to do it.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay. Just so you all know, I would like to wrap this committee up in the next nine minutes, because we do have some very pressing issues coming.

MR. BOWEN: To Dr. Crabtree and Mr. Carmichael's discussion a while ago, John, if you will, keep in mind that we've got -- I'm recalling from memory, but we've got seventy-six headboats. They are probably a lot easier to validate with the dockside intercepts than the 1,500 charter boats that we're going to have. I just wanted to put that on the record, and validation is -- I mean it's key. I respectfully disagree with Dr. Ponwith that I think this council needs to somehow instill some regulations, to make sure these catches and trips are validated. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: I am going to be part of the pilot project for the SAFMC and ACCSP, and they're going to be sending me an iPad with the satellite features on it, GPS and satellite features. When we enter it in there, it will give those locations there whenever we send our reports.

MR. BOYLES: I wanted to just remind the committee that we have talked a lot and the council has talked a lot about citizen science. With South Carolina, with twenty-plus years of experience in collecting this data, and to Mel's point earlier, we sort this data all the time. Is it valid? Sometimes we don't know, but when we go to our General Assembly, to our decision makers, we say this is reported data. This is what we have in terms of reported data, and I will tell you that I think, and I don't want to speak for Mark, but I think if you went to South Carolina charter operators, they feel they are more invested in the management and the decision making because of it, and so I would just remind you that we're spending a lot of time and a lot of effort to do citizen science. This is a perfect way to complement that. Thank you.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Robert. Okay. I know Anna has a motion that she would like to bring forth.

MS. LOWERY: I just wanted to raise one concern before you do your motions. In the introduction here, there was a concern raised by the IPT regarding the required nature of these core data elements and how that might restrict NMFS's ability to kind of adapt as needed, and so I think that Monica discussed this at your last meeting as well and raised some concerns, and so I wanted to just make sure that that concern isn't lost, and maybe you can have some discussion about how to approach that. It seems, I think, certainly reasonable to have these data elements identified potentially, as I think discussed, in an appendix or examples for reference, something along those lines.

MR. HAYMANS: I think as the staff or the IPT develops this amendment that these will be data elements as determined to include or some language to keep them from being locked in, correct?

MR. CARMICHAEL: As I said earlier, the recommendation is that these be included in the text and they be included in the discussion, but they're not included as actions is the IPT's recommendation.

DR. DUVAL: I'm not on the committee, but I think we did have some discussion about this at previous committee meetings. I am fine with not specifying this in regulation. I agree that they need to be specified in the document somewhere. We had discussion with the SSC about this, that in order to help build this trust among our stakeholders that they need to see what we're going to be asking them to submit, and so it's got to be in the document, but I understand that, in order to have flexibility, we don't want to specify that in the regulation, and I don't think we do it for the commercial vessels either, and so I am fine with that. I don't think we need to spend a lot of time talking about it.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you. What we need to address then -- Is everyone okay with the core data elements as presented and/or do we want to zero in a bit on the locale, rather than ten-by-ten? Do we refine that a bit, to perhaps one-by-one? On the econ side, I mean we don't have specific elements other than cost per trip. Does that want to be one of the elements?

MR. CARMICHAEL: There is no econ things listed here in the third column as the core variables. The headboat program collects information on fuel and price per gallon, and those are actually -- The reason they're not in here was because of the resounding objections we heard to those when we went out to public hearing on this and talked about the variables.

MR. WAUGH: Sorry to belabor this a little bit, but I would urge caution in not specifying those data elements in the amendment. As Zack has pointed out, this is very contentious. If you fix those, we have frameworks. We can change that in the course of two council meetings. We have been working with the Center to try and get those statistical grids adjusted for over twenty years and they haven't been adjusted. We have been trying to get this voluntary logbook program going now for close to two years, and so it isn't an issue of it being hard or difficult or take a long time to adjust those. You all have to decide whether you want to be in control of that or whether you want to let NMFS make the changes to the data elements with or without your input. That's the issue for you to decide.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Gregg, for that advice.

MS. BECKWITH: For the core variables, I think the ones that are listed, minus the discussion on the ten-by-ten versus the one-by-one, should be left sort of as the core. I think, again, my personal feeling is that the economic and the discard information should be a separate table, maybe specifying that that sort of information would be sought after in a survey, in a sub-survey, format, but I think if our industry sees the sort of extended laundry list of core variables -- It's my personal feeling that we're going to get a little bit more pushback, while maybe a sub-survey will be less difficult for them to accept.

MR. BOWEN: I respectfully disagree with Anna about the discards. I don't see how we can -- Knowing what we know with the red snapper assessment, I do not see how we can make a conscious effort to pull discards out of core variables. That is a very important piece of the dataset.

MS. BECKWITH: Sorry, but I didn't mean to take the discards out. The number of releases is under the core variable. Where John had discussed earlier seeking additional information on if those fish were released, the status of the release, if they were vented, if additional equipment was used to descend them, that sort of additional survey information would be appropriate as a sub-survey. I think the number released by species is an appropriate core variable.

MR. BOWEN: To your point, Anna, I feel like the more information we can get, in terms of discards, on this reporting, the better off we're going to be.

MR. COX: I was just going to say the commercial guys, the information is requested, the price for fuel and things like that. We do it in our discards, and it seems -- Once you get into the habit of doing it, it's not a big deal.

MR. HAYMANS: Does anyone wish to add anything to the core variables?

DR. PONWITH: I'm not a member of your committee, but, in this amendment, the amendment rolls the headboat collection into the for-hire collection, and losing econ data in that process would be a steep loss. Those data are really crucial. I'm concerned about this.

MR. HAYMANS: Is there a committee member willing to make a motion on the core variables and perhaps add in anything that's not included there, such as econ or the grid?

MR. BOWEN: **I would go on Dr. Ponwith's recommendation that we add the econ in with the core variables, such as price per trip, fuel used, and price per gallon.**

MR. HAYMANS: We have a second from Jack and discussion from Roy.

DR. CRABTREE: I am getting some input back from my office about things they need for economic analysis, and one of those is target species, and I see we do have that on here. It says target as categories, and does that mean snapper grouper or --

MR. HAYMANS: It's to the species level, isn't it? Yes, it's to the species level. That's the intent, yes.

MR. CARMICHAEL: It's target and it's suggested that it could be considered as category snapper grouper, coastal migratory, or something else. You know someone is going to implement this, and there is a level of detail that more data experts should probably be involved in, and that's certainly what we've heard back from the SSC, the Science Center, and the IPT.

What we've tried to do here is not be entirely prescriptive about what we want, but we do want to collect information on the target categories, on the target species, and suggesting doing it as categories may be a more efficient way to balance the need for fishermen to report so much or maybe they have multiple target species that they go after, and so this was seen as a way of giving some flexibility and efficiency.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay. We have a motion.

MR. BOWEN: Dr. Crabtree, if you're in communication with your office while this motion is being brought forth, is there anything that you or your office would like to see that we can put in here?

DR. CRABTREE: So far they mentioned target species. If something else pops up, I will let you know, but that's what I have.

MR. BOWEN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HAYMANS: Would the motion maker care to add anything regarding location? Do you want to tighten it down?

MR. BOWEN: Yes, sir. **I would, again, go with Dr. Ponwith's recommendation and try to get it to one-by-one-square-mile blocks.**

MR. HAYMANS: Is that okay with the seconder? Jack says it is.

MR. BOWEN: Can I add limited entry in there too, or this isn't the time for that?

MR. CARMICHAEL: **What I added there was to modify area reporting to be consistent with the existing headboat reporting.** Is that the intent?

MR. HAYMANS: If that's a one-by-one grid, then yes.

MR. BOWEN: **Yes, sir.**

MR. CARMICHAEL: They collect a lat/long off a chart, correct? That can then be reported at various expanded aggregations.

MR. BOWEN: I was under the impression, when this amendment got started, that we were trying to -- I think it was quoted that we were trying to mimic the headboat reporting, and, as close as we can align ourselves to that with them, I think the better off this reporting will be.

MR. CARMICHAEL: As I said, the only reason that it didn't go that route was because of deferring to the South Carolina program, because you also made an intent that you want this to be a single reporting thing, that people who now have to file multiple reports could file this report. You were trying to avoid stepping on too many toes, in terms of making them change. When we go to this, then South Carolina, to continue, their program and their fishermen will have to shift over to finer detail in terms of their area reporting, but we should make sure that that's clear as a consequence of this motion.

MR. BOWEN: Yes, sir.

DR. DUVAL: The other thing we're trying to do here is be consistent with similar efforts in the Mid-Atlantic, as per the déjà vu that we heard earlier. There are multiple efforts moving forward,

and we want to make sure that, for folks who are operating under Northeast permits and Southeast permits, that they're only having to hit one button to submit one report.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you. Is there any additional discussion on this motion? **The motion reads: To move to include in the charter amendment the core variables as listed, to add economic variables of charter fee (price per trip), fuel used in price per gallon, and to modify area reporting to be consistent with the existing headboat reporting. If there is no other discussion, is there any opposition? Seeing none, that motion is passed.**

Is there any move to either direct this to be included in the text of the document or to make it a specific management action and alternative? We have heard both sides, from the IPT and from the Executive Director. What is your preference?

MR. CARMICHAEL: I would think, the way this is, this is including it in the document as text. If you want to specify this as an action, then we'll need a motion that says to specify core variables as an action in the amendment.

DR. PONWITH: I had a talk with the director of ACCSP about this, and he has bumped into this concern as well, in terms of wanting the information out there, but not wanting to handcuff you and make you, from a science standpoint, less limber in being adaptive, as you learn new things.

What he has suggested in the past is that he's happy with how it has worked is creating a document that has the standards in it and then, in the amendment, having a reference to that document, so that if the program evolves, which likely it will -- Whenever you start something new, you learn things that you couldn't have anticipated, but it gives you the flexibility to make modifications for the better. That document citation doesn't change when the document has a new version.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you.

MR. BELL: Doug, as we include this in the document, I think what would be helpful, to address some of the concerns brought up, is to make sure, when we say here is a particular core element, that we explain the value of it and how it will actually improve things. That way, the fishermen get a sense of, okay, here's why they're asking that and here's how it will help improve my life, hopefully, and so that's just in how you format the presentation of the information in the document, but I think that is crucial to explain to them why we're asking for those particular data elements. Thanks.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you for that clarification. Good comment. Okay. Is there a motion to make it part of an action or alternative? If there's not, it stays as text. I see no motion, and so, John, I guess that means that it will stay as text in the document.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The final item on this is timing. It's been to public hearing. We're at the point of bringing it up for final approval and submission, and would you like to bring this to you for final approval in September? We need to have a motion, I guess, of specifying that.

DR. DUVAL: I think we pushed off final approval a couple of meetings ago, until at least September. I think my concern about having final approval in September is that we won't have

received the results from the pilot project yet, will we? I mean I think that's pretty key before finalizing this amendment.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am not on your committee, but I just throw that out there for consideration, and maybe if we had an update on the pilot or if we had some sense of some of the other moving pieces we're trying to coordinate with, in terms of what's going on in the Northeast. Bob, I don't know if you or Rob could provide any input on the timing of for-hire reporting through GARFO. That might be helpful as well.

MR. BEAL: Michelle, I'm not sure of the timing, but I think we can pretty easily find that out with Mike Cahall or talking to the folks up at GARFO, but, right now, I just don't recall, and some of it is administrative processes at the GARFO and Headquarters Region, and so those are a little bit unpredictable sometimes.

DR. DUVAL: Again, I think maybe, in September, if we can see a draft of the document, that would probably be helpful, so that we can see how the core variables are laid out, how they're explained in the document. Then I think one of the other key things we're probably going to want to talk about in September is also outreach, and so I think there are a few things we need to address, like what the results are of the pilot program, what kind of outreach we're going to conduct to educate folks and try to get them onboard with this, and hopefully demonstrate how this will make their lives easier and not more complicated.

MR. HAYMANS: Excellent points. Thank you.

MR. BELL: The pilot project we're participating in related to dockside validation with data collection actually goes through September, and so I think Michelle is on the right track. I there is a number of things we could bring back and look at in September, but not necessarily for final approval.

The other thing to keep in mind is the Law Enforcement AP will be kind of discussing, and we talked about this at the last meeting, but the whole integration of law enforcement and proper compliance and all of that sort of thing, and so that's another essential moving part, as Roy and others have brought up, and so we will be dealing with that in August. I don't think we will necessarily be ready in September for final approval. Thanks.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, Mel.

MS. BECKWITH: Two quick things. One, I still have that motion, and so I'm going to toss that out there. Then, after that, I was going to ask if, since this may or may not pass and we have all of these proposed core variables, would it make sense to send this out along with the other public hearing information, since there's not technically new information in the document, but certainly the industry has not seen what we are proposing as a core variable, and so it would give them a public opportunity to give us some feedback.

I'm going to go ahead and toss out my motion. **I move to add a description into the amendment that it is the intent of the council to use compliance with logbook reporting as an eligibility criterion for a future for-hire limited entry program.**

MR. HAYMANS: Does what's on the screen capture your motion?

MS. BECKWITH: It does, and I am personally interested in not having it say "possible", but that's up to the council.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I just ask that because I was thinking if we say "for a future for-hire limited entry program", it implies that you will have one, and so I was just questioning, if we don't have one, should we say "possible"?

MS. BECKWITH: Given that we put a control date in yesterday, we're also giving people notice that we're looking into one, and so I am okay with not putting in "possible", but, again, I'm just one person. I think the intent is to make very clear to the industry that, if the council moves forward with a for-hire limited entry program, that this would be a criteria.

MR. HAYMANS: Is there a second?

MR. COX: I will second it.

MR. HAYMANS: Is there discussion on the motion?

MR. BOWEN: **I make a motion that we table that.**

MR. HAYMANS: Who is my parliamentarian here?

DR. CRABTREE: Normally, if you table something, you are tabling it to later in the meeting, which I don't think Zack is doing. I think you're making a motion to postpone discussion.

MR. BOWEN: Yes, sir.

DR. CRABTREE: Until when?

MR. CARMICHAEL: You table if you have something more pressing to do.

DR. CRABTREE: Normally, you're postponing it until when?

MR. BOWEN: Until I have time to think about it.

MR. WAUGH: Zack, what you would want to do is either specify a later time at this meeting or to the next meeting.

MR. BOWEN: **To the next meeting.**

MR. HAYMANS: There was a second. Does the tabled motion need a second?

MR. BOWEN: The tabled motion didn't need a second the last meeting.

MR. HAYMANS: I am hearing two different things. Okay. It requires a second. Is there a second to the postponement to the next meeting? We have a second from Robert. Is there discussion on postponement?

DR. CRABTREE: Yes, there is. It's debatable.

MR. HAYMANS: It is debatable.

MS. BECKWITH: So I would ask Zack to explain his reasoning, if he could.

MR. BOWEN: One, you brought this up without -- I mean I need time to think about it, and I think the rest of the committee and council probably needs time to think about it. Can you go back, so I can read it? I mean it says -- Again, I need time to understand it and think about this motion. I think that's a pretty important motion. Eligibility criteria for any possible future for-hire limited entry program, when we -- We just had a vote yesterday, and it didn't go through, and I just need time to think about it.

DR. CRABTREE: The problem I see, Zack, is, if we pass your motion, then we're done with it and we're not going to discuss it. Then we're going to come in at the next meeting, where we're going to take final action on this, and we're going to have to decide everything there without the benefit of the discussion today, and so it seems to me we would be better to discuss this today and then at least get through the discussion.

MR. BOWEN: I don't think we are going to take final action in September. That's what we just, I think, decided a while ago.

DR. CRABTREE: So when are we taking final action now?

DR. DUVAL: It was my suggestion that we wait until after we get the results back from our pilot program, both the validation program that the State of South Carolina is doing as well as the pilot program that the council is doing through its ACCSP grant, where there are several charter captains within each of the states that are pilot testing the hardware and the software.

DR. CRABTREE: How far out is all of that again?

MR. CARMICHAEL: The program is underway. It has not started as fast as we had hoped. There will be some data collection going on this summer, and, by September, we should have some data collection, but the program will continue into next year. The final results from the pilot study are probably March of next year, at the earliest, but we should have some preliminary feedback in September and probably certainly know what happened this fall, during the fall fishing and summer fishing, by December.

MR. HAYMANS: Mr. Boyles has a parliamentary inquiry.

MR. BOYLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A point of parliamentary inquiry, maybe, or clarification. I believe a motion to table, I think, was in order, in order to give Zack time to think about this and these other things, and it would require a formal action by a member of the committee to pull it off of the table, and so that's the way I was --

MR. HAYMANS: That is different than the motion that is written and was seconded, which is a motion to postpone.

MR. BOWEN: I made the motion to table discussion.

MR. HAYMANS: Right, which is why it's now a move to postpone, and we are eating up valuable time for a very much needed discussion on cobia here shortly, and so let's take a vote on this motion to postpone until the next meeting. All of those in favor of the motion, raise your hand, please.

MR. BOWEN: With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, that's not the motion I made.

MR. HAYMANS: Zack, the motion, as written and seconded, was to postpone, after a brief discussion, between tabling and postponing. Now that we've had that discussion and Robert clarified table or postpone, I don't know that we can go back to the table. It's a postponement now.

MR. BOWEN: Well, that's not the original motion I made.

MR. BREWER: I am not on your committee, but you can make a motion to table, which is what you originally did. Then you said to a time certain.

DR. CRABTREE: That's a motion to postpone. If you want to bring this up at the next meeting, that is not a motion to table. It's a motion to postpone until a time certain, and it is debatable. If you want to have a motion to table this until we dispense with some other matter and then come back to it later today, that's a motion to table, and that's not debatable.

MR. BREWER: Zack, what you want to do is what the motion is. You want to postpone it to the next meeting. That's what your intent was, but you used the word "table", which is a different kind of motion.

MR. BOWEN: My intent was to not talk about this until September, when I've had time to think about it.

MR. HAYMANS: The motion that is on the board is what will do that. Okay?

MR. BOWEN: Okay. Yes, sir.

MR. HAYMANS: Okay. The motion is to postpone until the next meeting, September of 2016. **All of those in favor of the motion, raise your hands, four; all of those opposed, three. The motion carries.** We will deal with it in September.

MR. BOWEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm sorry for the hang-up and the time it took to get that done.

MR. HAYMANS: We're going to do the Citizen Science Update in two minutes. John, go.

MR. CARMICHAEL: The citizen science, as hopefully most of you guys are aware, we participated in a NOAA Quest Webinar near the end of May. It went quite well. There was great feedback and a great turnout. We had eighty-eight or eighty-nine people who were involved, which was actually pretty good for the series, and a lot of interest in getting our presentation, which is great, and so I think that really helped get the word out to a lot of folks, and we continue to receive a lot of positive feedback on the program.

The next step that's coming up is attending the IMCC, International Marine Conservation Congress, the first of August. It's up in St. John, and there will be presentations on the program, and there is going to be -- I think it's called a focus group. They're going to be getting together with folks and experts who are there and attendees and talking about the program. What we're hoping to get out of the focus group is some feedback on some of the real citizen science aspects of the program, which we as fisheries folks are not quite as well versed in, but our contingent has a good plan in place for the focus group, and we're going to send them off and wish for great success while they're up there in the great cold of St. John.

MR. HAYMANS: Thank you, John. Is there any other business to come before this committee? Seeing none, I do apologize for the overrun, but this committee is concluded.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned on June 16, 2016.)

Certified By: _____ Date: _____

Transcribed By:
Amanda Thomas
July 26, 2016

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COMMITTEES

ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

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

CATCH SHARES

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

DATA COLLECTION

- ✓ ~~Mel Bell~~, Chair **ROBERT BOYLES**
 - ✓ Doug Haymans, Vice-Chair
 - ✓ Anna Beckwith
 - ✓ Zack Bowen
 - ✓ Mark Brown
 - ✓ Chris Conklin **VIA WEBINAR**
 - ✓ Jack Cox
 - ✓ Wilson Laney
 - ✓ Charlie Phillips
 - ✓ Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative
- Staff contact: John Carmichael

DOLPHIN WAHOO

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

**HABITAT PROTECTION AND
ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT**

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

EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

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

GOLDEN CRAB

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

HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

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

(Continued)

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

COUNCIL CHAIR

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

VICE-CHAIR

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
2016 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (continued)

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

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

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

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

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

ERIKA BURGESS
NEK MEHTA
RECK DEVICTOR
DR. JACK MCGOVERN
DR. BONNIE PONWETH
DR. MIKE LARKIN
DR. ANDY STRELCHECK
DR. MARCEL REICHERT
TRACY DUNN
JEFF RADONSKI
SOCELYN D'AMBROSIO
IRIS LOWERY
JIM ESTES
ROB O'REILLY
CAPT. MARK GORDON
JOHN SANCHEZ

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
COUNCIL STAFF

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

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

✓ **Deputy Director - Management**
Dr. Brian Chevront
brian.chevront@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**
Myra Brouwer
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

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

Financial Secretary
Debra Buscher
deb.buscher@safmc.net

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

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

✓ **Purchasing & Grants**
Julie O'Dell
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**
Chip Collier
chip.collier@safmc.net

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

✓ **Administrative Officer**
Mike Collins
mike.collins@safmc.net

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

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

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

✓ **Fishery Economist**
John Hadley
john.hadley@safmc.net

| Timestamp | Full Name | Email | Mailing Address (If your | How do you participate in fisheries in the South Atlantic? (Check all that apply) |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| 6/16/2016 9:09:21 | Dick Brame | dbrame55@gmail.com | on file | Private Recreational Angler, Non-Governmental Organization |
| 6/16/2016 9:11:30 | Trip Aukeman | taukeman@ccaflorida.org | on file | Private Recreational Angler |
| 6/16/2016 9:30:39 | David Bush | davidbush@ncfish.org | on file | NCFA |
| 6/16/2016 10:22:10 | Frank Helies | fchelies@att.net | on file | Non-Governmental Organization |
| 6/16/2016 10:44:29 | John Conley | thcjohn100@yahoo.com | on file | Commercial Fisherman |
| 6/16/2016 11:09:41 | Leda Dunmire | ldunmire@pewtrusts.org | on file | Non-Governmental Organization |
| 6/16/2016 12:59:27 | Elizabeth Jolin | elizabethjolin@bellsouth.net | on file | Charter/Headboat/For-hire |
| 6/16/2016 13:00:23 | Dean Foster | dfoster@pewtrusts.org | on file | Non-Governmental Organization |
| 6/16/2016 14:05:01 | William F. Coley | wmcoley1@gmail.com | on file | Private Recreational Angler |

THURSDAY - JUNE 16, 2016 WEBINAR ATTENDANCE

| Last Name | First Name | Email Address |
|------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Abeels | Holly | habeels@ufl.edu |
| Alvarado | Nicolas | Nicolas.Alvarado@noaa.gov |
| Anderson | Joshua | joshuamarlinanderson1@hotmail.com |
| Austin | Anthony | redress@ec.rr.com |
| Ballenger | Joey | ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov |
| Barber | John | johnb@revcmpsys.com |
| Beideman | Terri | terri.beideman@vac-usa.com |
| Bell | Mel | bellm@dnr.sc.gov |
| Berry | Kyle | Kmania13@gmail.com |
| Binns | Holly | hbinns@pewtrusts.org |
| Blow | Wes | wesamy2000@cox.net |
| Brennan | Ken | kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov |
| Brouwer | Myra | myra.brouwer@safmc.net |
| Bush | David | davidbush@ncfish.org |
| Byrd | Julia | juliabyrd@hotmail.com |
| CONKLIN | CHRIS | CONKLINSAFMC@GMAIL.COM |
| Caton | patrick | info@littleclam.com |
| Clarke | Lora | lclarke@pewtrusts.org |
| Crimian | Robert | rcrimian@tnc.org |
| Crosson | Scott | scott.crosson@noaa.gov |
| D'Ambrosio | Jocelyn | jocelyn.dambrosio@noaa.gov |
| Davis | Meghan Davis Joshua Davis | Christopher.Davis@mrc.virginia.gov |
| DeVictor | Rick | rick.devictor@noaa.gov |
| Desfosse | Joseph | joseph.desfosse@noaa.gov |
| Erwin | Gwen | gwen.erwin@myfwc.com |
| FARMER | NICK | nick.farmer@noaa.gov |
| Foster | Dean | dfoster@pewtrusts.org |
| Franco | Dawn | dawn.franco@dnr.ga.gov |
| French | Jonathan | french60wasp@gmail.com |
| Gerhart | Susan | susan.gerhart@noaa.gov |
| Gerhart | Susan | gerhartgreen@gmail.com |
| Gore | Karla | karla.gore@noaa.gov |
| Guyas | Martha | martha.guyas@myfwc.com |
| Hadley | John | john.hadley@safmc.net |
| Hudson | Rusty | DSF2009@aol.com |
| Iverson | Kim | kim.iverson@safmc.net |
| Jepson | Michael | michael.jepson@noaa.gov |
| Jiorle | Ryan | ryan.jiorle@mrc.virginia.gov |
| Johnson | Denise | denise.johnson@noaa.gov |
| Kemp | Brian | Kempbrian6971@gmail.com |
| Knowlton | Kathy | kathy.knowlton@dnr.ga.gov |

6/16/16 WEBINAR ATTENDANCE

| | | |
|------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|
| Lamberte | Tony | tony.lamberte@noaa.gov |
| Larkin | Michael | michael.larkin@noaa.gov |
| Lee | Jennifer | Jennifer.lee@noaa.gov |
| Levy | Mara | mara.levy@noaa.gov |
| MacLauchlin | Kari | kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net |
| Mahood | Bob | rmahood@mindspring.com |
| Malinowski | Rich | rich.malinowski@noaa.gov |
| Matthews | Tom | tom.matthews@myfwc.com |
| Mehta | Nikhil | nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov |
| Merrifield | Jeanna | jeannam@wildoceanmarket.com |
| Miller | Janet | janet.l.miller@noaa.gov |
| Morton | Sean | sean.morton@Noaa.gov |
| Neer | Julie | julie.neer@safmc.net |
| Park | Paul | paulpark1988@yahoo.com |
| Raine | Karen | karen.raine@noaa.gov |
| Ralston | Kellie | krralston@icloud.com |
| Records | David | david.records@noaa.gov |
| Renchen | Gabrielle | gabby.renchen@myfwc.com |
| Reynolds | Julia | reynoldsj@dnr.sc.gov |
| Sands | Kathleen | kathleen.sands@noaa.gov |
| Schwaab | Alexandra | alexandra.schwaab@accsp.org |
| Shipley | Krista | krista.shipley@myfwc.com |
| Shipman | Susan | susanshipman@att.net |
| Smit-Brunello | Monica | monica.smit-brunello@noaa.gov |
| Stephen | Jessica | jessica.stephen@noaa.gov |
| Takade-Heumacher | Helen | htakade@edf.org |
| Travis | Michael | mike.travis@noaa.gov |
| Uibel | Nicole | nicole.uibel@noaa.gov |
| Webster | Robert | websterp@dnr.sc.gob |
| bublely | walter | bublelyw@dnr.sc.gov |
| c | joe | joe@va.gov |
| cimino | joe | joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.gov |
| holiman | stephen | stephen.holiman@noaa.gov |
| kilgour | morgan | morgan.kilgour@gulfcouncil.org |
| pugliese | roger | roger.pugliese@safmc.net |
| rindone | ryan | ryan.rindone@gulfcouncil.org |
| smart | tracey | smartt@dnr.sc.gov |
| vara | mary | mary.vara@noaa.gov |