

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

Hilton Riverside Hotel New Orleans, Louisiana

August 10, 2015

**VOTING MEMBERS**

- 10 John Greene.....Alabama
- 11 Doug Boyd.....Texas
- 12 Roy Crabtree.....NMFS, SERO, St. Petersburg, Florida
- 13 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 14 Myron Fischer (designee for Randy Pausina).....Louisiana
- 15 Greg Stunz.....Texas
- 16 David Walker.....Alabama

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

- 19 Kevin Anson.....Alabama
- 20 Martha Bademan (designee for Nick Wiley).....Florida
- 21 Leann Bosarge.....Mississippi
- 22 Glenn Constant.....USFWS
- 23 Pamela Dana.....Florida
- 24 Dale Diaz.....Mississippi
- 25 Kelly Lucas (designee for Jamie Miller).....Mississippi
- 26 Campo Matens.....Louisiana
- 27 Lance Robinson (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
- 28 John Sanchez.....Florida
- 29 Ed Swindell.....Louisiana
- 30 Roy Williams.....Florida

**STAFF**

- 33 Assane Diagne.....Economist
- 34 John Froeschke.....Fishery Biologist/Statistician
- 35 Doug Gregory.....Executive Director
- 36 Karen Hoak.....Administrative and Financial Assistant
- 37 Ava Lasseter.....Anthropologist
- 38 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 39 Emily Muehlstein.....Fisheries Outreach Specialist
- 40 Ryan Rindone.....Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
- 41 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 42 Charlotte Schiaffo.....Research & Human Resource Librarian
- 43 Carrie Simmons.....Deputy Director

**OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

- 46 Anna Beckwith.....SAFMC
- 47 Theo Brainerd.....SEFSC
- 48 Steve Branstetter.....NMFS

1 Eric Brazer.....Reef Fish Shareholder's Alliance  
2 J.P. Brooker.....Ocean Conservancy  
3 Shane Cantrell.....Galveston, TX  
4 Eden Davis.....Louisiana Wildlife Federation, Baton Rouge, LA  
5 Michael Drexler.....Ocean Conservancy, St. Petersburg, FL  
6 Julie Falgout.....Louisiana Sea Grant, Houma, LA  
7 Chad Hanson.....Pew  
8 Matt Hill.....MS DMR, Biloxi, MS  
9 Scott Hickman.....Galveston, TX  
10 Peter Hood.....NMFS  
11 Joe Jewell.....MS DMR, Biloxi, MS  
12 Mark Kinsey.....NOAA OLE, Galveston, TX  
13 Paul Mickle.....Biloxi, MS  
14 Ashford Rosenberg.....Audubon Nature Institute  
15 Bill Tucker.....Dunedin, FL  
16 Jim Zurbrick.....Steinhatchee, FL

17  
18 - - -  
19

20 The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery  
21 Management Council convened at the Hilton Riverside Hotel, New  
22 Orleans, Louisiana, Monday afternoon, August 10, 2015, and was  
23 called to order at 4:15 p.m. by Chairman Johnny Greene.  
24

25 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**  
26 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**  
27 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**  
28

29 **CHAIRMAN JOHNNY GREENE:** I will call together the Data  
30 Collection Committee. You have been provided a copy of the  
31 agenda and is there any additions to the agenda? Seeing no  
32 additions, the agenda will be adopted as written. Is there any  
33 changes to the minutes? Hearing none, the minutes are approved.  
34

35 The next item is the action guide, Tab F, Number 3, that has  
36 been presented for your review. With that, we will move on to  
37 Item Number IV, Public Hearing Draft, Tab F, Number 4, and Dr.  
38 Froeschke.  
39

40 **DRAFT PUBLIC HEARING DRAFT - ELECTRONIC CHARTER VESSEL REPORTING**  
41 **AMENDMENT**  
42

43 **DR. JOHN FROESCHKE:** Good afternoon, everyone. What I was  
44 planning to do, Tab F, Number 4, is just give you a Readers  
45 Digest of what we've changed since the last iteration of the  
46 document and then open it up for discussion and see where we go  
47 from there.  
48

1 If you recall, what we did last time was a joint meeting and  
2 there were two versions of actions and alternatives and the  
3 purpose and need with slight grammatical differences and things  
4 between the Gulf and South Atlantic. You all asked us to put  
5 that together, which we've done.

6  
7 In short, we basically took our version, with some minor non-  
8 substantive comments that are in the document. For example, we  
9 removed -- For each action, the South Atlantic put the affected  
10 FMPs and we do that in the title and so we removed those and  
11 cleaned them up and noted on Actions 1 and 2 that the Gulf  
12 Council had selected preferred alternatives and the South  
13 Atlantic has not.

14  
15 At the time, there was an Action 4, which dealt with the data  
16 flow and things, and we were directed to remove that, or to move  
17 it to considered but rejected, which we did. One other note  
18 that has come up in the last time with the request to improve  
19 the clarification of what's a charter vessel and how that's  
20 being defined in the document and so what we did is we requested  
21 some more information and some clarification from the Southeast  
22 Fisheries Science Center.

23  
24 We just received that after the briefing book, but prior to  
25 that, and so we will include that in the next draft and so we do  
26 that, but it's not in here. I guess I will stop there and see  
27 if there are any questions.

28  
29 **MR. MYRON FISCHER:** Can you at least tell us what it is?

30  
31 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Well, it's really essentially what's in the  
32 document. If you're fifteen or above, you're a headboat. If  
33 you're not -- What needs to be in there is just to make sure  
34 it's a little more clear. Really, it's if you're in the  
35 headboat survey, you're a headboat and if you're not, then  
36 you're a charter vessel.

37  
38 **MR. FISCHER:** John, if you recall, I brought this up at the last  
39 meeting and this definition seems to be contrary to what we even  
40 talked about the last meeting, because I think we said over six  
41 would be a headboat and I don't think the term of fifteen ever  
42 came up and I guess I'm incorrect, John.

43  
44 **DR. FROESCHKE:** It's over six in the South Atlantic and it's  
45 fifteen in the Gulf and you really almost -- That's why we need  
46 this clarification vessel-by-vessel, because it doesn't really  
47 address an eight-passenger vessel, for example, that I am sure  
48 there is one of somewhere. They it sort of falls back to

1 whether they just are in the headboat survey.

2  
3 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** I remember that conversation, because I  
4 certainly do carry more than fifteen passengers, but I am not a  
5 headboat either, but I think that, after listening to the  
6 comments that Dr. Crabtree had and a few others, that you're  
7 going to report to somebody one way or the other, regardless of  
8 who it was, and I was pretty comfortable with it at that point.

9  
10 You know obviously we've talked about this, it seems like for  
11 two years now, but it's one of those things that we're going to  
12 have to accept it for what it is and move forward.

13  
14 **MR. FISCHER:** It doesn't matter what it is, as long as we set it  
15 and then stick with it and go with that one and so the fifteen  
16 or more is a headboat and anything under that is a charter boat.  
17 No?

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** We may have to look back into that, because I  
20 believe it was Dr. Crabtree or someone, Mara or somebody at that  
21 portion of the table over there, that had made a comment that as  
22 long as you're reporting to someone within that purview that  
23 you're fine. If you're selected by the SRD, you're going to  
24 report to them and if you're not, then you're going to report in  
25 this other manner. I think that pretty well covered everything,  
26 as far as I remember. Dr. Froeschke.

27  
28 **DR. FROESCHKE:** One thing I guess you could weigh in on is the  
29 way it's done now is the SRD has some flexibility to determine  
30 whether a boat, for example, that's fifteen or above, but really  
31 does charter and not pay by the head, they wouldn't be in the  
32 survey, perhaps.

33  
34 Some of them, it seems, switch back and forth throughout the  
35 year and at different times and so currently it seems they have  
36 the flexibility to assign that, based on what their  
37 interpretation of how that vessel operates. If we think it  
38 should be more hard-coded or something, maybe that's the  
39 guidance we should give and really make it so if it's X number  
40 or above you're in or you're not.

41  
42 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Mr. Fischer.

43  
44 **MR. FISCHER:** I think if we're going to move forward with  
45 Amendment 41 and 42 that we have define and break it down of  
46 what group is going to be covered in the headboat amendment and  
47 what group is going to be covered in the charter boat amendment.  
48 I don't see any other kind of way and I don't know if we could

1 have boats at that stage saying they're going to play both ways.

2  
3 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Well, I think you're either going to be  
4 selected by the SRD to report to the Beaufort Lab or you're  
5 going to have to report somewhere else accordingly. There are  
6 CFR guidance definitions, 50 CFR 622.2, and I have read them and  
7 it is what it is.

8  
9 **MR. FISCHER:** Where I am coming from is each group is going to  
10 have a subquota and so once you get to that point, you can't  
11 have boats playing both pools based on where the subquota is.  
12 You're going to have to eventually divide it and these are the  
13 two groups.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Ms. Levy.

16  
17 **MS. MARA LEVY:** When we talk about Amendment 41 and 42 in Reef  
18 Fish, I think you will see that the documents do define who is  
19 included in each one based on who has been a part of the  
20 headboat survey. That will be in there and you all can discuss  
21 that.

22  
23 Somewhat of a little bit different issue in this document is who  
24 is, quote, unquote, a charter or headboat for purposes of  
25 reporting and I think we talked about it last time that if you  
26 end up covering everyone through Action 1 and 2 that it doesn't  
27 really matter, because everyone is covered no matter what you  
28 call them, but it would potentially matter if you have different  
29 reporting requirements for, quote, unquote, who is a charter and  
30 who is a headboat.

31  
32 Then those people selected under the headboat survey might have  
33 one reporting requirement and if you choose something else for  
34 charter vessels that aren't selected -- You know people would  
35 have to know who they are, but presumably the Science Center  
36 would keep those in the headboat survey in the headboat survey  
37 and everyone else would default to the other group, unless you  
38 all decide you want to change it.

39  
40 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Dr. Froeschke.

41  
42 **DR. FROESCHKE:** She got what I was going to say.

43  
44 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Mr. Donaldson.

45  
46 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** I think that we had that discussion of do  
47 we keep them separate or not and I think as long as the data  
48 collection tool can uniquely identify the vessels, we can

1 separate them out after the fact as being headboats or charter  
2 boats or guideboats, whatever classification we want. I think  
3 that's -- Because we could just sit around and spend the rest of  
4 our lives trying to come up with definitions for it and whatever  
5 definition we are going to come up with, there is always going  
6 to be an exception.

7  
8 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Good point. I certainly concur. Okay.  
9 Anybody else got anything to weigh in on? All right, Dr.  
10 Froeschke.

11  
12 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Two other points just on the general  
13 characteristics of the document. One, I mentioned or it's in  
14 the document, this notion of these tables of just how many  
15 headboats and charter boats by state and things there are.

16  
17 It turns out that we're still working on the chart. It turns  
18 out that's a lot harder, because it's separated by permits and  
19 the way the databases are set up, it's not easy to tell which  
20 boats have more than one permit and so we are working on that.  
21 I say we, but not me. That's the NMFS staff, which they are  
22 working very hard on this and so we will have that.

23  
24 The other thing, moving forward, if you've had a chance to look  
25 at some of the Chapters 3 and 4, you will see that there are  
26 sections in there of analyses or sort of X's where you might  
27 expect numbers. Part of that is that to move forward, we do  
28 need some additional guidance about -- In the alternatives, for  
29 example, we have "via NMFS approved hardware and software".

30  
31 We're getting to the point now where we're going to need to have  
32 some discussions about what that might be and if the Science  
33 Center has thought about that and are sort of onboard with this  
34 process, because to figure out, for example, a cost of  
35 something, we would need to know more about the hardware or the  
36 software and the process and all that and so it would be nice to  
37 get some input while we're here.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Dr. Stunz.

40  
41 **DR. GREG STUNZ:** Thanks, Mr. Chair. I think John brings up a  
42 good point and so I have a motion maybe, John, that might help  
43 out some there. I sent it over to you guys and I don't know if  
44 you all got it back there.

45  
46 You know we've got some preferreds selected and I guess, John,  
47 in nearly every case in this document and it seems like the next  
48 logical step, as John is saying, is to begin to specify what

1 does that electronic reporting really mean.

2  
3 My experience is that this takes some time and so we don't want  
4 to get far ahead with this document and then it's going to take  
5 much longer to develop what this electronic reporting mechanism  
6 and elements of it looks like. I crafted this and I am not by  
7 any means stuck to all the verbiage that's in here and if  
8 somebody has a better idea and wants to help me with this, but I  
9 put this up here kind of just to get us started. Do you want me  
10 to read through that, Mr. Chairman?

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Yes.

13  
14 **DR. STUNZ:** I move to request the technical subcommittee of the  
15 Gulf and South Atlantic Councils on Electronic Logbook Reporting  
16 Guidelines, in coordination with Gulffin, ACCSP, SEFSC, and  
17 council staff, develop a stand-alone reference document that  
18 describes specific catch and effort reporting elements, data  
19 standards, and protocols that can be used to standardize  
20 implementation of Southeast Region-wide electronic monitoring  
21 initiatives. The data standards and program protocols that  
22 should be developed include, but are not limited to, the  
23 following. I listed about nine or ten things that I generally  
24 thought should be included in there as a good start, but things  
25 like hardware, process and flow, data integrity, data  
26 integration, minimum reporting elements, effort validation,  
27 catch validation, compliance tracking, non-reporting, and  
28 expansion of estimates. That's my motion, Mr. Chairman.

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. We have a motion on the board. Is  
31 there a second for the motion?

32  
33 **MR. DONALDSON:** Second.

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Second by Mr. Donaldson. Any further  
36 discussion? Dr. Stunz.

37  
38 **DR. STUNZ:** I will just make a brief comment of is this sort of  
39 what you're looking for, John, or is this going to help out?

40  
41 **DR. FROESCHKE:** I think so. I guess one thing is if once we get  
42 this hardware or software, is this something -- How would one  
43 get a particular piece of software approved by NMFS? I guess at  
44 some point I am trying to understand that process and timeline.

45  
46 I guess, to expand, if we did this part, would we submit that  
47 and they would say yes, we agree or don't and a piece of  
48 software or hardware that could do this would be approved?

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Mr. Brainerd.  
3  
4 **DR. THEO BRAINERD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I believe, as the  
5 motion stands now, it would consist of someone -- At least  
6 people from the Science Center and they would be part of a group  
7 that would decide on the software that would be appropriate for  
8 this program.  
9  
10 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Dr. Stunz.  
11  
12 **DR. STUNZ:** I would envision something like -- I am just  
13 speaking here just as sort of a brainstorming component, but if  
14 you had certain specified data collection elements, like some of  
15 the ones here, it could be a variety of things, as long as it  
16 met some levels of standards that NMFS and these other groups  
17 specify.  
18  
19 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Well, I agree with you. I mean whatever the  
20 standards are, as long as it meets the protocols, I am fine with  
21 it, but I don't know -- I don't know. I assume that that's what  
22 you're looking for and is there any more -- I mean it's a little  
23 vague, I understand, but without getting more input out of the  
24 Center, I don't know which way to direct you here. Dr. Stunz.  
25  
26 **DR. STUNZ:** It's intentionally vague a little bit, just from the  
27 sense that it's a starting point to get this ball rolling. I  
28 mean I think I would caution against getting a little too  
29 prescriptive here, because you want to leave a little bit of  
30 flexibility, but I think these groups probably need some  
31 guidance from us that this is kind of where we want to go with  
32 this and this won't be the last time we visit this issue, I am  
33 sure.  
34  
35 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** I'm sorry. I misunderstood you. That makes a  
36 lot of sense. We have a motion. Dr. Froeschke.  
37  
38 **DR. FROESCHKE:** One thing maybe that we could do as part of this  
39 or something -- It seems like the first thing is we would need  
40 to come up with a flow chart of how -- Whatever the standards  
41 might be, how you go from this is what we want to actually  
42 something that's approved for use.  
43  
44 I hate to do it, but I don't know if maybe Assane could look at  
45 this and tell me -- The econ groups were the ones that really  
46 flagged that they didn't have what they needed to complete the  
47 analysis and so I'm just wondering if you guys have a thought of  
48 if this helps it or meets your needs.



1  
2 **DR. ASSANE DIAGNE:** I think at this point, as you mentioned, to  
3 have a better idea when it comes to the cost. Not only the cost  
4 of equipment, if there is equipment to be purchased or software,  
5 but the administrative costs of managing such a program and also  
6 handling that data volume, because some of the alternatives call  
7 for reporting on a trip-by-trip basis and some of them on a  
8 daily basis. Obviously that makes a lot of data for a fleet of  
9 1,200 vessels.

10  
11 Whenever we get information, based on the technical  
12 subcommittee, we can begin to see the contours of the costs that  
13 this would entail.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. We have a motion on the floor. **Is**  
16 **there any opposition to the motion? Seeing no opposition, the**  
17 **motion carries.** Dr. Froeschke.

18  
19 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Okay. At this point, I would like to open the  
20 floor for sort of a holistic -- Is there any things that you  
21 want to talk about since the last time that we reviewed this in  
22 terms of preferred alternatives? If not, do you want to think  
23 about selecting a preferred alternative for Action 3?

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** All right, committee, what is your pleasure?  
26 Okay. I guess we will go to Action 3 and attempt to select a  
27 preferred then. Dr. Froeschke.

28  
29 **DR. FROESCHKE:** One thing is this is a joint document and so  
30 we're trying very hard not to wordsmith the alternatives to  
31 death, because then when you get all these version issues and  
32 things, but several of the IPT have noted that the wording of  
33 Alternative 4 in Action 3 and this idea of clicking on a  
34 geographic grid or something could be a little vague and so a  
35 request to clarify that or explain that in greater detail might  
36 be useful in a subsequent draft. I am going to recommend that  
37 you recommend that we do that.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Well, I'll go with what you recommend.

40  
41 **DR. FROESCHKE:** The other thing, depending on how we develop the  
42 subcommittee and things, is it might be possible, if we have  
43 standards and things, that Alternatives 2 and 3 could be  
44 enveloped in a single alternative with subalternatives or  
45 something. Some have noted that it's not entirely clear what a  
46 VMS could do versus a tablet and things.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you. Well, I agree with you. I

1 remember the conversation on Alternative 4 and I remember the  
2 comment pretty well that most fishermen don't lie by more than  
3 fifty or sixty miles when given the opportunity of where they  
4 caught a fish and I am certainly one of them.

5  
6 I agree with you on Alternative 4. Now, Alternative 2 and 3, I  
7 have looked at a hundred times and they appear to be very close  
8 and very similar and I would guess that you could one or perhaps  
9 the other, as long as it was an approved device. Am I reading  
10 into that correctly? I am not trying to mislead anyone, but I  
11 am just trying to make sure I understand. Ms. Beckwith.

12  
13 **MS. ANNA BECKWITH:** Thank you. Simply from the South Atlantic  
14 perspective, we will not merge those two alternatives if the  
15 alternative has VMS in it. That's just the stance that we're  
16 taking and so they need to be separate.

17  
18 VMS is a form of electronic monitoring that is based for  
19 enforcement primarily and what we are discussing in Alternative  
20 2 is options to collect data electronically, but that would not  
21 be used for enforcement. That is the distinction that we're  
22 utilizing and so VMS is an enforcement tool to us and it's not a  
23 data collection tool.

24  
25 The South Atlantic is focusing in on data collection and not  
26 enforcement and so we will not be interested in merging those  
27 two and would kick that back to you guys if we had verbiage that  
28 sort of asked us to do that.

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Mr. Donaldson.

31  
32 **MR. DONALDSON:** In reading those, isn't Alternative 3 included  
33 in Alternative 2? Alternative 2 is just any approved electronic  
34 device and VMS is certainly one of those, but there is also  
35 alternatives and so I'm not sure why we need to specify VMS.  
36 Couldn't that just be subsumed into Alternative 2?

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Well, that was kind of where I was going a  
39 minute ago with my comment. I mean they seem very similar and  
40 noting the comment from the South Atlantic. Ms. Levy.

41  
42 **MS. LEVY:** The way that I read them, the difference is that  
43 Alternative 2 is electronic device that records your locations  
44 at specified intervals, but it doesn't report it in real time  
45 and so it's recording it and you get back to the dock and it  
46 somehow sends it to someone, as to where you were or whatever,  
47 whereas the VMS I read as real-time reporting of your movement.  
48 If I am wrong, then someone can correct me, but that's how I

1 read them.

2

3 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Mr. Fischer.

4

5 **MR. FISCHER:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. What does the Science  
6 Center want? What type of data do they want and need? I think  
7 that's what we should be concentrating on.

8

9 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you. Mr. Branstetter. Steve, I had  
10 skipped over you and I'm sorry. Do you have a comment? Dave.

11

12 **MR. DONALDSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I believe when we did the  
13 MRIP Gulf logbook pilot, as well as the report from the  
14 technical subcommittee, I don't think their recommendation was  
15 for real-time reporting. I think it was daily reporting or  
16 recording of activities on a daily basis, but reported weekly  
17 was the recommendation. I mean that's real time and that may be  
18 overkill is what I'm trying to say.

19

20 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** I agree with you. I think there was a sense  
21 of wanting to do daily reporting for in-season monitoring for  
22 some of the fish that have real short season limits. Dr.  
23 Froeschke.

24

25 **DR. FROESCHKE:** It's at least my view that the benefit of trip-  
26 level reporting is in the validation part. The MRIP pilot and  
27 other things noted that this is very difficult to do and the  
28 trip-level allows you to report your catch before you hit the  
29 dock and then it can be validated and that can only be done if  
30 you're reporting your catch before you hit the dock. That's  
31 sort of the gold standard, as I understand it, and so I think  
32 that's really the benefit of the trip-level, rather than the  
33 real-time.

34

35 If you don't want to do that, then weekly and daily without  
36 reporting your catch before you hit the dock I see as probably  
37 the same for management purposes.

38

39 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Dr. Stunz.

40

41 **DR. STUNZ:** Just to add a quick follow-up to John's comment  
42 there on the daily reporting. In addition, I think I probably  
43 brought this up to this group at our joint meeting and I know  
44 there's a little bit of issues about whether weekly or daily  
45 reporting, but if we're talking about sort of this gold standard  
46 of getting this, daily reporting is where it's at.

47

48 There is a lot more literature coming out showing major issues

1 with recall bias and you guys know that are fishing. You know  
2 there are different clients every day and a lot of fish hitting  
3 the deck and it's just a problem, when you put it off another  
4 day, to remember what you caught the day prior. I personally  
5 would recommend we go to a daily reporting requirement as we  
6 move this document further along.

7

8 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you. Anything else? Dr. Dana.

9

10 **DR. PAMELA DANA:** Thank you, Chairman Greene. I am not on your  
11 committee, but I would absolutely agree with what Dr. Stunz said  
12 about data reporting. You know being involved in these programs  
13 in the past, it's very easy to forget day to day. They all mesh  
14 together, especially in your peak season, and so if we're going  
15 to make it work, let's do it real-time and do it right.

16

17 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you for your comment. Anyone else?  
18 Okay. Dr. Froeschke.

19

20 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Any takers on a preferred alternative on Action  
21 3?

22

23 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Hang on just a second. Dr. Branstetter, did  
24 you want to make a point?

25

26 **DR. STEVE BRANSTETTER:** Yes and I wanted to follow up on John's  
27 comment a while ago on clarification of Alternative 4. I am  
28 afraid I am the grump that was complaining about the vagueness  
29 of the alternative.

30

31 What is report manually? Are you swimming to shore and talking  
32 to somebody or are you writing it down with an old pencil stub  
33 and a piece of paper? What is clicking on a geographic grid? I  
34 think just define these for us, please.

35

36 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Dr. Froeschke.

37

38 **DR. FROESCHKE:** The difference of this -- To start, the way that  
39 my understanding of this is reported is there is a map on their  
40 reporting software that has predetermined grids corresponding to  
41 geographic coordinates and you can mouse-over and click on a  
42 grid and that translates those coordinates into numbers that are  
43 then transmitted with the report.

44

45 The difference in terms of practical, for Alternatives 2 and 3  
46 versus this alternative -- Alternatives 2 and 3, the location  
47 information is passively collected by a device. It's not  
48 something that could be altered or subject to error in

1 reporting, whereas Alternative 4 is manually reported by this  
2 process and there could be either intentional unintentional  
3 error introduced through that process. That, to me, is the  
4 difference.

5  
6 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Anything else before we get on to  
7 Action 3? Okay. I guess we're at Action 3 now. Is anybody  
8 interested in selecting a preferred for the Gulf? Dr. Stunz.

9  
10 **DR. STUNZ:** I will float a motion out there. **I will make a**  
11 **motion that we make Alternative 2 our preferred alternative**  
12 **under Action 3.**

13  
14 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. We have a motion and --

15  
16 **DR. STUNZ:** John is telling me that I need to include  
17 Subalternatives 2a and 2b for the Gulf. It's the Subalternative  
18 2a and 2b included in this motion as part of our preferred  
19 alternative and so in Action 3, to make Alternative 2 be the  
20 preferred alternative, to include Subalternatives 2a and 2b.

21  
22 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay, Dr. Stunz, your motion is on the board  
23 and does it read as you wish?

24  
25 **DR. STUNZ:** John, if that specifies it correctly, the  
26 Subalternatives 2a and 2b -- Is that how it should read? What I  
27 am trying to give there is we don't want the 2c and 2d for the  
28 South Atlantic.

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. We have a motion on the floor.

31  
32 **MR. DOUG BOYD:** I second and I have a question.

33  
34 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Mr. Boyd seconds it and go ahead.

35  
36 **MR. BOYD:** In Action 3, we are talking about strictly reporting  
37 at this point, reporting location, and we're not talking about  
38 reporting catch at this point and is that correct?

39  
40 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Right. That's the location of what was caught  
41 and not what was caught.

42  
43 **MR. BOYD:** Right. Thank you.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. We have a motion on the floor. Any  
46 more discussion? **Any opposition to the motion on the board?**  
47 **Seeing none, the motion carries.** Dr. Froeschke.

48

1 **DR. FROESCHKE:** At this point, I would just like to reach out  
2 and see if there are any general comments or things missing from  
3 the document. One of the things that we had talked about --  
4 Well, this document will be reviewed by the South Atlantic at  
5 their September meeting. At that point, whatever changes  
6 probably -- We would bring it back to you all at the October and  
7 then what we had talked about was scheduling -- If we were to  
8 take this out to public hearing, we would do that in November.

9  
10 I don't know if it's premature to solidify that and pick  
11 locations and all that or if we want to wait until you see it in  
12 October. The South Atlantic has selected their dates and  
13 locations and I have those if you are interested. Just  
14 thoughts.

15  
16 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** To be clear, the South Atlantic has picked  
17 dates already to review this?

18  
19 **DR. FROESCHKE:** They have. It's my understanding they do their  
20 public hearings and they set those for whatever amendments they  
21 happen to have and they do them twice a year and so that's sort  
22 of a recurring activity and so this will just be part of it.

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Is there any desire to pick locations to move  
25 this forward to concur along with what the South Atlantic is  
26 doing? Okay. Seeing none, Ms. Beckwith, does this document, as  
27 we've gone through it today, does it seem something that may be  
28 potentially agreeable with you guys?

29  
30 **MS. BECKWITH:** We may not agree on all the alternatives, but the  
31 document seems just right to move forward.

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Thank you. Okay, Dr. Froeschke.

34  
35 **DR. FROESCHKE:** That's what I have.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN GREENE:** Okay. Any other business to come before the  
38 Data Collection Committee? Seeing none, Mr. Chairman, we are  
39 adjourned.

40  
41 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m., August 10,  
42 2015.)

43  
44 - - -  
45