

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE**

**Doubletree Grand Key Resort  
Key West, Florida**

**June 9, 2015**

### **SUMMARY MINUTES**

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

Mel Bell, Chair  
Jack Cox  
Dr. Michelle Duval  
Jessica McCawley

Mark Brown  
Dr. Jack McGovern  
Dr. Wilson Laney  
Anna Beckwith

#### **Council Members:**

Ben Hartig  
Zack Bowen  
Chris Conklin  
Charlie Phillips

Robert Beal  
Chester Brewer  
Doug Haymans

#### **Council Staff:**

Bob Mahood  
Kim Iverson  
Roger Pugliese  
Dr. Mike Errigo  
Chip Collier  
John Carmichael  
Julie O'Dell

Gregg Waugh  
Amber Von Harten  
Myra Brouwer  
Dr. Kari MacLauchlin  
Dr. Brian Chevront  
Mike Collins

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

Monica Smit-Brunello  
Dr. George Sedberry  
Col. Chisolm Frampton  
Jeff Radonski  
Capt. David Dipre  
Kenny Fex  
Capt. Bob Beaton  
Dr. Bonnie Ponwith

Rick DeVictor  
Erika Burgess  
Karen Antrim Raine  
Dr. Marcel Reichert  
Brett Pierce  
Dr. Nick Farmer  
Dr. Luiz Barbieri

Additional Observers Attached

The Data Collection Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened in the Tortuga Ballroom of the Doubletree Grand Key Resort, Key West, Florida, June 9, 2015, and was called to order at 11:05 o'clock a.m. by Chairman Mel Bell.

MR. BELL: We're going to go ahead and start the Data Committee.

MS. BECKWITH: Can I put a request in to officially be put on this committee, please?

MR. BELL: We would have to run that through the council chair, but so noted.

MS. BECKWITH: Ben, did you hear my special request? I would like to be put on the Data Committee if you so see fit.

MR. BELL: Okay, we have officially appointed Anna Beckwith as a member of the Data Committee as of right now. We will go ahead and call the meeting to order. The first item on the agenda is approval of the agenda. I'll make one note. Item Number 5 on the agenda, update on the Commercial Logbook Pilot Study that is going to be Bonnie.

Bonnie is over at the Gulf Council meeting right now, so we're going to put her briefing off until full council, but everything else should stand as is. Any other adjustments to the agenda? Seeing none; any objection to the agenda? The agenda stands. The next item is approval of the March 2015 minutes. Any changes to the minutes? Seeing none; any objection to approval of the minutes? Seeing none; the minutes are approved. That takes us to our first actual agenda item, which is status of work on bycatch reporting in the southeast, and I think, Jack, you're going to cover that for us.

DR. McGOVERN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. As you recall, a workgroup was established by Dr. Ponwith and Dr. Crabtree to review the standardized bycatch reporting methodologies that were established by the Gulf of Mexico, South Atlantic and the Caribbean Fishery Management Councils. This workgroup was charged with making recommendations for changes to the standardized bycatch reporting methodologies that could be made through the fishery management council process.

The workgroup consists of me; Jim Nance; Steve Branstetter from the Gulf of Mexico Branch; Bill Arnold, Caribbean Branch; Jenny Lee from Protected Resources; and Shep Grimes from General Council. We've met a number of times to discuss the SBRMs or standardized bycatch reporting methodologies.

Since the last South Atlantic Council meeting, we've continued to work on this. What we've done since the last meeting, we've summarized the standardized bycatch reporting methodologies that have been put in place for 16 fishery management plans for the three different councils. We've summarized information on what is being done to collect bycatch for the different fisheries, much of which is not included as SBRMs.

We've examined the commercial and recreational logbook data for reef fish, snapper grouper, coastal migratory pelagics, dolphin and wahoo, golden crab and wreckfish to get a handle on the

magnitude of bycatch in these different fisheries. The science center has looked at observer levels for different fisheries and provided information on that.

They're looking at observer levels desired for different fisheries based on the CVs from observer programs. We've made recommendations for improvement to SBRMs for the different fisheries. We have a draft document that has been completed. It contains all this information, and it is currently under review by the workgroup.

We met last week to discuss what else needs to be done. We thought that we needed some additional work on protected resources' needs, assessment of the need for observer coverage in the different fisheries. We're also trying to get more information on studies that have been conducted to determine the level of bycatch in the different fisheries. Our schedule is to have a draft that we're going to look at in July. We'll look over that again and have another draft in August. We hope to have recommendations for SBRMs in the fall.

MR. BELL: And I really appreciate the work that you guys are doing on this. I know you're obviously following a very logical and in-depth process in pulling all this together. We really appreciate that because it is an important area. We've discussed it at other meetings and it is something we really need to fill in the gap here. We'll look forward to your report. Any questions for Jack? Mark.

MR. BROWN: Jack, is there still funding available for that, because I read something just recently about NOAA not supporting funding for the observer coverage past August.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: I'll jump in for Jack. I'm not sure exactly what you're talking about. I know that there was some discussion in the New England or northeast area regarding some specific actions that the council had put forward. We can get more information on that for you. I have not heard anything about the Service saying they won't fund any observer coverage. I think it is fact-specific to something you read, so I'll get with you at the break and find out what it is exactly and then get back to you.

MR. BELL: Any other questions for Jack on this topic? Seeing none; then we'll move to the next agenda item, which would be status of implementation plan for commercial logbook electronic reporting. Gregg is going to cover that for us.

MR. WAUGH: I spoke with Mike Cahall yesterday, and they are still continuing with the process of getting the information that they are collecting into the system in the northeast. The northeast is looking at that, and they have to have approval that the Greater Atlantic Region is going to accept those data within the next month or two.

Once they accept that in the northeast, then we would expect the same thing to happen down in the southeast. Our intent is to work initially voluntarily to give commercial fishermen the opportunity to provide the same information they're providing now voluntarily. Instead of doing it via paper, they'd be able to do it electronically. There are a number of different platforms. That would all be voluntary. Brett is going to talk about the logbook pilot project.

Once that is completed and you give us the green light to start working on the amendment that would deal with commercial logbook reporting, the intent there would be to have that be electronic real time, similar to what we will be talking about with the charterboat and also to be specific to catch location so that we can get it to where that is recorded automatically.

As we get into the Charterboat Amendment, we'll explain why that is so important and so useful. We're all on schedule and we would hope by the end of the summer to have acceptance of that data in the southeast and then we can work with our commercial fishermen who want to provide that logbook information electronically, but that would be done on a voluntary basis until our amendment comes on line. I'd be glad to answer any questions.

MR. BELL: And keep in mind that we're making progress in areas where fishermen, whether they're commercial – in a little bit we'll talk about the for-hire sector. We've actually been asked to have these technologies available and electronic reporting available, so this is all under the heading of improving data reporting and capabilities in speed and accuracy in the information we have.

It is positive to see us moving in a couple different areas at the same time in this direction. Any questions for Gregg right now? Seeing none, a change to the agenda; Brett Pierce with the science center is actually going to cover for Bonnie and go ahead and make the presentation regarding the update on the Logbook Pilot Study.

MR. PIERCE: My name is Brett Pierce. I'm a biologist with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. I've been helping coordinate efforts with the Commercial Electronic Logbook Pilot. I just want to give you a brief update on the status of it and take any questions that you may have. In late April and early May the vendors finalized the pilot software for the use electronic logbooks.

During that same time, the Southeast Center finalized the infrastructure to receive those logbooks based on a secure FTP server that was set up and hosted by the ACCSP. As far as the recruitment of volunteers and participants go, we have finished our first recruitment of volunteer fishers for the pilot fleet.

This is about ten fishers and vessel owners ranging from Galveston to North Carolina, including about thirteen vessels with a variety of gears including both the reef and pelagic longline, handline, gill net and some trap gear in the North Carolina sea bass fishery. One thing to note is that hardware and software installation is still ongoing, but we are receiving data and it has begun.

We are accepting reports in that secure FTP. Now, one thing I do want to mention is that in the next several weeks we are going to do a second push to get – I guess to finalize our pilot fleet. We have a couple of things that we still would like to test. We want to test some more hardware with specific gear types just to see if we can get the amount of hardware that we need on smaller vessels.

We're going to be doing a push in identifying some potential volunteers in the next coming weeks. Hopefully in the next few weeks we should have a complete and rounded-out pilot fleet. Also during this process another priority for us will be to increase the fishing effort for our pilot fleet. We have several vessels that have the software and hardware installed and they're still learning

the software. As that process continues, we hope to get a little bit more effort and then that will significantly increase the feedback that we can get and then we can report back to the councils. We're hoping to have all that initially completed by August. I'm not over the last update how many vendors we had reported that were involved in our project, but right now we have three different vendors that have committed and have provided software to us for the electronic pilot program. This is Electric Edge, Offshore Lobster or OLRAC and ACCSP.

All three of these are present and fishing within the South Atlantic. We have more vendors that have expressed interest in developing software for commercial electronic reporting. They just not have the software in time for the pilot. Finally, we just have the distribution of vessels across the southeast.

We have currently five that are fishing in the South Atlantic. All five of these are from North Carolina. We have two that are in the HMS fisheries; one in North Carolina, one in South Florida. We have six in the Gulf. Four of those are in Madeira Beach, Florida, and the other two are in Galveston.

The makeup of our pilot fleet is a little bit different between the Gulf and the South Atlantic mostly because in the Gulf we have kind clustered fishermen where we have an owner that have four or five different vessels and he has made many different vessels and gear types available to us depending on our needs.

In the South Atlantic we tend to have more owner-operated vessels so we're kind of tied in and committed to that specific vessel. One benefit or one bonus from that is that several of these vessels do have multiple permit types, whether it be snapper grouper, HMS or dolphin and wahoo, so it does give us the opportunity and the options to fish or just ask for several different fisheries within the southeast. I believe that's it for what we have so far. If there are any questions, I'd be glad to entertain those.

MR. HAYMANS: I'm asking about hardware specific to this.

MR. PIERCE: Specifically for the pilot, we have a tablet and laptops. Some of the software only run on tablets and some of the software only run on laptops. Basically we have a Dell Laptop and we have an iPad, and those are the hardware that we're using for this particular pilot.

MS. BECKWITH: Then I would assume that the hardware that you're trying to test on smaller vessels is the laptop component?

MR. PIERCE: Well, for the smaller vessels we're actually trying to go tablet-wise. For some of our larger vessels, we are putting the laptop on there. However, we are finding just a little bit of issue with space. It has been an interesting process finding a lot of space to include some of these laptops. The laptops are quite large. Specifically for this pilot project, we do kind of have large laptops that need to go somewhere within the wheelhouse.

MS. BECKWITH: You had said the amount of hardware that you needed – you're trying to test the amount of hardware that you needed on smaller vessels, so you were never referring to trying to put laptops on the smaller vessels. You're only trying to do the tablets?

MR. PIERCE: Well, if we can get a smaller vessel – smaller is basically relative. Depending on if that laptop can survive; that's kind of what we're going with right now. Some of these smaller vessels we just can't simply put a laptop on there. It will not survive. We had one vessel we had all intention of putting a laptop on board; but when we got there, it was a center console, open air. There was no way it was going to survive, so we did give a waterproof tablet to that vessel.

MS. BECKWITH: And the same software that runs on the tablets; are they going to eventually be able run on like an iPhone?

MR. PIERCE: Specifically I talked to the vendors of the timeline; but that's kind of what I'm hearing. They would like to get to a smaller mobile version, but that is kind of what my understanding and just talking with the vendors their plan going forward. A lot of that will also be dependent upon the feedback that we get from our participants. Whether or not they can handle or they would like to go smaller, that is one thing we need to take into consideration.

MR. BELL: One thing to keep in mind, as the technology and the need and the fleet all blend together, we're going to see that there is going to have to be different hardware for different sized boats. Just within the snapper grouper fleet alone you've got anything down to a 20-foot center console to a 55-foot boat.

This is just something that will take time to evolve over time in terms of the right hardware, hardened hardware for the right platform. But given just that fishery as an example, you've got a wide spectrum of potential needs there; and I'm sure industry will rise to the occasion to meet those needs eventually. It is a learning process and kind of we're at baby steps I guess, if you will, right now. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Are you requesting the same things to be reported electronically that are currently required?

MR. PIERCE: Yes; at the very minimum every piece of information that is on our paper logbooks has to be included in the electronic version. We have gone a step above that including some hook size information and basically some characteristics that we felt were important that the assessment people would need.

With that being said, we've always kind of reserved the fact that we may have to go back and revisit those standards; but right now we felt it kind of important to test as many as we possibly could to see what is viable and what is not. But, yes, at the very minimum, everything that we're collecting electronically is being collected on the paper logbooks.

DR. DUVAL: Brett, I just wanted to thank you for your efforts and timely responses to the fishermen. I've certainly gotten compliments from a couple of the folks that I know are involved in North Carolina. At least one of the fishermen is involved in the pilot project that is also being

conducted by the Northeast Science Center, and they're apparently little bit behind the Southeast Science Center in terms of getting equipment on the boats and everything.

It is a lot of equipment. I've got a picture from one of our fishermen who participates in northeast fisheries. He is a snapper grouper, king mackerel, dolphin and wahoo fisherman and is an HMS-permitted fisherman. It has taken up an entire table's worth of gear because you have your computer for your VMS and then you have the laptop for the particular piece of software that he is testing.

It is a lot of space so trying to find a way to consolidate the amount of space that is required for this and hopefully use one piece of hardware that can meet multiple needs I think is what most folks are shooting for. I will just put in a plug as both science centers move forward with looking at these commercial electronic logbooks is there is duplicate reporting that occurs right now.

North Carolina is a specific area of overlap where there are statistical grids that go down to Cape Hatteras in North Carolina, and unfortunately our fishermen who are participating in South Atlantic managed fisheries are having to fill out vessel trip reports and send those to the northeast for fisheries that are not at all managed by either the Mid-Atlantic or New England Council.

I'm just making that as a comment that hopefully you can pass along to Bonnie, and this works through the process as both regions go through their pilot testing phase; that the duplicate reporting causes confusion that I have seen at the SSC level. It causes confusion I think at the management level because people think that, well, if there are statistical grids here in the southeast that are driven by the Northeast Science Center; that must mean that all of the reported harvest and landings is being attributed to northeastern fisheries, and that is not the case.

It is an artifact of the VTR regulations up in the northeast that fishermen are being required to report twice. As you guys think about kind of the big picture of this from an agency perspective, take that into consideration, the reporting burden.

MR. PIERCE: One thing real quick; our standards for our particular version of the electronic logbook were derived from the northeast. One of the big things that we wanted to do was hopefully consolidate it so someone in North Carolina or Virginia or somewhere in that area can then just have one specific electronic logbook and fill it out for multiple agencies.

Several of our dealers that we have reporting or that we're reporting to right now with the electronic logbook have both the northeast and southeast permit; so we do have that option currently within the pilot. We're going to have to do a little bit more work to consolidate it, but I think we are well of doing that.

MR. BELL: And that's a really good point to keep in mind we're just a part of that overall picture. We've got fishermen participating in multiple fisheries and you can't have six different devices in the pilot house. What we want through this eventually is simplification and ease of operation and ease of reporting. Jack.

MR. COX: Brett has been a pleasure to work with. I've got a laptop on my 35-foot boat and the iPad on my 28-foot center console, the day boat. Brett and I have been working together for quite a while on this. I can tell you that we prefer the iPad because it is so user-friendly and it is waterproof and the buttons are big on it.

As the vessel is coming home you can enter your data, you can put your discards, you can put all your stuff in it while it is still fresh in your mind. The iPad has a satellite capability, so it grabs your GPS box while you're engaged in fishing. That is really good information for the science center. We've got a ways to go. We're actually working with a software developer.

They come to Morehead. We spend time with them and we talk about what needs to be changed and how the process is working. It has been good. I think we're excited about it. We think it is going to be so much more helpful getting away from that paper logbooks because that is just so cumbersome and it takes so much time. By the time you get into it, you can't remember what your discards were. It has been great; it is a good program.

MR. HARTIG: I've actually got a question for Jack. How much downtime did it take for the installation and dedication of software education and things of that nature?

MR. COX: Well, the software was kind of already put into the program. On the laptop, it was a little bit tricky because that vendor – there are two different vendors for the software. The vendor for the laptop is up in British Columbia. After spending an hour and a half on the telephone – as we work with the vendors and we change software and find things that we need to upgrade, it has not been real user-friendly with one vendor because they don't have like the team viewer where they can take over software and go in there.

It is kind of challenging for the fishermen to have to kind of kind in there and update the software where like the North Carolina state trip ticket programs, the software developer can actually take control of the computer and the fisherman can just back off of it. I would recommend that. That has been a little bit tricky. The iPad is one that I kind of favor.

It is a lot more user-friendly; but both of the software developers have good point. I have a suggestion if those two could get together, even though they're competing for the contract, then it would be good stuff because both of them have good stuff. One is a little bit trickier than the other one, but it has not been too difficult.

MR. BELL: And Brett just mentioned Kenny is also a participant in this; so do you want to make a comment about it?

MR. FEX: It is very useful. Actually coming in from fishing, I was able to check out what I caught. It actually was really close to what I estimated. I know we're going to a lot more trip limits on different fish, and that will actually be useful, especially if you can look back and, well, I'm really close to my trip limit.

Also on the discards, like Jack had said, a lot of times when you're coming in, you really don't remember all the discards you had. I write them on my dash, but I don't get them all. I think that



would be useful because sometimes we don't realize how much we do throw over. It would probably heartening to ourselves to realize that, too.

Also on the tracking; the enforcement guys, them guys were guys talking about how to enforce; well, if we got these things on our boat, we know we ain't going to be rolling up in that MPA trying to catch fish because we're tracked. I think that's also a useful tool that we will find with it, too. I definitely will work hard with these guys to make it user-friendly, because there are few things that do need to be adjusted on them.

Some of the buttons she says are big, but when the boat is doing this (indicating), the button ain't as big. Everything else is good. I think, also, too, since it is a tablet, our regulations app would be on it, because a lot of times you hear people offshore, they're questioning, well, what is the regulations, what is this or that. That would also be useful. We could update it all the time. I actually think these should be on the wall at our fish house.

Like we're talking about logbooks; if this was on the fish house wall, when I weighed all my fish, I could go over there and type in everything I just needed, to, and I could leave. You know what mean; it would be said and done. It will beat the dealer report, too, so that would be beneficial. Yes, it is definitely useful. I don't have no problem with it. I can carry it with me; I can leave it wherever. I'll work hard with these guys to do what we can, but it is definitely a useful tool and I hope you guys utilize it.

MR. BELL: Thanks, Kenny, I appreciate the input. It is good to hear from the real-world operator out there having to deal with stuff on a day-to-day basis. Ultimately whatever gets implemented has to work and it has to work in a way that gives us the data we need and is practical for the fishermen. It is going to be a learning process and just working through a lot of the details. If we can get there, I think it is encouraging to see that we've got an initial good start. Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: In the internal team discussions, any thought about going to the navigation companies, going to Navtronics or to Garmin and having them be part of this as well?

MR. PIERCE: I don't think we've specifically reached out to them. We are reaching out to basically anybody that we can. I know that we have reached out to several other vendors that do have that capability; but Garmin specifically, we haven't really reached out. Once we get this kind of initial pilot down, we're going to start reaching out saying – once we define our standards a little bit better, that might be something that we are going to do.

I do know that on the Gulf side there has been some overlap with fishermen already having computers on board with the charter plotters and all that and integrating this into that already-existing laptop and/or computer that's board would be very beneficial just going by what we've seen so far.

MR. HARTIG: For the bycatch reporting part of this, I'm hearing what Jack is saying and I'm hearing what Kenny said and both of them are saying they're filling that information out on the way home. I see the utility of this in the future and I don't know how it is going to evolve within the center.

Basically you need to have each spot where you – you need to be able to fill this out real time on each spot that you have so can get at your discard numbers much more accurately. Even with filling it in on the way home, you're going to have some recall bias on any time delay between – I don't know how long Kenny's trips are; a couple days.

I think I remember him telling me usually two-day trips. If you're running out on a day trip, you would be better; but two days you're going to have recall bias. Any length of time that you're waiting to fill out discard information is going to be a detriment to your actual number of discards. I think we need to get somewhere on a real-drop basis for the reef fish fishery. You make one anchorage, you report for that anchorage; the next one, you report for that as well.

MR. PIERCE: Right; and one of the things I wanted to mention is that especially with the coastal logbooks, the thing that is very different about this electronic reporting is we are now doing a set-based reporting. That is one thing that is built into this where we tried to mirror the HMS requirements, which a lot of that involved us trying to identify exactly what a set is, especially for a handline guy or maybe a bandit reel guy.

That's one thing that we may need to revisit in the future. As far as this recall bias and all that, we would need to specifically work with the vendors so that they have that option saying I've ended my effort and I'm about to go to a new spot. Maybe it prompts you to enter that information in. That's one thing that we're going to try to collect over the next several months and actually implement that feedback into the software. The software versions that we have now are far from complete. We are testing it, we are trying to get feedback from the fishermen, and eventually we will provide that to the vendors to make the necessary changes.

MR. BELL: Any other questions right now? Brett, I appreciate your being here and appreciate the input and appreciate the hard work. Let's go ahead and we'll move to the last agenda item, which is Gregg is going to help us navigate through this. We'll discuss the Charterboat Reporting Amendment, and Gregg can bring us up to speed.

MR. WAUGH: And under other business, I just want to give a quick status report on our attempts to get a charterboat grant to do a pilot on the charterboat fishery. The briefing book containing Attachment 5 had the decision document with the wording from your last actions and the Gulf Council's last actions.

We also attached to that version the South Carolina and headboat logbook data forms. It was interesting looking at what sort of data elements we're talking about, so that was in that version. South Carolina has had a logbook system in operation for their for-hire sector since '93, so we've got a lot to draw on there.

In preparation for the joint council session on Thursday, Bob and I worked closely with the Gulf staff, and we tried to get an agreement where we would use our decision document as the document for the joint session. We've had varying success for that. The Hogfish Decision Document we've got agreement on and that's what we'll be using.

For the charterboat – and you’ll hear this in Executive Finance, too, for the Joint South Florida – the Gulf is more comfortable using the amendment document and they chose not to use the decision documents. We’re still hoping that can be resolved before the joint session, so at least in the joint session we would be using one document, but we’ll see how that pans out.

In comparing the amendment document that was included in the second briefing book with the actions that you took and the Gulf took at their last meeting; there were several changes to the wording of the actions and alternatives. We’ve prepared an additional decision document and that was e-mailed out to you. It says “revised” at the top in yellow. It has got a date of June 2<sup>nd</sup> on the front, and Mike e-mailed this out to everybody.

We added in the Gulf staff changes from the amendment document in green. As we walk through, when you see material in green, that is to differentiate what is in the decision document, it is not in the Gulf Amendment or where there are wording differences. We’ll walk through this document and make our decisions as we’re going through it.

Then I will get with Gulf staff and we’ll figure out how we’re going to put the motions that their Data Collection Committee makes on this amendment, put that together for action during the joint session on Thursday.

MR. BELL: Does everybody have access to the June 2<sup>nd</sup> version. That is the music you want to be using.

MR. WAUGH: At the bottom of Page of that, we’ve got some text there on actions, alternatives and we get into the purpose and need. Again, the wording that is shown without highlights reflects the guidance that you gave us and based on the motions that you gave us at your March meeting and the actions from the Gulf.

I have incorporated their committee report that is included as Attachment 4; those have been incorporated into this document. The text in yellow is what the IPT is recommending, and I’ll point out where these differences are. Again, in preparation for how this was to work at the joint council session, we want to project this information. Each council has decided to let the committee chair run the discussion.

Mel will be running the discussion on our side. Mel will be making the motions on behalf of our committee, just like we do normally when we go to full council. He will be making that in form of a motion on behalf of the committee and then our council will vote on that. Then it will go to the Gulf Committee Chair and they will do the same.

They will make their motion on behalf of their committee and their council will vote separately. This is the process we used the last time, three or four years ago, when we met and dealt with mackerel and spiny lobster. It works well. It preserves the administrative record for each council. Are there any questions procedurally on how this is going to work?

MR. HARTIG: Well, in the green – and I haven’t had a chance to look at this – in the green are there substantive changes that changed what the councils did?

MR. WAUGH: Yes, in some cases, and I'll point that out. In some cases the changes are good. The difficulty comes in if you jump from what you saw last time to the new wording without anything in between, it is hard to follow what was done before. We have new action that the IPT is recommending and that you haven't seen before.

MR. BELL: Keep in mind we're used to following a very – I think it works for us – a very orderly process of tracking changes and working through that, so now we're involving input from another group so this just makes a little more challenging, but we felt like our process works and that's what we're going to try to do here. It is just a little bit different because there are moving parts to this.

MR. WAUGH: So if we start with the purpose and need on Page 4; the purpose and need that's shown inside the box, this was modified from the Joint Headboat Reporting Amendment, the amendment s that were done by both councils. You looked at this and approved this wording at your March meeting. The Gulf Council looked at this wording but did not take action.

We had the note here that wording at that time was still focusing in on charter, and we had a couple of actions that you said you wanted included as subalternatives that would address headboats. Now, as we walk through this, you'll see that the recommendation is to deal the headboats as a separate action. If we are indeed broadening this to include headboats, then we need to modify this wording some.

Indeed, that's what is shown here in green. The Gulf Council staff reworded the purpose and need to make it more generic to cover charter vessels and headboat reporting. The one additional item that we need to address is the area. This revised wording and even the wording you talked about before dealt with the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Regions.

We need to expand that to include the Mid-Atlantic and New England Regions; because for Mid-Atlantic, they are involved in the Coastal Migratory Pelagics FMP; and then for the Dolphin Wahoo FMP, that's an Atlantic FMP, and we need to have both the Mid-Atlantic and New England. Ben, to your point, here is where this is a substantive change from the purpose and need.

Your options are to approve the original wording, approve the modified wording or you can even modify that some, which we really need to do to add, in addition to the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic in both the purpose and need, to add the Mid-Atlantic and New England. The intent is that we'll deal with this as a motion here each time as we go through.

MR. BELL: So then one motion we could take would be to modify our existing purpose and need statements to match the Gulf, but then change some of the wording with that because we have to include the other two regions that Gregg mentioned. That is just one way of doing it, I suppose. I want to make it clear that we are in agreement that what we would like to do is include the entire – what we're calling the for-hire sector. They broke it down into charter and headboat, but this is all about the whole for-hire sector. I just want to make that clear. Ben.

MR. HARTIG: So it is similar in a way to the IPT what we did. You have suggested wording from the Gulf Council. What you would do would get a motion to approve the suggested wording with the additional information that we need to have in each of those. Okay.

DR. DUVAL: I'm prepared to make a motion; but before I do so, I just want to say I like the proposed Gulf staff changes to make this more generic and then adding the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions, I think – and this might be something that the IPT can work on a little bit with regard to the wording; but with regard to the need, it states – and I'm reading the green highlighted text – “is to improve charter vessel and headboat fishery data used for stock assessments and to improve monitoring and compliance of for-hire vessels in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic regions.”

I think the nuance in there is that we need to improve the compliance and monitoring of vessels that hold permits for those regions, because we're not improving compliance of all for-hire vessels in the Mid-Atlantic and New England Regions. It is only those that hold permits that are administered by the Southeast Regional Office.

It is a nuance; I just think it is important that there not be – because we are going to have to provide opportunity for public input and comment, just as we did with the dealer reporting amendment in those other regions, I think it is important to be clear about what exactly we're improving the monitoring and compliance of. It is not all the for-hire vessels; it is the ones that hold Gulf and Southeast regional permits. Maybe Monica has something.

MR. BELL: Right; and that was one of the things that I showed to my staff. They wanted to make it clear that it was for appropriately federally permitted vessels. Monica

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: My question is not to that point, but it is another, but it has to do with the purpose and need. I don't know that it is making it more generic. It looks to me like it is getting more specificity as to what exactly you're requiring. My question I think is for Gregg although it could be for Bonnie and she is not here.

There was a number of years ago, I think it was for the commercial sector that there was a requirement in certain fisheries to collect economic information as well. My question is do we also require that in the for-hire fishery that collection of information? Remember the economic logbook and the add-on and all that.

Anyway, if you do, it would be covered necessarily by this purpose and need. It would be under the original purpose and need that you had because that just refers to data; but this gets into more specificity. Maybe this is just something for the IPT to look into; I'm not sure. If the economic information isn't collected, then no problem, this purpose and need would probably be fine. I just can't recall. I know we did it in the commercial sector. I just don't recall whether we did it in the for-hire.

DR. DUVAL: So as part of headboat electronic reporting right now I think there is a table with the data elements that it does ask for information about the amount of fuel and cost of fuel; so that would be considered economic data.

MR. BELL: And Mark might could add to that as well.

MR. BROWN: Yes; I do reporting for the state and I have to do a separate one electronically. What my question was is if this is approved or whatever, will the states be able to access the codes for this where we don't have to do separate reporting for the state and then were it to be more combined to where everybody would have access to it so it would more uniform?

MR. BELL: So keep in mind right now, as far as I know, I think we're the only state; but, yes, our goal would be basically bring this together into one system and not have duplication in reporting.

MR. BROWN: And the only reason I bring this up is because I mentioned it to Bonnie a few months ago about that, for being able to access that information, and she said there might be some sort of a legal aspect to it. I just wanted to make sure that if we went in the direction of trying to modify things or bring things closer together and in line; that the states would have the opportunity to access the information.

MR. BELL: As a state that has a program would, of course, obviously be interested in maintaining its ability to collecting these data; we'll have to work that out in detail. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: And we get into that a little bit in Action 4; and we've got a proposed modification for how we deal with that; but, yes, the intent is that the data would go to – similar to how they're working the commercial pilot now where ACCSP is administering an secure FTP site, and that's where the data goes first; that is what the technical subcommittee that looked at charterboat reporting, for-hire reporting has recommended that there be a central place where the data go first.

Then everybody can pull it from there. We would need to work with South Carolina to make sure that their data elements are included in what we would specify as the minimum data elements. That way if you filled out one of these reports and it was provided to ACCSP, then South Carolina could pull off either all the data or the data to match up with what they require. The intent is you would only have to hit the send button one time and that would take care of your reporting requirement across the board.

MR. BROWN: And that's a tremendous benefit there, because it always gives you how long it takes to fill out a report; but when you have multiple reports you've got to continually fill out with a lot of redundant same information, it just kind of runs into a problem.

MR. BELL: Yes; we're sensitive to that at the state level; and we should be sensitive to that at our level here as well as other states may come on board with their own versions of this or whatever. But kind of back of Monica's points; is the degree of specificity in here prohibited in terms of collecting those data or did we decide we're okay. Because we're already doing it with headboats, we're good there. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I think really where it is contained as in the purpose statement where it specifically references accuracy and timeliness of landings, discards and effort; so I certainly see Monica's

point; and based on that would probably recommend just leaving it at recreational for-hire data for federally permitted vessels participating in Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic.

MR. BELL: Right; I can see where that degree of specificity locks you in and then maybe prohibits other things that you might want; so if we're a little more general in data, then perhaps we're okay. We're working on some suggested wording for a motion that might work.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: One thing you could potentially do is – I mean I like this, the accuracy and timeliness of landings, discards and effort and other data; just something to put in here in case there were some requirements that weren't covered by landings, discards and effort.

MR. BELL: What do you think about that; and other data?

DR. DUVAL: I'm fine with that and just other data; but generally when we've been that general, what comes back is, well, what do you mean by "other data", blah, de, blah; so I think if you guys are happy with that, then I'm happy with it.

MR. BELL: From a public perception standing; what other data?

DR. DUVAL: I'm happy with just adding "other data" if that will solve the issue.

DR. McGOVERN: I was just going to suggest changing South Atlantic to just Atlantic so then you cover the Mid-Atlantic and north for dolphin and other species.

MR. BELL: Okay, I guess that's fair; we're all Atlantic on this side. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Well, in terms of the other data, I'm a little sensitive to that as well. For the commercial logbooks where we're going from a group of people that is already accustomed to providing data to a different version of providing that data for the for-hire charter, non-headboat guys, they really don't provide data on a regular basis; so I think they're going to be ultra-sensitive to every piece of this because this is completely new.

I don't like that open-endedness. In fact, you're going to keep seeing me ask for more and more specificity and more description sort of throughout this so those of the charter industry that have never had to report before will have the most information available to them. I'm not okay with just other data.

MR. BELL: Okay, I figured we'd pick a little sensitivity there. I suppose we could also add something like – if economics is the one area we were talking about, we could add economic to the data or socioeconomic data or something like that. That would be, again, specificity, but not going crazy for anything, and it would help define exactly what we're looking for, perhaps.

DR. DUVAL: I think I would want to be clear if we could insert "federally permitted" in front of "for-hire vessels".

MR. BELL: Yes, I think that's a good idea.

DR. DUVAL: Do we have Jack's suggested – yes. The one thing I was going to maybe suggest was referring to federally permitted for-hire vessels participating in Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic managed fisheries, because we have vessels that are – the point is that we have vessels that are permitted; that hold permits for fisheries that are managed by these two management bodies, but they are in other regions.

They are in the Mid-Atlantic region; they're in the New England region; and referencing the fact that they are participating in Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic managed fisheries takes it beyond the region but it makes it specific that we're not trying to take over any for-hire data collection in those other regions,. We just want to make sure that we're properly managing the vessels that hold permits to participate in our managed fisheries.

MR. BELL: Those are the ones we're responsible for; so does that make sense to take a look at that wording?

DR. DUVAL: I guess I would ask Monica can you mull that over, Monica and Jack. You understand the point that I'm trying to get to. We manage the fisheries. We're not trying to impose any for-hire data collection requirements on vessels participating in fisheries that are managed in the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions; just the ones that we manage but they're operating in other regions.

MR. BELL: Does that make sense?

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Yes.

MR. BELL: Okay, if we're comfortable with that, would somebody be willing to – Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I would move that we approve the purpose and need as modified.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, I have a question to the need; and the need is are we just using this for stock assessments? It does say, "Used for stock assessments and to improve monitoring and compliance of for-hire vessels." My question is wouldn't we also use some of this information – if we're getting socioeconomic information in developing FMP amendments and those sorts of things that aren't always related to stock assessments. Do you see where I'm going with this?

MR. BELL: Yes; and I was actually thinking we'd just knock out the purpose first; but, yes, I follow you.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Well, the motion was to approve the purpose and need.

**DR. DUVAL: We don't have a second to this motion, so I'm happy to modify that motion to just move to approve the purpose as modified.**

MR. BELL: Okay, and Mark seconds that. We're just dealing right now with the purpose statement. Okay, everybody clear on what the motion is? We have a motion to just go ahead and



deal with the purpose first. **Any objection to that motion? Seeing none; then that motion carries.** Now we can deal with the need statement.

MR. HARTIG: You've already voted on that last motion?

MR. BELL: On the purpose; yes.

MR. HARTIG: On the need; could you get away – I'm not on your committee, by the way; but could you get rid of – in the first line "improve charter vessel and headboat fishery data used for management and to improve monitoring and compliance," getting to what Monica said about amendments. Since stock assessments is part of management; do you want to get that specific?

MR. BELL: Yes, that would and that would cover a bunch of different uses. Take a look at that, Ben, and see if that works. Jack.

DR. McGOVERN: I think you're supposed to have "Atlantic" after "South" there.

MR. BELL: Okay, so the need for this action is to improve charter vessel and headboat fishery data used for management and to improve monitoring and compliance of federally permitted for-hire vessels in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic managed fisheries. How does sound; look good to people? Michelle.

**DR. DUVAL: I was going to make that as a motion to approve the need as modified.**

**MR. BELL: Okay, we have a motion from Michelle; second by Mark. Any further discussion on that motion to approve the need as modified? Any objection? All right, then that is approved.** It is amazing how long it takes us to get through the purpose and need; but that is good, though. I think that does clarify things and I'm comfortable with that wording myself. Mr. Chairman, do you want to recess for lunch?

MR. HARTIG: Yes; I think that's an excellent idea and we'll come back at 1:30.

MR. BELL: Okay, we're recessed for lunch until 1:30. All right, it 1:30 and we're going to reconvene the Data Committee and pick up where we left off. Gregg, do you want to pick us up. This amendment only has four actions in it, but it is a little more complicated because of the joint nature of it.

MR. WAUGH: On Page 5 of that decision document, we start with Action 1. The wording shown here is what you approved at your March meeting. At the Gulf March/April meeting they approved a motion changing "via computer or internet" to "via NMFS-approved hardware/software" in Alternatives 2 through 5.

What you see first here, with the highlights in yellow, are the changes that the Gulf made after you saw this. The material on Page 5 shows the alternatives that you approved, but I've shown in either highlight in yellow and strike-through the changes that the Gulf approved. There is one alternative that I want to point out, Alternative 4, that requires the charterboats submit the fishing

records weekly, and that weekly time period is defined as defined as seven days after the end of each week, which would be a Sunday.

Now, when we move to the IPT recommendations, that alternative is not included in the IPT recommendations. What the technical subcommittee has recommended is to get everybody organized so that – well, get the headboats and the charterboats organized so that they're reporting weekly, but that would be the Tuesday following each week.

When you move from the first set of alternatives on Page 5 continuing over to the top of Page 6, that is what you approved the last time, highlighting the changes by the Gulf Council that met after you. Then the IPT got together and they looked at this; and we teased out what applied to charterboats and what applied to headboats and the desire to standardize the time period when they would report, you see this reflected in Alternative 2 here where we require that federally permitted charterboats submit their records weekly, and that's Tuesday following each week.

That coincides with the recommendation from the technical subcommittee. The IPT felt, well, since we're trying to move everybody to that, then we really don't want to have an alternative for charterboats that would go to the old standard, which is weekly on a Sunday. That's why you see that change.

Then you get down to the top of Page 7 where you see the changes that the Gulf staff has made to the IPT recommendations. This is the wording that is included in the amendment that was sent out to you, and that amendment is what the Gulf Council is going to be working from. I've highlighted either in green their changes, some of the strike-through.

Some of it is just wordsmithing. The changes to the wording of the action itself; the South Atlantic would need to be just changed to "Atlantic". You can see that there is more use of acronyms. We have been advised by our I&E AP years ago to try and minimize the amount of acronyms that you use; so we try not to use them too much in the wording of the actions and alternatives, but several of their suggestions are to just use SRD instead of Science and Research Director. In this case there is not really substantive changes in the wording that has been recommended by the Gulf staff. Those are the three versions that you have to work from.

MS. BECKWITH: Gregg, I guess, first of all, can you remind me of what the overall timing for this amendment is and also explain to me a little bit about the timing of a potential new application for a new pilot study and how that is going to coincide. Then I've got quite a few after that.

MR. WAUGH: At Page 27 of this document we outline the timing. Of course, this is all dependent on what happens here this week. The Gulf and South Atlantic Councils acted on this in March/April. The hope is here to get agreement on the actions and alternatives to go out to public hearing. The Gulf would conduct public hearings in July.

We have a block of time set aside for public hearings in August. Then the councils would review that input and action; us in September, the Gulf Council in August and October. We would give final approval in December; the Gulf at their October 2015 or January 2016 meeting. Obviously, that's a timing if everything works properly.

If we get tangled up and slide a meeting, then we'll slide a meeting. As far as the Charterboat Pilot Project, remember the last meeting there was some discussion about the funding opportunity that was coming with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Grant. We got with our four state partners; we worked with Ken Brennan at the Beaufort Lab and put together a proposal along with Fran, who works for Harbor Light Software, who gave the presentation to you.

We put a proposal in there. Unfortunately, that proposal was not funded. A big project in the Gulf was funded and some projects in the northeast and out west were funded. We are now revising that charterboat project proposal and submitting it towards the end of the month to ACCSP. The hope was to get that in place and test out the tablet that was developed in Rhode Island and to modify that for use down here and use that as a test; so that then when this amendment came online, we would be farther along in having the mechanics' side sorted out.

MS. BECKWITH: And I guess that's one of my many concerns with where I am right now is without a pilot study; I remember looking at what they had and what they had in the northeast, and to me that didn't jive with what the needs of what the small boat charter for-hire fishermen would need in our area.

If we were going to go the more technically advanced routes that we're discussing and within some of these alternatives, I'd be really uncomfortable to move forward without having those specifically tested for our specific-style fisheries, site-casting for cobia. There is multiple examples of where we're a bit different. That's just for the record.

I guess specifically to this action, I did have a couple of questions. Overall I would like to see some specificity in what data elements we would be asking for. There are some tables in each of these actions, one for the for-hire and one for the headboat, that sort of specify what they're required to do now via paper versions but not necessarily what we would be requiring through this amendment.

I would want some discussion on much more specifics so when this goes out to the public they see exactly what it is that we have the potential to be asking them to report on. More specifically, I've got concerns since we don't have a pilot study to consider, I think there is a need to consider differences between boat types in the for-hire charter, the smaller boat fishery.

There is a lot of variation. If you have a boat that has a captain and a deckhand or a captain and a couple of mates, that boat may be in a position to report at a higher level of specificity than a charter captain who is on a 19-, 20-, 21-, 22-, 23-foot boat, has four to six people, depending on the size of the boat during the charter; that you're just not going to be able to provide that same level of information. I'd like to see a little bit more on that.

Then when we talk about the other data components in terms of discards and socioeconomic data, I would be interested to see if that is something that this council is considering requiring from each trip or each day or all captains or is it going to be a 10 percent and 20 percent survey for some portion of reports that you get pulled up and you have to provide some of this additional information, but your set amount of required elements is smaller and more refined.

Those are just some of my questions. Then in terms of Alternative 4 where we're looking at kind of trip level information and at the end of each trip, before you sort of back up to the dock, certainly I can see where that would reduce recall bias, but one of the phrases I read in here a couple of times was it offers the greatest ability to prevent ACL overages.

I guess when I think about ACL overages, I've got a bunch of questions that I can see us being asked by our charter captains is, really how is this going to be used to track ACLs? Are we really going to use the South Atlantic's charter information to close down a fishery because we have these joint ACLs between recreational and for-hire.

And really what is the need for that because there are very few species outside of our deep-water species that we're closing due to overages in our ACL right now from a lot of our recreational species. I can anticipate these being questions that I'm going to be asked, and I don't have the answer to those, and I certainly don't see them in the information as it is right now. Then I have some more stuff for Action 3.

MR. WAUGH: Just to respond to a couple of points there; as far as the data elements, you're right, we need to be specific in what we're requiring. Table 2.2.1 on Page 17 shows what is required right now in the Southeast Regional Headboat Survey. They're providing that information for every trip.

The decision document that was included in the second briefing book had the logbook form for the headboat. It also had the South Carolina logbook form showing those data elements. To me, the intent was to insert that level of detail after this meeting. Now, you may very well want that level of detail before you approve it to go out to public hearing; and if that's how you want to do it, that's fine.

The state of South Carolina has been running a logbook program since '93, so we need to make sure that – and they are moving to electronic reporting now; not at-sea electronic reporting, but to the ability where they can send in their information electronically. In terms of specifying the minimum data elements, we need to coordinate with the state of South Carolina to make sure their data needs are met.

The state of North Carolina is in the process of developing a for-hire logbook program, and we would need to look at their data elements. To me that would form the basis of our minimum data elements. Then you're absolutely correct; we want to try to work and get a sub-sample of individuals who would provide more detailed information, and that would need to be laid out and specified how that is going to be selected. I think a lot of these issues can be address in this pilot program.

If we can get that going, people see how easy the software and hardware are to use. Then we'll also learn what types of vessels you can ask for enhanced data reporting on and which type of vessels you need to just have the minimum data elements reported from

MR. BELL: And I didn't envision perhaps setting up the degree of specificity right now. I viewed that as maybe coming out in the public process. It is a little different for me because I do have a program in place; and so if I'm talking to South Carolina fishermen, I can just say, well, here is what you've been reporting.

You've been doing this 20 years; here is what you've been reporting; and we're just going to provide an opportunity to do it electronically now or through or some other means. It is a little easier for us because that's already defined. I would envision for the other states that don't have programs; that is going to be some – you're going to get some public input on that. You're going to get questions about that. I don't think we're in a position right now to try to define what the data sheet looks like at this point.

MS. BECKWITH: But if we're not in a position right now to define what those data inputs are going to be, then this isn't a public hearing document. To me this is a scoping document; and to call it a public hearing document without that sort of level of specificity, when people are going to look down and see that we've got the potential to take final action on this in less than a year and make this mandatory without having had a pilot study that we can kind of lean back on, I'm not okay with that; I'm not comfortable with that.

And then sort specifically to my ACL questions, I didn't know if there was somebody that would be able to answer that in terms of how is this going to be used to track ACLs and some of those other points I brought up?

MR. WAUGH: Jack or Rick may want to follow up; but if you look at the technical subcommittee final report, they lay out a lot more detail in there. The intent was that would be an appendix to this charterboat amendment. Unfortunately, it didn't get attached when the Gulf completed that document.

If you look in there, they lay out that there needs to be a parallel study for two to three years where the MRIP Program continues to collect data; that is what would be used to track the ACL. We run the charterboat logbook in parallel for a period of years; and once they figure out how to transition the data, then we would anticipate moving to using the charterboat logbook information to track – at that time it would be the entire for-hire fishery; and then MRIP would stop collecting information from charterboats and focus just on private anglers. That would be after a two to three year parallel run to make sure all the data issues are sorted out; and then they would stop collecting data from the charterboats and we'd move to tracking the ACL from the logbooks.

MR. BROWN: One of the things I wanted to tell Anna is I'm a V-2 vessel; and so I'm licensed to carry 7 to 49 passengers in the state of South Carolina. We do a logbook for them, but I'm also doing the electronic logbook for the feds for the headboats, and that's weekly. I have to do that on a weekly basis, and I try to do it as quickly as I can.

Then I get also the Quantech Surveys twice a month, and you have to respond to that as soon as possible or by the timeframe they've got set in there. One of things I did want to mention to Gregg and to Mel is that there is a little bit of conflict between the South Carolina logbook and the electronic logbook. When you put in your position, the grids on the South Carolina logbook are

different than the ones on the electronic logbook. It makes it a little bit difficult to try to match them or to parallel them.

Unless you've got your exact coordinates in latitude and longitude and where a lot of us are still working off the old conversions with the Loran-C; it puts you in a position of not understanding exactly where you are on that grid because the two grids are a little bit different. You have to make sure you have that lat and long to be able to enter that, because you can't go by the South Carolina grid and the electronic logbook grid because they're different.

MR. BELL: Okay, I'll check on that. Zack.

MR. BOWEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm again not on this committee either, and I really appreciate the opportunity to speak. Anna, I agree with you in a lot of ways, but we kind of do have a pilot program. It is just going in the northeast; and, yes, you're right, we do not have one here; but we do have one to learn from.

Secondly, the small boats and big boats, I'm one of the fortunate ones that does have a full-time deckhand that I really don't need to get out of the seat. I understand where you're coming from when you say it might be easier for me in that position to do what we're talking about. But also from the smaller boats, we don't limit our fish compared to the size of the boat.

Those guys in those 19-foot boats, they catch and they're allowed to catch the same amount of fish that we in the bigger boats are because it is mostly per person or per boat. We don't decipher between the sizes of the boats. Any data or any information that we can get from the for-hire sector at this point going into the future is better than what we've had in the past. I just wanted to make that point. I sympathize with some of your concerns but we've got to have something.

MS. BECKWITH: It isn't sympathizing with my concerns, Zack. It is this document does not give enough information for our industry to be able to give proper public comment. They will read this – and if I read this and I'm educated and I understand what we're trying to do here and I can't answer this list of questions for myself, then how would we expect our for-hire industry – not the headboat guys that are accustomed to reporting but the brand new request from this council to go from not having reported in North Carolina to having a potential end-of-trip reporting before you back your boat into the dock; that is not okay.

There are not enough answers to questions that these guys are going to have. If this is a true public process and we want buy-in, this document is not going to get buy-in. We need to consider it in my opinion a scoping document and send it out; but this timeline is not realistic to me. In terms of the logbook pilot study that we did in the northeast, great, they did it in the northeast, but our histories are not like it is in the northeast.

They need to pilot study; they've got different boats, different setups. It is not the same; so you can't just take something that they're doing up there and say here you guys go; here is a set package; and take two or three years of people being angry to have to fill it out the entire time. They're going to be mad to start with; but at least if we're going to do it, it makes sense to slow it down and take the time to do it right. I don't have a problem sending this out.

I'm just not sending this out, if I have a choice, as a public hearing document where we're going to take final action in December and make this mandatory. I'm just looking for some additional specificity. I'm happy to work with the staff and whomever to get listed out some of the things I think my side of the for-hire industry will need to understand to make better choices.

MR. BOWEN: They're mad now, Anna. The charterboat people are mad now.

MR. BELL: Hang on one second; I follow you. I know what you're saying is basically before we sign on the dotted line, so to speak, we want to see more detail. What we were kind of hoping to do here today was agree on sort of big-picture things without that degree of specificity, and that would come out.

Another way to get that, perhaps, would be to agree on big picture at this point moving forward to maybe take another look at it and in between taking another look at it at the next meeting try to work out some more details, working with staff and sort of fleshing this out a little bit more as opposed to a whole separate scoping, hearing or whatever. That's another way. I understand what you're saying and I understand your concerns about the level of detail and then moving straight to a product which we're ready to sort of sign off on. That's just a thought. Mark.

MR. BROWN: Well, I hear her loud and clear. I told Michelle, too, at one point that I'm getting calls from their constituents. I've gotten several calls from them; but it seems to me like they're already confused about what was trying to be proposed and mixing it in with commercial and recreational and for-hire and everything. I was like they're all over the place; so more confusion with presenting this will really cause a problem.

DR. DUVAL: Anna, I hear your concerns and you're obviously coming from a different perspective than I am in terms of someone who has to make decisions about managing the fishery and the data that's necessary to do so and listening to the complaints of a vast majority of charter captains that are really, really pissed of right now that blueline tilefish is closed.

I see something like this as being necessary for proper management of the fishery and that can help support – particularly with regard to ACLs that can help support these fisheries being opened or closed based on more accurate catch information. We did scope this a year and a half ago, two years ago, so it has been scoped.

It was contained within CE-BA 3 and then we broke that up I think at one of the Wilmington meetings. I think it might have been in December of 2013, something like that. We broke up all the actions that were in there; so it has been scoped. I think that we can include additional example information of what the data elements might be.

I think the current chart that's in there with regard to the headboat data elements is a great example of what we would be asking. I think if you put something out there that is so detailed that the public thinks that this is exactly what you're going to do, it sort of defeats the purpose of taking something out for public hearing.

The point is we want the public's input on some of these items, both the timing and data elements that would be requested for reporting. You want to be able to modify those. I think presenting as this is what we currently ask the headboat guys to report, here is an example of similar types of data elements that we would want here. There has been a pilot done in the Gulf. I would hope that we could get money to pilot the technology here in the southeast.

I agree with you that the platform that we would want to collect this information on is pretty important. The things that I have heard is that folks are going to want to see something like an iPhone app or a phone application particularly for some of the smaller vessels. I understand your concerns, but I guess I would just remind folks that we did scope this action a whole ago.

MS. BECKWITH: I know we scoped it; but if we scoped it and we clearly didn't get enough detail back to bring some of these discussions out in more specificity or did we?

DR. DUVAL: Because we had other items that we were doing; we had dealer reporting in there, we had bycatch reporting in there, we had commercial logbook reporting in there; so it was a lot of really big stuff. It just happened that we started working our way down the line. The Dealer Reporting Amendment was one of the most critical because we do use that for monitoring our ACLs and having the frequency of that reporting move forward more quickly as well as the headboat electronic reporting.

We had already had a headboat pilot project; and the center was ready to pull the trigger, so to speak, on getting that electronic reporting program in place. That is why we took these in sort of piecemeal fashion. It is not that there wasn't input on it; it is that there is only so much work you can do in a day.

MS. BECKWITH: Right; and let me be clear; I support this going forward. When we attempted to move this through North Carolina, what we were able to provide the average public was sort of a PDF version of what we saw the final product potentially being and then asked them to comment on that final product.

They were able to specifically give comments on, well, I don't like that box there, that doesn't make sense, or I don't want to have to checkmark that I'm targeting each species. We were able to give them something a little bit more concrete to comment on. When I read through this – this is just broad enough where if I was a captain and I'm reading through this, I'm going to get the sense that this is kind of a blank check; like if we sign this out, then there is really no telling what the minimum of maximum amount of data requirements that we're going to be asked for is going to be. That all has to be specified certainly we approve this.

There has to be a bookmark I think on either end that says these are the minimum requirements and these are the maximum requirements that we're going to ask from you guys to provide under these circumstances. What I'm not comfortable with is the level of broadness where you don't know where those bookmarks are at the moment or how they're going to be required of you. I have specific concerns and I'm happy to work with whoever wants me to.



MR. BELL: And that's fine and particularly you being from that industry, you know what you're talking about; so how about this? Right now the action itself deals with frequency and it deals with mechanism, some type of data form. There are some examples in here of what sort of data elements; but between now and any hearing through IPT or through staff we could develop examples of what a form would look like. We could basically gin up a form in terms of then whether that again keys off of – I mean, South Carolina already has a form, but we could develop something that would be a strawman, if you will, for people to look at. That could go to the hearings and then you'd have something.

I don't see us doing that right now, but we have time between now and the next meeting to work that out either through IPT – and again we can lean on the – well, we have the technical working group's input. We can kind of lean on all that and try to develop something and have something to show people and then they can say it works or it doesn't work. Again, I know it is easier for me because I already have a form to start with; but maybe we could do that and still kind of move forward on the same timeline. Zack.

MR. BOWEN: Does anybody at the table or maybe even in the room have an estimate on what a pilot study would cost?

MR. WAUGH: \$490,000 was the proposal that was submitted to the National Wildlife Federation. We're in the process of scaling that back to submit it to ACCSP. The expectation there is a maximum that we could reasonably submit to ACCSP would be a maximum of \$200,000.

MR. BELL: And in keep in mind the reason that we included the South Carolina form in this was there is an example of what a form could look like or what sort of data elements we're talking about. That's one example, but we can gin up a different one. Maybe it looks like that and maybe it looks a little different, but we could have multiple examples, perhaps, but would be something we could do between now and any series of hearings, perhaps.

MR. HAYMANS: Isn't the format that Fran currently has on the tablet pretty close to what it may wind up being? It is there; it is being tested.

MR. BELL: Jack, have you've got experience with that?

MR. COX: I'm using one of her programs now; and it has a lot I think of what you're wanting to do. I'm sorry I didn't bring my tablet with me. Kenny may have his: I thought I saw him with it earlier. This pilot program that I'm involved in is not very hard. It kind of moves along pretty good; and I think a lot of this data that we had a while back may be helping us on some issues like blueline tile and the snapper and other things. Yes; it is working pretty good.

MR. BELL: So all that to say I think we can move forward perhaps in a general sense here but agree to have examples or something to show people when we go to hearing and they've got multiple examples to look at of what we think would be the common data elements that we would need in there and then just kind of move forward and get input on that. Chris.

MR. CONKLIN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not on your committee either, but listening to all this and putting the fine set of what is going to be in the report and minimum and maximum amount of information, whatever, might kind of tie our hands behind our back; because you never know down the road we might need a certain piece of information for an economic analysis or something like that; and we wouldn't have to circle back through and say, well, we didn't include so we can't get that information. I could see where you could put minimum requirement but not a maximum. It seems like these guys are ready to step up to the plate if we can get it going.

MR. BELL: So it needs to kind of evolve overtime, but you've got a general kind of box you're working in. Okay, what is the pleasure of the committee here? We do need to kind of move along on this particular action, which might need some tweaking. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I guess it would be my preference to continue to work through the rest of the document. Action 1 really deals with the frequency of reporting and what day things would be required to be reported. Action 2 does really just the same thing but with typos to just try to make it consistent.

Action 3 deals with the location information; and Action 4 deals with the data flow. I think we at least need to just step through the rest of the document and at least look at the changes that are being proposed to the language of the different alternatives and the language of the actions to keep moving forward and try to address Anna's concerns about data elements that would be requested.

I think the technical subcommittee report lays out a whole suite of minimum data elements that would be required as well as validation. Certainly a lot of that has been pulled into this decision document with regard to the recommendations. The second version of the decision document doesn't have the South Carolina logbook forms tacked onto the back of it.

I think inclusion of that, also noting what data elements are currently being required of headboats and laying out in some tabular format the minimum data elements that would be required from the agency to do what we want this to do, such as being able to monitor ACLs, et cetera, would be good. But I think just the broad framework, I would hope that we could step through the rest of the document.

MR. BELL: Right; and that's what I was thinking. We're at a point if there is any wordsmithing or tweaking we want to do to the wording we had related on input from IPT or Gulf, now is the time to try to do that. If we like any aspect of their wording or the suggesting wording better than ours, now is the time to incorporate that. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: **I'm certainly happy to make a motion to accept the IPT-recommended changes to the wording of Action 1 and the alternatives.** I don't have any strong preference for the changes that have been recommended by the Gulf staff. I think it is really more just semantics and style in terms of acronyms versus no acronyms. I would hope that the IPT could work that out. I don't really think we need to insert ourselves in that, but that's me.

MR. BELL: That makes sense; so is that motion?

DR. DUVAL: Yes.

MR. BELL: Okay, we have motion; Jack Cox seconds. Monica.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: Gregg, on Page 7 of the document would you mind reading me what the changes would be suggested by the Gulf staff? As I read the action, some of it is in green, some of it is not, and I understand that. I'm not sure it is making sense to me the way I read it; so if you'd read just the title of Action 1 as modified by the Gulf staff or recommended.

MR. WAUGH: Modify Frequency and Mechanism of Date Reporting for Charter Vessels Harvesting Gulf Reef Fish, South Atlantic Snapper Grouper, South Atlantic Dolphin Wahoo or Coastal Migratory Pelagics.

MS. SMIT-BRUNELLO: So the data-reporting requirements are supposed to be struck?

MR. WAUGH: It was supposed to be struck and inadvertently underlined.

MR. BELL: Any discussion on the motion right now? **Any objection to the motion? Okay, seeing none, then that motion passes.** Now we would move to Action 2, and you can see it picks up on Page 13 and on Page 14 there are Gulf changes, IPT recommendations.

MR. WAUGH: This is a new action. At your last meeting you had a couple of subalternatives for what is now Action 3 and 4 that dealt with headboats. The IPT felt it would be more clear if we dealt with the requirements for the charterboats in Action 1 and the change in the reporting frequency for headboats in Action 2. That's why this is a new action.

The no action alternative tracks basically what we had before. Alternative 2 would change the reporting frequency to weekly, which is Tuesday following each week, and that is what the technical subcommittee has recommended. Then on the top of Page 14, Alternative 3 has daily by noon of the following day; and Alternative 4, prior to arriving at the dock.

They track the alternatives that were included in Action 1. The Gulf has just proposed some changes to the wording of the action itself. In the wording of the action that the IPT has recommended, if we stay with that, we need to delete "South" in from of "Atlantic" because it is Atlantic dolphin and wahoo.

MR. BELL: So if we take the IPT recommendations, that lines up with the Gulf as far as they've got an Action 2 that matches our new Action 2 with headboats.

MR. WAUGH: Well, the Gulf has recommended these changes to the wording of the action.

MR. BELL: Okay, so one option would be adopt the IPT recommendations here. Michelle.

**DR. DUVAL: I move that we approve the IPT recommendations for new Action 2 and the alternatives and approve the range of the new Action 2 alternatives shown for detailed analyses with the modification of removal of the word "South" from the title of the action.**

MR. BELL: Jack Cox seconds. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: Again, Mr. Chairman, I don't have any objection to the Gulf staff proposed changes. I just feel like that's sort of an IPT issue that can be worked out.

MR. BELL: Right, I think so. At this point we're just trying to track along with what we're dealing with here, but, yes, certainly nothing wrong with theirs either. Basically the motion is to adopt the IPT recommendations related to Action 2. **Any objection to that motion? Seeing none; that motion passes.** That would take us to what was the old Action 2 and now Action 3 starting on Page 19 of the document.

MR. WAUGH: This deals with how you record catch location. What appears there first is what you approved at the last meeting. It was my understanding at that time, if you look at Alternative 2, that headboats were reporting latitude and longitude in degrees and minutes or they were clicking to show which headboat grid they fished within.

During the IPT discussions, it was clarified that the headboats are providing latitude and longitude in degrees and minutes one of two ways; either by providing that latitude and longitude in degrees and minutes or clicking where within that headboat grid they were fishing, and that would record latitude and longitude. We clarified that in the IPT recommendations.

We also included the words "use of a NMFS-approved electronic device" to make it more clear. One of the issues we don't have in terms of the IPT options, it does not include an alternative similar to what you had in there before just dealing with latitude and longitude in degrees and minutes. If you want to see an alternative like that go forward, we would need to add that.

The recommendation coming from the IPT is to parallel what is being done in the headboats but to also provide the opportunity to get more specific catch location by having the device be GPS-enabled and record the specific location. The benefits to this are increased precision in knowing where your catch came from, better catch-per-unit effort, indices that can go into stock assessments and better locational information so that you could look at what is discarded and calculate a more appropriate discard mortality rate based on where that catch has occurred.

We also have now oil-and-gas exploration about to take place. If we had better catch location information, we could have more influence over where that testing was allowed and where drilling may be allowed. In the future you may be dealing with wind farm locations. If we had more specific catch location information, you can steer them away from more critical areas.

The flip side of that is obviously that the fishermen would be providing more specific catch location information. That would be treated as highly confidential information. Any analyses that are done and reported would be done by headboat grid; so we wouldn't be giving away any of that specific catch location information.

That's the main differences with the IPT recommendation. Then the Gulf staff has made some more changes; one of which is very helpful is to insert "federally permitted for-hire vessels" that

will track the others. That is an excellent suggestion there. That would parallel this along with Actions 1 and 2.

Of course, you have subalternatives there for this to apply to Gulf headboats and/or charter and Atlantic headboats or charter. Of course, the hope would be that we would have the same level of specificity in our area for both of our sections. That would be the most useful to us for stock assessments and dealing place-based issues.

DR. DUVAL: Just to clarify how the headboat electronic reporting of catch location works, it is latitude and longitude in degrees and minutes or you're logging into the computer after you get back from your trip, you can click within this one square nautical mile grid box and it will automatically record a lat/long in degrees and minutes for you?

MR. BELL: Ten-minute blocks.

MR. WAUGH: That's correct.

DR. DUVAL: I'm looking down to Mark –

MR. BELL: Mark, do you want to tell them how it is done?

DR. DUVAL: – so it is ten-minute blocks, right?

MR. BROWN: Yes, it is a big block but it is in a small little area; and what makes it hard is like our South Carolina logbook, if you look at it, it is a big grid. It is a big page and you can see even the contour or the depths and everything; so it kind of gives you some insight of about where you're at; but when you go to the electronic logbook, it is a little tiny square with no bottom contour or anything.

You can't really see anything, so then you have a hard time if you're using TDs and you don't have that lat/long in front of you trying to figure out exactly where you're at within the large amount of area condensed to a small scale is what I'm trying to say.

MR. BELL: Yes; but the take home there, though, is it is a ten mile by ten mile box; that somewhere in the box you click the box.

DR. DUVAL: And so I guess one question about Alternative 2 and the no action alternatives specifically to headboats is just that it would be an approved electronic device that automatically records the vessel location for later transmission as opposed to right now you're going back home, you're looking in and you're clicking on the box or specifically recording that lat/long?

MR. BELL: Right; so the way this is set up right now, if we were to go with the version without Alternative 2 under the original Action 2, which is now 3, you wouldn't have that. You'd just have the automatic versions of recording a specific position. That's the way I'm reading this, right?

MR. WAUGH: That's correct; the IPT recommendation does not include an option to manually input the latitude and longitude in degrees and minutes.

MR. BELL: I'll tell you just personally I like the idea of having that at least as an option moving forward. I didn't losing that alternative myself, personally.

DR. DUVAL: And that was my concern was that it was so sort of different from what we had requested to be included from our March meeting was that lack of manual ability. I'm pretty sure that the headboats have a phone app that they can use to record their catch and everything and record their vessel location via a phone app.

Again, that's a manual input, and it just seems like we need some – for the IPT proposed revisions, it just seems like we need something in between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 that's going to allow for some manual input based on a grid. I like continuing to use the 10 by 10 grids that are already in place for the headboats, but having that manual version in place would give me some level of comfort.

MR. BROWN: So with Alternative 2 could we just add to that the device that automatically and/or records manually vessel's location and specified time?

MR. WAUGH: What I would suggest and meet your intent, if you like the rest of the IPT recommendations that are shown there on Page 20 as modified by the Gulf, because I think it is helpful to have "federally permitted" in there; then what you want to do is add another alternative that would be our old Alternative 2, but you don't need subalternatives. It would just be require charterboats to report catch location by latitude and longitude in degrees and minutes.

MR. BELL: Or the headboat grid.

MR. WAUGH: Well, they're clicking and if you want that in there, yes, or by clicking on the headboat grid. They aren't subalternatives, right? You want to give them the option – under this right now the headboats have the option to report latitude and longitude either way, either by inputting it or by clicking on the grid. We don't want to show those as subalternatives. We want all that to be a part of what could be new Alternative 4 to what the Gulf has added here.

MR. BELL: So it would just something like by latitude and longitude in degrees and minutes or by indicating –

MR. WAUGH: Clicking on the headboat grid.

DR. DUVAL: I would make a motion that we direct staff to add an alternative to Action 3 that would allow for charter vessels to report manually by latitude and longitude or headboat grid.

MR. BROWN: It is not just charter, though, is it?

DR. DUVAL: That's the status quo for headboats right now. That's why the Alternative 1, no action is sort of difficult because it is vastly different scales of location reporting for charter vessels

versus headboat vessels, and we would like the option specifically for the charter vessels to be able to report manually by latitude and longitude, aka and/or headboat grid however that needs to be structured in an alternative, that's the intent.

MR. BELL: Right; the idea is to get the for-hire boats on the same system.

MR. BROWN: Mark, if your decision was you don't want the automatic recording of catch location, then you would pick no action – just picking this alternative would put charterboats on the same current reporting for catch location as headboats are. You only need to then change charterboat reporting to give them the option to supply latitude and longitude in degrees and minutes either manually or by clicking on a chart. Then then that would bring them in line with what headboats are currently doing. Then one of the other alternatives would be moving both of them to automatically recording the catch location information.

MR. HARTIG: I'm not on your committee but just one question about the VMS that the Gulf has in there. When we saw that presentation by Scott Baker, whenever it was, he showed that in order to get area-specific VMS points, your ping rate would have to be at so high that it would be prohibitively expensive. I remember I guess in the commercial stuff that you really have to have a high ping rate if you really want to get locations. That's just one thing I remember from that discussion.

DR. DUVAL: I'm not proposing VMS.

MR. HARTIG: I know you're not.

MR. BELL: That's just in there because it was in there from the last version and the Gulf has it in there. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: I was with Mel; I wanted to keep the manual option in because that's the only option right now that if a captain leaves the dock and forgets his phone at home or drops it over the side of the boat or something like that, well, he can actually call into someone and have that data be inputted regardless of the timing that we choose.

Let's say we choose that captain has to have that trip information before he hits the dock; then being able to input it manually, you'd still the ability to call someone else and have them input your data for you and still be in compliance. That was one of the many reasons I wanted to keep that in.

MR. BELL: Right, understood. I can't recall now; did we actually make that motion yet or we just typed it at this point?

DR. DUVAL: I made the motion; I don't know who the seconder was. Second by Jessica.

MR. BELL: Okay, we have a motion on the board; Jessica seconds it. **The motion reads direct staff to add an alternative to Action 3 that would allow for charter vessels to report location**

**manually by latitude/longitude in degrees and minutes or by clicking on a headboat grid. Any objection to the motion? Okay, that motion carries.**

MS. McCAWLEY: Mel, do we need to ask the IPT to go back and revise the no action alternative now?

MR. WAUGH: I would suggest you give us some editorial license with the no action alternative; because that should describe what is in place now, which sounds very simple but it gets very complex. I think as long as the IPT, which includes NOAA GC, can agree on what is in place now and state that, I think that is what we as a no action alternative.

MR. BELL: Yes; since we're not changing anything; it is just a statement of what life looks like at this moment.

MS. McCAWLEY: I'm good with that.

**DR. DUVAL: I was going to make a motion to approve Action 3 as modified with the proposed Gulf staff changes to the wording.**

MR. BELL: All right, what that does is on Page 20 incorporates the green wording related to "are required to in federally permitted for-hire vessels". It just kind of makes everything altogether under federally permitted, and we thought was the reason. Does everybody follow the strategy there? That is the motion; seconded by Mark Brown. Any discussion of that? **Any objection to that motion? That motion carries.**

MR. WAUGH: Action 4, as you remember this comes directly from the technical subcommittee report. You all were e-mailed that report. At the last meeting Dr. Ponwith expressed some concern about this action and whether it needed to be an action. Monica and other NOAA GCs on the Gulf side have expressed concern with this and whether the council has the authority to put something like this in an FMP.

We've talked about this and our recommendation to you would be to move Action 4 into the discussion laying out the need for this process; and indeed you see that even with the commercial logbook pilot, they are using an ACCSP-hosted secure FTP site. So put this into the discussion and the intent would be that the Southeast Fisheries Science Center would review this in conjunction with that final report; and then at the meeting, when we go through this again, would give us some indication of their agreement and intent to implement the subcommittee's recommendations.

It removes it from being an action where we would encounter some concerns, puts it all into the discussion. Then we would look at this again at our next meeting; and the intent would be that Dr. Ponwith would indicate their agreement or non-agreement with moving forward and implementing this.

MR. BELL: So basically the discussion at the last meeting we were getting into kind of the details of the wiring diagram for the data flow. I think if this acceptable we can basically take that



discussion and between now and the next time get together we can have a mutually agreeable, acceptable, legally solid version. Michelle.

**DR. DUVAL: Mr. Chairman, I move that we move Action 4 and the alternatives into the discussion of the Joint Amendment.**

MR. BELL: Mark Brown seconds. Everybody follow what we're doing there? It is basically we'll work out the details in an agreeable manner on how we're going to make the data flow. We don't have to get into the weeds on that right now. Any discussion of that motion? **Any objection to the motion? Okay, that motion carries.**

MR. WAUGH: On Page 26, remember we've got two FMPs that extend into the Mid-Atlantic and the New England area. We need to address how we're going to deal with charterboat reporting in that area. Right now all federally permitted for-hire vessels fishing in the Mid-Atlantic and New England areas are required to report via the Northeast Vessel Trip Report Program. We've got a link there to that program.

They're already reporting; and remember they have different permitting systems up in that area, so we want to be careful about how we deal with things like permitting and reporting. They're providing VTR – if this amendment were to move forward, the intent that while the evaluation is ongoing for our charterboat logbook reporting in the southeast; it would seem prudent at that same time to look at the VTR that is being collected in the Mid-Atlantic and New England, compare that with the MRIP data that is being collected along the entire Atlantic Coast.

Then when the decision is made to stop collecting charterboat data in the MRIP Program; that would be made along the entire Atlantic Coast and not just in the southeast. The options we have there for you would be you could extend the requirements for this amendment through the Mid-Atlantic and New England area; but again that raises duplication of effort and all sorts of issues dealing with that.

Option 2 would just be to provide us guidance that your intent would be in the long term to use the existing VTR data from the Mid-Atlantic and New England areas to track the charterboat and the headboat portion of the ACLs. By long term, that means once all the verification is worked out and the decision is made to stop collecting charterboat data in the MRIP Program.

MR. BELL: Okay, everybody follow that in terms we definitely want to avoid duplication and confusion. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I just had a few questions about this particular thing. I agree we don't want to duplicate effort, and I know that the for-hire sector is sampled both by the MRIP charter mode as well as by these vessel trip reports, which that is a requirement of having a northeast for-hire permit.

You have to have species-specific permits to harvest these different species in the New England and Mid-Atlantic jurisdictions. I guess my first question would be to what extent are those VTR data being used to track ACLs in the northeast region?

MR. WAUGH: They're not.

DR. DUVAL: I was pretty sure that was the answer, but I just wanted to confirm that. We've already stated in the purpose and need that we want to extend the requirements of this amendment to those federally permitted vessels that hold permits for our South Atlantic and Gulf-managed species.

I'm just wondering if there is ever potentially a situation where you would have a vessel operating in the Mid-Atlantic or New England that would have a southeast or Gulf permit for one of our managed fisheries but does not have a northeast permit and therefore is not subject to the VTR requirement. I'm thinking about like either coastal migratory pelagics or dolphin and wahoo most specifically. That is probably like a permits' office kind of question. That means if they have those permits, we're saying we want you to report your data electronically; but there is no fallback in terms of a VTR because you don't also concurrently hold a northeast permit.

MR. BELL: Right, and then there are no data; it is missing. Gregg.

MR. WAUGH: It seems to me if we're requiring all federally permitted charterboats in our fisheries to report via the logbook; that would seem to apply if one of those vessels was fishing up in the Mid-Atlantic because they're federally permitted here. Maybe we need to clarify that it would seem we would capture the fishing done by our federally permitted vessels regardless of where they're fishing.

If they just fish in state waters but they're federally permitted, we're going to get that data because they're federally permitted. If they fish in the Mid-Atlantic and New England, we're going to get it. The ones that we wouldn't get are vessels up there that aren't federally permitted under us, and we would get them through the VTR Program up there unless they didn't hold a federal permit in the Mid-Atlantic and New England, also, so if they were a state vessel, for instance.

MR. BELL: But the permit requirement is associated with a specific fishery. I mean, that's what we bring – it just seems like goes with the requirement to report. If it is your fishery, it is your fishery.

DR. DUVAL: I think my questions are really more in clarifying which reporting system takes precedent. I think, as Gregg has stated, for any vessel that is operating in the Mid-Atlantic or New England that has a dolphin wahoo or a coastal migratory pelagics for-hire permit and they don't have a northeast vessel permit, they would automatically be pulled into this electronic reporting that we would be setting up through this amendment.

I think the thing is just ensuring that the regulations are written such that if a vessel holds one of those two southeast permits but also holds a bluefish permit or a sea bass permit for the northeast, so they've already been reporting by VTR; then we would not also require them to report by South Atlantic logbooks I guess is what I want to try to clarify, and I think that requires some science center input.

MR. BELL: Mike, did you have something to add to that?

DR. ERRIGO: If we follow what the technical subcommittee suggested and everyone submits their data through ACCSP and then the data is distributed, then everyone submits a single form to ACCSP. As long as they're submitting the most restrictive of their minimum data requirements, they should be able to take that single form, collect all the data that is necessary for each partner that the vessel is required to submit to and transmit the data necessary to each partner.

Therefore, the vessel submits a single logbook and that data is transmitted to the respective partner, wherever it needs to go, whatever data is necessary. It would be worked out if that is how it was done. Now, if each center handles the data separately, that is not as easy to work out unless the centers collaborate, in which case they would submit to, let's say, the northeast center. Then the northeast center would transmit data to the southeast center.

MR. BELL: And that's an advantage to the particular way that the data flows; I think that's an advantage, but that's something we're still going to try to work out. Like you said, it hasn't been determined yet, but I follow you. We want to avoid duplication, but we want to also avoid missing data as well. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: Just for my own clarification, so if someone is holding a snapper grouper for-hire permit, are they only going to be required to input data for the snapper grouper fishery? Are we saying that person, because they hold a federal permit, is going to have to do all fisheries that they're involved in, including our state fisheries? No, okay, just the federal fisheries.

DR. DUVAL: This is where some of the – this is the basis for some of my questions because there is duplication of reporting that is sort of forced by the northeast for vessels that do have – at least on the commercial side that have both northeast permits and southeast permits. The Northeast Science Center requires that whenever you're fishing – it doesn't matter.

Just because you have one of their permits, it doesn't matter if you're fishing for snapper grouper, you still have to report to them that you are catching all snapper grouper and you send in a vessel trip report for snapper grouper and whatever else you've caught. In addition to that you have to fill the snapper grouper commercial logbook.

I'm interested in eliminating that kind of duplicate reporting with any type of for-hire effort that we have here going forward. Mike saying that the recommendation that all data be submitted to ACCSP and then it flows out from there to the different centers for use in monitoring makes sense. I'm still wrapping my head around I guess maybe getting the northeast region on board with that kind of concept, because I don't know if the VTRs – on the recreational side I think they're still paper forms for the northeast. Bonnie is shaking head she doesn't know.

I think those are just some questions that we will want clarification to; because it is great that we want to use ACCSP for its intended purpose to be the central gathering point and distribute everything to where it needs to go, but we need to get both science centers on board with that. If we're impacting folks up at the northeast, we just want to make sure we're communicating with

Northeast Fisheries Science Center to make sure that they understand that we're not trying to duplicate effort, and this might actually help them along.

MR. BELL: I think it is not our desire to extend our requirements to the northeast or whatever, but we want to avoid that duplication. Maybe at this point, since this requires a little more thought and some teasing out of how to do this, we could kind of lateral to staff for further clarification on a way to proceed with this. It is going to take a little time to work it out.

MR. WAUGH: And I'll flesh out some wording in the timing and task motion for you to look at it in full council. The intent is not to extend our requirements up through the Mid-Atlantic and New England areas, but we want to reduce duplication from either the northeast requirements or the southeast requirements, so that one vessel is not reporting to both places.

MS. BECKWITH: And our intent is also to only require our fishermen to report for the permit that they're holding and not any other species like bluefish or other species.

MR. HAYMANS: Is this not something, not necessarily the data elements, but the fact that all the five councils along the Atlantic and Caribbean – is this not something the Coordinating Council could work on to come up with some agreement that we're going to have electronic reporting on the Atlantic Coast and it is going to go through ACCSP? It seems like we don't know what the northeast wants or how they –

MR. WAUGH: Well, I think we're getting there actually. Certainly, what the Coordinating Council has done for the Atlantic Coast is lay out minimum data elements. They have laid out certain other aspects. Both the northeast and southeast are working towards that; and I think we're very close to that now. I think we're getting there, but I don't think it would be appropriate to sort of pass this to the Coordinating Council, because they don't have any regulatory authority.

MR. BELL: Michelle can kind of speak to that, I think.

DR. DUVAL: Well, it is not actually to that. It is to a comment that Gregg made earlier I just want to clarify, which was that we don't want to extend our requirements to the Mid-Atlantic and New England. We do want to extend the requirement for permit holders who are operating in those regions – for Gulf and southeast for-hire permit holders operating in the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions in our fisheries to report; so we want to extend those requirements. What we don't want to do is duplicate the system that is being used to report that catch.

MR. BELL: Yes, again, the data need to be acquired; it is just that we don't want duplication in systems and confusion that would bring. Okay, that is just lateraling to you guys. We have one more –

MR. HARTIG: Mel, just a question of Michelle. If you operate in the Mid-Atlantic, do you have to have their permits and do their VTR requirements?

DR. DUVAL: If you want to operate in one of their fisheries; so if you want to fish for bluefish as a for-hire operator or as a commercial operator, yes. It is for fisheries that are managed by the New England and Mid-Atlantic Councils, yes.

MR. WAUGH: Yes; the last thing is to deal with the timing. As I indicated, I don't know where the Gulf is going to be on this, and it is certainly dependent on whether we get close enough agreement at the joint session on Thursday whether you are comfortable approving this to go out to public hearings with the direction we've gotten for filling in on the data elements and all the other details and analysis. Some guidance from you on what is your intent in terms of timing; are we still going to try and take this out to public hearings in August or do you want to see this amendment again before we go out to public hearings.

MR. BELL: I thought what we were trying to do is keep it on track and agreeing to cover some of the areas of concern that were brought up in terms of additional information for public hearings, particularly stuff that Anna covered, but I didn't sense – I mean, you tell me; I didn't sense a desire to get it off sequence there. Jessica.

MS. McCAWLEY: Do we want to talk on Thursday in the joint meeting about the timing?

MR. WAUGH: We do. I think if it is our intent to take it out to public hearings in August, it would be good to have a committee motion indicating that. Then all of our motions are going to that joint session and will be resolved with the Gulf.

If you feel that maybe the timing is too contentious and you want to wait to deal with it during the joint session; that is fine if you want to do that. It seems the more we have as far as our committee's position to go to that joint session, the better.

MR. BELL: Yes; if it is just sort of fleshing out what we want to do and then we'll get into the joint session and see how things go there. That would be the idea. Anna.

MS. BECKWITH: It is no surprise I'd like to see this one more time before it went out to public hearings, but I gather that I'm likely outnumbered, but that's certainly my preference.

MR. BELL: All right, what is the intent to the committee here? Do we want to go ahead and put our intent in the form of a motion and then just kind of see how things go when we get to the joint session in terms of how it ends up? This way we will have stated our desire, anyway. Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I think if we can include additional information to satisfy the concerns that Anna brought up about data elements that would be included examples and we can have a little more clarification on mechanistically how things might work with vessels that are also holding northeast permits so as to not duplicate reporting, it would be my hope that we would still approve this for public hearings in August.

I think once we get some of that public input back, then in September we can certainly make a decision that while some of this northeast stuff might require an additional meeting's worth of

work or it may not, and some of the input that we get on the reporting elements might require another meeting's worth of work or it might not.

MR. BELL: Right, so this would just keep up moving down the road at this point; and if we realize it is a little more complicated than we thought given some of these other concerns, then we can adjust at that time, but this allows us to go into the joint meeting with the Gulf with a clear intent, anyway, and then we'll see what they say.

**DR. DUVAL: I move to include additional information on data elements, clarification on how northeast vessels would report without duplicate reporting and approve the Joint For-Hire Reporting Amendment as modified for public hearings.**

MR. BELL: Mark Brown seconds. Any discussion of the motion? Everybody understand what we're doing? Again, we'll see how it goes when we get to the joint session and then working out some of these details. **Any objection to the motion? Okay, that motion carries.** Okay, Mr. Chairman, that's my half hour meeting, so we're adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 2:55 o'clock p.m., June 9, 2015.)

---

Signature

---

Date

Transcribed By:  
Graham Transcriptions In.  
July 2015

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**2015 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 Chevront

**DATA COLLECTION**

✓ Mel Bell, Chair  
✓ Mark Brown  
✓ Jack Cox  
~~Roy Crabtree~~ **JACK Mc GOWAN**  
✓ Michelle Duval  
✓ Wilson Laney  
✓ Jessica McCawley  
Staff contact: Gregg Waugh

**ANNA BECKWITH**

**DOLPHIN WAHOO**

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

**HABITAT PROTECTION AND  
ECOSYSTEM-BASED MANAGEMENT**

Doug Haymans, Chair  
Anna Beckwith  
Mark Brown  
Chris Conklin  
Michelle Duval  
Lt. Morgan Fowler  
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  
Jack Cox  
Roy Crabtree  
Jessica McCawley  
Charlie Phillips  
Staff contact: Brian Chevront

**HIGHLY MIGRATORY SPECIES**

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

*(Continued)*

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**2015 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP**

**COUNCIL CHAIR**

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

**VICE-CHAIR**

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](mailto:fishzack@comcast.net)

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

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

Chris Conklin  
P.O. Box 972  
Murrells Inlet, SC 29576  
843/543-3833  
[conklinsafmc@gmail.com](mailto:conklinsafmc@gmail.com)

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

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

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



SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**2015 COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP (continued)**

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

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

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

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

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

MONICA SMIT-BANNELLO

RICK DEVICTON

GEORGE SEBGMAN

ERIKA BURGESS

COL CHISOM FRAMPTON

KAREN ANTRIM RAINE

JEFF RADONSKI

MARCEL REICHANT

CAPT DAVID DIPRE

BRETT PIERCE

KENNY FEX

NICK FARMER

CAPT. ROB BEATON

LUIZ BARBIERI

7 BONNIE POWWITH

SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL  
**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](mailto:kim.iverson@safmc.net)

**Fishery Outreach Specialist**

Amber Von Harten  
[amber.vonharten@safmc.net](mailto:amber.vonharten@safmc.net)

**Senior Fishery Biologist**

Roger Pugliese  
[roger.pugliese@safmc.net](mailto:roger.pugliese@safmc.net)

**Fishery Scientist**

Myra Brouwer  
[myra.brouwer@safmc.net](mailto:myra.brouwer@safmc.net)

**Fishery Biologist**

Dr. Mike Errigo  
[mike.errigo@safmc.net](mailto:mike.errigo@safmc.net)

**Fisheries Social Scientist**

Dr. Kari MacLauchlin  
[kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net](mailto:kari.maclauchlin@safmc.net)

**Fishery Scientist**

Chip Collier  
[Chip.Collier@safmc.net](mailto:Chip.Collier@safmc.net)

**Staff Economist**

Dr. Brian Chevront  
[brian.chevront@safmc.net](mailto:brian.chevront@safmc.net)

**Science and Statistics Program Manager**

John Carmichael  
[john.carmichael@safmc.net](mailto:john.carmichael@safmc.net)

**SEDAR Coordinators**

Dr. Julie Neer - [julie.neer@safmc.net](mailto:julie.neer@safmc.net)  
Julia Byrd - [julia.byrd@safmc.net](mailto:julia.byrd@safmc.net)

**Administrative Officer**

Mike Collins  
[mike.collins@safmc.net](mailto:mike.collins@safmc.net)

**Financial Secretary**

Debra Buscher  
[deb.buscher@safmc.net](mailto:deb.buscher@safmc.net)

**Admin. Secretary /Travel Coordinator**

Cindy Chaya  
[cindy.chaya@safmc.net](mailto:cindy.chaya@safmc.net)

**Purchasing & Grants**

Julie O'Dell  
[julie.odell@safmc.net](mailto:julie.odell@safmc.net)



**South Atlantic Fishery Management Council –  
June 2015 Council Meeting  
Key West, FL**

**Date: Tuesday, June 9, 2015      Committee: Data Collection**

**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 above.*

Name:	Mailing Address/E-mail: <i>(Check box if information is on file)</i>	How do you participate in South Atlantic fisheries? <i>(Check all that apply)</i>	
Bill Kelly	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other Describe _____
Kuzin Burdore	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other Describe _____
Sue Gerhart	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other Describe _____
Mike Merritt	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other Describe _____
	<input type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other Describe _____
	<input type="checkbox"/> On File	Commercial <input type="checkbox"/>	NGO <input type="checkbox"/>
		Recreational <input type="checkbox"/>	Govt. <input type="checkbox"/>
		Charter/For-hire <input type="checkbox"/>	Other Describe _____

**South Atlantic Fishery Management Council  
4055 Faber Place Drive, Suit 201  
Charleston, SC 29405**

# Registration Report

# GoToWebinar

Generated

Jun 17, 2015 9:40 AM EDT

## General Information

Webinar Name	SAFMC Council Meeting - Day 2 of 5 (Tuesday)	Webinar ID	156-169-035
Scheduled Start Date	Jun 9, 2015	Registered	
Scheduled Start Time	8:00 AM EDT	Opened Invitation	30
Scheduled Duration (minutes)	540	Clicked Registration Link	47

## Registrants

First Name	Last Name	Email
Joe	Klostermann	grkjk@cprmcst.net
Ken	Brennan	kenneth.brennan@noaa.gov
Helen	Takade-Heumacher	htakade@edf.org
Wayne	Mershon	kenyonseafood@sc.rr.com
Peter	Barile	abaco711@hotmail.com
Tony	Lamberte	tony.lamberte@noaa.gov
Helen	Takade-Heumacher	htakade@edf.com
Joe	Klostermann	grkjk@comcast.net
Joey	Ballenger	ballengerj@dnr.sc.gov
Bill	MacLauchlin	billmac@adttrends.com
Lora	Clarke	lclarke@pewtrusts.org
rich	malinowski	rich.malinowski@noaa.gov
Rusty	Hudson	DSF2009@aol.com
m	c	mec181@yahoo.com
Holly	Abeels	habeels@ufl.edu
Karla	Gore	karla.gore@noaa.gov

John  
I  
Julie  
Jessica  
Julia  
Susan  
Nicolas  
Anik  
scott  
Andrew  
mary  
Nikhil  
NICK  
Michelle

froeschke  
L  
Neer  
Stephen  
Byrd  
Shipman  
Alvarado  
Clemens  
sandorf  
Herndon  
vara  
Mehta  
FARMER  
Duval

john.froeschke@gulfcouncil.org  
captaindrifter@bellsouth.net  
julie.neer@safmc.net  
jessica.stephen@noaa.gov  
julia.byrd@safmc.net  
susanshipman@att.net  
Nicolas.Alvarado@noaa.gov  
anik.clemens@noaa.gov  
scott.sandorf@noaa.gov  
andrew.herndon@noaa.gov  
mary.vara@noaa.gov  
nikhil.mehta@noaa.gov  
nick.farmer@noaa.gov  
michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov