

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE**

**King and Prince Hotel  
St. Simons Island, Georgia**

**March 5, 2015**

### **SUMMARY MINUTES**

#### **Dara Collection Committee:**

Mel Bell, Chair  
Jack Cox  
Dr. Wilson Laney  
Mark Brown

Dr. Roy Crabtree  
Dr. Michelle Duval  
Jessica McCawley

#### **Council Members:**

Lt. Morgan Fowler  
Zack Bowen  
Charlie Phillips  
Doug Haymans

Ben Hartig  
Anna Beckwith  
Chris Conklin  
Chester Brewer

#### **Council Staff:**

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

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

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

Monica Smit-Brunello  
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith  
Roy Williams  
Iris Lowery  
Robert Boyles

Erika Burgess  
Pres Pate  
Dr. Jack McGovern  
Sp. Agt. Tracey Woodruff

Additional Observers Attached

The Data Collection Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Sidney Lanier Ballroom of the King and Prince Hotel, St. Simons Island, Georgia, March 5, 2015, and was called to order at 3:55 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: We'll go ahead and call the Data Collection Committee to order. We had a slight change in membership, so it is myself, Jessica McCawley, Jack Cox, Michelle Duval, Roy Crabtree, Wilson Laney and we will be adding Mark Brown to the committee. .

The first item will be approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda? Seeing none; the agenda stands approved. The next item would be approval of the December 2014 minutes. Are there any changes needed to the minutes, any edits? Seeing none; then the minutes from the December 2014 meeting stand approved. The first item on the agenda is the status of bycatch reporting in the Southeast for CE-BA 3, and that will be Jack and then Bonnie; I guess a two-part presentation or something like that.

MR. WAUGH: The background information for Jack's presentation is Attachment 1 in the Data Collection Committee; and then there is a folder in there that is called presentations and that has a short presentation that Bonnie will be going through.

DR. McGOVERN: You probably remember that last fall Dr. Ponwith and Dr. Crabtree assembled a workgroup to look at the current SBRMs and to recommend changes that could be made through the fishery management council process. I am the lead on this workgroup for the Southeast Region and Dr. Jim Nance is the lead for the Science Center.

We also have regional representation. Steve Branstetter is on there for the Gulf of Mexico; Bill Arnold, the Caribbean; Jennie Lee represents Protective Resources; we have Nick Farmer on there to do data analysis; and Shepherd Grimes is on there from General Counsel. I gave an update in December; and since December we've continued to collect information on the standardized bycatch reporting methodology that is in place for 16 FMPs.

That is what we're dealing with, 16 FMPs from the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean and the South Atlantic. We are also gathering information on what is being done to collect bycatch in those different areas. There are things in place like things that require biological opinions and things like that.

Thus far we've met a number of times, and we've assembled these very large spreadsheets and populated them with all this information. We've continued to collect information on bycatch. Nick Farmer has looked at logbooks for commercial fisheries and for recreational as well and provided discards for the different fisheries.

He is going to work on that more and try to get discards by fishery and gear type. Jim Nance and the Science Center are looking at observer coverage; the need for observer coverage in different fisheries, and desired observer coverage where it is needed. We've also recently begun developing recommendations for improvements to SBRMs, and we are getting started on this. All this is being incorporated into a draft document that we're putting together that summarizes the SBRMs.

The bycatch collecting programs that are currently in place, level of bycatch associated with these fisheries, studies that have been conducted to measure bycatch, current levels of observer coverage; we're working on that and we'll be continuing to make progress on those as time goes on.

DR. PONWITH: If we could just jump right away to the next slide, this is a slide that should look familiar to you. It is the shrimp fishery coverage in the commercial South Atlantic shrimp fishery over the last several years. You will see in both terms of trips and sea days that the number of trips in sea days in 2014 is considerably lower than what is normal.

Of course, that raises a lot of questions. What I learned in that answer is we've got a little bit of work to do to be able to better understand what those shrimp vessels are doing. This is basically kind of a compliance problem. In 2014 a large number of selected vessels either didn't respond to the selection letter or they replied that they were not fishing, which in some cases can be true and some cases maybe isn't true.

The way the data collection is right now, it takes a fair bit of time to figure out whether they did have landings or not, which would be an indicator that they said they weren't fishing but they really were. It takes a long time for those factors to be resolved. Out of the 99 vessels that were selected to carry an observer, 16 trips were made – well, it looks like 17. Twenty-one of the vessels indicated they had either been sold or were not fishing.

Twenty-three of the vessels said they would take an observer but then didn't contact the program to schedule the trip. Thirty-five vessels did not reply to the certified letters and five vessels were officially cleared and excused from carrying an observer for some of the qualified reasons. What I think I need to do is with this kind of a situation, which is unusual in the patterns, is to work with the enforcement officers and probably the data collectors to come up with some protocols of how to best handle those; because often by the time you have the information you need to solidly confirm that something is afloat, it is a long period of time to get to that point.

Of course, if we were getting shrimp dealer reports on a weekly basis like we are the other species, we would have a mechanism to sort of cross-reference these cases. We don't have that in the South Atlantic or in the Gulf, so we are going to have to come up with a better solution if this becomes the pattern. It is something that we'll be talking about and keeping an eye on.

MR. BELL: I've got a couple questions, Bonnie. The vessels are selected from the list of federally permitted vessels. It is basically just those that fish federal waters and you don't ride the ones in state waters? Okay, so I guess December 2015 there will be a mandatory inspection required by Coast Guard that goes into effect, right, December? I've heard some discussion about whether you have to have that inspection in order to carry a NMFS observer; is that correct?

DR. PONWITH: Yes; it is my understanding that for an observer to be carried, you have to have the inspection, and not having the inspection is not an excuse for not carrying. If you are called and you get a selection letter, basically the next step is that if you don't have it, you are required to get that inspection.

MR. BELL: More pressure to get the inspection. One other quick question; the voluntary, how does the voluntary piece work?

DR. PONWITH: We've had some cooperative research projects that are set up to characterize vessel behavior and bycatch in landings. In those CRP programs, because they are carried out by a grantee – in this case I believe it is the Gulf and South Atlantic Fisheries Foundation – they don't have the authority to require them to carry an observer and so they find vessels that will voluntarily carry them. We use those data, but we tend to use those data differently.

MR. BELL: That is with other projects or things that are going on; they don't approach you and say; hey, I want to carry you out, how about going next week?

DR. PONWITH: Oh, yes, they stand in line.

MR. BELL: Are there any questions for Bonnie or Jack? All right, seeing none; we'll move to the next agenda item, which would be electronic technology data collection and monitoring implementation plan. Are you going to run through that, Gregg?

MR. WAUGH: I'll give a little bit and then Jack will give us an update. We've got some background, if you are interested in seeing how we got here, in the overview beginning on the bottom of Page 2. In addition, our original letter is included as Attachment 2A; that is a December 18 letter commenting.

In reviewing the revisions, a lot of our changes were made. You will see that the February 9, 2014, letter included as Attachment 2C acknowledges and thanks to NMFS for making those changes. We had several items that we highlighted that we would still like to see modified. The final plan has just been released. We e-mailed it to everybody.

I haven't had a chance to go through it to see where we ended up; but again this is a living document so we have the opportunity to make additional changes to it. I think Jack was going to give us an update on where that is now and what the next steps are sort of.

DR. McGOVERN: The final draft went on our website, I guess, on the 26th of February. Andy Strelcheck was the lead on it. Just some background; the goal of the plan is to provide an operational strategy for implementing and expanding the use of electronic technology for federally managed fisheries in the southeast.

The primary focus was expanding the use of electronic reporting. You guys are really familiar with it, so I won't go into all the contents of it. The plan incorporates input received from all three councils last summer; and the three councils in the southeast were briefed on the plan at their meetings in December and in January. It was made available for public comment from January 9th to February 9th.

Then the South Atlantic Council provided their comments, which is in the briefing book, on February 9th. There were a total of 43 comments that were received. Opposition to the plan; and there were 15 comments in opposition was primarily from the South Atlantic commercial and recreational fishermen who were opposed to the use of VMS and electronic monitoring systems.

Andy revised the plan based on public comment received, including the letter that was sent by the South Atlantic Council. A summary of the comments as well as the response to those comments is in Appendix 1 of the document that Mike just sent out. That is a brief summary of where we are.

MR. BELL: There were a couple different times that we provided comments, and I really appreciate the job Andy did. I went through the final version quickly, but I noticed some of the comments we made in the last suggested comments were picked up. I really appreciate Andy's hard work in this. I know it was a lot of work in moving on a fairly quick time table. He did a good job with that, so let him know. Are there any questions?

You have this document; it has been forwarded to you at least probably twice actually. If you have any questions about the document or anything in it that you want to comment now. If no comments on the document at this point, let's go to the next item, which would be status of implementation plan for a commercial logbook electronic reporting. Gregg, are you going to start that out?

MR. WAUGH: Again, our overview beginning on Page 4 lays out the history behind this. As of January 2015, the plan is to have that tablet-based system operational in the northeast by late spring or summer. Once that is operational in the northeast, it should be easily transferrable to the southeast. In talking with ACCSP, they have access to permits data through the copy of the permits data file that is provided to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center by the Region.

In discussions with Mike Cahall, he says based on the excellent cooperation on the part of the Southeast Regional Office, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, and ACCSP; all systems are on schedule for implementation of the voluntary use of the ACCSP electronic system to submit commercial logbook data sometime in the late summer of 2015.

It is looking good; things are moving along. I know the commercial fishermen are anxious to begin using that system. We should be ready sometime in late summer. Thanks to the Center and Region for all their work on that; that is progressing very well.

MR. BELL: I noticed, looking at the history here, Phil had brought up something about connectivity with the data, but we've got that worked out. We are all good there?

MR. WAUGH: Yes.

MR. BELL: So summer; stay tuned.

MR. WAUGH: Stay tuned for summer.

MR. BELL: Good deal, thanks. Thanks for your work on that. Are there any questions for Gregg about the status of that? Let's go to the next item then; update on commercial logbook pilot study. Bonnie, are you going to do that?

DR. PONWITH: This is something you've heard about before, and again it is an electronic logbook that goes kind of the next step; and that is to enable real-time documentation of the

fishing practices almost on a tow-by-tow or set-by-set basis depending upon the gear. A lot of this is going to look familiar, but the list of checkmarks gets longer each time we talk about it.

We've got vendors who have finalized software. This is based on input that we provided them on what the data requirements are and then let them develop the software. We finalized the infrastructure so that we have a way to ingest that information when it comes. We've got the actual equipment that we're going to be using based on secure a FTP server set up with ACCSP.

Again, we're grateful for those collaborations. We've recruited volunteer fishers for a pilot fleet. Again, we've got 11 vessels ranging from Galveston through North Carolina and 15 vessels testing a variety of gears, so vessels that have different gear types that we will be able to test this on. The behaviors of each of those are going to be different.

In 2015 our focus is working on hardware and software installation. Pilot data collection will begin as soon as the software is delivered, which we expect to happen right around now. Once we get the data collections begun, it gives us an opportunity to then start the feedback loop hearing back from the people who are carrying these systems to say this is working this is not or I've got a better idea and be able to make those modifications.

We anticipate those changes to be complete by August of 2015. If we go to the next slide, you can see some of the vendors. The notion of this is we create all of the data requirements. This is what has to happen on this system; but then we hand those specifications to a third party vendor. They take those specifications and develop the software, so that people who are interested in carrying this can go to the different vendors and see what the costs are, see what the additional bells and whistles are; but all of them meet the minimum requirements that we have for the way the system operates.

You will see that included in those vendors is ACCSP. We've got more vendors who are interested in participating, but, of course, we wanted to be able to get the pilot collection on, so we've held it at that. If you go to the last slide, you will see that of the vessels that are participating, they are kind of a geographic and fishery-diverse group.

We've got five from the South Atlantic, we've got some HMS vessels from around the region, and, of course, we've got six vessels in the Gulf of Mexico as well. Just to reiterate, different permits, different gears so we can actually look under the hood and see how those vessels interact with this software and hardware systems to get these data to us. That is my report. I think everything is going along smoothly. I haven't heard of any hiccups, so we're pretty much carrying this out as planned. Thank you.

DR. DUVAL: Just looking back at the vendor page; Seal Us, America is a vendor that has VMS hardware. Do you know is that the vendor that provides the hardware for the HMS fishery; do you know?

DR. PONWITH: I don't know the answer to that but I could probably find out.

MR. BELL: That brings up a good point about vendors and things. You notice we just talked about two different efforts going on, both dealing with commercial logbooks and both dealing with different vendors; ACCSP being common to both of them, which is good. Ultimately I

think the most important thing is particularly let's say from the science side is to identify the key features you need in the data, what the data elements are that need to be collected.

Then the vendor thing will at some point work out, but we've seen presentations from other vendors that have good products. It is not so much the product that ends up being available or multiple products available to use. It is making sure that you get what you need in terms of the data. As long as we are all coordinating and making sure once we're through all of this, the R&D is worked out, it all comes together.

DR. PONWITH: That is the beauty of it is working closely with ACCSP on their project. The notion is taking that same form that you fill out on paper, and skip the paper; being able to do it electronically. By working with them, we are positioned to be able to ingest those data as easily as if the paper went to someone to keypunch and the keypunch data came to us.

That is working out well. What this will be able to do is alleviate – how many times have we read criticisms of you want to know where I'm fishing; well, I don't stay put. I fish all over the place and there is one square on my piece of paper; what do I do about that? We've heard that for a really long time.

We also have had many times where the council is struggling with a decision that was spatially oriented of should we close this area or close that area or is the bycatch higher here or bycatch higher there? The rigidity of these paper logs makes that kind of analysis extremely difficult. Well, the system that we're talking about now will give us the granularity of those data to be able to answer those more sophisticated questions.

It is going to help the council, we believe it is going to help the industry in terms of having a much more refined feel for what is happening out there. I think right now we need to watch really closely. Again, I appreciate the opportunity to talk about this at each meeting with the council and keep you in the loop, because right now this is a pilot and it is being funded by a proposal that we wrote and got funded.

What we need to do is watch this pilot, talk to the industry folks that are involved and see what they think about it; do they like it; do they see the utility of it; talk to the data people and the councils about the type of data that we're able to get. If this is something that we want to do, the time actually to start looking for some funding to be able to shift to this type of a data collection is pretty much right now.

If we watch this and we say this is more than we think we need or more than we think we can afford; we can run the pilot study, put it in the wish list for later, and put the brakes on it. But if we like what we're seeing and we can see that this is going to be the direction the council needs to go, wants to go and the data collections and analysts are going to need this; it is a really good time to start talking about how would we finance this if we decided we wanted to go operational on this? That is an excellent opportunity then to turn back to that electronic reporting, electronic monitoring policy and plan that we're talking about.

There are some considerations in that for things like cost-sharing and how do you manage those costs. It is a good time to start talking about it, because it is not only the financing of it; it is do

we want this to be voluntary or do we want it to be mandatory? Those are other important discussions once we see what is under the hood of this.

MR. BELL: Thanks for that. Remember at the end of the day the whole purpose of all this is to enable us to get the science to make the decisions we need to make, but make life better for the fishermen as well. That is why I think they are so on board with working with this, because they realize the benefits from it. Related to the spatial thing, if you go back to the electronic monitoring reporting document, I think golden crab was actually used as an example in there of a fishery that might benefit from the use of electronic technologies and things.

DR. DUVAL: Bonnie, I also heard that there is a similar pilot that is being conducted in the northeast; are you aware of that? I just know this from talking to one of our fishermen who is participating in the pilot here; and he is one of those multiply permitted fishermen, HMS northeast permits, southeast permits. I was just curious what you know about that and what you could tell us about that.

DR. PONWITH: I know some about it. My data colleagues know quite a bit about it, and it is because they went to school on that project, what you like about it; what is going right, what is going wrong; help us avoid any box canyons here. They are in really close communication on this one.

DR. DUVAL: Just a follow-up, so it sounds like they are further along up there than we are down here in the pilot?

DR. PONWITH: That is correct; my understanding is I think it is at least a year jump on us.

MR. BELL: Yes; that is what happens with these; you have emerging technologies and things and use of stuff, and there are multiple things going on. It would be nice if all that could be kind of coordinated.

MR. COX: I was just going to say I am working with Brett Pierce, and I am one of the boats that signed up to do the program. I tell you the way we do business now is very cumbersome. I almost compare it to be if you did away with your e-mail and just used snail mail every day; that is how we're working with the Science Center. We are very excited about getting up and running with them.

MR. BROWN: Yes, Gregg, and I were having a discussion about this the other day. We were talking with Ken Brennan about the update with the headboat logbook, the electronic, and how it was modified I think last year. We were wondering what the size is of the area. When you report now and if the captain is reporting in degrees and minutes, it brings it down to within a square mile.

MR. BELL: Speaking of money; I noticed recently where a couple congressmen in Florida and Alabama, I guess, are looking for money to try to deal with electronic reporting and stuff to improve snapper grouper data. You are right; the time to look for money is now. There are probably multiple sources out there that we need to make ourselves aware of and to be looking for, because it is kind of on the front burner.



DR. DUVAL: Yes, Mel, I am glad you mentioned that. There was some press on that particular chunk of money, sort of urging that it all be dedicated to the Gulf, it sounded like. I would just put a huge plug forward for our region as well. It is not that we don't – you know, we could use a little bit of that money, also. I am just wondering, Gregg, I don't know what kind of recourse the council has to send a letter that the chairman signs to somebody sort of pleading our case down here for maybe pushing a little bit of money towards the Science Center.

MR. BELL: My understanding is while that was sort of presented in the article or whatever as kind of Gulf; I don't think that is necessarily the case. I think we can; I think we probably could ask to be considered for that. Yes, I think that is a good idea. We can explore options for doing that. That is the first thing I thought of is, hey, what about us, what about us?

It is not like we're rolling in the dough, and we have some things that we would like to accomplish that fit exactly what they're talking about; maybe not necessarily focused on red snapper, but I don't think it was all necessarily about red snapper. I think that was just the article I read was kind of focused on that.

Are there any other questions for Bonnie or anything about this particular topic right now? Okay, let's go to the last item on the agenda, which would be the Joint South Atlantic and Gulf Council Generic Charterboat Reporting Amendment. I guess, Gregg, you're going to walk us through the document?

MR. WAUGH: Yes. The first thing we want to touch on is what the Gulf Council did. They are administrative lead on this amendment. At their last meeting they approved a motion that the Data Collection Committee – and this passed at full council – directed staff to begin developing a plan amendment that would require electronic logbooks for the charter for-hire vessels in the Gulf and South Atlantic that considers the use of VMS and other recommendations from the Joint Council Technical Subcommittee.

We're going to talk about that. We have a draft decision document that deals with this issue of VMS. It also deals with the other recommendations from the Joint Council Technical Subcommittee. If you remember, Mike gave us a presentation at our last meeting on the final report. We've got that final report; that is included as Attachment 5B.

We're actually going to walk through Attachment 5A, which is a draft decision document. It addresses basically all of the items from the Technical Subcommittee. We've got a little background there just presenting the history of how we got here. This is pulled from our overview so that would be familiar to you.

I don't know to what extent you have had a chance to look at this. If you are ready to move on some of this, I put together a draft purpose and need. I got together with John Froeschke, who is the Gulf staff lead on this. We discussed this. There are several spots where he had some input that I will mention. But in terms of a purpose – and again this is patterned directly after the headboat reporting amendment that the two councils just completed. We figure between that and the Technical Subcommittee recommendations, we can jump this and get it moving pretty fast.

The purpose of the Joint South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico Generic Charter Reporting Amendment is to improve charter data collection methods to help ensure recreational annual

catch limit overages do not occur in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic fisheries. The need is to improve data collection methods and timeliness of reporting to limit overages of annual catch limits, to improve stock assessments, and to improve compliance in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic fisheries.

MR. BELL: If you will take a look at the purpose and need; in my opinion the purpose doesn't necessarily match the need exactly in that the main thing you will see in the purpose is all about monitoring catch for ACL compliance and all. If you look at the need, it talks about improving data collection for data that feeds into stock assessments and things.

In my opinion perhaps the purpose could be tweaked a little bit to be a little broader than just all about ACL coverage. Are there any thoughts on that? One thing that really stuck – and the reason I thought of that is we've had a logbook system in place for charterboats in South Carolina since 1993.

I'm looking at our form, and I'm thinking, well, there are things on here, if we structured it similarly to this that is useful other than just for ACL compliance. For instance, we ask about discards and all. If you have discard data, discard data is always good; disposition of discard, dead, alive, and those sorts of things. There is some utility to the data other than just quota monitoring, so to speak.

DR. DUVAL: I'm wondering if perhaps something like improve charter data collection methods to increase the accuracy of recreational catch data in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic fisheries. It is broad enough. Accurate data is important for stock assessments, and accurate catch data is important for monitoring of ACLs; so something along those lines, maybe. Yes, accuracy and timeliness.

MR. BELL: Maybe we add timeliness to that. Would you like to put that in the form of a motion?

DR. DUVAL: Yes, what if I simply move to approve the purpose and need as modified?

MR. BOWEN: I am not on your committee, so I appreciate the opportunity to speak. Before we all vote on that, can we tweak on that a little more? I have an idea if it is okay if I express it.

MR. BELL: Sure, the collective wisdom here is always good.

MR. BOWEN: Well, I think we need to have in there for the charter for-hire part, right before Michelle's addendum, it says "increase the accuracy and timeliness of recreational data", maybe "in the charter for-hire sector"?

MR. BELL: I thought about some of that, too, because I wasn't really sure how we put this together and all for consistency sake in wording; but I agree it would be clearer the way you are perhaps describing it, or charter sector.

MR. BOWEN: If you will, not only to help increase accuracy and timeliness – I'm having trouble reading it – but timeliness of catch, but also – and Anna and I had discussed the term difference, the definition meaning difference of either discards or – what was your term, Anna?

MS. BECKWITH: Well, in North Carolina we refer to the discards from the for-hire industry as releases; but semantics.

MR. BOWEN: Well, the purpose of this would need to in my opinion include not only catch, – but discard/releases.

MR. BELL: To that point, Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Yes, to that point; technically catch is all the stuff you keep and all the stuff that you release/discard do not keep. That is why I said data, because I think it encompasses that.

MR. BOWEN: Fair enough.

DR. DUVAL: Is that okay?

MR. BOWEN: It sounds good to me.

MR. BELL: My suggestion would be not to get too wordy in there, but I think we can cover it, and then we pick up a little bit more in the need. But we're thinking the same thing, I think, without the words.

MR. BOWEN: I appreciate that. I'm not on your committee, but this is near and dear to me.

MR. BELL: It is, and I appreciate your input.

MR. HAYMANS: I'm also not on your committee, but a question about accuracy. Are we improving in accuracy only through improving recall because of this one week that may wind up in here or is there something else that is going to improve their accuracy?

DR. DUVAL: I think we're modeling this after what was done for the headboat reporting amendment. I would think that the one-week recall would increase the accuracy of the information. The use of electronic technology would potentially increase the accuracy of the information. Then also if there is a catch location component to this, that could help increase the utility of the information, certainly.

MR. BELL: GA has some geo-reference stuff, and I think Roy wanted to say something.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, I was just going to say that in the Gulf charter fishery they are looking to be part of a census rather than part of an estimate. That is the ultimate goal here, I believe.

MR. HAYMANS: I completely understand that and am for this; but we've had a lot of discussions at home about whether this simply speeds up the inaccurate reporting or whether it actually does improve the accurate reporting. I just wanted to have a little something on the record as to why it would improve the accuracy.

MR. BELL: I think some of the things that Michelle just covered and an additional one that we kind of left off with is that there is interest in geo-reference data. If you go with electronic, it

could be really timely; like mash the button timely, it goes in that fast. That would hopefully improve your accuracy.

But, yes, that is a good point; what are the practical ways that your data would be more accurate? I think Michelle covered a number of those. Is there anything else on that? Is there any more tweaking? Do we need to read that then or read the motion? Yes, we need to read it and then have a second and then move from there I guess, right?

Right now the purpose reads, “The purpose of the Joint South Atlantic Gulf of Mexico Generic Charter Reporting Amendment is to improve charter data collection methods to increase the accuracy and timeliness of recreational charter data in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic fisheries.” That is the current wording.

MR. BOWEN: Again, thank you, I’m not on your committee. Wouldn’t it be better if the word “catch” was between “charter” and “data” since that encompasses what we catch, release, and discard? Thank you for your time.

MR. BELL: I’m fine with that if you want it?

DR. DUVAL: Do you really want to limit it to just catch data? What if there is other data?

MR. BOWEN: No, you’re right, if we can get some kind of GPS system on there, it wouldn’t be just catch data. You’re exactly right; thank you.

MR. BELL: Okay, the motion then was to adopt the wording for the purpose as modified. That is the motion. Do I have a second? Does anything need to be tweaked in the need? That looks good. **Okay, holding that wording; then the motion would be to approve the purpose and need as modified. Michelle made the motion; seconded by Jack Cox? Okay, that is the motion. Is there any objection to the motion? The motion stands.** What else do we want?

MR. WAUGH: The next item is Action 1, which begins on Page 5. This would amend the Gulf Reef Fish, South Atlantic Snapper Grouper, Coastal Migratory Pelagics and Atlantic Dolphin Wahoo Fishery Management Plans to modify data reporting for charter vessels. Alternative 1 is just stating what is in place now.

We will double check that no action wording to make sure that is correct. Alternative 2 – and again this is patterned after what was in the headboat amendment – would require that charter vessels submit fishing records to the Science and Research Director weekly via electronic reporting, via computer or internet. Weekly means seven days after the end of each week, ending on Sunday.

Alternative 3 would require that the reporting be done daily. Alternative 4 would require – and this is what we implemented for our headboats – require that charter vessels submit fishing records to the Science and Research Director weekly or at intervals shorter than a week if notified by the Science and Research Director via electronic reporting, via computer or internet. Weekly equals seven days after the end of each week.

That also tracks the commercial reporting. The Technical Subcommittee recommended that we change that timing, and this is something that John Froeschke pointed out to me. They would like to see the timing changed for all of the data to come in weekly on the Tuesday following each fishing week.

I put in a new Alternative 5 that would require that charter vessels submit fishing records to the Science and Research Director weekly or at intervals shorter than a week if notified by the Science and Research Director via electronic reporting, via computer or internet. Weekly equals the Tuesday following each fishing week.

Just before we start discussing, I just want to call your attention to the compliance measure that begins on Page 6, such that a vessel is only authorized to fish if they are current in their reporting. We've got the no-fishing forms. The issue of catastrophic measure is shown on Page 7. All of those items that we have in place for the headboat sector would be copied over to here.

Some of the Federal Register Regulations that we have here are outdated. Those need to be updated and make sure they track what is in place now. Actually we just want them to show what is in place now for charter vessels. We will fix that. Again, that new alternative would track the recommendation from the Technical Subcommittee.

MR. BELL: Okay; can we have some discussion of the alternatives under Action 1?

DR. DUVAL: I guess maybe a question for Bonnie. Right now the headboats report electronically, weekly, seven days after the end of each week; correct? I am just wondering what this new Alternative 5; to sort of bring things into the same reporting schedule as the commercial dealers, if that is the intent for the headboats as well.

DR. PONWITH: I am not sure if the intent was to make it like the commercial or whether there was some other motivation for going to the Tuesday. I know with the commercial the notion of Tuesday is to give that time to be able to get the records together, to have it go Tuesday to Tuesday. I am uncertain what the motivation for that as an alternative was.

DR. DUVAL: Gregg, you said John Froeschke requested that added. I was just curious if it was a Science Center thing, a Gulf thing; where it came from, that's all.

MR. WAUGH: This is shown on Page 9 of the decision document. It is a recommendation of the Technical Subcommittee. They recommend a trip level reporting with weekly submission due the Tuesday following the week.

MR. BELL: Mike might know something.

DR. ERRIGO: You are asking why Tuesday rather than just seven days. There was a lot of discussion about that. Part of the discussion had to do with recall bias and things like that. Of course, we wanted to give people time to get their stuff in order, in order to send it, but didn't want to leave too much time for the recall bias to get larger.

I can't remember who it was, but they were talking to me about after a week recall bias tends to go up by quite a bit. We felt that Tuesday was probably more than enough time, if it is

electronic, for them to get their reports in. It had to do with that and also to have it all synched up so that reports weren't coming in, well, my week finished here, this is the seven days. We wanted to make sure by Tuesday everyone sends in their report. If it is after Tuesday, you are late, and then that gives time for letters to go out and then; oh, I forgot to send in my report. Hopefully, by the actual end of the week you could get almost all of the reports.

MR. BELL: It is really about trying to standardize everything and get them on a schedule.

DR. ERRIGO: Right; and then, like I said, if people haven't turned in their reports, then that gives you time to send out e-mails or letters. They get those; gee, I didn't send in my reports, and hopefully be able to get those in by the actual end of the seven-day time period. This way in a timely fashion you would be able to actually have real records in hand.

MR. BELL: I don't know enough about the details of the different alternatives to say one is better than the other at this point, myself personally, but it sounds like that is a valid one to have included, certainly, Alternative 5.

DR. DUVAL: I assume that we would just need a motion to add that alternative to this action?

MR. BELL: I would think so.

**DR. DUVAL: Okay, well, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to make a motion to approve the range of Action 1 alternatives shown above for detailed analyses.**

MR. BELL: Okay, Zack, and this isn't a second, because you are not on the committee. I tell you what; let's do the motion and second. Motion from Michelle as written and Wilson second. Now, Zack.

MR. BOWEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman; again I am not on your committee. The alternatives; I have a little amendment I would like to make to all of those except for the first one.

MR. BELL: You want to propose some word changing for four out of the five?

MR. BOWEN: Yes, sir, but it is all the same word.

MR. BELL: Well, tell us.

MR. BOWEN: I would like to in two, three, and four, after the words "require the charter vessels submit fishing records", I would like to add "of landed and released catch" to all three of those Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. It would read "submit fishing records of landed and released catch to the science and research", blah, blah, blah, after that; but those four words.

MR. BELL: Yes; I follow what you're saying; but if you think about it, they will design the form, the record and I would assume it would include that data. You don't really have to – it is just some additional detail there; but that would already be included in what the fishing record would be, perhaps, I am assuming how this is designed. Is that right?

MR. WAUGH: Yes. One other thing, Zack, if you are specific to just the landed-and-release catch, then you are saying that is all that we can collect. You wouldn't be able to collect information on fishing depths, information on fishing area. If that is the intent in leaving it broad to say fishing records, then we will lay out all the specific data elements.

MR. BOWEN: How about wording it something; "but not limited to"; put that kind of wording in it.

MR. BELL: I don't really think you need that level of detail at this point. It is just like the way our system works right now – this is the record; this is the report. You send in your completed report, and we populate that with the data fields that we're looking for. You don't really have to go into that. The other thing I would think is if you establish it that rigidly, then you've got no flexibility down the line for additional data, perhaps.

MR. BOWEN: Well, I appreciate the opportunity. The discards are a driving force and it is –

MR. BELL: I understand what you are saying. That will be in there; that is what I am saying. I think you can get that in there; that becomes your catch.

DR. DUVAL: I appreciate exactly what Zack is trying to do. He just wants to make sure that detail is in there, and that those are data elements that would absolutely be collected. I think it is probably tough to tell only because we just don't have a list of those data elements right now. It is hard for folks to I guess see exactly the range of data elements that might be collected.

MR. BELL: I will say your desires are my desires in terms of what I think needs to be in there. If I were designing the data fields, that is my understanding, because that discard information is essential. When we talk about improving stock assessments and the benefits from this, that is some of that data. That is captured. If you start trying to list every little data element now, you would really have to list them all kind of if you follow what I'm saying. We're in total agreement on what needs to be in there.

MR. BOWEN: I'm not on your committee; I appreciate the opportunity.

MR. BELL: Well, this is what you do for a living. I understand that.

MR. WAUGH: We will have a draft list of the data elements in the next version that you see in June. You will be able to see everything that is there and make sure we've got discards and anything else adequately covered.

MR. BELL: I've got a motion; I've got a second. Is there any further discussion of the motion?  
**Any objection to the motion? Motion carries.**

MS. BECKWITH: Is the committee going to consider establishing the preferred so the general public can start to see where we're moving towards?

MR. BELL: Yes, I was going to ask about that.

DR. DUVAL: I guess I was thinking that we would not select preferreds at this time, because there is no analysis to inform what your preferred would be. It is really sort of continuing with making sure that there are all the alternatives that we want in there first for analysis. Our attorney usually advises us not to.

DR. PONWITH: We were just conferring over here. If the ultimate desire is to have better data, having this electronic data is going to do that. If the idea is to be able to recognize very quickly where you are in season relative to an ACL, then the most accurate way of getting those data, which is sort of the gold standard electronic reporting system, is for that electronic reporting to happen on the vessel and for that report to be sent before that vessel hits the dock, before they have knowledge of whether they are going to be intercepted by either an enforcement officer or a dockside sampler.

Because, right now if you report weekly and we intercept a subset of all the people that went fishing; the way we would validate those self-reported logs would be to look at the average landings of people who reported that weren't sampled and average landings of people who were sampled and see if there is a statistical difference in the numbers or the species' composition.

That would give you an indication that there was some reporting error in those electronically reported data. It is comparing an average to an average. It is technically possible; it is just not as precise. The more precise way to do that would be if a charter vessel, before they hit the dock, pushed the send button on that report.

Then a person would encounter them as part of their random sampling and they would say I see what is in your fish box. Then electronically we would take this sampler's report and match it to what was reported electronically. We would get a one-to-one relationship between that report and what was in the fish box and was actually seen as opposed to looking at an average compared to an average.

It would be a much more precise way with a much higher level of accountability. The real question that we were consulting on here is the way this reads right now is the requirement is weekly unless the Science and Research Director says that it needs to happen more often. The question is if that word comes, if the council is ready to go to that sort of day-to-day reporting before you hit the dock; is that enforceable? Is that daily reporting enforceable or is only the weekly reporting enforceable?

MR. BELL: I assume that is a Monica question.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'm sorry; my head was in the NEPA World. Would you summarize your question? I didn't know you were going to ask.

DR. PONWITH: The thumbnail sketch of that question is right now the alternatives are reporting weekly unless a more frequent reporting is requested from the Science and Research Director. If the Science and Research Director says I want daily reporting because we have created that flexibility for us; is that daily reporting enforceable?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: You're talking about this draft document that is before everybody. I think you would have to build that into the document ahead of time, right? If the Science and



Research Director says that we need daily reporting and that is required; there is some notice that has to be given to the individuals as to what you're requiring.

If you are requiring normally weekly and you want to switch to daily, and you have built your document such that that could happen, I think that would be fine; but we've got to make sure that the reporting public had adequate notice that they needed to start reporting daily. One, you want it; but, two, you want to be able to enforce it, so they need notice.

MR. BELL: To that point, Roy?

DR. CRABTREE: Well, sort of. We have talked about this in the Gulf a lot. When I hear the expectations from people in the Gulf about what we are going to be able to do with this data, which is to track the quotas on a daily basis, it does seem to me that the best program and the best data would come from a system where you had to hail-in and hail-out.

You had to submit your electronic logbook before you hit the dock. You have to come to the dock to a pre-identified landing location that is in a law enforcement database, so that an enforcement officer could meet you at the dock with your logbook in his hands and see if it matches up with what is in the box.

That is very similar to the way the IFQ program works; and they have VMS and all these things. They are met at the dock by law enforcement officers who check out what they've got. A lot of this has come – in the Gulf at least – has come from duly permitted charterboats that are also in the IFQ program and all that. At the end, it becomes a balance of how much burden you want to put on these guys in exchange for getting real-time, real quality, and enforceable kinds of data.

I don't know where that balance is going to come out. I am a little worried that just having them get on their computer at home once a week and enter what they catch – I mean, I used to run a charterboat – my worry is that they will just do it from memory. I'm not so sure how great that is going to be. There is a lot to this, and I am not quite sure where all this is going to come down at the end of the day in terms of how you do it; but it is going to be a tradeoff between putting reporting burdens on people and where is that balance in tradeoff?

MR. BELL: We may find ourselves talking about a little bit of this in Action 2, but, Roy, did you have something you wanted to say to this first?

MR. WILLIAMS: Well, Dr. Crabtree has already said most of what I was going to say. The Gulf Council I think is thinking in terms of daily reporting. I think the length of the red snapper season for the recreational fishermen probably dictates that this is going to have to be daily to try to account for red snapper.

The charter fishery I believe hopes that in the long term – right now they are part of a 20 percent buffer on red snapper. What they are allowed to catch is 20 percent lower than what they would be able to catch if they were fully accountable for their catch and had daily reporting. I believe that is their long-term goal is to try to report every day, so that they can get out of this 20 percent buffer that they are under right now. They've talked in terms of VMS requirements for these reef fish boats at least that are targeting red snapper.

They've discussed hail-in and hail-out, and they have looked at ways among themselves trying to figure out ways to validate the daily catches like having another charter fisherman review their catch and sign off on it; put his or her name on the validity of it.

If the red snapper season continues to be fairly short, I think the council is probably going to be targeting daily reporting. Really, in terms of a charter fisherman that is the unit of effort is the daily fishing trip; so it makes sense to try to collect it that way if you can. The problem is going to be perhaps in the size of some of these boats. Some of the boats are real small, some are big. It is going to be easier for some to do than for others to do. All that has to be worked out, but I really believe they are thinking in terms of daily reporting.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Roy, that is good to know, and keep in mind this is a joint amendment and we've got perhaps different views on things; and that is fine, we can work through this.

MR. BROWN: Bonnie, I have a question for you. I do the electronic reporting for my headboat business. We talked about this I think in December as far as it went into effect for the weekly reporting last year at the beginning of the year. I guess I am not sure if that data is available yet or not for last year. The headboat fishery in the South Atlantic is relatively small compared to the charterboat fishery. I was just wondering is there analysis infrastructure in place to be able to handle that additional information and to process it in a timely manner?

DR. PONWITH: I know that is a good question, because that is a question that came up when we contemplated going to daily reporting for commercial dealers. We talked at length about that. You are correct; there are more charterboats than there are headboats. You are also correct that in the event that we go to electronic reporting, we would have to make a shift in our business model to be able to capture those data and handle them appropriately.

Other steps that we know we are going to have to do, particularly if you have closely studied that ER/EM report, is that we have to keep the existing system up and running and run those two side by side. One is a standardized sampling procedure where you get samples and you expand based on those samples to represent the total fleet.

Particularly if it is done the way we were just talking where you send in your report and we validate those reports on a one-to-one matching by getting those reports sent before you hit the dock; that would be designed as a census. There may have to be some estimation for people who violate the regulations and are late, whether it is daily or weekly.

We would have to have some algorithms that knew how to deal with missing data, so that we knew what to plug into that missing data. All of that needs to exist; and then while that is set up, we need to run it side by side with the existing data collection program so we understand how those two perform against one another, so we can use that to then calibrate that time series since that time series is so important to our stock assessments.

MR. BROWN: I appreciate what you're saying. Most fishermen are in a big need right now and want to see these stock assessments processed in a timely manner and as accurately as possible. I was just concerned that if the system is not in place to be able to process this data in a timely manner, then it is going to delay anything that we can use for a stock assessment.

DR. PONWITH: That is a good observation, because it is a delicate dance right now. If you have the system built and you still have a two-year process to cut the regulations, then there is a delay. If you cut the regulations but I don't have the system in place, the infrastructure in place to use these new kind of data, then it is the exact same problem but in the opposite direction.

That is a very astute observation. The thing that complicates this is right now the charters are sampled by the MRIP Program, so it is not my job. The real question then is if we go to this electronic reporting, will the MRIP continue to run this program when we phase out MRIP and phase this in or does it come to my shop? All of those kinds of decisions have yet to be made, and the system to capture those data doesn't exist yet but can.

MR. BELL: Keep in mind I've got to get to Action 2 and Action 3, and some of the stuff we've actually already talked about is in Action 2 and Action 3, but, Zack, if you could ask something quickly, that would be fine.

MR. BOWEN: As I sit here and listen to Dr. Crabtree talk about balance and burden; I have a vision for the charterboat. I've been doing it a long time and I hope I can continue to do it for many, many years to come. Roy is talking about the small boats. We've had presentations with the iPads. If you've got a small boat, I've got a small iPhone and its waterproof case. I have a vision where I do want to get to that daily reporting; and the dockside samplers or surveyors, they can come and validate it.

That is the vision I see, but you talk about burden on fishermen. The burden on me is when MRIP says that the state of Georgia – and I can't recall the exact year – in one of our mini-seasons caught 34,000 pounds of red snapper in three days, and then we don't have an extended season the next year on red snapper. That is the burden for me. It is not punching in what I caught or what I discarded. That is the line of thinking that I am thinking about.

DR. DUVAL: My question was much less detailed and it was for Bonnie. Really, just given that the existing regulations give you the authority to require electronic reporting of charter vessels if a permittee is selected to do so; what kind of reporting have any charter vessels in the Gulf or South Atlantic been selected for outside of this sort of standard MRIP intercept and for-hire effort survey?

DR. PONWITH: We have done some observer work. Most of that has been aboard headboats.

DR. DUVAL: I'm specifically talking about reporting where if you selected someone and said could you please fill out these paper forms.

DR. PONWITH: Outside of MRIP, no; the Center really hasn't gone to the charter fleet and invoked that mandatory requirement.

MR. BELL: Okay, if we could, let's go ahead and take a look at Action 2. I want to make sure we get through the next two actions, and we're up against a hard stop at 5:30 with a hearing.

MR. WAUGH: Action 2 would amend the Gulf Reef Fish, South Atlantic Snapper Grouper, Coastal Migratory Pelagic and Atlantic Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery Management Plans to require – and what is in the document now is vessel. It perhaps could be changed to say catch

location. We'll talk about that no action alternative. Alternative 2 would require the use of an electronic device that automatically records vessel location for later transmission along with the logbook information.

This would be similar to the iPad presentation we received from ACCSP, the pilot that was done for Rhode Island charterboat fishermen. Zack pointed out some of the benefits of that; it is low cost, it is small, it can be ruggedized. Alternative 3 is of interest to the Gulf Council, is to require the use of VMS for charter vessels.

Then I added in another one, because I overlooked – what is recorded now is using the statistical grids. The headboats currently report by degrees and minutes and that gets you down to a one square mile location. I think to cover all our bases we should add that alternative that would require charterboats to report catch location by latitude and longitude in degrees and minutes.

Again, this is based on some of the recommendations that have come from the technical subcommittee to minimize the reporting burden. I pointed out some of the discussions we have had. Our Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel has received a presentation on that ACCSP system, and they really liked it as well. I know we talked before about whether we pick preferreds here. My discussions with Mel, since we had so much fun last time we went out requiring VMS, we really try to make it clear to the public that we are not considering doing that again however we need to do that.

MR. BELL: The thing to keep in mind with that; again it is a joint amendment and the Gulf is much more comfortable with use of VMS in more of their fisheries than we are. We know that so that might be something that is of more importance to them right now than us, let's say. That is why again as a joint amendment it is in there.

MS. BECKWITH: I am not on your committee but I did have a question. For the new Alternative 4, are we basically referring to the grids that the current headboats are reporting on or is this something different?

MR. WAUGH: No, this is the current grids. In the logbook they are requested to report the latitude and longitude in degrees and minutes. If they put that information in, that gets you down to that one square mile area.

MS. BECKWITH: But otherwise they can pick the grid, basically, the piece on the grid or is that not an option?

MR. WAUGH: Yes; I know there are some statistical grids that have been used in the past in headboats, but in my understanding going back and forth with Ken Brennan, now what they are required to do is report the latitude and longitude in degrees and minutes. I can certainly verify that to make sure that is correct.

MR. BELL: Yes; that would be good to do. Mark might know something about that.

MR. BROWN: Yes; it does give you an option of either/or. You can either place it on the grid or you can give it in degrees or minutes; but you do have an option on that.

MS. BECKWITH: I would clarify that in the alternative, if you could, and then I would also suggest using catch versus vessel in the language under Action 2. It would make more sense to me if we had the new Alternative 4 kind of listed as Alternative 2 and then down the line. It would be the least burdensome on down the line to the most burdensome.

My last suggestion, because I am not on your committee, would be that we use subalternatives for the South Atlantic and for the Gulf under the Alternative 2 and 3, because as we've heard I think the Gulf Council has some different intentions than the South Atlantic may have and some different needs. It would give us a little bit more flexibility and maybe send a message that these aren't necessarily things we're considering, but certainly the Gulf is considering these.

MR. BELL: I think that is being sensitive to what Gregg is talking about. You are right; again keeping in mind it is both councils trying to find something that can work for both of us and for both of our fishermen.

MR. WAUGH: I think if we deal with the VMS one, we could certainly put sub-options under it, South Atlantic and Gulf; but would we want to be more clear and say "require the use of VMS for charter vessels in the Gulf of Mexico," because that makes it clear that if the Gulf wants to do it in the Gulf of Mexico, that is up to them; but we are not interested in having it in the Atlantic.

MR. BELL: That does further separate it.

MS. BECKWITH: That would be great; but I would also want the subalternatives under the GPS component as well. Under the Alternative 2; I would still want the subalternatives under Alternative 2.

MR. BELL: Are there any other comments or tweaks?

MR. HAYMANS: I echo Anna's concerns and hopefully in the intent or whatever goes out to the public they will understand that we are not asking for a pinpoint location; but that if is Alternative 4, it is in a one square mile grid. Whatever way it needs to be reworded or written intent, it is not for that linear location.

MR. BROWN: That is a pretty good-sized area. I don't think that is really an intrusion on their privacy of where they are fishing or anything. I think that gives you an area small enough, too, to where you can get a real general consensus of the depth, which seems to be the biggest concern for these assessments and stuff, knowing what the depth is when they are being caught.

MR. BELL: Right; and what we're living with the commercial side right now are the 60-by-60 boxes, I guess, right, huge boxes. We've talked about the need to crank down on those, so this would start out in a better way.

MR. BOWEN: I had to leave a little while ago for a phone call, so I am kind of coming in on the tail end of this and I apologize. The VMS, I understand most of the council's position on that, but can't we just leave it in there or GPS tracking; can't we leave it in there just to go to –

MR. BELL: It is in there.

MR. BOWEN: In my opinion it is going to be hard to do what we are trying to do without some kind of tracking of these vessels.

MR. BELL: Yes; there are options available for both. What we were saying – maybe you weren't here – is that given the two councils, the two areas, the two groups of fishermen that are use to different things and tolerant perhaps a little more than other places; VMS is certainly more acceptable right now in the Gulf than it is here, and we know that. That is just a reality we're going to have to work with to get something in place that works for both sides.

DR. DUVAL: Similarly, I support Anna's suggested change to Alternative 4 to at least make the language more reflective that it would utilize the headboat grids for reporting.

MR. BELL: Right, I think that would be good, because we've tried to be consistent with what the headboats are doing.

DR. DUVAL: Yes; I guess you could do a subalternative by latitude/longitude and degrees and minutes and then another subalternative by the headboat grids. That would be great.

MR. BELL: Mark, that is the way it is set up now; you can use one or the other? All right, take a look at that; anything else?

MR. BROWN: This one is for Roy. Do you already have in place VMS for the charter fleet in the Gulf?

MR. WILLIAMS: No, just the commercial snapper grouper fleet I think has to have it.

MR. BROWN: Okay, and what kinds of response are you getting back from the general fishing fleet in regards to that?

MR. WILLIAMS: They like it; they are very much for it. Zack was over there last time and must have heard some of it; but as a whole they like it, they like it real well.

MS. BECKWITH: Can you shift that one up between the current Alternative 1 and 2, just so they are logical? Make the new Alternative 4, Alternative 2; make Alternative 2, Alternative 3; and then make VMS Alternative 4.

MR. BELL: Does that just flow better logically for you? You should put in for this committee. Seriously, I appreciate everybody's input on this.

MR. BOWEN: Alternative 4A, about the latitude/longitude, I know this is probably being a little more specific than necessary, but some of us don't use latitude and longitude. We're still on the LORAN. I guess I could switch it over.

MR. BELL: Yes, you can do that.

MR. BOWEN: It's conversion.

MR. BELL: The last holdout.

MR. BOWEN: I'm still working off TD.

MR. COX: Yes, they did shut it down. He is talking about the Phantom LORAN; some of our GPS still allow you to switch the coordinates back and forth.

MR. BELL: Enter the 21st Century with us.

MR. BOWEN: I haven't gone to that yet.

MR. BELL: Is there any other tweaking?

**DR. DUVAL: I guess I was just going to offer a motion to approve the range of Action 2 alternatives as modified.**

**MR. BELL: Okay, we have a motion to approve the alternatives in Action 2 as modified; second by Jack Cox. Is there any further discussion of the motion? Is there any opposition to the motion? Okay the motion carries.** We have one more action to look at. Take a quick look at Action 3.

MR. WAUGH: This is Action 3 on Page 12. This would amend the Gulf Reef Gish, South Atlantic Snapper Grouper Coastal Migratory Pelagics and Atlantic Dolphin and Wahoo Fishery Management Plans to specify certain aspects of reporting for commercial and for-hire vessels. Note that more than one preferred alternative can be chosen.

These recommendations come directly out of the Charterboat Subcommittee final report. Alternative 2 would specify the following data flow and timing aspects of electronic reporting. One; in terms of simplification reporting, reporting should allow the individual to hit one button to simultaneously send the data to the state, ACCSP, and NMFS.

There may be a little duplication with this one now, and it was shown in Number 2 in terms of data flow. This Roman numeral one is from one of our recommendations that we have made continuously in commenting on the electronic technology plan. The data flow comes directly from the technical subcommittee.

They recommend that logbook and dealer data collected via authorized platform; for example, web, tablet, phone or VMS application. They recommend that data be submitted to ACCSP or GulfFIN, that the data be integrated by ACCSP or GulfFIN into a single composite dataset. That composite dataset is then distributed to appropriate agencies for analyses and use.

Three; the data would be fed to ACCSP and made available to the public via the ACCSP website. The official numbers used for closures would continue to be the numbers maintained by NMFS and available on a NMFS website, but this would provide more timely and useful updates to the public.

Roman numerals one and three are from our comments. Item 2 is directly from the Technical Subcommittee. This amendment right now deals with charterboat reporting. A question for you to talk about is do you want this data flow issue to just deal with charterboats? Do we also want to specify that for headboats in this amendment, which would broaden the amendment?

Do we want it to apply to dealer reporting, and that would broaden the amendment even more? Then the third alternative would specify some additional aspects. Again, these come directly from the Technical Subcommittee recommendations. One; that NMFS and/or ACCSP is to develop a compliance tracking procedure that balances timeliness with available staff and funding resources.

Two; NMFS is to use validation methods developed in the Gulf of Mexico Logbook Pilot Study as a basis to ensure that the actual logbook report is validated and standardized validation methodologies are employed among regions. Three; NMFS is to require and maintain a comprehensive permit, e-mail database of participants.

Four; NMFS is to include procedures for expanding estimates for non-reporting. Five; NMFS Is to allow multiple authorized applications or devices to report data as long as they meet required data and transferability standards. Again, do you want to broaden this to apply to headboats and/or commercial as well or just charterboats?

MR. BELL: Here is where I am right now; we've got five minutes left. I am not real comfortable with trying to rush this in five minutes. I look to you for guidance, Mr. Chairman. Would it be possible to pick some of this up in full council? We are operating kind of in full council mode, anyway. I would feel much more comfortable if we kind of thought about some of this and tried to pick it up rather than to just, boom, approve it or not.

MR. HARTIG: I would feel more comfortable as well. As you give your data report, we will just pick up where you left off during full council, and we will operate as a Committee of the Whole.

DR. CRABTREE: Just sort of food for thought; we ought to think through how we transition to this. Are we going to require these things and put them in place; are we just going to immediately start using the catches that come out of them? What do we do if we find out that what they are reporting in the logbooks is way different than what the previous estimates in MRIP are? What if what they report is way higher than what we thought they were catching?

Now we've got a calibration issue, and I just went through a huge mess in the Gulf dealing with calibration and a real abrupt jump in the catches. We ought to give some thought about how do we actually transition to this, because it is more complicated than just doing this and all of a sudden that is what we're going to use. There are a lot of implications about it that we ought to think about. I just lay that out as food for thought.

MR. BELL: That is very good; I appreciate you pointing that out is to keep in mind we're looking at MRIP transition, what we're doing side by side for a couple of years perhaps to do that. While it may look like we've got the best possible system in place in the world; how do you get from where you are now to that up and totally running? That is good to think about. I would ask you to give the document a little more look tonight, if you can, or whatever. We'll pick up the discussion in full council. Is there anything else we need to cover right now?

MR. WAUGH: No; just to mention that in particular for this Action 3, there is a lot more detail in the discussion; and particularly the point that Roy just mentioned, the subcommittee does recommend a dual-survey method for no less than three years. They recommend that the data



from the new program would not be expected to provide management advice during the first year of operation. There are a lot of details in this discussion. If you want a little more background, you have the Technical Subcommittee report as well.

MR. BELL: Can I just ask you to kind of take a look at that? Given two minutes left, I won't worry about any other business right now. The Data Committee will stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 o'clock p.m., March 5, 2015.)

— — —  
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE AT FULL COUNCIL SESSION

Recall yesterday we were into Action 3 when we had to end the meeting for the public hearing. Gregg included in the actual report here the language that is in Action 3 as it is worded right now. What we want to ask ourselves; is there anything in there that we might want to adjust in Action 3? I'll just suggest, if you look at the wording there, we're kind of down into the weeds in some areas.

For instance, under Alternative 2, little i, simplification of reporting; "Reporting should allow the individuals to hit one button to simultaneously send" – I don't know that we need that level of detail right now as this goes out to the public. To not kind of lock us into just that particular way to go with this, we could strike that whole sentence.

Another thing, notice that under Alternative 2, two little i's, we have included wording in there that says "logbook and dealer data". That was the thinking that you could do other great things with this, including dealers; but I think if we drag dealers into this, it changes the whole flavor of the amendment, so perhaps we might want to just strike "dealer" out of that. That is a suggestion.

Then if you go under three little i's, "data fed to ACCSP"; again, we're kind of presupposing a certain way this needs to go. I don't know that we need to get into that specificity at this point. Then also under Subalternative 2A, it says "apply to dealer reporting"; so I'd take that out. I think it would be best to separate ourselves from that. That's a whole 'nother world.

Then the other question is we have "headboat" in there as well. There is a whole separate system for headboat reporting right now; but I guess sort of in a perfect world if we were building all this together, your headboat and your charterboat systems would all be same and be able to work the same.

I know in South Carolina we treat our headboats and our charterboats as for-hire boats and they all report in a similar fashion; but we do have a separate headboat reporting system. This document is related specifically or the focus was charterboats. We just need to ask ourselves do we want to leave some language in here as an option for the future or strike it now to simplify it. I throw that stuff out for consideration and maybe some discussion on that. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Although I agree with the simplification reasons, I thought that part of the flow process was because some of the data was going straight to NMFS and it was delayed in

getting through the ACCSP. I thought we wanted to require it to go to all three simultaneously. I mean, I thought that is what we were trying to do.

MR. BELL: Gregg, would you like to address that?

MR. WAUGH: Yes; and Roman Numeral II there does that, what is outlined under the data flow. This is what came out of the technical subcommittee; that the logbook data would go to ACCSP on the Atlantic side or GulfFIN on the Gulf side.

That would be the first place it would go to; and then the data would be integrated into a single composite data set and then distributed, made available to the centers, and we would be able to tap into it there. In essence, the way you achieve Roman Numeral I and III is by using the data flow that is outlined in Roman Numeral II.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I don't know that you all usually get into this level of detail as to where the data goes and that sort of thing. Maybe we could have some discussion of why that is needed; because when you lock it into an amendment, if anything needs to be changed, we need another amendment to amend how the data flow is going.

I don't know that you usually get into that and maybe you could have a brief discussion at some point, whether it is today or later or whenever you want to do it, as to why this is necessary to have this in here as opposed to perhaps a discussion in the document of what the technical committee said would be the best way to handle the data. I'm just trying to think of down the road for maximum flexibility for you.

MR. BELL: Yes, I agree; we don't want to lock ourselves into something if that is what this does, but I think this in effect came as a recommendation from the subcommittee if that seemed to be a reasonable to flow it. Bonnie, do you want to speak to that?

DR. PONWITH: Yes; just the same point. It is a little concerning because this has the look and feel of regulating science; basically regulating the science and the flow of the data as opposed to regulating the conduct of the fishery. We do have that report. That report was hard won. They worked really hard at it; and certainly I would see those recommendations as being given due weight as any program going forward unfolds; but there are risks in regulating science.

DR. DUVAL: I appreciate Bonnie's comments and Monica's about not wanting to tie ourselves into something that is going to take a lot of effort to undue later. I think part of the concern is that right now the data flow is sort of like spaghetti; and that doesn't help us very much. I know the issues that we have to go through in North Carolina just with our dealer reporting.

If we have dealers that have both northeast and southeast permits, it has got to go to the northeast. We've run into multiple issues with having to extract black sea bass landings and then some of that stuff goes directly to Bluefin and then the Southeast Center picks it up; and so there is lots of spaghetti involved in the data flow right now. I think the concern here is that we just want to make sure it is flowing in the most expedient way possible but allows everybody to access it.

MR. BELL: And I'm not piling on with that; but I've mentioned before when we sit down and try to draw out our data flow on a particular fishery, it does look kind of like spaghetti. That has been frustrating I know at the state level for me. I think that was the idea here was to try to come up with something that seemed simplified enough; but that is where that comes from. I think that's why we wanted to leave that in there; and it didn't consider it necessarily as – well, not at all dictating science. It is more of just frustrations over timeliness and data flow process. Bonnie.

DR. PONWITH: It is just when we look at how long it takes to get a regulatory amendment into place, basically these are regulations. There is no other way to look at this than you're regulating the way the science is being done. If this is exactly what the council wants, that is fine, but the council isn't a science body.

If something happens where you decide you need to make changes, then you're right back at this council table X numbers of months, weeks, years, whatever, making changes to this. I hear what you're saying and I believe rationalizing the flow of data is a smart thing to do. My suggestion is that there might be a more efficient way of doing it than putting it in the amendment.

MR. HAYMANS: Well, I would ask Bonnie before we finalize this amendment and wherever we get to; that you would offer up that rationalization.

DR. PONWITH: So allow me to say I'm not saying that I'm king of the world and know exactly how this should be done; you know, what the outcome should be. What I'm saying is the process of arriving at that by putting it in a council amendment which freezes it and makes it very difficult to change. I'm not telling you I have the perfect solution.

I'm saying that the way of arriving at that perfect solution and agreeing upon it in my mind isn't putting it in the amendment. I would be happy to be a participant in taking the joint committees' recommendations, getting that group back together again and working through how do we align the flow of the data and keep that conduit as short and straightforward as possible and reach rational agreement. It may be this exactly, I don't know, but doing that kind of in a science forum in a way where the agreement is a little more flexible than this may serve the process better.

MR. BELL: So the way it is structured right now commits to a particular flow; so what you're saying is that perhaps that might be good or perhaps it might not be the best; but we don't necessarily – I mean, we're going to have one more shot at this. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: I guess it might be a subtlety, but to me this doesn't have anything to do with science. This is talking about the flow of data. We convened a collective group of experts that are involved in data collection and management, including the center, including headquarters, including ACCSP, GulfFIN, the councils. This is the technical folks' recommendation.

They have dealt with the problems with the data flow for years; and this is their collective recommendation. We have frameworks and we can complete a plan amendment in one or two meetings. We can modify this very quickly should the need arise, but this is a recommendation of the collective "our" technical experts on how to design a system that is going to be efficient, that is going to be timely and that is going to work.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: My thoughts were not so much that it was regulating science but you've all hardly ever do this in terms of put a motion in an amendment that says where the data goes. I understood and I heard why you think that is important. I also heard what Bonnie was saying.

When I looked at the timing of this, you're going to see this again in June and at that point I guess approve it for public hearing. If we can't hash this out here or Bonnie wants to bring something back or something like that, that could be done at the June meeting, too, where we discuss this. For example, you leave it in the document now and then if we want to further discuss it June, we can do it there, too.

MR. BELL: Well, that is what I was about to ask. We are going to look at this again in June. If there is a better idea or a better way to do this, we can certainly discuss that. We can leave it as it is right now and move forward but fully understanding Bonnie's concerns and maybe there is a better way to do this. Well, we could hear it. Does that make sense? Obviously, I can't make a motion.

MR. WAUGH: We still need to deal with guidance on the headboat. Are we going to include this headboat subalternative in here or delete that?

MR. BELL: Is everybody comfortable with deleting the dealer part? I think we need to stay away from that. Headboats, now, do we want to leave language in there right now with the potential tie-in for headboats or do we want to simplify things and just keep doing headboats; the intent being we're setting up a completely independent system here for just charterboats only. What do you think?

MR. BROWN: Well, we've already got a system set up for the headboats. This is pretty much directed towards just the charterboats; isn't that correct?

MR. BELL: That is how it has been worded; although the language was kind of taken from some headboat language I guess originally.

MR. WAUGH: We're just talking about the data flow here; and we're talking about where the charterboat data flow – how that would go. Do we want to apply that same data flow to the headboat data?

MR. BROWN: Okay, so just to make it uniform so it all flows in the same direction? Yes, that is fine.

MR. BOWEN: Couldn't we use the term "for-hire" and that would encompass both?

MR. BELL: Well, we haven't used that term throughout the whole document; but I follow the logic there. It makes sense. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: It is logical to me to have headboats and charterboats flowing the same way. In fact, it may come where if we put greater restrictions or more stuff with the charterboats than headboats currently have; we might even want to bring the Actions 1 and 2 in line for headboats and charterboats as this amendment goes forward. Just a comment.

MR. BELL: Yes; as Gregg said, right now this is just under this particular action dealing with data flow. Any strong feelings one way or the other? Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Let's just leave in the subalternative to apply to headboat and charterboat. I think with the previous actions dealing with specifically charterboats because we already have electronic reporting weekly for headboats right now; I think it is good to have the subalternatives in there to make sure to be specific about which component of the for-hire sector we're applying this to.

MR. BELL: All right, we'll leave it in. Are there any discussions on Alternative 3; I don't have any.

MR. WAUGH: The only question is do you want that to apply – put in those same subalternatives to apply to charterboats or headboats? I would assume not commercial since we –

MR. BELL: Yes, I would strike “commercial”. The question is as it is currently worded is should Alternative 3 apply to both charterboats and headboats?

MR. WAUGH: So now we would need a motion. If we're leaving it in for charterboats and headboats, we would need a motion to approve the range of alternatives under Action 3 as modified.

MR. BELL: Is someone willing to make that? Michelle.

**DR. DUVAL: So moved.**

**MR. BELL: Second by Jessica. More discussion? Any objections to the motion? The motion is to approve the range of alternatives under Action 3 for detailed analyses. We have a second by Jessica. Ant additional discussion? Any objections to the motion? We have one objection; the motion carries.** What other little piece here – okay, Action 3 is added. We need to go back and address the purpose and need.

MR. WAUGH: Right; and by virtue of you adding that, what I would suggest is that then staff and the IPT will propose to modify wording to the purpose and need and bring that back to you in June.

MR. BELL: All right, do we need a motion for that or that is just direction to staff?

MR. WAUGH: No, if that is okay with everybody. Then the final item is just timing. This is the rough timing that we have discussed with the Gulf and it is laid out in our amendment. I talked with John Froeschke and he has given some indications of when the Gulf would take action. They will be discussing this at their March 30 through April 2 meeting.

(END OF DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE REPORT MADE IN FULL COUNCIL)

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

Transcribed By:  
Graham Transcriptions, Inc.  
March 23, 2015

# South Atlantic Fishery Management Council 2014 Council Membership

## COUNCIL CHAIRMAN:

### Ben Hartig

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

## VICE-CHAIRMAN

### Dr. Michelle Duval

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

### Robert E. Beal

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

### Mel Bell

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

### Anna Beckwith

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

### Zack Bowen

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

### 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 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue South  
St. Petersburg, FL 33701  
727/824-5301 (ph); 727/824-5320 (f)  
roy.crabtree@noaa.gov

### LT Morgan Fowler

U.S. Coast Guard  
510 SW 11<sup>th</sup> Court  
Fort Lauderdale FL 33315  
morgan.m.fowler@uscg.mil

### Doug Haymans

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

### Deirdre Warner-Kramer

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

### Dr. Wilson Laney

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

### Jessica McCawley

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

### Charles Phillips

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

JACK MCGOVERN

BONNIE POWERS

MONICA SMIT-BRUNELLO

PRES PATE

ERIKA BURGESS

IREN LOWERY

TRACY WOODRUFF

ROY WILLIAMS

ROBERT BOYLES

# South Atlantic Fishery Management Council

## 2014 Committees

### AD HOC SOUTH FLORIDA COMMITTEE (NEW)

Ben Hartig, Chair  
Michelle Duval, Vice Chair  
Chester Brewer  
Jessica McCawley  
Charlie Phillips  
Staff contact: Bob Mahood and Gregg Waugh

### ADVISORY PANEL SELECTION

Doug Haymans, Chair  
Chester Brewer  
Mark Brown  
Chris Conklin  
Jack Cox  
Ben Hartig  
Staff contact: Kim Iverson

### CATCH SHARES

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

### DATA COLLECTION

✓ Mel Bell, Chair  
✓ Jack Cox  
✓ Roy Crabtree  
✓ Michelle Duval  
✓ Wilson Laney  
✓ Jessica McCawley  
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh  
✓ ~~MARK BROWN~~

### DOLPHIN WAHOO

Anna Beckwith, Chair  
Zack Bowen  
Chester Brewer  
Mark Brown  
Doug Haymans  
Mid-Atlantic Liaison, Pres Pate  
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

### ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT

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

### EXECUTIVE/FINANCE

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

### GOLDEN CRAB

Ben Hartig, Vice-Chair  
Chester Brewer  
Mark Brown  
Roy Crabtree  
Jessica McCawley  
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

### HABITAT & ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Wilson Laney, Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Chris Conklin  
LT Morgan Fowler  
Doug Haymans  
Charlie Phillips  
Robert Beal, ASMFC Representative  
Staff contact: Roger Pugliese  
Chip Collier - Coral

### HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES

Anna Beckwith, Acting Chair  
Zack Bowen  
Chester Brewer  
Mark Brown  
Ben Hartig  
Staff contact: Brian Cheuvront

### INFORMATION & EDUCATION

Anna Beckwith, Chair  
Mel Bell  
Zack Bowen  
Chester Brewer  
Chris Conklin  
LT Morgan Fowler  
Staff contact: Amber Von Harten

### KING & SPANISH MACKEREL

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

### LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

### PERSONNEL

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

### PROTECTED RESOURCES

Wilson Laney, Vice Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Michelle Duval  
LT Morgan Fowler  
Ben Hartig  
Jessica McCawley  
Staff contact: Kari MacLauchlin

### SCI. & STAT. SELECTION

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

(Continued)



# South Atlantic Fishery Management Council Staff

✓ **Executive Director**

Robert K. Mahood  
robert.mahood@safmc.net

✓ **Deputy Executive Director**

Gregg T. Waugh  
gregg.waugh@safmc.net

---

✓ **Public Information Officer**

Kim Iverson  
kim.iverson@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Outreach Specialist**

Amber Von Harten  
amber.vonharten@safmc.net

✓ **Senior Fishery Biologist**

Roger Pugliese  
roger.pugliese@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**

Myra Brouwer  
myra.brouwer@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Biologist**

Dr. Mike Errigo  
mike.errigo@safmc.net

✓ **Fisheries Social Scientist**

Dr. Kari MacLauchlin  
kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net

✓ **Fishery Scientist**

Chip Collier  
Chip.Collier@safmc.net

✓ **Staff Economist**

Dr. Brian Chevront  
brian.chevront@safmc.net

✓ **Science and Statistics Program Manager**

John Carmichael  
john.carmichael@safmc.net

**SEDAR Coordinators**

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

✓ **Administrative Officer**

Mike Collins  
mike.collins@safmc.net

**Financial Secretary**

Debra Buscher  
deb.buscher@safmc.net

**Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator**

Cindy Chaya  
cindy.chaya@safmc.net

✓ **Purchasing & Grants**

Julie O'Dell  
julie.odell@safmc.net

# PLEASE SIGN IN

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

South Atlantic Fishery Management Council  
Data Collection Committee Meeting  
Thursday, March 5, 2015

NAME & SECTOR/ORGANIZATION: AREA CODE & PHONE NUMBER: EMAIL ADDRESS: MAILING ADDRESS:

Dick BRAUNE CCA

Leta Dunmore Peru

Holly Sims Peru

Lara Clark Peru

Rodney Anderson SFAECFS  
PSE

Ron Swensen

Michael Kelly CLS America 301-580-6367 mkelly@clsamerica.com

~~Erin Kelly~~ Peru

Julie Califano gadr 912-264-7218

3

**My Webinars**

- Schedule a Webinar
- My Recordings
- Webinar History
- Generate Reports
- Settings

My Webinars   Manage Webinar   Registrant List

## Registrants for "SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 4 of 5 (Thursday)"

Registration Report

Enter part of a name or email address

	Registrants	Email Address	Registration Date	Time
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wheatley, Thomas	tomwheatley24@gmail...	Mar 05, 2015	3:57 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	kloster..., joseph	grkjkf@omcast.net	Mar 05, 2015	3:44 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hanson, Chad	chanson@pewtrusts.org	Mar 05, 2015	3:38 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hildreth, Delaine	delaine_hildreth@gad...	Mar 05, 2015	3:33 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Knowlton, Kathy	kathy.knowlton@gadnr...	Mar 05, 2015	2:36 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	gregory, doug	doug.gregory@gulfcou...	Mar 05, 2015	2:28 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brennan, Ken	kenneth.brennan@noaa...	Mar 05, 2015	1:42 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Clarke, Lora	lclarke@pewtrusts.org	Mar 05, 2015	1:38 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Malinowski, Rich	rich.malinowski@noaa...	Mar 05, 2015	1:30 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Larkin, Michael	Michael.Larkin@noaa...	Mar 05, 2015	1:20 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Brogan, Gib	gbrogan@oceana.org	Mar 05, 2015	12:41 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Williams, John	john@shrimpalliance...	Mar 05, 2015	11:18 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	cardin, bobby	finchaser357@aol.com	Mar 05, 2015	10:57 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	hull, jimmy	hullsseafoos@aol.com	Mar 05, 2015	10:20 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lee, Jennifer	Jennifer.Lee@noaa.gov	Mar 05, 2015	10:10 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gore, Karla	karla.gore@noaa.gov	Mar 05, 2015	10:05 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	rindone, ryan	ryan.rindone@gulfcou...	Mar 05, 2015	9:27 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Alvarado, Nicolas	Nicolas.Alvarado@noa...	Mar 05, 2015	9:22 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Takade-..., Helen	htakade@edf.org	Mar 05, 2015	9:17 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bubley, Walter	bubleyw@dnr.sc.gov	Mar 05, 2015	9:00 AM EST

46 Selected | Deselect All Registrants

1-20 of 46

Cancel Registration   Resend Confirmation Email

**My Webinars**

Schedule a Webinar

My Recordings

Webinar History

Generate Reports

Settings

My Webinars Manage Webinar Registrant List



## Registrants for "SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 4 of 5 (Thursday)"

Registration Report

Enter part of a name or email address

	Registrants	Email Address	Registration Date	Time
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DeVictor, Rick	rick.devictor@noaa.g...	Mar 05, 2015	9:00 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bailey, Adam	adam.bailey@noaa.gov	Mar 05, 2015	8:59 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Package..., Christina	christina.package-wa...	Mar 05, 2015	8:58 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Lamberte, Tony	tony.lamberte@noaa.g...	Mar 05, 2015	8:38 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Neer, Julie	julie.neer@safmc.net	Mar 05, 2015	8:33 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Ballenger, Joseph	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov	Mar 05, 2015	8:25 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bresnen, Anthony	anthony.bresnen@myfw...	Mar 05, 2015	8:22 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	c, m	mec181@yahoo.com	Mar 05, 2015	8:19 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gerhart, Susan	susan.gerhart@noaa.g...	Mar 05, 2015	8:18 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bademan, Martha	martha.bademan@myfwc...	Mar 05, 2015	8:18 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	holiman, stephen	stephen.holiman@noaa...	Mar 05, 2015	8:17 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Erwin, Gwen	gwen.erwin@myfwc.com	Mar 05, 2015	8:04 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Raine, Karen	karen.raine@noaa.gov	Mar 05, 2015	7:58 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Laks, Ira	captainira@att.net	Mar 05, 2015	7:35 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MacLauc..., Bill	billmac@charter.net	Mar 04, 2015	10:04 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DuBeck, Guy	guy.dubeck@noaa.gov	Mar 04, 2015	2:43 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	vara, mary	mary.vara@noaa.gov	Mar 04, 2015	10:10 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Karp, Fran	francine.karp@gmail...	Mar 03, 2015	1:27 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Foreman, Allan	acforeman1@hotmail.c...	Feb 26, 2015	12:49 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Binns, joe	joebinns@gmail.com	Feb 23, 2015	2:46 PM EST

46 Selected | Deselect All Registrants

21-40 of 46  

Cancel Registration

Resend Confirmation Email

My Webinars

Schedule a Webinar

My Recordings

Webinar History

Generate Reports

Settings

My Webinars Manage Webinar Registrant List

# Registrants for "SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 4 of 5 (Thursday)"

Registration Report

Enter part of a name or email address

	Registrants	Email Address	Registration Date	Time
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Herndon, Andrew	andrew.herndon@noaa....	Feb 13, 2015	8:16 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Byrd, J	julia.byrd@safmc.net	Feb 12, 2015	10:05 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FARMER, NICK	nick.farmer@noaa.gov	Feb 11, 2015	12:39 PM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Mehta, Nikhil	nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov	Feb 11, 2015	11:54 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	sandorf, scott	scott.sandorf@noaa.g...	Feb 11, 2015	11:48 AM EST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Clemens, Anik	anik.clemens@noaa.gov	Feb 11, 2015	11:47 AM EST

46 Selected | Deselect All Registrants

41-46 of 46

Cancel Registration

Resend Confirmation Email