

# **SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**

## **SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC PANEL OF THE SCIENTIFIC AND STATISTICAL COMMITTEE**

### **Webinar**

**October 7, 2024**

### **Transcript**

#### **Socio-Economic Panel of the SSC**

Dr. Jennifer Sweeney-Tookes, Chair  
Dr. Scott Crosson  
Dr. Brian Chevront  
Dr. Chelsey Crandall  
Dr. Eugene Frimpong  
Christina Package-Ward

Dr. Kevin Hunt  
Dr. Andrew Ropicki  
Adam Stemle  
Jason Walsh  
Dr. John Whitehead

#### **Council**

Trish Murphey, Chair

Amy Dukes

#### **Council Staff**

Dr. Judd Curtis  
Myra Brouwer  
Dr. Chip Collier  
Allie Iberle  
Meg Withers

Christina Wiegand  
John Carmichael  
John Hadley  
Dr. Michael Schmidtke  
Julia Byrd

#### **Attendees and Invited Participants**

#### **Observers and Participants**

Other observers and participants attached.

The Social and Economic Panel of the Scientific and Statistical Committee of the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council convened via webinar on October 7, 2024, and was called to order by Dr. Jennifer Sweeney-Tookes.

## **INTRODUCTIONS**

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Good morning, everyone, and welcome to our Social and Economic Panel meeting, our webinar today, on Monday, October 7, 2024. This is, as many of you know, my first meeting as the chair, and so please forgive me the hiccups and stumbles that will definitely take place today.

I would like to recognize my vice chair, Jason Walsh, and, as our first order of business, I will also just mention a very big note of gratitude to Scott Crosson, who led this, who chaired this, committee for many years, very well, and they are big shoes to fill, and so thank you, Scott, for all of your good work for the SEP. We'll start off with introductions today, and we're going to go I think probably down a list that's not visible to me, but hopefully is visible to some other folks, or we can just -- John, do you want us to just follow the order that's at the bottom of the agenda, and would that be easier? How would you prefer that we do this?

MR. HADLEY: Sure. We can do that. Let me scroll down here. There we go.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: All right, and so I am Jennifer Sweeney-Tookes, and I'm an applied anthropologist at Georgia Southern University. I'm a member of the SSC and the new chair of the Social and Economic Panel. Then next up will be Jason.

MR. WALSH: Hi. I'm Jason Walsh. I'm an economist at North Carolina Division of Marine Fisheries, and I'm also a member on the SSC and vice chair of the SEP.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I'm Brian Chevront, and I'm a retired deputy director for the council, but I also worked in social and economic issues for fisheries for many years before that.

DR. CRANDALL: Hi, everyone. Chelsey Crandall, and I'm with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. I lead our social science program.

DR. CROSSON: Scott Crosson, and I'm an economist down at the Southeast Fisheries Science Center in Miami.

MS. WIEGAND: It looks like we don't have David or Eugene on, and so, Kevin, you're up next.

DR. HUNT: Kevin Hunt, and I'm a human dimensions professor at Mississippi State University, in the Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Aquaculture.

MS. PACKAGE-WARD: I'm Christina Package-Ward, and I'm an anthropologist at the Southeast Regional Office of NMFS in St. Petersburg, Florida, and I'm also on the SSC.

DR. ROPICKI: Andrew Ropicki, and I'm an economist at the University of Florida.

MS. WIEGAND: Then Adam will be here, but he's running a bit late, and so I think next up is John Whitehead, and it looks like you're unmuted on our end. Let's see if we can hear you.

DR. WHITEHEAD: I'm John Whitehead, and I'm an economist at Appalachian State University.

MS. WIEGAND: We got you loud and clear. Thanks, John.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: All right, and so it looks like we have a good number of SEP members here, and so our next item on our agenda is to review and approve this agenda, and so, John, is there an official way to do this? It all looks kosher to me.

MR. HADLEY: You can ask if there's any objections to approving the agenda.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thank you. Are there any objections to approving this agenda? Seeing no hands popping up on my screen from John, I will assume that means we have approved the agenda. Thank you. We also have, as Attachment 1, the April 2024 minutes, and so I hope that everyone has had an opportunity to review those. Are there any questions, concerns, or objections to approving the April 2024 minutes? Hearing nothing, and seeing no hands raised, I believe we can approve the April 2024 minutes, and so we'll go ahead and do that, and we would like to open the floor now for any public comment about the agenda or anything pertaining to this meeting. Do we have any public comment?

MR. HADLEY: If anyone on the webinar would like to make public comment, please raise your hand, and we'll call on you. I'm not seeing any hands go up.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: All right. We will stop again, at the end of the meeting, for another opportunity for public comment. Thanks, John, and so I guess that means we will jump right in now to our first substantial act of the day. Christina will be presenting us the recent and developing South Atlantic Council amendments, and so I'm turning it over to you, Christina.

### **RECENT AND DEVELOPING SOUTH ATLANTIC FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL AMENDMENTS**

MS. WIEGAND: Thanks, Jennifer, and so I'm not going to through each and every one of these amendments. There are details in your briefing book, but I do just want to highlight a couple of amendments that I think would be of interest to the Social and Economic Panel or are amendments that are likely to be coming to you for discussion at future meetings.

The first of those is Snapper Grouper Amendment 46. This is the private recreational permit and education requirement amendment that looks at addressing deficiencies in recreational data collection as well as implementing an education requirement for private recreational fishermen, with the hope of reducing discard mortality.

The most recent action on this amendment is the council has been sort of reviewing input from a variety of APs, including their Snapper Grouper AP and their Outreach and Communications AP, and they decided to hold off on continued discussions at the last meeting, because, this past September, the council had a discussion on MRIP revisions and improvements, and then the goal

is that, post that discussion, they would pick this amendment back up for more discussion in December of 2024, and so likely something the SEP will be hearing about at future meetings.

Next up is Snapper Grouper Regulatory Amendment 56, and this is an amendment that is addressing the most recent stock assessment for black sea bass, and this could be a pretty significant amendment for the council, depending on what sort of catch level recommendations ultimately come out of the SSC, but we wanted to note this one, because this will be a topic of discussion for the SSC at their coming meeting, two weeks from tomorrow, I believe, and there will be -- Sort of the SSC and the Science Center will be working to develop a method to allocate projected removals and subtract the discards of black sea bass, in the hope -- When doing allocations, and so the hope is that this will be presented to the council at their December 2024 meeting, after which they will finally begin to conduct scoping on this amendment.

The next thing I want to cover is the snapper grouper management strategy evaluation. We've talked to you guys about this project a couple of times, and it's looking at considering sort of multispecies effects of potential management changes, in the hopes of developing a more holistic approach to managing the snapper grouper fishery, and so that project is getting ready to wrap up. There were presentations, and discussions, with the SSC, Snapper Grouper AP, and the council about different strategies to be included for evaluation this past spring, and the hope is that we will have results from this later this year, or early next year, followed by what's likely to be a pretty significant amendment to the snapper grouper fishery.

Similarly, the dolphin wahoo management strategy evaluation has been underway, and that one is scheduled to be received by the council in the middle part of 2025, and then, again, the plan is for the council to begin work on a dolphin wahoo amendment that would address some of the things that may come out of that management strategy evaluation.

Then a similar, but smaller, effort was the king and Spanish mackerel port meetings, and these have been ongoing since April of this year, going to sort of different communities up and down the coast, throughout the entire range of the king and Spanish mackerel management jurisdiction and talking to fishermen about what they're seeing in their fishery and how sort of changing environmental conditions are altering fishery dynamics. The final report from that effort should go to the council tentatively in March of 2025, at which time the plan is to start, again, a pretty significant amendment that would address anything that comes out of these port meetings, as well as catch levels for Atlantic Spanish mackerel.

Continuing on, the council has also begun work on a comprehensive for-hire limited-entry amendment, and this would address limited entry for snapper grouper, coastal migratory pelagics, which is king and Spanish mackerel and Gulf cobia, as well as the dolphin wahoo fisheries. Back in March, they reviewed a discussion, and so they've talked about for-hire limited entry for a while now, and so they looked at the existing control date that's on record, as well as some of their previous considerations related to limited entry, but they ultimately decided to sort of pause development on this amendment until permits data from the Regional Office are available.

Then, last, but certainly not least, at the September meeting, the council found out that, because they have not taken action to end overfishing of red snapper, as required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act, NOAA Fisheries, or NMFS, does intend to begin a secretarial amendment to address the overfishing status of red snapper, and their goal is to explore management strategies that will both

increase opportunities for red snapper, specifically by reducing the amount of dead discards, and, because this is an action that is the result of a lawsuit, there is sort of a strict timeline that NMFS is operating under, and the goal is to implement regulations, through the secretarial amendment, before the recreational and commercial fishing seasons begin in the summer of 2025.

That was a very, very quick breeze through all of the things the council is currently working on right now. If you've got questions about something specific, let me know, and you can use that raise-hand button we're always talking about, that looks like the Thanksgiving hand turkey that you would have drawn in kindergarten, and we'll get your name up on the screen.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thank you, Christina. Thanks for these updates. Any questions, or comments, for Christina on any of these? I am seeing no names going on our list of raised hands, and I'm not hearing anyone, and so it looks like we have no questions, or comments, for Christina, and thanks very much, Christina, and so we will be moving on now to Item 3 on our agenda, and this is the Southeast For-Hire Integrated Electronic Reporting (SEFHIER) Program Improvement Amendment, and John will be giving us an overview.

We do have a fair number of discussion points following, and so I'll be asking you to make notes on this particular item, as well as the item that -- There are like six follow-up questions, and so, just to give you a heads-up right now, and I will go ahead and email this out to the group as well. As we're listening to this, and as we're discussing those items, I'm going to ask for Number 1 of our discussion points at the end, and, Andrew, if you would please take notes. On Number 2, there are multiple subsections for Number 2, and I know people are coming and going, and so, if possible, I would like to assign Chelsey, John, and Adam to Number 2, just because it's such a lengthy one.

Items Number 3 and 4 are not nearly as long, and so if I could have Scott and Kevin please take notes on those, and Items Number 5 and 6, I was going to ask Christina and Eugene, and I don't know if Eugene has joined us yet, and, Christina, I'll take notes on that one as well, if you don't mind doing that, and then, on Item Number 4, coming up next, I'll ask Brian and Jason to take notes on that, and, again, I will email this out to the group, but, as you get started, John, if folks could just be paying attention and listening and taking some brief bullet point notes, that would be wonderful, and so are you all ready to go, John?

MR. HADLEY: Absolutely.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Awesome. It's all yours, sir. Thank you.

### **SOUTHEAST FOR-HIRE INTEGRATED ELECTRONIC (SEFHIER) PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AMENDMENT**

MR. HADLEY: All right, and so what I will be going over is the presentation summary slides, and this is Attachment 3b in your briefing book, and, basically, this presentation pulls out some of the points from the document that was included as Attachment 3a, and so just kind of pulling out the summary points in general, but this is -- You know, generally speaking, I will give an introduction.

This is an item that -- It's one of the, obviously, large-ticket items, big-ticket items, for the council right now, is trying to improve compliance with the for-hire reporting program, and so essentially with the for-hire logbook, and I will go into a little bit of information, and background, but, you know, just to get everyone thinking, we're, you know, thinking of ways -- One of the questions at the end is, you know, thinking of ways to incentivize reporting, to improve reporting compliance, with this logbook, essentially so that it can be used in management.

If you can get the reporting compliance up, you can validate it, and have confidence in the information, and then it can, in turn, be used in management, and so that's kind of a very, very brief, high-level problem statement, if you will, but I will go into some additional details, and background, on the recent issues and reporting requirements.

Another thing to keep in mind is that this amendment is not being worked on in a bubble, and there's sort of a larger electronic reporting effort going on in many different areas, and so the Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council is working on their own for-hire reporting amendment, which ideally the Gulf Council and the South Atlantic Council will have at least similar requirements, and then, to go along with that, another moving part is that highly migratory species, or HMS, is also developing a for-hire reporting requirement, and so there's certainly some overlap there in jurisdiction across regions, and so there's -- You know, there's a question of -- Jumping ahead, there's a question that the SEP will be asked regarding, you know, considerations for trying to make things link up and trying to have consistency across reporting requirements, but we'll get into that and some of the information on the measures that are being considered.

Then I'll take a break for questions, and so that's kind of the background, the full background section, and then we'll jump into the FMP amendment itself, and so looking at the timing, the measures being considered, and then I'll turn it over to the SEP at the very end, to answer some discussion questions.

Starting off with the background portion, looking at the reporting requirements, the Southeast For-Hire Integrated Electronic Reporting program, or SEFHIER, was launched with the implementation of the Comprehensive For-Hire Electronic Reporting Amendment, and so this amendment went into place, or at least the regulations went into place, in January of 2021, and it covers the big finfish fishery management plans, FMPs, for the South Atlantic Council, and so it covers the Snapper Grouper, Coastal Migratory Pelagic, and Dolphin Wahoo Fishery Management Plans, and specifically the for-hire component of those.

The electronic logbook, there are reporting requirements for for-hire vessels, and so charter vessels, six-pack, if you will, as well as headboats, are required to electronically report each for-hire fishing trip, and so trip-level reporting, and trips must be submitted weekly. Additionally, if there's no for-hire fishing activity, a did-not-fish report must be submitted by the Tuesday of the following week, of that reporting week, and so, essentially, there's a reporting requirement, whether or not fishing activity took place, and then did-not-fish reports, or DNF reports, can be submitted up to thirty days in advance, and so that's kind of a brief overview of some of the reporting requirements.

Looking at the information collected on each one of these trip reports, there is the start and end date, the time and location, and there's a vessel ID and captain ID, the number of fishermen and

crew, the general method that was used, how long the trip -- How long fishing took place, and so hours fished, some general information, such as primary depth fished and where the --

Kind of a general location, and not necessarily specific GPS coordinates, but a general location, within a grid, of where the fishing took place, the target species on the trip, the number of each species kept and released, and so whether or not the fish is kept or released is supposed to be included on the for-hire trip report, and then there's an economic component. This includes the charter fee, the fuel used, and the fuel price per gallon, and we're going to come back to that economic component towards the end. There is some specific questions for the SEP on that.

Some of the recent issues, as I mentioned, compliance, overall compliance, is low. In a nutshell, that's the -- That's one of the main issues with this program at the moment, that compliance is low with the for-hire reporting requirement, and so the council was presented information on overall compliance with the program. 83 percent of permitted vessels reported at least one time in 2023, and so, on its face, that sounds pretty good, but, when you dig into the details of it, overall compliance drops considerably, and so many vessels may be submitting one report throughout the year, or several reports throughout the year, but vessels are not meeting all of the reporting requirements, such as the timing of reporting.

As I mentioned, there is weekly reporting, and so vessels may not be reporting weekly, and vessels may not be submitting the did-not-fish reports, which is important, particularly for validation, and then vessels may not be reporting all of their for-hire fishing activity, and so maybe reporting a few trips, but not all trips.

Overall, when you really dig into it and see what the overall level of compliance is, according to the information provided by the Southeast Regional Office, in 2023, only 37.4 percent of the vessels were assessed to be meeting all of the reporting requirements of the SEFHIER program throughout the year, and so, again, that's an important -- That's the crux of the issue, if you will, on that slide.

This has been a topic of discussion over the past several meetings for the council. You know, the council has gotten updates from the Southeast Regional Office, the National Marine Fisheries Service, several times, on progress made with the SEFHIER program. Of note recently, of course, has been that low compliance issue, and so the council has discussed this over the past several meetings, and they have essentially initiated an amendment.

Some of the NMFS guidance that has been provided to the council recently is, at the June 2024 meeting, National Marine Fisheries Service Southeast Regional Office, and Southeast Fisheries Science Center, essentially wrote a letter to the council, and they noted that the for-hire logbook data cannot be used for management, due to low compliance and lack of validation, and so those are the two issues there, and so, essentially, this data, while it has been collected since 2021, it cannot be used in any sort of management sense, for analysis or ACL tracking, anything of that context.

Some of the recommendations from the agency were to require logbook submission prior to the offload of catch, a dockside intercept -- Implement a dockside intercept survey to estimated misreporting and nonreporting, require a declaration, or a prelanding combination submission, prior to a trip, and so, essentially, a hail-in and hail-out provision, to require landing at only

approved locations, and so you can see some of these recommendations are aimed at implementing some sort of logbook validation, and so, you know, that's one of those items that would help with the validation portion, and then also require weekly did-not-fish reports when fishing has not occurred.

The council has been building many of their actions of that letter that was received from the agency, but, to go along with this, as I mentioned earlier, there are some other moving parts in the for-hire reporting world, if you will, and so the Gulf Council is currently working on their own for-hire reporting amendment. They had a for-hire reporting requirement in place, but, as the SEP actually discussed at the last meeting, the United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit set aside their rule, their reporting rule, in February of 2023, and so they're starting again, from scratch, in a way, and building their for-hire reporting program, through a for-hire reporting amendment, and so you have the Gulf Council working on their for-hire reporting requirements and, again, trying to at least somewhat make these match up with what the South Atlantic Council is considering, and, you know, the two councils are kind of keeping an eye on each other, looking over and seeing what the other council is doing, to hopefully line up some of the reporting requirements for these vessels, several vessels, that are dually-permitted, particularly, and so at least you have somewhat of a regional consistency.

The Gulf Council's amendment includes actions that would establish the frequency and mechanism for data reporting for charter vessels, modify some of the existing reporting requirements for headboats, establish a trip notification and effort reporting requirement, which is essentially, you know, a hail-in and hail-out provision for a for-hire trip, and establish reporting of economic data.

One of the, I guess, key points to this is that the Gulf Council is exploring a sampling methodology, or a random sampling approach, rather than the census approach, for their economic component, and so, essentially, choosing a certain percentage of vessels that would report on the economic component, rather than a total census, where every vessel is asked the economic portion on every trip, and so they're taking sort of a sampling approach, and I highlighted "vessels" there, because there is a small change.

Our friends at SERO pointed out that, while the Gulf Council considering was considering random sampling of trips, it will need -- Just due to the technical feasibility aspects, it will need to be a percentage of vessels that will be sampled, and so, essentially, a subset of the total permitted vessels will be pulled out, and those vessels will be sampled for the economic question, or the economic components. That is some of the -- That is the Gulf piece, the Gulf moving piece, if you will.

Moving -- Switching gears a little bit, looking at what Highly Migratory Species is considering, the NMFS Highly Migratory -- The Atlantic Highly Migratory Species has a published rule, or a proposed rule that they have published, that is sort of an overall electronic reporting rule that looks at commercial dealers, commercial vessels, dealers, and private vessels, but also for-hire. So, pulling up that for-hire piece, the proposed Highly Migratory Species rule would implement electronic reporting for all trips, regardless of whether fish were caught, reporting all species caught, including those that are non-highly-migratory species, and fishing location, reporting within twenty-four hours of the end of each trip, and monthly no-fishing reports. It would also require trip-level reporting of costs and earnings, and so looking at that census methodology, where



the economic information would be required on every trip, and, if selected there, would be additional annual expenditure information, through a survey.

A couple more slides to get through, and then I will take a break to answer any questions, but, generally speaking, jumping back to the South Atlantic Council and recent action, and that's sort of the background on what's going on in other regions, but, coming back to the South Atlantic Council and recent action, sort of in response to that letter that I mentioned with NMFS recommendations, the South Atlantic Council passed a motion to start an amendment that would focus on incorporating actions that can be taken in the near-term without an amendment, and so essentially actions that can be taken that don't need a regulatory change, and we'll go over a few of those.

Consider actions and alternatives being considered by the Gulf Council, and so, there again, looking at lining up those different requirements, at least within the region, and consider actions that modify reporting frequency, hail-in and hail-out, landing locations, no-fishing reports, and validation surveys.

At the September meeting, a few weeks ago, it was noted that the National Marine Fisheries Service cannot validate the logbook until reporting compliance improves, and so, again, there are a couple of discussion questions, and I think the first two, or the first three or so, are really aimed at gathering some feedback for the council on that note and improving reporting compliance, but, generally speaking, in relation to that, the council has requested feedback from the National Marine Fisheries Service, as well as advisors, on what level of compliance would be necessary for validation to take place and for data to be subsequently used in management, and so that's really the end goal there, is using this information in management and for analysis.

The council also reviewed the draft purpose and need statement, potential actions in the amendment, and it will be receiving additional information on several topics at their December meeting. This list includes the process for approving landing locations, how would one do that, is there -- There is an existing did-not-fish report requirement, and does that need to be changed, and how a validation survey would be administered, and, in relation to the economic component, what other relevant programs require and what are some of the tradeoffs of moving from a census to a sampling approach, as far as requesting, or asking, information of for-hire vessels for that economic piece.

As mentioned, within the council's motion, some of the efforts that can be taken in the meantime, while this amendment is underway, potentially, and, again, it depends on resources, but measures that can be taken without an amendment, and so if there's existing authority, or no authority needs to be granted, and there can be efforts put towards improving outreach, and so increasing and improving outreach is something that could be pursued, and increasing enforcement, and so certainly any additional available -- Again, the resource issue certainly comes to mind, but any additional law enforcement presence available, on the water or dockside, could help with improving compliance, and, also, better enforcing of the potential harvest prohibition and the ability to renew permits if delinquent reporting is found.

Increase monitoring, and so requiring observers, increasing dockside sampling, and administering validation survey are other options that could be pursued, but, again, all are dependent upon prioritization of initiatives by the National Marine Fisheries Service, and, very importantly,

availability of resources, and so funding and personnel, and certainly there's always a -- That's always a consideration, and there is a scarcity there.

One thing to mention, and to address, is, you know, as I mentioned, there are several different reporting requirements that vary potentially by region, and trying to make those different puzzle pieces come together is certainly a topic for many council members, as they work on this amendment, and so there are several South-Atlantic-permitted vessels operating in other regions, and so there are multiple for-hire reporting requirements that are in place, or are being developed, and, as I mentioned, the Gulf Council and Highly Migratory Species are in the process of developing their for-hire reporting requirements and procedures, and there are also long-standing for-hire reporting requirements in the Mid-Atlantic and New England, through vessel trip reports, and all of these differ from what is currently required in the South Atlantic region, and so that's a topic that the council is going to need to tackle as they develop this amendment.

Just to give you an idea of what sort of overlap may exist for South-Atlantic-permitted vessels operating in other regions, based on 2020 data, there is approximately 14 percent of the South-Atlantic-permitted vessels are homeported in the Gulf of Mexico, and 12 percent are homeported in the Mid-Atlantic and New England, and so those vessels likely have the coastal migratory pelagics permit and/or the dolphin wahoo permit to operate in regions to the north of the South Atlantic, and so the GARFO Greater Atlantic region.

Additionally, there's an unknown, but likely notable, number of vessels that have HMS permits, and so consistency in reporting will likely be a major consideration, moving forward. I'm going to take a break there, and I'm happy to answer any questions on some of the background information, that's either in the document or that I just presented, but, coming up, just to kind of get your minds right, and on what's coming up, we'll have an overview of the tentative timeline, the draft purpose and need, some of the actual measures that the council is considering, at least thus far, and then we'll wrap it up with discussion questions for the SEP, but, before moving forward, does anyone have any questions on any of the background information?

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Any questions for John, before we move forward? Chelsey, you can go ahead with your questions for John.

DR. CRANDALL: Thank you. Thank you for that overview, and, first, I apologize if you said this, and I missed it. We've got hurricane brain around here for sure, but has there been any information gathering with some of these for-hire folks, to learn, you know, more, from their perspective, about why they think compliance might be so low, or, you know, what they think might improve compliance?

MR. HADLEY: No, and there hasn't been, I guess, an overall effort, at least to my knowledge. You know, I think -- One thing I didn't mention, and that is another item that the council has in the works, is they're putting together a for-hire reporting advisory panel, made up of stakeholders, and so I think a lot of that information can be gathered from them. You know, depending on the SEP's recommendations, we could always ask some of our other advisory panels, you know, to get that feedback, but, to my knowledge, there hasn't been an overall effort to gather information on, you know, essentially why are people not reporting.

DR. CRANDALL: Thanks. It seems like that might help us in, you know, understanding if it's a knowledge barrier, if there's things that make it hard to do that might like functionally help them, if it's a motivation thing, and that might help us in thinking about, you know, what would be the best things to target to improve participation and compliance in the future.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Great question, Chelsey. Thank you. Thank you for asking that. Other questions? Any other SEP member questions? If not, I would like to open the floor to Jessica for a question. Go ahead, Jessica.

DR. STEPHEN: Great. While we haven't done any concerted effort from the Regional Office, like a survey of why people aren't reporting, we do talk to the participants an awful lot on the phone. What we typically hear is there's a bunch of people who just don't want the program, and that's why they're not reporting, and the other thing we hear, from people who are reporting, is why am I reporting, because all these other people are not, and so that just adds a little bit to the discussion of what we've heard at the Regional Office when we reach out and talk to folks.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: That's great information, Jessica. Thank you. John, I don't know if this is appropriate point to jump in with sort of a list, myself as well, of things that have come up in interviews over the whole region over the last year, or if I should wait until we get to the discussion section, and what would you prefer?

MR. HADLEY: Either one. You know, it's certainly up to you. I can see that Kevin just put his hand up, but whenever you're ready, and certainly we're taking notes, and so feel free to jump in.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Well, maybe we'll stick to clarifying questions now, and then we'll propose our information, and our feedback, when we get to the discussion section, and how's that? Okay. Kevin, clarifying questions, or follow-up questions, for what John has just presented to us?

DR. HUNT: John, or Christina, on the follow-up with the charter boat people who aren't filling it out, or why they're not, is there a fear of the IRS knowing too much of their business here? You basically, especially if you added economic questions -- They would lay out here's my income through the entire year, whereas like, for example, a hair stylist doesn't have to report how many customers she has, and it's up to them to report truthfully to the IRS. Well, this kind of gives them -- It makes them report their exact earnings for every trip, and are you hearing anything with that's why they may not be reporting?

MR. HADLEY: Yes, that's a good question, and so the short answer is yes. I mean, we've heard a lot of feedback on the economic questions, and just kind of, you know, that the government doesn't need to be knowing every single thing that's happening with my business, or, you know, that sort of just -- The not wanting additional government oversight, which, of course, is very understandable, and so that's been a sticking point with the economic questions, and that was one of the hopes -- I will take a step back.

Just generally speaking, I would say, of all the portions, at least that I've heard, and all the feedback, negative feedback, if you will, that I've heard, or criticism, of the for-hire logbook, has been that economic component and kind of it being a little, you know, overstepping, and particularly -- You know, again, these are my anecdotal observations, and the feedback that's been

given to me, but that charter fee, particularly, has been a sticky question on that, you know, asking for the charter fee on every single trip.

That has been sort of a question that we've gotten a lot of pushback on, and particularly not only from our region, but from other regions, and so that's been a -- I think that is one of the reasons, and not the only reason, but one of the reasons that the council, and the councils, if you will, are thinking about going to a sampling, a random sampling, approach, just to sort of reduce that reporting burden, that regulatory burden, specifically focused on that economic component, and so vessels aren't necessarily having to report every single trip, or all vessels aren't having to report that information on every single trip, and, you know, it would hopefully boost compliance, since that has been an item that we've received a lot of criticism over.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, John. I see that Andrew has his hand raised as well.

DR. ROPICKI: I was just curious, and what are you going to do with that data? You ask about fuel price, fuel use, and, you know, what the fees are, and why ask for it, and what are you using it for?

MR. HADLEY: The idea there is to try to get better information on the -- Well, you know, if you have a charter fee, you have the total revenue for the trip, or at least not including tips, but you have the total revenue for the trip, and that information, and the fuel usage, and that's one of the variable trip components that you can sort of back out of that total revenue, to get towards -- Not all the way there, but get towards net revenue on a trip, and we can use that for several different uses, but, you know, certainly included in the economic effects analysis in our amendments, and then, also, there's other uses, you know, disaster relief, and that sort of information, and working towards compensating people for natural disasters, but the idea there is to gather, I guess, trip-level information, or some trip-level economic information, for use in analysis.

Again, you know, there are several notable expenses that aren't there, but it's at least a step, a pretty large step, in the direction of gathering the gross revenue for the trip and then some of the -  
- At least one of the major expenses for the trip and getting at a better estimate of net revenue.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, John, and I know I said that I was going to wait, but it's feeling very relevant to the questions and conversation that's coming up here, and so I would like to just mention that we definitely know -- We definitely have some indication of what these issues are, and you're raising a good many of them, and, in some of the work that my colleagues and I have done across the whole region in the last year, on a different topic, and not about these logbooks, but, in interviews with charter fishermen, this reporting has come up often, this along with all other reporting, which always just gets glossed as reporting, and so it may be this, and it may be others, but some folks are asking questions that are definitely answers that have been proposed to us.

Many charter fishers told us, really often, that it really wasn't clear to them why this information was important, why they were being asked to do this, how it would be used, and whether or not it would be used against them, or be harmful to them, and many told us that they thought that it was a very laborious process, and all of the online app reporting was really taking charter fishers a lot of time to complete.

Many said, you know, what seems simple sitting a desk is not simple on your phone, on a boat, at the end of a twelve or fourteen-hour day, or when you're, you know, on the water, trying to come in. There was definitely concerns about the IRS, about taxing, and also definitely, commonly, people mentioned government overreach and concern about why this information was even needed, and how would this come back to haunt them, or to hurt them, and so I just wanted to throw a lot of those out there, because it seemed relevant to this conversation. Any other questions for John, before we proceed to the next section? It looks like I shut everyone down. Very sorry, folks. No hands. John, would you like to continue?

MR. HADLEY: Absolutely. Thank you. Thank you for the great follow-up questions, too. All right, and so, with that, we're going to kind of jump into the sort of amendment itself, and so we'll go over some of the timeline, some of the actions that are being considered, the draft purpose and need, and then we'll get into the larger discussion questions specific to the discussion questions for the SEP to answer.

Looking at the general timeline, you know, this amendment is scheduled to be approved for scoping in December. You know, the council may approve it in December, and they may push it back to March, depending on how comfortable they feel with the notion that they explored many of the topics thus far, to be able to send it out for scoping and gather public input, but, generally speaking, you can see the draft timeline is there in front of you, but the council is likely to be working on this amendment over the next couple of years, at least.

For me, you know, I see this as part one of a multipart discussion for the SEP, and so, right now, we're trying to gather information, and gather recommendations and comments from you, at the very initial stages for the council to consider, but I imagine there will be an additional discussion, maybe at your spring meeting, kind of drilling down on some of the specific topics as this amendment develops, and so it's probably part one of a multipart discussion for the Social and Economic Panel.

Overall, this is going to be on the council's workplan likely for the next couple of years, and you're looking at a couple more years, potentially, thereafter before regulations may become effective, and so that's a general timeline.

Moving over to the draft purpose and need, you can see, in front of you, are the draft purpose and need statements, or initial, I should say, and they've kind of had one look by the council, and I imagine they will change a little bit before the council fully approves them, but, generally speaking, you know, the council is going through this amendment to improve the SEFHIER program, to improve accuracy, precision, and timeliness of landings, discards, fishing effort, and economic data, and so those are, you know, the major topics that they're trying to address in the for-hire fishery, and the overall need, again, is to improve compliance, and so increase that compliance and improve the ability to validate the data, and so, that way, the data can be used in management.

Generally, you know, I'll have a quick overview of some of the items that the council is considering, and, again, they really only reviewed this, the specific items, in September, and they're likely to have several questions, and so these may change. They may -- There may be some additional items added after the December meeting, and the council has had a chance to gather additional information, but at least -- You know, the initial considerations in the amendment, and, again, trying to be consistent, at least, with what the Gulf is considering, so they

can have sort of a regional approach to for-hire reporting, the council is looking at changing the reporting frequency, and so modifying the reporting frequency to require daily, instead of weekly, reporting, and potentially requiring reporting before offloading of catch.

There is some provisions in there, essentially, if fish are harvested, then the trip report would need to be submitted before offloading the catch. If fish were not harvested, then trip reporting could occur after the trip was completed. There is a trip notification requirement, and so you can kind of think of this as a hail-in or hail-out, and so, upon departure, there would be notification that a for-hire trip is taking place. That may include the landing location, and then, upon return, there would be a hail-in provision, and so, essentially, the vessel would be indicating that they have returned to port.

Depending -- You know, some of the considerations for the trip notification that the council is going to be discussing, and discussed a little bit in September, is what sort of trips would need trip notification, and, of course, for-hire trips, but other trips may need to be reported as well, whether they be for sightseeing tours, or if the vessel is going commercial fishing that day, and, there again, improving the ability to validate the information. Another consideration is approving landing locations, and so, under that provision, for-trips would need to offload at approved, at preapproved, landing locations.

Then a few of the other measures being considered are requiring participation in a validation survey. Currently, a validation survey can be administered, but, you know, there's no requirement to actually participate in that survey, and there's an action, a potential action, in the amendment that would require participation in a validation survey as a part of having the for-hire permit, and so essentially making the survey mandatory, if selected, and then there may be a change to the frequency of did-not-fish reports.

Currently, there is weekly reporting, but those can be sort of put in ahead of time, up to thirty days in advance, and so, you know, initial information is needed to determine what sort of, if any, changes would be needed to the did-not-fish reports.

Then, last, but not least, is the economic component, and so, again, looking at potentially reducing that reporting burden, and then, also -- You know, that's one piece of it. The other piece is making sure, or ideally lining up reporting requirements in the Gulf and South Atlantic, and the council is considering moving from a census-based approach, where the economic questions are asked on every single trip, to a random sampling approach, where some, but not all, vessels would be required to report, and that may change through -- Essentially through the year, or vary from year to year, on which vessels are sampled, there again gathering information on the charter fee, fuel usage, and fuel cost.

As noted, and we kind of had a little discussion, and the census approach has been sort of controversial, and it's received a notable amount of stakeholder pushback, and so, you know, potentially, you know, maybe that's one of the benefits of moving to the random sampling approach, is that it does reduce that reporting burden. The Gulf Council is considering a random sampling approach to gather economic information through their for-hire logbook.

There again, looking at the other different pieces that exist, and this amendment is not being developed in a bubble, HMS is considering a census approach to gather trip-level economic

information, and then, looking north to the Mid-Atlantic and New England regions, the vessel trip reporting requirements do not have an economic component.

I am going to hand it over to the SEP to work through the discussion questions, but, really quickly, I just wanted to give everyone an overview of the topics that will be discussed, and so we'll ask the SEP, you know, any thoughts that you have, as far as incentivizing reporting, and I'll come back to that question in just a second, and there are several kind of subparts to this question, but asking for information on the economic component of the logbook, and kind of initial considerations for the council, and potentially some of the tradeoffs for moving from a census to sampling methodology.

The use of logbook information, and so, you know, is there -- Does the SEP have any recommendations for the council to consider on, you know, what would be the realistic target compliance rate?

The importance of consistency in reporting requirements, and, as noted several times in the presentation, there is potentially different reporting requirements based on region, and so that information -- That's a question that will be asked to the SEP, as far as your recommendations on consistency in reporting requirements, and then sort of a catchall for other items.

Are there any other comments that you wanted to bring to the council at this point, and, as I noted, this is probably a multipart conversation with the SEP, and so, if there's any additional information you would like to see at your spring meeting, staff can work on getting that information for you in the meantime. With that, I will hand it over to the SEP, and perhaps we can start with Question Number 1 and work through them. I should also mention that I'm happy to answer any questions, you know, clarifying questions, as well.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Awesome. Thank you very much, John. That was really interesting, and it gives us a lot to think with, and so, yes, clarifying questions first, before we maybe move into addressing the discussion questions specifically? Just a reminder that, Andrew and David, you're up on Number 1, and, Chelsey, John, and Adam, you're up on Number 2, and so just a reminder there. I see hands raised. John Whitehead, go ahead, please.

DR. WHITEHEAD: We have three scribes on Question 2, and three topics. Could we be assigned to a topic, so that we're not duplicating effort?

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Sure. Happy to do that. Maybe you all can just take them in order. Chelsey, you do 2a, and John 2b, and Adam 2c. Sorry, Adam, and that's the longest one. Maybe I can just back him up a little bit there.

DR. WHITEHEAD: Yes, and I can chip in on 2c. Thank you, Jennifer.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thank you. Did you have a question for John Hadley as well, or was it just about the reporting? I'm going to assume that it was just about the reporting, since you haven't come back. Chelsey, you have a hand raised. Go ahead.

DR. CRANDALL: I do, and sorry, and I actually had thoughts on this Question 1, and so I know you said, if anyone had any clarifying questions, they should go first, and so I should probably defer to if anyone else in line has questions, before I speak to this.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: I think that maybe this might be too complicated, if I try to parse it out, and so let's just go ahead with what you were thinking.

DR. CRANDALL: Fair enough. All right. Okay, and so thoughts on this Question 1, and so it sounds like we do have some ideas of why people aren't complying on reporting, and, I mean, to be honest, it sounds -- I know we've talked about like theory of planned behavior before, and it sounds pretty classically like some of those elements cropping up, in terms of, you know, those norms of it sounds like people feel like not everybody is doing it, and why should I do it, and they don't necessarily have good attitudes around, you know, the outcomes of it, and they think it might hurt them, and they don't understand why it's important, or why the information is needed, and there's logistic barriers, in terms of them feeling it's actually hard to do, and so, you know, there's lot of things we could pull from those types of work, looking into those things, to help us incentivize here, but it sounds like some of those --

If we could address those things, like help folks understand why we're asking the questions we are, sharing where it's going, you know, anything we can do to make it logistically easier for them to actually report it, you know, and some of those things we can do to address norms, and that might be worth pursuing, and I'm thinking out loud here, and so I'm sure that others have ideas too, but that's just my first thought in hearing what came out earlier from the interviews with the for-hire folks, that, you know, we can address some of these things.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Great suggestions, Chelsey. Thank you. Good point. Kevin, you're up next.

DR. HUNT: Yes, and I've conducted trapper surveys for the state agency here in Mississippi, and it's a similar thing. Trappers are required to report harvest, through a mail survey every year, and, when the agency did it, even though it was a mandatory requirement, they got about 30 percent. When I started doing this, I was upward of 80 to 90 percent.

There's a trust factor here with the federal government and who is collecting this data, and the question is, you know, have you guys thought about an independent researcher who the charter community trusts more than the federal government, because these all come down to agency trust, and government trust, and, if you look at any of the polling, we're talking about 20 percent of the people trust government now. You know, to me, this could possibly be who is doing it, as opposed to what you're asking, and so I just don't know if anybody -- If you guys are considering that at this point.

MR. HADLEY: Jennifer, I can jump in, really quickly, to that point.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Awesome. I was going to ask you.

MR. HADLEY: That's a great point, and, you know, well taken. At this -- You know, at least at this point, there hasn't been any discussion of a different organization collecting that information, and it's -- You know, I guess it would be -- Not that the logistics, and the difficulties, couldn't be



overcome, but it's something that needs to be ongoing every single year, and into the future, but, you know, thus far, it would be -- The notion is that the National Marine Fisheries Service would be the ones collecting this information. I haven't heard any discussion of any other agency, or any other organization, collecting the information instead.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, John. Scott, you're up.

DR. CROSSON: I guess two comments, and the first one really is just more of a clarification for those who are not in the know. In comparison to the commercial logbooks, which the commercial logbook program itself is a mandatory census, and, if commercial fishermen are noncompliant with it, there are repercussions, in terms of getting their licenses continued, and then the economic component of that is a sample, which is set at 20 percent, and the reason for 20 percent are lost to the sands of time. I guess Jim Waters probably set it originally, and, if he was still on this panel, he could answer that question, but it's been 20 percent consistently, and it's not a random sample. It's a stratified sample, according to a number of different criteria, and it's also set up in a way that, if you are selected in one year, you don't get selected in the next year.

Once you are selected, it's mandatory, if you are part of that 20 percent population, and there are two components. One is a per trip cost estimation, which I guess is similar to what they're talking about here, which, you know, are mostly fuel costs and things like that, and then there's an annual survey, which we time to ensure that it's probably around tax season, when they're looking at all of the big fixed costs that they have to incur as part of their businesses, and so we send out the fixed survey, the fixed costs survey, around the same time as tax season every year, and then we take that information, and kind of combine it together, and also make sure that the per trip costs are similar to what they're reporting on the annual survey that also asks for the per trip costs in addition to the fixed costs.

Then what we do with that is we estimate profitability, and also, you know, potential resource rents, and then look at what are the drivers for profitability, or lack thereof, from the regulations. Now, in this particular situation, you still have an open-access fishery. You don't have sector separation, and so the commercial -- I'm sorry. The charter captains, and the headboats, are not getting a separate quota, the way they would with the sector separation we have between the general recreational and the general commercial fleets, and so there are differences between those two, and so I just wanted to put that stuff out there.

I mean, the 20 percent subsample enables us to do quite a bit, as some of the folks might remember from some of the presentations that we've done in the past to this panel, and to the SSC, and to the council itself. There are limits, when you decide to drill down. You know, with any kind of subsample, the smaller the subsample that you want to ask questions about, the quicker you're going to lose -- Your margins of error are going to increase rather dramatically, right, and your PSEs are going to increase, and so that's kind of the contrast that you have, and so it's going to depend on what kind of regulations that the council intends to add, and so I guess to the charter sector, in terms of what information that you want to gather from them.

If there's any intention of setting up sector separation, or potentially having different regulations, it probably should be a higher priority, and so I guess that's just information, you know, from the background, and I forget what my other point was, and so I'll just leave it to the next speaker to pick it up.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks for that background info, Scott. That helps. Christina.

MS. PACKAGE-WARD: So I've heard that compliance was better in the Gulf, and I was wondering if Jessica might be able to speak to why she thinks that is, if we have any idea, and if we might want to consider some of those things as possible carrots.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Good question. Jessica, I see you have your hand up as well, and so would you like to address Christina and then mention what you were thinking?

DR. STEPHEN: Yes, absolutely, and so some of the reasons that we saw better compliance in the Gulf, and this isn't true for everyone, but a handful of these different reasons were true for a variety of folks. One was the nature of the limited-access permit, as someone just brought up, and the ones in the South Atlantic are open access. With a limited-access permit, you know, the cost of not reporting, and either not renewing your permit, or potentially losing that permit for good from the fishery, and not just from yourself, is a pretty big stick that helped reporting compliance.

We also had a good number of people who really advocated for and wanted the program, and those, of course, were the ones who were reporting and were working as ambassadors to those that didn't understand the reporting requirements and why we were doing it moving forward.

We also had a little bit more stricter reporting requirements, and so they had to report prior to offload, and, if they were being encountered by enforcement or port agents, you know, there was a higher likelihood that the report would happen, and they wouldn't forget about it, and so having that reporting right after the trip really helped with that reporting compliance in general, as well as the quality of the data.

Then, finally, there was also a very strict validation survey in place that had the intention of getting the use of this data used in management in a relatively short amount of time, once it passes MRIP calibration studies, as well as certification from MRIP, and then, for part of the year, when we had that program up and running, we had the VMS, which also allowed an additional way that we could track vessels and know when they should be reporting.

Some of the other reporting requirements, such as the hybrid hail-out notification and prelanding notification, also allowed us to track reporting compliance better. Early on, that made it easy for us to contact someone relatively quickly after a trip, to explain that the logbook was needed, answer any questions, and then that got them kind of onboard for trips afterwards, to kind of report and comply on time.

My hand was raised before just to the idea of someone other than the agency collecting data, and we do -- I do want to point out that we use third-party vendors, in order to collect the data, and, currently, we have two of them approved, and we've had some interest from others, but I'm not sure if they've come on, and so there is that, to kind of have a separation from where the agency is the first-line collector, versus the second-line collector.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Those were a lot of good answers, Jessica. Thank you. Thank you very much. Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Thanks. Some of the things that, you know, we talked about, trying to figure out how to increase carrots, and one of the things that you might want to consider is asking people who are reporting why they're doing it, and their level of knowledge about the program, and things like what's being done with the data and all that, and find out is it really simply a matter of knowledge, or is it about their impressions of, you know, intrusion, and do they really believe that's going on, and is it government overreach, et cetera. It could also help with outreach, as well as identifying potential carrots that could be used to help incentivize.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Good suggestions, Brian. Good ideas. Thank you. Andrew.

DR. ROPICKI: My question was already answered, and so I took my hand down.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: No problem. Chelsey.

DR. CRANDALL: Some really great points coming up, and some good discussion, and one suggestion I would have, as we think through this, and stepping it back a little bit, and I know I was throwing some theory around earlier, but, you know, there is probably lots of strategies we could think about that might be employed here, but it might help us if say, on the one hand, we had a list of all of those potential barriers that we talked about, the reasons that people don't do it now, and, you know, alternatively, in addition, the reasons that some people do.

Then, on the other side, came up with strategies that are specific to each of those barriers, and so, you know, what would help us address this thing that we hear is keeping people from doing it, and that might help us, again, target the incentives, or strategies, that we use for the things that are really serving as barriers in this situation, and I think included in that is like learning more and collecting lists of strategies that other people are doing, that is effective, might be helpful too, and so not saying it has to be some really multiyear, in-depth, behavior change research project or anything like that, and this could just be a brainstorm, but it sounds like we have a good handle on some of the reasons that people aren't doing it, and lots of strategies we could pick from, and maybe we could think about which ones would target those things that might be the biggest barriers.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: I love these ideas, Chelsey. I think that's brilliant, and I have no idea how the creation of the agenda for the April meeting goes, but, if this seems like something that would be appropriate, and useful, Christina and John, and this sounds like a great idea to me, and so I'll leave that ball in you all's court.

MR. HADLEY: Yes, absolutely, and that's something that we can work on. Just thinking that we're probably going to go to our finfish APs in the spring, and so that -- Maybe the SEP could help calibrate what we ask of the APs, depending on the timing of the meetings, but, yes, duly noted, and we'll start putting that together, and that's a great suggestion. Thank you.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Chelsey. I think I actually see a hand raised now, and, John, is that correct? I see Kevin's hand up. Kevin, if your hand is up, please go ahead.

DR. HUNT: Yes, and, you know, more of a clarification of what I said earlier with an independent vendor, and it kind of goes back to Andrew's point. You know, what is the focus of this? Is it to learn something about the fishery, in which case an independent researcher who can maintain the

confidentiality of the anglers -- That would be a management -- You know, this is designed to improve management, but, if it's regulatory, to bust people for overfishing, or something like that, then it just kind of goes back to Andrew's point of what is the purpose of this, you know, overall.

Just because you have a third-party vendor collecting the data, it doesn't mean it's confidential, and that's where I think the compliance would increase, if they knew this was -- If their name was not going to be associated with the data, if the data is designed to improve management, versus a regulatory component.

MR. HADLEY: If I could, to that point? Kevin, I guess the goal is -- I guess, ideally, there is several -- It's a tiered goal, if you will, and, you know, the idea is -- The overall goal is to be able to use this information in management, and what I mean by that is specifically -- You know, in an ideal world, if we can have confidence in this information, it can be used to track annual catch limits, versus the reliance on MRIP right now, and so there's -- You know, if you can have a true census, or almost census, logbook that you can trust, you know, something that can help improve the tracking of annual catch limits, and, ideally, you know, the more -- The closer you can get to the, quote unquote, truth, the better, as far as the landings and what's being extracted from the resource, but that takes a pretty high level of confidence in the information that's coming from the logbook.

I think, secondarily, the goal of the logbook is to be able to use this information in analysis, and so that would be, as mentioned, in sort of regulatory analysis, and, you know, helping estimate the economic effects of these different regulatory changes on the for-hire sector, and then, also, look at how -- Then, also, perhaps other uses, such as compensation for natural disasters, and so there's sort of a tiered goal, but a lot of that depends on the level of compliance, and the level of confidence, that, you know, can be had in the information that's being gathered. I hope that helps.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: That's great, John. Thank you. Yes, definitely so. Scott.

DR. CROSSON: Just maybe I wasn't clear earlier. In over twenty years, twenty-something years now, that we've been collecting the commercial fishery's cost data, we've never disclosed anything to the IRS, and, as I stated earlier, we actually designed the survey method so that fishermen can probably most easily compare it to their IRS tax filings for their businesses. I mean, they're businessmen, and so they're always trying to account for costs, which is the same thing that we're interested in looking at, right, because, when you're trying to estimate profitability for the IRS, you need to make sure that you account for all of your costs, and so you're probably going to be more generous on it than, you know, sometimes -- Well, never mind.

You're just always going to be making sure that you account for all of your costs, when you're trying to report things to the IRS, because anything, you know, beyond that is going to be taxable, and so the idea that we're going to somehow turn this over to the IRS and bust them -- We're doing everything -- If we're the ones doing it, and we're doing it the same way we do the commercial data, we're going to be doing it in a way that makes it both unlikely that there's going to be a difference between the IRS and also, you know, making it easy to -- So that they can probably just take what they're filing with the IRS and give us something similar.

We don't have access to the IRS data, and they don't have access to ours, and so, if we're going to collect any kind of economic information, and look at the cost of business regulations, we're

going to need to get it from them directly, because, again, these government agencies do not share things with each other, deliberately.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks for that information, Scott. I wonder though if there is a gap between, you know, your understanding, and knowledge, about this works and how this filters down to people who are doing the reporting, you know, and that might really be the problem, more so than there being any potential for reporting. Perception is everything, right?

DR. CROSSON: Yes, undoubtedly, and I'm not disagreeing. I understand where the distrust comes from, but I'm just saying that the way that we present this to them is important, and doing any kind of mail survey, or online survey, is always going to be more complex, and prone to lower response rates, than doing it in-person, because it's harder to confront people directly.

When you go and do something in-person, as you and I know, when we've done work, for example, in the USVI together, when you actually are in front of fishermen, and you have a captive audience, you're likely to get a higher response rate than when you mail something off. It's just sort of the nature of the beast.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Definitely so, and I think you nailed it. I really do, and perhaps we just need to think about, big picture for this overall topic then, how do we have this information, and how do we have these answers, in an easily-digestible form for the people who are being asked to give the information, right, because, like you said, it's much easier to explain it in-person, but that is, unfortunately, not what we have in front of us today, but, yes, thanks, Scott. Andrew.

DR. ROPICKI: I was just curious, and the idea of natural disasters keeps coming up, and I'm guessing it's in reference to like a fisheries disaster declaration, but there are like two components to that, at least. I mean, are you planning to use the data in determining whether a fisheries disaster occurred, like the 35 percent threshold they require, or is it the states will use it to determine payouts, if there is a disaster, or both, or, I mean, that just keeps getting thrown around, and I just wanted some clarification.

MR. HADLEY: I can try to answer that. I'm not going to have a very specific answer for you though, unfortunately, and I'm not aware of it being -- Or intended to be used eventually for that threshold level that you referenced, but maybe that could be -- You know, it could be in the works, and I'm not sure.

You know, the context that I've heard it used is essentially distribution of funds, and so, if you have some sort of proof that, you know -- I'm making up numbers here, but, you know, I missed out on fifty for-hire trips, due to this hurricane, you know, that sort of information could be used to help compensate for that lost income. That's the context that I've heard it used, but, again, that's not a comprehensive answer, and there may be better avenues.

DR. ROPICKI: Well, my compromises would be -- I mean, that would require the states to tell you that, because they're the ones who are going to figure out the spend plans and stuff, but that's a pretty big carrot. I mean, if we're looking for incentives, or carrots, to reply, you know, if it's going to be -- If it's going to affect whether you're included in a payout, that's a pretty big incentive.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Scott, go ahead.

DR. CROSSON: To that point that Andrew just made, when Hurricane Florence parked itself off the North Carolina coast, and I was the one that was assigned to do the commercial economic impact for the fleet there, from that fishery, from that storm, North Carolina was able -- Because they had good trip ticket records, they were able to kind of quickly come up with a formula for figuring out the economic impact, the economic damage from the storm, saying -- You know, they looked at landings in different areas, and then compared it to the three-year average before, you know, for a particular month, and then they had --

You know, I can't remember exactly what the formula was, but that determined whether there had been a significant impact in that area, and it's something that then they could use later on, like Andrew said, for determining how bad the economic impact was on the fleet and for potential future payouts for a relief plan, for a disaster plan, but you need a baseline to do that. If you don't have a baseline, then it's just sort of -- There's nothing to go from, and so I think that's a really valid point that Andrew is bringing up.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Scott, and thanks, Andrew, for bringing up that point. Jessica, go ahead.

DR. STEPHEN: I wanted to go back and speak a little bit about the data and confidentiality, and so all data that the agency collects does fall under the Magnuson-Stevens' Act confidentiality rules, and it does sound like, from some of the discussion, we might need to do more in outreach about explaining how that works, and so that data is never given out to anyone without aggregation levels, at least three people or more, so you can't tell individual people's reporting requirements, and so that does include something like the IRS.

If another agency did want to receive information from us, they would need to subpoena us. Likewise, if someone was in a divorce, and some of their information was going forward in that divorce proceeding, they would need to create a subpoena, in order to get the data from us, and so we do really strongly hold to keeping this data confidential, and we also keep it in extremely high security level electronic systems that protect the confidentiality, and then just one comment here on some of the disasters.

I will say that -- This is a little bit different, but, when we had the Deepwater Horizon oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, and I also run a lot of our other data collection programs, in the ledgers that we had collected from direct reporting from fishermen, and this would be on the commercial side, it was directly helpful to them to submitting to the agencies that were supplying money for work lost under the Deepwater Horizon.

I do believe that we have recently kind of changed some of the disaster rules, that the for-hire sector is now considered under that, and I'm not an expert in that or anything, by far, and I know we have a couple of our economists from SERO on, and I don't know if any of them would be willing to speak towards how that disaster recovery process now works and how the information is used.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Jessica. Thanks for clarifying that, and I think, as someone mentioned earlier, I think the reality of the situation, and perhaps what people understand on the

ground, and, like you said, there's a big gap, and so, going forward, this might be really useful then to the reporting programs. Do we have any SERO folks that wanted to respond to that? I see several hands up. John, I don't know, and help me out. Does it look like anyone is wanting to respond to what Jessica just raised?

MR. HADLEY: I believe Mike Travis has his hand up.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Awesome. Go ahead, Mike. Thanks.

DR. TRAVIS: Yes, and, as Jessica mentioned, there were some significant changes made to the disaster provisions, with respect to fisheries disasters, under the Magnuson-Stevens Act. That was part of the appropriations bill that was passed in December of 2022, and we have had a number of discussions, workshops, meetings with the state folks, across the South Atlantic, as well as in the Gulf and the Caribbean, regarding the implications of those changes, and, with respect to this particular discussion, one of the important provisions is that, before these changes were made, when it came to determining whether a fisheries disaster had actually occurred, we could only take account of the commercial sector of any fishery. No other sectors were taken into account in those determinations, at least when NMFS is making that determination.

The Secretary has authority of her own, and she can make, you know, disaster determinations of her own accord, based on various information, but that's not the standard -- That's not the standard process anymore, and so -- But now, the for-hire sector, as well as actually the processing sector, but that's another issue, but the for-hire sector can now be included in those disaster determinations.

The problem is that, if you don't have the basic economic data, which is the revenue information, then you can't take them into account, and, as I explained to the Gulf Council, a few months back, that could actually hurt folks in the commercial sector, by reducing the amount of money that ends up getting allocated to the state for the disaster as a whole, and so I won't go into all the details of that presentation, but the critical point is that you really want that revenue information for the for-hire sector, in order to make the best possible determination with regard to whether a fisheries disaster has occurred.

I will mention one other point, because I don't know if anyone from the state of North Carolina is on here, but this is really important for them in particular, because, if I understand them correctly, they are currently prohibited, by their legislature, from implementing a for-hire logbook program, and so, if they're going to have that data at their disposal, it's going to have to come from this program. Otherwise, it's going to hurt their fishermen. I'm happy to take any questions.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks very much for all that information, Mike, and definitely you're giving us a lot of ideas for carrots for this discussion question. Any follow-up questions for Mike Travis, before we move on to Kevin, who has his hand raised? I'm not seeing anything happen on my end, but thank you, and, if questions arise later, we might reach out to you again. Kevin.

DR. HUNT: I want to go back to Christina, because I ran into the same issue here on that trapper survey with a subpoena. The special agents wanted some of my confidential trapper data, and we had a big to-do with them and my legal counsel at the university, and, instead of getting -- I

requested a subpoena, because they had to go to a district judge to do it. They came back with an FOIA, saying it was federal funds, and it was a federal investigation, and, therefore, they didn't need a subpoena, and so, if you could point me to that language that you just kind of summarized, where it requires a subpoena, and that's kind of up in the air, as far as I'm concerned, because I ran into just the opposite on that in an investigation, and so I'm just kind of asking you to kind of point me to do that, you know, maybe offline, if you can. Thank you.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Jessica, I think that question was for you, and that was Kevin Hunt wondering, and so if you don't mind reaching out to him, off of this webinar, that would be wonderful.

DR. HUNT: Sorry, Jessica.

DR. STEPHEN: That sounds good. I can do that. I will work with our lawyers, and, you know, we've had this discussion a lot of times with lawyers, and, with the data collection programs that I run, we've require some court document, in order to release any data, and I think it's mostly built into the Magnuson Act, and you would be able to see it there, but I will find the language and get it sent to you.

DR. HUNT: Thank you. I've got to teach a class on that next week, and so I'll look for it. Thanks.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Jessica. Thanks, Kevin. I don't see any other hands up, and so it looks like we're ready to move on to Discussion Question Number 2. Are we missing anything, John?

MR. HADLEY: No, and I appreciate the discussion. I think we have several bullet points to put down in the notes section for that, for Question 1. Moving over to Question 2 --

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Lots of ideas there.

MR. HADLEY: Yes, absolutely. Moving over to Question 2, this kind of narrows down the focus on the economic component of the logbook, and so, as mentioned, the Gulf Council is considering a random sampling method, or a sampling method rather than a census method, for the economic component of their logbook, and so, you know, a multi-tiered question, or a multipart question, here, but the -- You know, we're looking for feedback, essentially, of does the SEP have a recommendation for the council to consider on an action that would implement a random sampling method for the economic component of the logbook?

If a sampling method were implemented to gather the economic information, do you have a recommendation for the percentage of vessels that should be sampled, and so, the way that the Gulf Council discussion has gone, at least to this point, is up to a certain percent could be sampled, and so do you have some feedback for the South Atlantic Council on that? I mean, what's a reasonable range that they should consider, there again balancing that reporting burden versus making sure that you have a robust sample?

Then the last part is just if we could get a general discussion on the strengths and weaknesses of a census versus sampling approach to gather social and economic information, and that was a specific question that came up at the September South Atlantic Council --



DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: I don't know if it's my Wi-Fi or if John is gone. Can anyone else hear John?

MR. HADLEY: -- very importantly, the application of the results. Then, you know, in the end, do you have a recommendation one way or another, you know, as far as how the council may want to lean, or considerations of which way the council may want to lean, whether to continue the census approach or look at the sampling approach. With that, I will hand it over to the SEP.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: You cut out for me in the center there, John, but I think you were reading the question, and so I think I'm good, and it might just be my Wi-Fi, and I'm not sure, but I see that Kevin has his hand raised.

MR. HADLEY: Sorry. Okay. I'm happy to go back over it, if it did cut out, and I apologize.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: It could have just been my Wi-Fi, and, you know, things are still wonky in my county. Christina, are we good? Is everyone else hearing John okay, or is it just me?

MS. WIEGAND: He cut out for me too, but we've already got some questions raised, and so I think it's fine to move forward with the discussion, and John can clarify if there are additional questions, as we start working through all these bullet points.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Awesome. Thanks, Christina. Kevin, go ahead.

DR. HUNT: Back to Scott's point earlier on the sample size. You know, I tend to look at this, when I sit down with agencies, and I'm saying what's the smallest possible subgroup that you want to be representative of, and that should be represented at a sample size of 384, which gives you the 5 percent margin of error, and then you figure out total sample size, based on that lowest possible subgroup, and so I don't have an idea of how many you have in the population, but, if you, for example, stratify, you know, across states, then you should have at least 384 per state, which would dictate total population, or total sample size, for a study, and so, I mean, that's how I would approach it. I don't know what the lowest possible subgroup, you know, like Scott was referring to earlier, and so maybe he could chime-in to that.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Kevin. Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Sort of playing off of what Kevin just said, you know, there's statistical-type modeling stuff that you can do, that's really pretty easy. It's been years since I've done it, but what you need to know is basically your total population size and the level of confidence that you want to have, and it gets more complicated when you start throwing in stratification, but you can calculate, based on the level of confidence that you want to get in your population, what the actual sample size is that you need.

I remember doing this in some fisheries things, and the -- I was really surprised at how large of a sample was needed to get confidence information, or a confidence level that I wanted, but it would give you an idea of really what you would need, and how confident you can be in your results, and you can also work it backwards, by figuring out what your sample size is, as a percentage of the

population, and calculate the confidence you would have at that result, but that might be something that somebody might want to look at. I wouldn't imagine that it would take too long to perform those calculations, and that will help you figure out how many you really need to sample in the long run.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Brian. Scott.

DR. CROSSON: To that point, unless I'm -- John Hadley can correct me if I'm wrong, but there's nowhere in the council regulations for their fisheries that tell the agency that this is sample size that they want, and it's something that we've always had the discretion to figure out, depending on what we think are the needs for the regulatory system, and so I wouldn't want to put an exact percentage in there, but, like has been stated, the smaller the size -- I mean, I'm the economist who is responsible for dealing with the golden crab and the wreckfish fleets for the South Atlantic, and those are both less than a dozen boats, and so I pretty much have to do a census, when you get to that level. I mean, I have to do a census when you get to that level. Otherwise, I can't trust the output that I'm getting, and so, for something like this, I think we would probably be aiming at something that we can get an accuracy similar to what we get for the general logbook program.

I mean, there's no special little sub-permits for the charter fleet, the way that there are for the snapper grouper fishery, for example, where you have the tilefish longline permit, and you have the black sea bass pot permit, and then you have the wreckfish fleet. You don't have any kind of little sub-fleets in there, and so I wouldn't think that we would need to get too small for any of these, but I think we need to, you know, have as much discretion as we can to properly sample the fleet.

For the logbook program, again, we also make sure that we sample active vessels and inactive vessels separately. We do sample some of the inactive vessels, for example, for the shrimp fleet, just so that we can get an idea of where that capital is -- If it's being utilized for something else or what, but, you know, we need a properly-stratified system, I think, to try and come up with answers that are useful, but I think it's something that you will definitely want to leave to the discretion of the agency to come up with.

MR. HADLEY: If I could, to that point, you know, I think that -- Again, this is sort of following along with what I've heard from the Gulf Council, and, you know, the South Atlantic Council is going to discuss this quite a bit more. You know, they kind of approached the topic at the September meeting, and they will probably approach it in much more detail at the next couple of meetings, but I think the intent was to give the agency discretion, you know, to have a robust sample size, but, at least based on the discussion that I heard from the Gulf, they were looking at kind of capping the upper level of the regulatory burden, if you will.

I think that's kind of the approach that they were using, and, again, that's my interpretation of it, and so, you know, take it with a grain of salt, but I think that's the notion for trying to put an upper bound on that, but, again, you know, a very important discussion, and great recommendations, and I think that's very helpful for setting that reasonable range of probably what will be subalternatives in this action, to help calibrate that for the South Atlantic, so the agency absolutely has the ability to get the sample size that they need, but, again, kind of capping -- You know, capping that upper level of how many -- You know, how many vessels may be required to be in the program, you

know, with the notion that it would be less than 100 percent, and so I hope that provides a little bit of context.

Again, this is probably going to be a little bit of a moving target between the South Atlantic discussion and the Gulf Council discussion, back and forth, probably at least until March, but, you know, I appreciate the feedback on that. Thank you.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: It looks like we're getting some good answers for 2a and 2b. I'm not sure if we've really hit on 2c too much, but let's go ahead. Brian, please.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Just to clarify, I think we can assume that the group agrees that random sampling would be okay, as long as we have a sufficient sample size, and I'm not sure that we've actually stated that directly, but that seems to be what 2a is asking, is do we think it's okay for there to be -- To use random sampling, versus a census method here, and I'm guessing, from the discussion that, in general, we probably do, and, again, it would be based on having a sufficient sample size.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Brian. Thanks for articulating that, and, yes, I would agree. That's what I'm hearing, but, if Brian and I are hearing wrong, then please raise your hand and chime-in. Chelsey.

DR. CRANDALL: Yes, I'm more or less following what everyone is saying, in terms of ways we can determine the minimum sample size, but just, you know, adding and thinking about the tradeoffs, and folks talked about confidence and error and all those things, and so, you know, we could come up with a suite of options, right, that have varying degrees of confidence, and error, associated, and have that tradeoff between like, hey, do we want a lower burden, a lower, smaller size, knowing, you know, that this is what it will mean, in terms of confidence, and what level of confidence are we okay with, and would we rather have 95 percent confidence, and have more people, or are we okay with 80 percent and fewer, and so, you know, there's kind of a suite of things that we could think through, in terms of that, almost like a table of, hey, these are the different options, given, again, the population that we have, but I do agree that, yes, I think that random sampling makes sense, as long as there is a sufficient sample size.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Chelsey. I'm not seeing any other hands up. John, do you feel like we address this slide, or these questions, sufficiently? Would you like us to try to dive into the specifics of 2c any further? How are you feeling about this?

MR. HADLEY: I think it's a great discussion. If you have any additional comments on that sort of subpart of c, kind of the tradeoffs of reporting -- I mean, I know it was mentioned, but just to help kind of flesh that out, particularly for the council's review on some of those tradeoffs, kind c1 and then those four of, you know, reporting burden, incentivizing compliance, administrative burden, application of results in analyses, and are there any additional comments on that portion specifically?

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Anyone with specific comments on those portions? Any thoughts for John to go forward to the council with? We have a hand. We have a couple of hands. Scott, please go ahead.

DR. CROSSON: I'm actually going to -- Although I'm sure the council won't be ecstatic over it, I'm going to encourage them to consider letting us ask about fixed costs as well, at least put it in there, and, I mean, we can get a lot more information from that.

If the tradeoff is that we use a proper sampling technique, and I don't think we need to sample the entire fleet every year, but I do think we need to have fixed costs, and, again, in terms of selling it to the fishermen, and I understand some of the disconnect, but, you know, tell them to think about it the way that they think about costs for their business, something that they're deducting back off of their earnings, in order -- So that they don't have to -- You know, it's something that they need to have accounted for in the system, so that people can properly understand the regulatory impact of all of the different stuff that's coming from the council and from NOAA. I think it would be something that I would really think that we could add, and it wouldn't be something every trip, but it's just something that we could add at the end of the year, and I think it would be helpful, from our perspective.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: This sounds like a way to increase data as well as incentivize in engagement. Brian.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I agree with what Scott just said, and I think it would be really helpful, in terms of determining economic impacts later on, but, looking at Section c(i), and the four sub-questions under that, is -- I believe that using randomization, in terms of who reports, will obviously reduce reporting burden, but does that sort of incentivize not reporting when you are selected, because you're not in the habit of doing it all the time, and so I can see both sides of it.

It might require, in the administrative burden aspect, to -- It might increase that, because you might have to do more reminders to get people to actually report, and does it incentivize logbook compliance? I'm not sure there's a relationship between that, for the reasons that I just said, and then, when you get to the application of the results and analysis, I think you certainly can still do that, as long as you meet your confidence level, but you would just have to report that, that that's what you had from the data that went in, but I don't think that's going to really hurt you, in terms of the application of the results and analysis.

I mean, it's -- I mean, the U.S. Census Bureau has been working, for years, trying to get Congress to agree to doing random sampling, but they're resisted that, because, for them, it basically means whether they get to keep their jobs or not, and so they want everybody reporting in the census every time, and they don't seem to trust random sampling, but, statistically, it's a good method.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks for that, Brian, and thanks for going through that list for us as well. I see that we have Amy Dukes, from the council, with us. Please go ahead.

MS. DUKES: Good morning, guys. Thank you so much for this robust conversation and discussion. Actually, Brian got to the point that I was going to actually ask for this committee's input on, which is that tradeoff from going from a current census approach to perhaps this sampling methodology of a random subset, and so that conversation, if that could continue a little bit, was sort of my question for this panel. Thanks.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Great. Thank you. Other thoughts on that then, this tradeoff? How does the SEP feel about this? Is there really a benefit to one method over the other? What would be the costs of this? Chelsey, kick us off, and then, Scott, you'll follow.

DR. CRANDALL: I'm going to go back to my like -- I'm always like, have we asked them, and so one thing we could do is, again, ask some of the charter folks too what they think about this, and, if we were randomly sampling, do they perceive it would confuse people, in terms of compliance, or would people, you know, accept and understand that, okay, this means we don't have to all do it all the time, and that's one thing we could just even informally do, is check in with them.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: It's always a plus-one, whenever you suggest going back to a community to ask them, and so, yes, I agree, Chelsey. Thank you. Scott.

DR. CROSSON: Just, again, I'm in favor of sampling for the economic component. For the catch report, I think they probably -- They should be a census, but, in terms of -- If we move to a census though, the council has to understand, and the agency as well, that it needs to be combined with stricter measures, to ensure compliance among those that are selected. I mean, if it's just a way of lowering the number, and we're not going to get the cooperation rates, then the whole thing is going to be a waste.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Good point, Scott. Thank you. Kevin, go ahead.

DR. HUNT: That was my point, too. I've attempted a couple of censuses in my life, and I've never got a census, and so, you know, that kind of throws in statistically too, and what happens when you shoot for 100 percent, and you only get 90, and is that random? Are those 10 percent random, or non-random, and so unless -- You know, as Scott mentioned, you're going to get 100 percent compliance, and I don't know what it is on the commercial side, if you guys get 100 percent compliance, and, you know, it's tricky either way, and the random sample, you know, would probably save some more money here, or save some time as well, and burden on the respondent.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Kevin, and I will say, in our interviews in the region over the last year, only having to report periodically was something that was suggested as being more amenable to some of the charter captains that we talked to, and so just anecdotally in that sense, and it could certainly lessen the burden and make people possibly more likely to then comply when it's their turn. Other hands? Other folks? Brian, you have your hand up again, I think?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, my hand is up. I was just wondering, because I can't really say for sure, and it's been a while since I've been out of all these datasets, and do we have any examples that do like what Scott was talking about, or other variations, where he was saying try to get a census for the actual landings information, but a random sample for the economic portion, or do we have any examples that are currently being used that use a randomized sample for reporting of landings as well as the economic component of it, because it's --

I think it was Kevin who said that, if you don't get your compliance from your randomized sample in reporting, and it's still really low, then you're really screwed still, even worse than before, when we were trying to get the census, because you just have that same reporting percentage from a lower percentage of the actual population, and so you get less data in the long run. Anyway, I was

just wondering if anybody knew, and are there methods, sampling methods, data collection methods, like using randomized sampling, for something other than just the economic component?

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Great question, Brian. Is anyone familiar with any examples of this? Scott, go ahead.

DR. CROSSON: Yes, and it's called MRIP, and it gets this same kind of blowback that you would expect, you know, in terms of actually trying to estimate landings. There's all kinds of concerns that you're not getting a proper random sample that is, you know, sufficient, given all the different subgroups, and so, from the commercial fleet though, I'm not aware of anything like that.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Scott. Anyone else, other than MRIP? Not looking like it. Any last thoughts then on Discussion Question 2, and its multitude of sub-questions, before we move on to Number 3? John, is there anything you would like us to push a little further on this one?

MR. HADLEY: No, and I appreciate the additional discussion though.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Yes. Good thoughts today. Everyone had their coffee this morning.

MR. HADLEY: The caffeine is kicking in.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: All right. Let's move on to Question Number 3 then.

MR. HADLEY: All right, and so this focuses on we're trying to get a better handle on what may be a realistic target compliance rate, and so, as mentioned, the logbook compliance is too low. It's 37.4 percent in 2023, and it cannot be validated. NMFS has stated that the information cannot be used in management, until compliance increases and the logbook information can be validated, and so, you know, as part of the discussion question -- You know, I think the council is going to be receiving feedback, perhaps from the SSC, and certainly from the agency, but, you know, does the SEP have any thoughts on what would be a realistic target compliance rate, knowing that you're probably not going to get up to 100 percent, that would need to be reached before you would have confidence in the information and be able to use the logbook data in management?

As far as kind of parsing out that discussion, are there different uses, based on different compliance rates, and so, for example, would there need to be a different minimum compliance rate to be used to track ACLs, versus using the information in some sort of economic analysis, and so is there any additional discussion on that as well, and so, with that, I'll turn it over to the SEP. Thank you.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Brian, please kick us off here.

DR. CHEUVRONT: Okay. In looking at this, I can see why NMFS would say this about the existing logbook information, but, to avoid running into this problem again in the future, if the SEP was to recommend something, and they would be able to -- The data collection was able to achieve it, you're still running into the possibility that NMFS could say that the logbook data still aren't sufficient enough, and is it possible to provide NMFS with data parameters, like population size, et cetera, and ask them what do they think would be sufficient, and work from that, as opposed to the SEP just trying to come up with something that may still -- In the future, may end up not

being sufficient, when we don't know exactly what they're using as their metric for determining what is sufficient data.

MR. HADLEY: If I could, to that point, yes, absolutely, and that's feedback that could be given to the agency, or the council provide to the agency, and kind of ask that specific question, and so that's certainly a possibility.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks for that idea, Brian. Kevin.

DR. HUNT: I think we're asking the wrong question here. Any compliance rate that you could set is valid if the data is representative of the population, and so we're really talking about a nonresponse, and what's the difference between the 37.4 percent who comply, their data, and the 63 percent who didn't, and, if there's no significant differences between those two, then a 37 percent compliance rate would be perfect at making population estimates, and so I think the question needs to be how do the people who respond differ from those who don't, which I think was a comment earlier, but, you know, that's critical here, because you could be 20 percent, if that 20 percent is representative of the population, and so, you know, I don't know if you could set one without answering that question, and it could be lower than we think, if the data is representative.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Kevin. How would we know the data was representative though, if we're talking about a non-stratified sample?

DR. HUNT: You do a nonresponse check. You know, we do them all the time. We have to do that in basically -- You know, you do follow-up phone surveys, and you do something to get at that nonresponse sample, to see if they're representative or not, that you could weight by the inverse of the variance due to sampling error, or various ways you could weight that data, but, you know, I think it behooves somebody to figure out the 63 percent, and, you know, do they differ from the 37 percent, and, you know, that needs to be done.

Otherwise, it brings up Brian's point that, you know, the council, or whomever, could come back, and we would be tinkering with this compliance rate, and what's an ideal compliance rate, forever, you know, without answering the true question of is that data of those who comply representative of the population, and it's kind of similar to what we're talking about with random samples. Is that representative of the population? A 37 percent compliance rate, from a sheer numbers perspective, is probably sufficient, if it's representative.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks very much for that. Adam.

MR. STEMLE: One of the issues with setting the target rate for compliance is that we don't actually know the population that well. We don't know the percentage of active vessels in the for-hire sector in the South Atlantic, because of the compliance issues that we're talking about, and so we don't have a good, established population to make this determination, and so, until we can get that, this is kind of hard to answer.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Good point, Adam. I think we're just thinking of the licensed permitted boats at this point, but you raise a really good point, that we're not quite sure. We're not quite sure. Jessica.

DR. STEPHEN: So a couple of points that I would like to make. In general, just using the word overall “compliance” is a little bit too generic to kind of get at some of the questions I think we really want to answer, and so someone could be compliant by just turning in a did-not-fish report, and so they are reporting to us, compliance in that manner, and it could be that they turned in a did-not-fish report when they actually went out fishing and had a logbook that we didn’t get, and so there’s kind of a reporting-level compliance, and then there’s a compliance in the accuracy of reporting with the right report for what you did, and so there’s a lot of that to consider too, and I can’t remember right now if Michelle’s was just an overall compliance, which included -- So we had people who reported, but we haven’t looked into the accuracy and whether that did-not-fish report really should have been a did-not-fish report or we should have had a logbook.

What we’ve seen is that, when people go to renew their permits, if they have not been submitting their reports on time, and that’s a whole other level of compliance, whether you submitted on time or late, that they will just end up submitting a did-not-fish report in order to get their permit.

The other thing we need to think about, when we’re looking at this, and this is going back a little to I think what Adam was saying, with what’s the population, and so, if we have people who aren’t reporting, are they truly latent permits, that are not fishing, not reporting, or are they fishing permits that are not reporting, and, at this point in time, I don’t think there’s any way to determine that without boots-on-the-ground looking at every vessel, and that’s just not really realistic, moving forward.

Then kind of another final thought is, when we’re looking towards this, and so, even if we get compliance up, we need to have a validation methodology that results in an estimation. As people mentioned, a census is never really truly a census, and you use some estimation procedure to account for nonreporting and misreporting, in order to get to your final levels that you would use within management.

In there, you know, we are currently investigating two mechanisms, or methods, to go through, and there is the mechanism that the Gulf was using, that did a mark-recapture strategy, in order to get to an estimation procedure, and then there’s also a different procedure being, I believe, suggested by ACCSP. Now, that one might be more similar to what GARFO does, which is really just use the logbook information to, you know, supplement MRIP.

If we had higher compliance, we probably could be using this data as a minimum validation of effort within MRIP, which is what -- You know, when this program was put into place, that was what we said could be the only use for it, the way it was designed at the time, and so I just want to caution people not to get too hung up on the word “compliance”. Think about the different types of compliance, and so reporting compliance, frequency of compliance, accuracy of your compliance reporting, and think about, in those different mechanisms, what it would take for us to get there. We have been struggling with this for quite a while, just because overall compliance is low within the South Atlantic program.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks for clarifying that, Jessica. Yes, you raise a lot of important distinctions. Scott, go ahead.

DR. CROSSON: Jessica answered this far better than I can, and so I’m not going to say much, other than the one -- This actually links back to what Brian asked earlier, and the other -- It was



pointed out to me that the one aspect of the commercial fleet that's not a census is the discard logbooks, which has a declining response rate, and then, as Jessica pointed out, sometimes the answers are non-valid, because we'll get -- If they do comply, they're just sending in reports that say that they don't have any discards at all, when we know that tightening regulations probably produce the opposite effect, and so that's all.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Scott. Kevin, go ahead.

DR. HUNT: Just a crazy thought here, and I have no idea if it's ever been discussed before, but have you guys ever thought about observers on randomly-selected charter boats, to answer all of these, or a lot of these, questions?

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Is there anyone on that can respond to that?

DR. STEPHEN: I can take a stab at it, if you want.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Please. Go ahead.

DR. STEPHEN: So we do have a small observer program, that I believe is occurring in the South Atlantic. The real trouble with observer programs, particularly on charter vessels, is the amount of passengers that can be on there, and an observer would, of course, decrease the number of passengers, particularly on the six-pack vessels. It's a little bit easier sometimes, just, you know, number-of-people-wise, to get someone on a headboat.

The other thing is the cost to the agency. Observer programs are fairly expensive programs. You know, the way a lot of other regions have gone, and this is a little bit more on the commercial side than the for-hire, is some kind of electronic monitoring, and that would take the place of the physical person onboard a vessel. That does run into extremely high costs, both for the agency and for the fishermen as well, and so I believe we haven't really pursued that, just due to the cost that that would have, with this fishery in particular, but those are sort of the different things here, and I don't know if anyone else from the Science Center is on here that can speak to the observer program that we have in place.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Jessica. Did anyone else want to respond to that? If so, please go ahead and just unmute yourself.

MR. HADLEY: I was going to respond, but I saw that Chip just raised his hand, and I think we're kind of thinking along the same lines, and so I'll defer to Chip.

DR. COLLIER: So the State of Florida has an observer program for some of these offshore trips. It's been used in some of the SEDAR stock assessments, to look at basically some of the catch rates, and usage rates, of different pieces of gear. There's a project going on, or getting ready to start, in South Carolina, where they're going to have observers on some charter boats. It's part of an exempted fishing permit for the red snapper. There were some funds that came out through that, and then there is another project that is going to be looking -- I think it got funded to look at potentially doing some electronic reporting, or at least investigating whether or not charter boat captains would be willing to have some of that electronic gear on their vessels, and maybe pilot test some of that gear.

There has been some Caribbean countries that have put some of the electronic gear on some very small vessels, for minimal cost, maybe a hundred or two-hundred bucks a year, and that's not analyzing the data, but hopefully we'll have some of the AI available that they're trying to work out over in the Gulf of Mexico available on the South Atlantic, and so those are some additional projects, in addition to what Jessica had mentioned on the federal side.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Adam, I'm not hearing you. Is it possible that you're still muted on your end, or have we lost you?

MR. STEMLE: It looks like my internet dropped this time, and so sorry about that. Can you hear me?

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Yes, sir. It's all yours.

MR. STEMLE: Okay. Good deal. I just wanted to bring up -- Actually, I don't know if I want to bring this up, but just another matter that might come up, and one of the big issues that we have is that our for-hire permits in the South Atlantic are an open-access fishery, and so our population can change from year to year, and forgive me, and it's been a few years since I've really dug into sampling that, and the procedures and things like that, but I believe that would complicate any sort of temporal analysis that we want to do.

It just makes it really hard, because the population can change from year to year, and I believe, even recently, we've seen a recent spike in the number of permits for the South Atlantic for-hire fisheries, and we don't know if all those permits are currently fishing or they're speculative, because I'm sure the public is aware that, you know -- The limited entry document has been out for a little while, and so there are some other things that we have to consider here too, and I don't know that we're going to be able to get at these specific -- At answering these specific questions without first addressing some of the problems, and I think that might have to go back to the council and let them know of the issues that we're facing when trying to answer these questions, and we kind of end up circling back to broader issues. Thanks.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Adam. Yes, we have sort of strayed into some of the complications of the issue. Coming back then to this idea of compliance, and its multitude of ways of looking at compliance, Brian, you have your hand up?

DR. CHEUVRONT: Yes, and Adam touched on some of the points that I was going to bring up. Basically, just the open-access nature of the permit, I would guess, is a large part of the reason why we're not getting a whole lot of compliance here. I think there's some people, when they get permits, they may say something like, you know, what permits am I eligible for, et cetera, et cetera, and the cost of permits is really quite low, and so some people who may not do many for-hire trips, or any at all, specifically, might still be getting the permit, and we don't really know, and so we don't even really have a good handle on the nature of the incentives for why people even get this permit, and are they actively using it or not, and some of it would be helped, I think, by going to limited entry, but there's pluses and minuses of that as well.

I just -- Until we can get a handle on who the people are who are getting the permits, why they're getting the permits, are they actually using them, that's going to have an effect on what -- Right

now, I know Jessica is not real excited about using the overall compliance thing, but at least -- I think that is probably something that is affecting that compliance rate, that people might just be getting their permits on the off chance that they might use, because it's so inexpensive to get it, and then they just don't use it, and they forget about it, or they use it just rather sparingly, but we don't really know that.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Good points, Brian. Good points. I see two hands, and so, Chelsey, feel free to jump in.

DR. CRANDALL: I did have to step out for a second, and so someone else may have already thought of this, and so it's been a while since I was in my quantitative modeling phase, but are there any types of -- Is "sensitivity analysis" the right word, where we could play with, you know, if we have this percentage of the population turning in books, or, you know, 80 percent, for example, and we know we aren't hearing from 20 percent, if those 20 percent are super different, how much does that affect the conclusions we draw, or how different of an answer we get, in however we're using these data?

Again, this is a little bit fuzzy, and I'm just trying to think through possible ways to weigh how much it matters if we have a super high nonresponse bias, depending on how many folks that represents, and does that make sense? Hopefully that makes sense.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Yes, it does, and I think that -- I think you may have stepped out, and Kevin was talking earlier about checking the representativeness of the non-responses, and so I think it does tie into that.

DR. CRANDALL: Okay. Cool. Yes. that's kind of what I mean, like how much does it matter, depending on how many aren't responding, who different they may be.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Right.

DR. CRANDALL: I think I'm overexplaining now.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: No, no, and I think you're nailing exactly what he was mentioning earlier, that the nonresponse rate is more or less important depending on how representative those people who didn't respond are of the situation, and I'm just quoting from here, but you all were here. Kevin is going to clarify. Kevin, go ahead.

DR. HUNT: I was going to say that, I mean, Jessica brought up a point earlier, and it's not just necessarily how representative is that 37 percent of the population, but Jessica mentioned that we don't know reliable, and valid, the data of the 37 percent is, and that's, you know, got to be answered first, you know, or in tandem with, you know, a nonresponse check, you know, and so it seems like there's a lot of data quality issues here, regardless, and it's -- Right now, I think it's how -- I think the first question is how good is the reliability, and the validity, of that 37 percent, which I thought Jessica was bringing up.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Kevin. Chelsey, go ahead.

DR. CRANDALL: Good points, and I guess my question is are there things we can do, within whatever model, et cetera, we're going to use the data for, to determine how reliable it needs to be, or, you know, if a fair amount of spread in how confident we are in it doesn't really make that much of a difference in the conclusions we draw, and then maybe think through that, and, as we think through, okay, what are these different layers of compliance, who are we hearing from, and who are we not, and how much do we need to push for a higher participation rate.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: All good points there. All good points there, Chelsey. Scott.

DR. CROSSON: One further thought on this is that the council may want to think about future headaches that it's going to be setting itself up for if they're not requiring a census-level response, especially for something like catch rates. You know, I don't usually hear -- It's been a long time since I've heard discussions of people questioning the validity of the logbook landings data. It seems to be the compliance rates are so exceptionally high, in the upper nineties, that generally people trust and think that that data is valid, it's representative of what the commercial fleet is landing, and there are questions about the discard rates, which I pointed out earlier, but the actual landings data from the commercial fleet -- People seem to accept its validity.

There seems to be -- Every time that there is a new regulatory proposal being put forward, people immediately start questioning the validity of anything that's not census-level, that's coming from the recreational sector, and so, you know, if the council doesn't push, in terms of trying to get a complete census for the landings data, from the headboat and the charter fleet, be prepared that you're going to hear the data that is presented constantly questioned in the way that the people are on this panel right now.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Good warning, Scott. Thank you. John, how are you feeling about Number 3? I think we got a fair amount of discussion on this, and it looks like Chip would like to weigh-in though. Chip, go ahead, please.

DR. COLLIER: Scott, I had a question on that logbook data. I thought we used dealer reports, as opposed to logbooks, to track the landings, because there were some issues with the logbook, and is that correct?

DR. CROSSON: That's a good point. Still though, I think, generally, that's also -- The dealer reports are also mandatory census-level data, and so it's not a sampling technique that's used, and so it's a question, again, of whether -- Do you hear people questioning whether any of the landings that are being put forward by the dealer reports are, you know, unreliable, because I haven't heard that brought up during council discussions, or by the public.

DR. COLLIER: No, not the dealer reports, but, you know, we've heard issues, in the past, on logbook data.

DR. CROSSON: Yes, they don't always jibe up, and so decisions have to be made about what you're going to use for official landings, but I think, generally, they're not too far off.

DR. COLLIER: Thanks.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Jessica, go ahead, please.

DR. STEPHEN: Just a little bit to Chip's question, and so the dealer data, in essence, becomes the validation and estimation protocol that we're looking at compared to the logbook, and so that's kind of the two independent surveys that are going through, and, while we typically use the dealer reporting for ACL monitoring, and some of the other management measures, when we're looking at amendments, and we're looking at things like maybe seasonality, or area, or bag limit size, or trip size, that's all logbook data, and so keep in mind that the different types of reporting are used in different ways within management and so that logbook data becomes pretty critical, when we're looking at size limits or trip limits coming through, and that's information that can't come from the dealer.

Some of the mismatch, sometimes, between dealer and logbook too is that a fishing trip may go to one dealer, or more than one fishing trip might be held on a vessel, and go together to a dealer, which then it kind of appears as one. We've taken a lot of steps, in recent years, to start matching up the VPR number on the logbooks to dealer trip tickets, so we can dig into that more.

With SEFHIER, you don't have a dealer, right, and so all you have is the logbook, which is why that validation methodology, and estimation, become so critical, because then it can help tell you -- Not only maybe who is not reporting, but you can get a feel for the misreporting, and, when I say the -- I don't mean to say that fishermen are intentionally misreporting, and it could just be accidental misreporting that you're seeing, and it kind of helps to clarify that, and the nature is that that validation and estimation survey probably needs to be independent of the logbook from the SEFHIER program coming through, so that you have that validity and the independence in the two survey methodologies, and so just a couple of ways to kind of compare how commercial works versus how SEFHIER would work.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks for that, Jessica. I'm not seeing any other hands up. John, are you feeling good about Number 3?

MR. HADLEY: Yes, absolutely. Absolutely, and I appreciate the discussion.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Excellent. I realize that we're sort of stopping in the middle of an agenda item here, which I know we don't normally like to do, but we have been on this webinar for over two hours now, and we have less than two hours left, and so, if it's all right with John, let us all keep thinking about SEFHIER, and thank you for saying that, Jessica, and I wasn't sure how to say that acronym, and so I appreciate you saying that, and let's take a ten-minute bio break to refill your coffee cup, and come back in ten minutes, please. Is that good with you, John and Christina?

MR. HADLEY: Perfect. Thank you.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: I see you already typing it out. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

MR. HADLEY: I think it's safe to get underway here. All right, and so we'll jump into the -- This is kind of the last big-ticket question, and, just as a reminder, we do have that Other Business black sea bass item that will come up, and I think, you know, ideally, if we can get at least twenty

minutes or so on the agenda to discuss that, that would be great, but, with that, we'll hopefully -- We'll address this last question, and there's a couple of catch-all other-item questions coming up.

You know, this item, the importance, and sort of a discussion on the importance of consistency in reporting requirements, and so, as was noted during the presentation, there are approximately 24 percent of the South-Atlantic-permitted vessels that are operating outside of the South Atlantic region, and then, additionally, it's unknown, but likely a notable number of vessels have HMS for-hire permits, and so you have a bunch of potentially different reporting requirements that are going to go into place, with the Gulf Council and HMS developing their requirements, the South Atlantic Council considering changes, which we're discussing here today, and then, also, you have the longstanding Mid-Atlantic and New England, GARFO region, requirements for vessel trip reports.

Again, each one of those programs has varying reporting requirements that differ from those currently in place in the South Atlantic region, and so just -- This question is looking to see if there's any discussion from the SEP on whether or not you have any comments, or recommendations, for the council to consider on the importance of consistency across for-hire reporting requirements, considering, you know, these vessels that are homeported outside of the region may have different competing, if you will, reporting requirements, either based on their region or whether or not they have an HMS permit. If you have any comments for the council to think about as they, I guess, further consider their own changes to the for-hire reporting requirements and how those may need, or not need, to match up with those other regions for HMS.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Any thoughts on this? I will wait for hands to go up, and I will say that a confusion about inconsistency in reporting methods was something that has been raised by charter fishers across the region, and so I would urge consistency, wherever possible, understanding that it can't be completely the same as some of the other for-hire reporting procedures. Anyone else though? Go ahead, Scott.

DR. CROSSON: This isn't even just a thing between councils, and this also gets -- Both the Gulf and the South Atlantic are being managed through NOAA's Southeast Regional and Southeast Fisheries Science Centers, but the Virginia into North Carolina border is also one where you shift the science center responsibilities, and so you go from Woods Hole to, you know, Miami being the one responsible for keeping track of everything.

We have, internally in the agency, tried to address this issue before, and we had a meeting, during the height of COVID, and I think it was like a workshop for four or five days, that was held internally in the agency, to try and go through some of this stuff, but it's still an issue, where we have these big data jumps as you go from the Northeast into the Southeast, and so I think this is more complex than just a question about management across councils. It's something that the agency is going to have to deal with, and I'm not sure -- I would encourage the South Atlantic Council to be as consistent as possible with the Gulf Council, but going up into the Northeast is something that -- It's also going to involve the agency, as well as the councils.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Great feedback, Scott. Thank you. Anyone else have other thoughts, anyone with experience with this? I believe that Kevin is up next. Kevin, go ahead, please.

DR. HUNT: I don't have any experience with this, but, you know, what is the argument, for example, of the for-hire having inconsistency, and I don't know, you know, if we're jumping into

procedural -- You know, is having inconsistency -- What are the ramifications of that, from a legal perspective down the road, and maybe somebody from a legal perspective, or maybe Brian, you know, can answer that, based on his experience on the council.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: I think you said Brian, and his hand is up next, and so, Brian, feel free to jump in.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I'm not sure how well I can answer what Kevin brought up, but I mostly wanted to respond to what Scott had said, and I think he laid it out pretty clearly. The problem, for the South Atlantic Council, is that they are sandwiched in between the Gulf and New England, and, when each of those two councils were coming up with their reporting requirements and all that, they may have looked at what the other was doing, but didn't see probably a need, at that time, to make their data collection methods compatible.

Well, now that the South Atlantic Council is involved, and we do have people who report to the Northeast, for certain species, and there's a lot of overlap in permit holders between the Gulf and the South Atlantic, and so the South Atlantic Council is in a unique position in this discussion.

However, I think I agree with Scott, and I believe it was Scott who said that it makes sense, and probably would be easier, at this point, to work as closely as possible to have consistency between the Gulf Council and the South Atlantic Council, in terms of their reporting requirements, because I believe that's probably the highest percentage of overlap we have in the South Atlantic permits. That is -- You know, not doing that just simply adds to the burden of reporting, for specifically those vessels who participate in the reporting programs for both different councils.

Now, HMS, I have not really ever worked much with HMS for-hire permits, and their reporting, and so I really can't address that very much, and I'm not even sure how much overlap there would be between HMS and the South Atlantic for-hire permit. I'm not sure how much they're even really the same vessels. I don't have a good grasp on HMS, to be honest with you, but I would think it would be really, really helpful for -- If I had to make a recommendation to the council, I would recommend that -- To start with the Gulf, and let the agency work on how they want to address the issue, and then go back later and see if it's necessary to then modify the South Atlantic reporting requirements.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Brian. Chelsey, I'm not hearing you. Is it possible you're muted on your end?

DR. CRANDALL: Sorry. I didn't realize that it was a go for me. That's my bad. Just echoing what others are saying, and this parallels a lot of conversations we're having elsewhere in the recreational world, for example, talking about creels across states, and how we can, you know, have more consistency across those, you know, the benefits, in terms of being able to compare what we're seeing in different places, and scale things up, and folks also mentioned that it makes easier for the people, especially when they cross, and so I'm just echoing what others are saying, in terms of, you know, there's just many benefits, when we can, in being consistent in how we collect these data and do these things.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Chelsey. Scott, go ahead.

DR. CROSSON: One other concern is that, as climate change continues, you're going to expect to see more species bleeding across the border from the South Atlantic into the Mid-Atlantic region, and the council has already had to deal with this with blueline tilefish, and the lack of reliable catch records made dividing up the quota between the two regions particularly difficult, and so the Mid-Atlantic, I think at that point, had better records than the South Atlantic did, and so we had to kind of rely on a hack, using some very limited pilot fisheries-independent data, and so blueline tilefish is the first, but I'm sure it's not going to be the last, and so, the further you can get in terms of keeping these things in sync, the more useful it would be from the council's perspective, when they have to make decisions in conjunction with the Mid-Atlantic Council.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Really good point, Scott. Thanks. Jessica.

DR. STEPHEN: All right, and I've got a couple of points to make, after listening to everyone, and so one thing about the inconsistency in the data reporting, and why it's happening, is typically you'll see is what was the purpose of the data, and how they're intending to use it, and so, if you're intending to use it to supplement MRIP, there might be different requirements that they're not going to use in the -- Or, if you have other data streams that are available to supply certain information for you, you might not require certain questions.

Just what's driving those differences often has to do with what's occurring within that region, or area, and what kind of questions they need to ask with this type of logbook. Typically, what we've said to folks is you'll see the permit requiring -- It's a requirement of the permit, and not a requirement of the trip you're on, or where you're located, and almost all of the agency, I think, has gone consistent, and we have one small program that's a little bit different, and that's the Southeast Regional Headboat Survey.

It's a little bit different because it's been in existence for an awful long time, but, when it's a requirement of your permit, that does mean that you have to abide by all the permits on your vessel, and so, typically, the way this would work is, for each different type of requirement, if there are differences in the permits you have, you would have to abide by the more stricter one, and so, for example, if you had a Gulf, assuming the program is rebuilt, a South Atlantic, and an HMS, you would be required to report your logbook prior to offload, because that's the most strictest, versus weekly, or every -- I can't remember if HMS is forty-eight or twenty-four hours, one of those, and that just gives you kind of an example of where that goes.

To that point too, the agency, I think as Scott said, has been well aware of some of the problems with increasing climate change, and stocks shifting northward, and we want to kind of get a better handle on this. I am involved in an IRA-funded project that is going to create a single database system, where all the information from the different logbook records, both for-hire and commercial, can go for what we're kind of calling the east coast, from Texas through Maine, and, as we're working towards that, what that would allow us to do is to kind of share access.

Our goal is not to have the fishermen report two logbooks for the same trip, to do two different parts of the agency, and the idea is to get them to submit one logbook that goes into a shared system, that then the different people who are involved in it have the ability to access and move towards it, and so it's a pretty large project. We're just going through the initial stages, but we have been funded for it, and so, in a couple of years, I think some of these questions might become a little bit more of a moot point, as we're moving forward, but, until that point in time, we



recommend that someone abides by all the requirements of all their permits and just report at the most strictest for each type of level of reporting that's required within that program.

I think someone asked what the overlap was of our vessels to HMS, and so, in the for-hire sector, for the entire Southeast, and so keep in mind this is including the Gulf and South Atlantic, we had, back when we calculated it in 2020, I think 2,151 vessels that also held HMS for-hire permits. Keep in mind, in the South Atlantic, we tend to have 2,500 permits total, and so that actually is a fairly good representation that have both South Atlantic and HMS permits.

Keep in mind that number could be slightly different, if we happen to have someone who only holds a Gulf for-hire and HMS and doesn't also hold a South Atlantic. Typically, we see, because the South Atlantic permits are open-access, and, again, it's only ten-dollars more to get another permit, a lot of people tend to hold both Gulf and South Atlantic permits, and so I hope some of that information helps clarify at least where the agency is going and the thoughts we're thinking about as we build that kind of joint database that will be accessible by all, and we're hoping that it also drives the councils to have more joint discussions and recognize where the burden comes in for having different types of questions asked, or different inconsistencies, and, again, those are primarily driven by how the data is being used within each region.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Good answers, and a lot of great information there, Jessica. Thank you. Any other thoughts then on this Discussion Question 4? Just in the interest of time, I want to keep us moving through these last two slides on Agenda Item Number 3. I am not seeing any hands raised, and so maybe let's head to Questions 5 and 6, John, if that's okay.

MR. HADLEY: Absolutely.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: We've probably sort of already answered some of them.

MR. HADLEY: Yes, and so there's a couple of kind of catchall items here. You know, they're additional items, or just thoughts, recommendations, that you would like to bring to the council at this point, as far as what can be -- What they should consider exploring as they look to develop this amendment and really work towards scoping for the amendment, and so, if there are any other topics that didn't come up, that you think that they should consider, and, also, is there additional - - Is there any information, that you can think of, of, oh, I wish I had this in front of me, so I could provide better feedback for the council, and, you know, that helps us, as staff, prepare what information you would like to see at the upcoming spring meeting, since, again, this will likely be coming back to the SEP for some more detailed discussions, and so a lot of the details of the amendment will hopefully be kind of fleshed out by then. You know, if that's additional, oh, I wish I had this information, you know, we'll work on it, if we can find it, as staff. Thank you.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, John. I think we may have answered Question Number 5 before we started Question Number 1, and we started with -- Even earlier, in the middle of your presentation, a lot of other ideas, and topics, that we raised, and so I think we may have addressed that one, but, if there's anything else on people's minds, any additional topics, or items, that we really want to make sure the council considers when they're thinking about compliance with this, or the utility with this, and/or what else would you like to see, as we discuss this again? We got all of our good ideas out at the beginning. There we go. Kevin, go ahead.

DR. HUNT: I just wanted to reiterate, because it was a point that came up I think when you were talking about, you know, why are they not reporting, and I think it behooves us to develop a phone-app-friendly logbook. I thought you had mentioned that that was a drawback with maybe compliance, that it wasn't easy to do on a phone, and, you know, just kind of, you know, reiterate that point.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Kevin. Yes, definitely that's something that was raised to us, and keeping in mind that what's easy at a desk is not always easy, like you're saying, on a phone app, and that people are -- All of us, perhaps, are being overloaded with apps, for every purpose these days, and so, the easier, and quicker, that can be, the better. You know, this is -- There's a whole field of study on UX, user interface, and so it's something that, as these apps are created, I hope, and believe, and I'm assuming that UX people are involved in the creation of them, but, if not, that's definitely something that should be considered. Any other thoughts? Any other hands? Anything we want to keep in mind, anything you would like to see presented to us in the spring, alongside this update? John, I'm worn them out. They have nothing else to say on this agenda for you. I'm sorry.

MR. HADLEY: I think so. You know, one thing that I wrote down is perhaps -- You know, we'll discuss it more amongst staff, but just getting feedback from our AP members on, you know, some of the questions that the SEP posed, is, you know, why do you think people aren't reporting, or, you know, what do you like, and what do you not like, about the program, that kind of thing. I think that may be helpful to gather from the Snapper Grouper, Dolphin Wahoo, and the Mackerel Cobia AP, and then, also, that new for-hire reporting AP that I mentioned, and so gathering feedback from that.

We may come back to you to help calibrate those questions and, you know, solicit the proper feedback from those AP members, and so that may be another item that we'll provide more information to you on in the springtime, but I'm not seeing any hands go up for additional pieces of information outside of that.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Great. Well, then it looks like we're moving on to Agenda Item Number 4, Other Business, and we do have a presentation here. We have SPR proxies for black sea bass. This is Attachment Number 4, that John emailed to all of the SEP this morning, and I don't know if it's up on the website, and I'm assuming so, because you all are on top of things, but let's go ahead then and turn this over to Judd and/or Chip.

#### **OTHER BUSINESS - MSY CONSIDERATIONS BASED ON SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC INPUTS**

DR. COLLIER: Thank you. This is Chip, and I'll be speaking today, and sorry about having the title under Other Business incorrect. We were working, as staff, figuring out what to call this presentation, and we changed it along the line, and so this is going to be talking about MSY, or maximum sustainable yield, considerations, based on social and economic inputs, and sorry about getting it to you so late. We've just had quite a few meetings, and trying to get everything prepared, and I got way behind on this one, and so if you go to the next slide.

Just a real quick primer on maximum sustainable yield. This is a theoretical value that produces the highest yield in the fishery, and, typically, you'll see a graph over here, like is displayed on the right side of your screen, where, as you increase your FMSY, F representing effort there, you get to a point where you start to have decreasing catch levels. Because effort is so high, you begin to start overfishing the population.

At catch levels below FMSY, you have moderate levels of fishing, and, if you go too low, then you're definitely not optimizing your fishery, and what we try to do within Magnuson, as we're required, is to avoid overfishing, and that's going to be to the left side of that FMSY, but we also try to make sure we have a population that is healthy and try to prevent an overfished stock, which basically means you don't have enough spawning stock biomass in the population to rebuild the adult population.

If you go to the next slide, what I also want to point out is, quite often, when we're getting stock assessments, the way we get it is we have one single value of maximum sustainable yield. However, when it comes down to it, maximum sustainable yield does vary. There are several factors that can go into it, and what I have depicted on the right side of the screen is a maximum sustainable yield for a fishery if you allowed harvest at one year, compared to if harvest was allowed at three years.

In this study, Chavez indicated that there's almost a 50 percent increase in your potential yield if you delay harvest until age-three, and so the reason that MSY changes like this is because it's impacted by growth, natural mortality, maturity, selectivity, and I'm going to be talking a little bit more about selectivity in the future, and I also listed on here biological and environmental conditions. This is being talked about quite a bit nowadays, where they're talking about non-stationarity for a lot of these metric points, and so, if you're having differences, or changes, in environmental condition, which impacts the growth rate of the population, then that's going to change your maximum sustainable yield, and so what you're getting today might not be the same as what you're getting out, or potentially getting out, of a population thirty years ago.

We found this nice little study conducted by Scott and Sampson, where they developed some selectivity -- They wanted to test the impact of selectivity on maximum sustainable yield, and they developed it for a hypothetical species and hypothetical fisheries, and they looked at three different types of selectivity.

I have it listed over here, and we have contact selectivity and population selectivity, and what they have indicated in their study -- They were talking about population selectivity, and so that's what I'm going to be talking about here. That's going to be presented on this slide and the next slide, and the top one is a flat-top selectivity, and this is typically what you get in like a -- Maybe a hook-and-line fishery, where it's 100 percent retention after a certain size. You can see that, as it's going to the right, it's increasing age, and so that could be done by changing something like size limits. That can increase a change in a selectivity curve like this.

We also have presented here, and this is like a lot of the fisheries we have in the South Atlantic, and they're dome-shaped, and, typically, this just means that the older part of the population may not be as susceptible as the young part of the population, for whatever reason it might be, and one of the reasons that we have in our South Atlantic region is, typically, older fish are in deeper water, and, therefore, let's say something like the recreational fishery -- They might not go out to that

deeper water, if they're getting equal satisfaction in the shallower water, and, therefore, you're going to have lower catch rates on some of those older individuals.

Then, finally, you can have something like is displayed at the very bottom, which is two fleets combined, and we typically don't have a selectivity pattern that looks so much like this in the South Atlantic, but what happens is you have a very broad entry into the fishery, and one way that this can be controlled, in order to decrease the susceptibility of a population to gear capture, is to potentially maybe close an area. If you know that's a juvenile habitat, and you close the area, you might be able to reduce the efficiency of contact with that gear.

Once again, these are the results, and they match up to that flat-topped, dome-shaped, and two-fleet, with A being flat-topped, B being domed, and C being the two-fleet, and what I want to point out is the responses that you get, based on changes in growth, or changes in selectivity, it was not always linear. In that top A graph, you can see about a 30 percent change in the overall F, or the relative F, and it gets you about a 30 percent change, but you also see almost like a question-mark in there, indicating that it was definitely not a -- It was not always easily predicted what was going to happen.

If you switch over to B, you can see about a 50 percent change in the relative F resulted in only a 20 percent change in relative yield, and so this is a substantial drop in the amount of effort in order to get a pretty small reduction overall in the F. Then, if you go to the bottom one, which is that two-fleet selectivity, you see a very drastic response, where you have a 100 percent drop in the F, and you only get a 15 percent drop in the relative yield.

With all this being said, FMSY does change quite a bit, and it has a pretty big influence on relative F, and these responses are going to vary based on species, area, and fishery, and the reason I have area in there is that's a representation of, you know, potentially different environmental and biological conditions that a fish might be impacted by, but, also, the fishery might change in that area as well. Then, finally, in reading some of the research for black sea bass, we see that -- We've heard, several times, that fishermen are willing to sacrifice some of the yield in order to have a longer fishing season.

One of the reasons that we're bringing this up is we've been looking at information on the recreational fishery and really trying to think about how to integrate it into management, and potentially into considerations for MSY, and one of the studies that we looked at was the attitude and preferences of saltwater recreational anglers, and this is a nationwide study that had a regional component of it, but they were looking at attitudes and preferences, basically on folks that would be covered through MRIP. It's not just people that have federal-water fisheries, and so it does vary quite a bit on the scope that was interviewed, and they did that through the mail.

We also had a bag limit analysis that one of the staff members here, Mike Errigo, had done, where he looked at the potential of folks for even reaching a proposed bag limit, and it just indicated that it can be very difficult to get to that bag limit size with the population condition the way it was in at that point, and so that's mainly looking at a modeling exercise and predicting what's going to happen in the fishery.

There was also a master's student's work that was done looking at trip satisfaction in the South Carolina for-hire industry. She did some interviews of fishermen coming back, or even on the

boat, and was able to get some of how people like to fish, especially on some of these maybe more inshore species, like black sea bass, and not necessarily focusing on some of the more deeper-water species, just because it is so difficult to get to some of the deeper water.

There is also the American Sportfishing Association had done exploring approaches to innovative management of the private recreational sector, and so they dove into exactly what the fishermen would like to have, and they did surveys, or they held meetings, along the South Atlantic coast, really trying to figure out what fishermen would like to have, and, you know, that survey occurred around the time of some of the red snapper management actions, and some of the comments were really directed at red snapper.

Then, finally, we have information on preferences, fishermen preferences, identified in previous public comments, and we have, I believe, two fishery performance reports that have been developed by our Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel. We have a general discussion of black sea bass by the Snapper Grouper Advisory Panel. They just did that, and I can't remember if it was April that they had answered some questions in regard to what they would like to see out of black sea bass, and so we have a bunch of information that could be available for analyzing black sea bass, and potential trip satisfaction, on what it would like it to be.

The questions we have for the SEP are how much staff combine these results from survey methods, from multiple surveys and sources, covering similar material, in order to provide something that is really meaningful for the council to analyze, for the SSC to chew on, and the second question that we have is what is the most compelling way to present this information on fishermen preferences that could impact selectivity, and a sub-bullet under there is we have what are economic factors that might influence fishing behavior, or preferences, that could change selectivity?

Then, finally, are there any additional reports that we don't have cited, or datasets, that could inform preferences, particularly for black sea bass, but maybe for other snapper grouper species? With that, I will pass it back to the SSC, pass it back to you, Jennifer, for any clarifying questions.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Chip. Thanks for that presentation. A lot of interesting stuff, and I'm sure we have lots to say, being the SEP, and the big question is, I guess, about combining all of these different datasets, all of these different types of information from different surveys and sources, and what do we suggest they do to put this all together, folks, and then we can handle these one-by-one, or, if you're feeling particularly moved to answer the second question, or the third, then please just jump in. Let's handle these as a whole, I think. What do we think, SEP? I'm having flashbacks to teaching on Zoom during COVID. Thanks, Chelsey. Go ahead.

DR. CRANDALL: I don't know if I have a clear answer, but I just didn't want to leave you hanging. I can say that I'm struggling to think about how to combine, and summarize, the results, without actually seeing exactly what they are in front of me, and I don't know if others are having that problem, and so, for me, I would probably want to kind of reflect on exactly -- I know you mentioned an overview of what the datasets were, but, really, what it was they were asking, and seeing, and how consistent those things are. Maybe that broke the ice.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Chelsey, I owe you. Yes, thank you, and it is hard to think about this in the abstract, without knowing exactly what these datasets look like, but we're going to tackle this. Kevin, what are you thinking?

DR. HUNT: I've done some meta-analysis in my time, and the first bullet point here -- But the meta-analysis would be like say if each of these studies looked at both rec and for-hire, for example, and you had some significant differences between them, or not, and you basically have an effect size, and the unit of analysis in the meta-analysis is the effect size, and it doesn't really matter how it was collected, the method, and so, if you have consistent group comparisons in these individual studies, then they could be combined with a meta-analysis, and I don't -- You know, otherwise, you could probably still combine population estimates from various studies, if you weighted by the inverse and the variance due to sampling, which would basically just give you your least unbiased weight to combine these studies together. That's just my two-cents.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Great. Thank you. That's a very concrete way to approach this quantitatively. Thanks, Kevin. Scott, what are you thinking?

DR. CROSSON: At the national SSC workshop that was in San Diego, and I guess it was 2017 or 2018, one of the first presentations that we saw was by Michael Jones, who I guess is a professor at Michigan State University, and it was the result of an MSE that they did on walleye in Lake Erie, and they had basically a production possibility frontier, or whatever biologists call it, showing the tradeoff between the catch of the commercial fleet and the CPUE of the recreational fleet, and it was just a -- It was a very easy-to-understand presentation of the tradeoffs that the different sectors would be looking at, depending on how they set the catch levels, and I guess it was very useful in enabling the stakeholder conversations about what they were actually looking at for when they were trying to produce a healthy fishery overall and what that meant for the different groups and what tradeoffs might be entailed.

That's the sort of thing that I might -- When you're asking me about how to present preferences to the council, or to the SSC, that's the sort of thing that pops into my mind first, is this sort of like a simple -- You know, it's possible to do an outline of the tradeoffs you're going to get between selectivity or average catch size or CPUE or whatever, and just, if you're able to get to that kind of level, I think that's probably the most productive thing, in terms of engaging stakeholders.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Great suggestion, Scott. Thank you. Brian, what are you thinking?

DR. CHEUVRONT: I was faced with something similar to this probably at least fifteen years ago, because it happened before I went to the council, and I was able to use a meta-analysis technique called multi-trait-multi-method, and it's been at least that long since I used this, and I can't remember a whole lot of the specifics of the type of analysis. I don't think you need access to the actual raw data that was developed from these different data sources that you have, but it's a way of how you can analyze data coming from different avenues to get to a single conclusion, based on what you have found.

I think, if somebody does a search on that multi-trait-multi-method, and it's a social science technique, and I remember having even used it in graduate school, in social psychology, and it allows you to make some inferences, based on the quality of the data that were collected in each of the different surveys, or data collection techniques, and come up with a single answer, and give

you a feeling for how confident you can be, but what you need to have though, for each of the things that you want to discuss, is you would have to have more than one data source that addresses the same issue, and this technique helps you to analyze those different approaches that are similar, but not the same.

I wish I could tell you more, but it's been so long since I've done that that I can't get into any more on the specifics, but it is called multi-trait-multi-method, and I think, if somebody wanted to look at it and see if that would be an applicable method for -- Not necessarily applicable, but a relevant method for synthesizing some of this information that you could then present to the council, or whoever, and tell them what you think you know, and how well you know it, and, anyway, I just wanted to put that out there.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Thanks, Brian. You gave them some good terms to start with. When I saw these questions -- You know, as a qualitative researcher, it seems fairly straightforward to be looking for the common themes that arise across all of these different surveys and sources.

You know, while you might lose on the quantitative background for them, you're still going to be able to say these were common things that were raised across all of the literature, or across much of the literature, you know, and we definitely know that a compelling way to present information is to tell a story, and not a false story, but a true story of people, and so, anytime that you're able to bring in illustrative examples of people in the fisheries, right, and their social and economic contexts, that that is compelling to managers, and to people in general, and so those would be my suggestions, right off the top of my head.

Other thoughts though? Some folks we haven't heard from today, I'm hoping that you're out there, and I know everyone is stressing over storm prep, with Milton bearing down on Florida right now, but, if you have any thoughts for us. I am not seeing any other hands go up, John. Chip, do you have any other -- Chip, go ahead.

DR. COLLIER: I was just going to say thank you so much for the comments, and, in all likelihood, what we're going to be doing is bringing this back to you in April, and hopefully have an analysis done with you, and I'll have a more thorough description of the surveys as well, and, that way, you all can chew on it a bit more, but, you know, it's -- I am not a social scientist, or an economist, and so I just wanted to get some feedback from you all on what would be needed to really analyze these and present them to you in a way that we're going to get good feedback, and so thank you for your time today.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: That's great, Chip. Thank you, and, actually, Brian raised his hand, and, Brian, did you want to respond to Chip there? If so, go ahead.

DR. CHEUVRONT: I'm sorry for the late addition here, but this is something that I'm thinking about, based on what Chip just said, and that triggered something in my mind. When the council was doing the recreational fishing app, about five years ago, one of the things that was included in there was what were you targeting, and what did you actually get, and targeting could then be a synonym for preference, I would think, and I was just wondering if you all had looked at the data that had come in from that, and was there enough of that coming in, reliable enough, that you could use the data to help you get at some of these issues? I guess that's a question to Chip.

DR. COLLIER: That was pre-COVID, and so my brain has been cleared out since then, but, yes, we could definitely look at the information that was available for what people had listed as what they were targeting on a trip, and that's another dataset that we could pull together and potentially look at, and so thank you for that.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Kevin, go ahead.

DR. HUNT: John or Andrew may be able to chime-in, but I think, you know, what Brian was just mentioning is the difference maybe stated and revealed preference. You know, with revealed preference though, you're kind of -- It may not be what you want, but it's just what you're stuck with, or maybe the easiest thing to do, and so, you know, maybe John, or Andrew, can kind of chime-in there, and maybe a difference between, you know, whether revealed is actually a true preference or not.

### **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS REVIEW AND NEXT SEP MEETING**

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Good suggestion, Kevin. Thank you. One more thing for Chip to mull over. Any last thoughts for Chip or this topic? All right. It looks like we're moving on to the very end of our agenda here, and it says Report and Recommendations, and so I am assuming this means us discussing our report out of the SEP, but somebody chime-in if I'm wrong there, please.

MR. HADLEY: Yes, and that's correct. Just kind of the gameplan for the -- Kind of the round-robin of recommendations from the SEP.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Awesome. Thank you, John. I appreciate all the support today, getting through this meeting, and so, yes, the report will be compiled out of those bullet point notes that you all have been taking, and I thank you, from the bottom of my heart, for doing that, and so if you can please finalize those, and send them off to me, and the sooner, of course, the better, but let's put a deadline of next Monday.

That gives all of us seven days to keep an eye on the storms and hope that they don't hit, and get these finished, but, if you could please send those to me then by Monday the 14<sup>th</sup>, and then I will put them all together, compile the beginnings of the report, and the get that to council staff, so that they can have that ready for me to present to the SSC the following week, and so I know I will see many of you there, but I will send an email reminder of those dates as well. I am supposed to now talk about the next SEP meeting, which I sincerely hope will be linked to the next SSC meeting in April, but I have no details on that. John, or Christina, what should I say about the next SEP meeting?

MR. HADLEY: No, that's correct. We'll just -- We'll be in touch, but the plan is for the SEP to meet ahead of the SSC at the spring meeting, which will be -- I don't have the dates in front of me right now, but I believe it will be in April of next year, and it will be in-person, in Charleston, and so I look forward to seeing everyone next spring, and I will say, you know, I appreciate all the discussion today.



Madam Chair, excellent job getting through your first meeting, especially on a webinar, which is not the easiest meeting to run, and so excellent job getting through that, and I appreciate everyone -- As staff, also as staff, we all appreciate all of the comments, and the recommendations, and the discussion. You know, this group always has a really, really great extensive set of feedback, and, you know, some out-of-the-box thinking to go along with that, and so it's always very much appreciated, but that's about it.

I did want to -- I did want to come back to the public comment, before we adjourn, and I know there was mention that we would have a public comment session before the end of the meeting, and I see Judd's hand is up, and, Madam Chair, I will hand it back over to you.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: I was going to say the same thing. We have to make sure that, if there is any public comment, that you all have a space to add those comments now, and just please raise your hand, so that John can let me know, and I have a feeling that Judd is chiming-in to let us know the dates of the SSC, and so, Judd, please go ahead.

DR. CURTIS: Well, that's two things you read my mind on, Jennifer, and so, just to clarify, the SEP is going to meet in Charleston on April 14 and 15, just ahead of the SSC meeting, on the 15<sup>th</sup> through the 17<sup>th</sup>, and so you can put those on your calendars, and then, Jennifer, you're already on it, but we've got an agenda item at the SSC meeting in a couple of weeks discussing the South Atlantic for-hire reporting that you all just reviewed, and so, if you could give the SEP's report under that action item, that would be great. Thanks.

DR. SWEENEY-TOOKES: Judd, we're on the same wavelength. Excellent, and so, yes, please get those notes to me, so we can get that report written, so we can share all of our really good thoughts with the SSC. I just wanted to echo what John said. You know, you all have great feedback, and I love listening to you all.

We come from different places, and very different training, in some of the things that we approach here, and it's fascinating to learn from you all, every time, and so, with that being said, everyone please stay safe. I hope that you're recovering successfully from the last storm, if you were hit by Helene, and have plans in place to stay safe and dry during the next one, and so let's all just cross our fingers that Milton doesn't come anywhere near our Florida friends. With that being said, unless Christina or John jumps in and corrects me, I'm going to call this meeting adjourned. Have a great week, you all. Take care.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on October 7, 2024.)

- - -

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

Transcribed By  
Amanda Thomas  
November 4, 2024

## Oct. 2024 Socio-Economic

### Attendee Report: Panel Meeting

Report Generated:

10/07/2024 02:10 PM EDT

**Webinar ID**

630-933-627

**Actual Start Date/Time**

10/07/2024 08:36 AM EDT

**Duration**

3 hours 38 minutes

### Staff Details

**Attended**

Yes

**Interest Rating**

Not applicable for staff

**Last Name**

Council

### Attendee Details

**Attended**

Bianchi

Brouwer

Byrd

Carmichael

Chevront

Clinton

Crandall

Crosson

Curtis

Dukes

Frimpong

Glazier

Guyas

Hadley

Hunt

Iberle

Long

Masi

Mehta

Murphey

Ostroff

Package-Ward

Records

Ropicki

Schmidtke

Silva

Stemle

Stephen

**Interest Rating**

Alan

Myra

Julia

01 john

Brian

Haley

Chelsey

Scott

Judd

Amy

Eugene

Edward

Martha

John

Kevin

Allie

Stephen

Michelle

Nikhil

Trish

Jenny

Christina

David

Andrew

Michael

George

Adam

Jessica

**Last Name**

Sweeney Tookes  
Travis  
Walsh  
Walsh  
Whitehead  
Wilson  
Withers  
collier  
Schlenker  
Wiegand  
Wolfe

Jennifer  
Michael  
Jason  
Mick  
John  
Jackie  
Meg  
chip  
Lela  
Christina  
Wes