Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council

February 6, 2019
10:00 – 11:00 am
Arlington, VA

Draft Agenda

The times listed are approximate; the order in which these items will be taken is subject to change; other items may be added as necessary.

1. Welcome/Call to Order *(L. Fegley)*

2. Council Consent
   - Approval of Agenda
   - Approval of Minutes from October 2018

3. Public Comment

4. Discuss Funding Status *(M. Cahall)*

5. Review Results of Partner Data Accountability Survey *(J. Simpson)*

6. Receive Progress Update on eTrips/Mobile 2.0 *(M. Cahall)*
   - ACCSP Support for For-hire eVTRs in the South Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico
   - Smartphone Version

7. Recreational Data Updates
   - Receive Progress Update on Deployment of Dockside Interceptor APAIS Tablet *(A. DiJohnson)*
   - Announce New Computer-Aided Telephone Interview (CATI) *(G. White)*

8. Review Improvements to Data Warehouse Confidentiality Management Process *(J. Simpson)*

9. Other Business/Adjourn

The meeting will be held at the Westin Crystal City, 1800 S. Eads Street Arlington, VA 22202; 703.486.1111

Vision: Sustainably Managing Atlantic Coastal Fisheries

DRAFT PROCEEDINGS OF THE

ATLANTIC COASTAL COOPERATIVE STATISTICS PROGRAM

COORDINATING COUNCIL

The Roosevelt Hotel
New York, NY
October 24, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INDEX OF MOTIONS

1. **Approval of May 2018 Proceedings** by Consent (Page 1).

2. **Move to fund the proposals as ranked by the Operations Average columns, and if there are any further needs for funding discussion after the overhead rates have been determined, then that decision will be left to the ACCSP Management and Policy Committee** (Page 18). Motion by Cheri Patterson; second by Jay McNamee. Motion carried (Page 19).

3. **Move to approve the Operations and Advisory Committees recommendation to apply the 33 percent funding cut for Year 5 to whichever is larger: the prior two year average base funding or the average funding received during the allotted four years of full funding** (Page 20). Motion by John Carmichael; second by Dee Lupton. Motion carried (Page 20).

4. **Move to adjourn by Consent** (Page 25).

ATTENDANCE

Council Members

Nick Popoff, ME
Cheri Patterson, NH
Dan McKiernan, MA
Jason McNamee, RI
Matt Gates, CT
Joe Cimino, NJ
Andrew Shiels, PA
John Clark, DE
Lynn Fegley, MD

Lewis Gillingham, VA
Dee Lupton, NC
Robert Boyles Jr., SC
Doug Haymans, GA
Bob Beal, ASMFC
Marty Gary, PRFC
Alan Lowther, NMFS
Wilson Laney, USFWS
John Carmichael, SAMFC

Staff

Mike Cahall
Geoff White

Ali Schwaab

Additional Attendees

Nicole Lengyel Costa, Operations Committee Vice
Chair

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Terrace Ballroom of the Roosevelt Hotel, New York, New York; Monday, October 24, 2018, and was called to order at 3:15 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Lynn Fegley.

CALL TO ORDER

CHAIRMAN LYNN FEGLEY: Welcome to the ACCSP Coordinating Council meeting. I am Lynn Fegley from the state of Maryland; and I am joined up here by the venerable ACCSP data heroes.

MR MIKE CAHALL: Venerable?

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: I think that's appropriate.

MR. CAHALL: I'm not old enough to be venerable.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: To my left is John Carmichael. We have a couple of actions before us today. There are going to be some conversations we're going to have; particularly about funding proposals, so I would just like to just roll on through. The first thing that I need to do is get approval of the agenda. Is there anybody with issues with the agenda? Seeing none; the agenda is approved.

APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: The last time that this body met was in May of 2018. You received those minutes in your meeting materials. Is there anybody who has changes, comments, or issues with those meeting minutes from May, 2018? Seeing none; those meetings minutes are approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Next, is there anybody out there in the public who would like to comment? Okay seeing none; we are going to roll right into Committee Updates from Mike Cahall.

PROGRAM AND COMMITTEE UPDATES

MR. CAHALL: Good afternoon everyone. I'm actually going to be handing this off a little bit; because I have the people here that were at some of these meetings, and who sometimes have a little bit more knowledge than I do. We're going to cover through our program updates first; and talk a little bit about the SAFIS redesign data work that we have, and what's going on with recreational.

The SAFIS Redesign is a very big project; and it is going to hopefully result in a much more flexible, much more powerful product than we already have. We've already done our initial design review. We've held, and some of you attended, our Integrated Reporting Workshop, about 18 months ago; where we looked at how we could make integrated reporting, which is essentially an automated linking of the different pieces of the spectrum of reporting together. Then we've also had a couple of meetings of technical stakeholders; where we brought people into Arlington, who for no other way to describe it are the geeks that really understand the nuts and bolts of database and system design, and hacked our way through. How would we make this integrated reporting concept work internally inside SAFIS?

Also, how would we be able to redesign the system so that it could accommodate the broad requirements and the variations that we're finding as we work with our program partners, and at the same time stay inside essentially the ACCSP design specifications and the ACCSP standards? We have created and completed a general system specification; which is guiding our efforts at this point.

It basically lays out; we must be able to do integrated reporting that includes the ability to integrate electronic monitoring, and vessel monitoring systems, this is location tracking. Again, what we're looking at with location tracking in some cases, for example the work we're doing with the Southeast Region. There

is a requirement for us to be able to integrate the VMS vessel tracks to the trip reports.

That has not been done before so far, and we're looking at how that might be accomplished. We're also looking at how we would record the vessels tracking; either using an onboard GPS utility that virtually every desktop, laptop, and phone has, or potentially connecting to a fixed piece of hardware that are on vessels, and that would provide the data stream to the trip report.

This also passes over into the lobster project; which was discussed at a meeting a little bit earlier, along with some research that is ongoing in Rhode Island, which I also talked to, actually talked to you just earlier about that. It will also have to be a flexible design that will allow our program partners to make changes to the system.

This would include the ability for example, to add or remove specific data requirements from each of our program partners. In our vision there would be an administrative switchboard; that would be able to be used by any of our program partners who would turn on and off, or in some cases create specific data elements that are required for them.

If you have a specific reporting requirement, I'll just use black sea bass, because I know that Maryland requires both a count and weight. That exceeds the system requirements; the baseline requirements for ACCSP are to provide a single unit of measure. If they want to provide us with two, they would have the ability to turn that on and specify what they need to be.

Of course, the newer versions have got to be able to do Smart Phone reporting. Smart Phone reporting represents a specific challenge; because of the amount of data that we're talking about collecting on a Smart Phone. For any of you that have done the online banking; where you have to peck in all those little tiny numbers, and not screw it up. That is a bit of a challenge.

But, we do expect to have a Smart Phone version of the system coming out sometime next year. In order to make the integrated reporting work, we stole somebody else's idea; because when in doubt, steal from somebody else. GARFO has been working for a long time on integrated reporting; using a concept they call the Trip Management System. What this is; is an umbrella that stands over all of the different modules of the system that keeps track of an individual trip, using some specific identifiers. It doesn't make any difference which piece came first; it will register the trip, store it. As the additional pieces are brought into the system, it will look at each individual report and make a determination about whether they're connected together, and then create a Universal Trip ID that's used in a background to link them all back together.

In theory, the Holy Grail that we've talked about for many years is our ability to connect automatically; a trip report to a dealer report, to a biological sample to a dockside sample, to an observer trip report. The goal of the trip management system, which is really another module of SAFIS or a subsystem, will be to do that.

We're going to look at achieving a flexible design. We're going to use some new database design concepts. A lot of you have dabbled in databases over the years by necessity. What we're looking at is using what's called a recursive or vertical object; where each road describes itself. That's why it's called recursive. I don't want to glaze everybody over; but essentially it makes it much easier for the system to be flexible.

Each row in a table defines itself; so it says I am row one, I have 9 columns wide, I am a species, and I am validated by looking at the species ITS table, and I am a Number 9 field. By doing that that will allow us to greatly increase the flexibility of the database design; and then the tricky part then is the system has to be able to read those data for each specific trip, and build a report based on what's in there.

That means you're going to have fields that will turn off and on inside your trip reporting tools; depending on what it finds when it goes to look at the validation table. Basically we're also looking at developing software that will build our reporting forms; based on a series of rules. So far in the analysis that we've been doing, we see three big groups of rules that will be required; permit-based rules, which by their nature then are partner-based rules.

Then gear-based rules, so you may have specific gears may require specific better description; circle hook for example. We might need to describe the size of the hook. Trawl, we might just need to describe the mesh size or composition; those kinds of things. Then finally species-based rules, for example a bluefin tuna must be measured individually and requires a catch card.

Those are the different kinds of things that we're looking at; and how we would go about to develop these rules, and integrate them into the system so that it's smart enough to be able to generate these forms on the fly, based on the combination. Now if you think about it and step back for just a minute; we may have trip reports that encompass more than one partner. What we'll have to do is we'll have to have the capability to say oh, this person is federally permitted, has a GARFO permit, but is also providing data to Maryland.

When we look and mesh the two different sets of requirements together, what we're going to have is potentially a hybrid report that would contain all the requirements for GARFO and potentially all the requirements for Maryland at the same time. In most cases the federal reports do satisfy state requirements; but not always. Right now we and your staff have been asked all kinds of questions by my folks about how do you do this, and what do you need about that? That's why we're doing that; so we can begin an effort to get our arms around what that's really going to look like. In terms of integrating what VMS and monitoring, and I'm calling them distinct different things; because VMS is a federal, in my mind and in kind of our

discussions internally, is one of the federally approved mechanisms to provide a continuous plot of a vessel location.

Monitoring, in our view there are two different pieces there. There is location monitoring and VMS. For us, location monitoring could be anything; it could be VMS, it could be onboard capabilities that are attached already to your machines that use satellite tracking and satellite locations, a lot of different ways.

In order to do that we have to develop a hail-out capability, which our systems currently do not have. Those are going to be needed for Southeast Trip Reporting; and we're getting more interest from the states about potentially doing hail out, because it will aid in validation. Also then hail in, to provide warnings potentially to dockside monitors who might want to be coming in to validate what's going on.

This will integrate we hope, with the Northeast Fisheries Science Center Pre-Trip System. They have a system right now that is designed to accept trip report data; and then it disperses it to the other systems within the Northeast Region that require it. For example, if you have a groundfish vessel that's getting ready to go out, it has to do a pre-trip notification that has to be sent to the Observer System and to VMS simultaneously.

It's sort of like a switchboard; it's intended to send it wherever it needs to go, and in our concept and in the discussions we've had with them, they're willing to expand the system to cover the entire coast. For example, since I have Maryland sitting here. If Maryland has a hail-out requirement for commercial trip reports, and our system collects the hail out.

We might send that hail out; we would send the trip report and the preliminary to this distribution system, which would say oh hey this is Maryland it needs to go over here to notify the Maryland folks that this vessel is hailed out. Then a VMS tracking requirements, we're definitely reviewing all of those; mostly

with the southeast, and most frankly with the Gulf.

We may have to create some back end tools to integrate with the existing VMS data streams. We've talked to OLE about this. They've been very cooperative; in terms of being willing to provide us access to these data. The intention is that we would receive a trip report at some point further down the road.

Maybe within a few hours, we might come back to the VMS reporting database, pull back the relevant VMS data, and then merge them together to create an integrated report that would provide whatever information is in the trip report; and also the VMS stream that would be associated with it.

In terms of our current software development status, as you all are aware we've been pretty busy; eTRIPS Online had a verbal certification for GARFO for accepting commercial trips in July. We are able to do both commercial and recreational data collection for GARFO on both our mobile and our online tool. The eTRIPS Mobile, it's also expanding its gear attributes; and again, this is designed to provide flexibility in the gears and what kind of requirements is associated with them. This is part of the requirement for the for-hire and commercial rollout that we're doing with them. We're also working on the ability to back up data.

We've had a lot of concern. The folks that are using our mobile tools are also using the tablet system to store the reports. They are available online at any time to any of those users; but they're storing them onboard their mobile tools, and if they get dumped overboard then they are lost. What we've done is we're working on a capability to restore all of the reports back to the mobile tool; in the event that the tool is lost or is replaced.

We're also working with the Connecticut shellfish harvesters. We believe we'll be able to modify the eTRIPS Mobile pretty easily; so that we can start looking at how we would collect shellfish data. I think this may have wider

applicability over time. Right now also, in terms of electronic dealer reporting; we're in Georgia to test our mobile version of the electronic dealer reporting.

I'm getting pretty positive feedback. Unfortunately that was a little bit delayed; because we had some issues with frankly contractor time. We've been extremely busy making sure that our eTRIPS tool is able to accommodate the various mandatory reporting rollouts; and so there are only a limited number of contractors available to get the work done.

An electronic trip reporting support, our eTRIPS Mobile tool has already been reporting the Mid-Atlantic harvesters. We swagged the incoming eTRIPS at about 80 percent. It's actually more like 70 percent; my apologies. I didn't get a chance to adjust the slide. As I said before, we're working with SERO right now on their mandatory for-hire reporting; which is currently scheduled to be deployed on January 1st.

My understanding is it's going to be a soft deployment; and that they're not likely to come after people immediately. There will be an extended period of time where folks have time to work out the kinks and get used to using the tool; and at the same time they've asked us to provide a voluntary commercial tool, which we believe we'll have ready.

In fact there are already some southeast folks who are reporting voluntarily through our tool. The advantage right now is that it will immediately provide them with data. It will provide this data to GARFO; which brings them into compliance in both northeast and southeast. It's this ability to provide the data to both of the regions that has been very attractive to the regional folks.

We're also just beginning to look at what it's going to take to be able to bring in Gulf data. Gulf is a little bit daunting; because they are extremely specific in some areas, where we're a little bit more general. It will be everything from very small docks listed in our system as port codes to being able to manage their IFQ

reporting and port codes; a lot of very strict permitting requirements and very tight integration with vessel monitoring. We do not have a date yet on any of the work that we're going to potentially be doing for the Gulf.

I mean our tool may not even be used in the Gulf very much; because there is already a couple of different reporting tools that are already deployed there, in which case we'll be the repository for the information as it comes in. Moving forward on our data update, we did release the fall data at the end of September.

Thank you everyone for cooperation in providing us the information; we really appreciate it. We are in the process right now of revising a standardized naming convention; so that bass will always be bass comma something. Instead of striped bass it will be generic comma specific; potentially comma specific again.

We've already done a one swipe through with that; and we'll continue to work with the coding committees to get that finished. In our data warehouse enhancements, we have rolled out a new confidential account management system. It took us some time to get consensus across the coast about the best way to manage the confidentiality; but we did finally get it.

The new version of the query tools and the account management for confidentiality reflects that. We are able to much better indicate whether or not data has been redacted; and we are striving to provide as much information as we can, without violating any kind of confidentiality. Then finally biological, we do have the database structures; they've been built.

We unfortunately don't have the personnel resources to do much more than populate the system with information that's already being provided to us; which right now is herring and lobster. The issue really just comes down to every feed needs thinkers, and we do not have a source system that is part of the SAFIS suite that can be used to collect biological data that would do an automatic transfer.

I think right now we will go ahead and deploy the biological module into our production data warehouse; and that means that the existing data streams that we have of the lobsters and herring will be made available, and any that are – how do I describe it – easy to get into the system, we'll probably go ahead and start looking at how to integrate them.

But we really are running up against the limits of what we can do with the number of people that we have. I wanted to go ahead and check on the site. It's not on the slide show; but I wanted to point right at Cheri and say we have not forgotten about the social economic module. We've been working with the SESS on that.

There has been a little bit of excitement generated about the directions that we're going to be going in; and hopefully I'll have some more information for you in the very near future. This is why we are busy. You're seeing a list of the stock assessments and management actions that we provided information for; for the last few months.

Then underneath there are custom data request highlights. We have passed 100 per year. Last year we did a total of 60 all year; and we're already well over a hundred this year. We're getting the end, it's exactly the kind of things that we are glad that are happening, and it's everything from weakfish discard information to fishing area activity from New Jersey, working on average age for fishermen in the New England states. It's a wide variety of different kinds of data request; and it's exactly the kind of thing that we could be hoping for. I'll let Jeff take the recreational update.

MR. GEOFF WHITE: We're going to jump through a couple of high level items here; including the dockside metrics, things that are coming up on the for-hire telephone survey for some of the states, and future work on the Comprehensive For-Hire Program. But first a little bit of good news on the APAIS metrics.

This graphic shows the edit rates of average edits per intercept that are kind of coming through. In Wave 4 it went from an average of 6 down to an average of 3. When we started in 2016, these averages were closer to 15. It really speaks to how all of your staff has learned to work with the system. We've tweaked some of the scanning and the OCR issues; to alleviate some of those writing issues.

But, this basically means we're spending more time on substantive data edits than little things about writing and getting other things done. This is really an appreciation of the work that your state staff has been doing. We've got two other slides to kind of point out these other improvements. This one talks about overall productivity; this is a summary of January through June of 2016, '17, and '18.

In general, there have been increasing averages of number of completed intercepts per assignment; moving from five intercepts to six. There are some that are zeros; there are a few that have been over 90, and there were two assignments, six hour blocks that somebody exceeded 100 intercepts in a six hour time block, which is pretty amazing.

That is the first time that's happened outside of Florida in quite some time. But anyway, again folks are doing better. There has been about a 22 percent increase in overall interviews completed in 2018 compared to 2016. The next graphic is a little bit about addressing the question of how many anglers that we see during a site are actually completing an interview. This is a relative proportion.

The green bars are 2017; and the blue are 2018. It generally goes from about 50 percent to about 60 percent of eligible anglers completing an interview. That means that some of them are initial refusal. Some of them the interviewer was too busy; and had to count anglers, because they were busy interviewing somebody else at that moment, and some of them are literally a language barrier, if the person doesn't speak English you've got to move on.

But, this kind of looks at the state staff doing better at converting people that might say no into completing an interview. These are things that get better representation of the catch as it gets multiplied out through to the estimates. It also speaks in many cases to an improving relationship with the fishermen; between the state staff and the fishermen.

It does vary by mode. It isn't kind of perfect about how many people are refusing versus how many people are completing. But it does kind of speak to an improving trend of getting more folks to answer the survey and participate; which as we know goes into better estimates in the end. Next year we're really excited about moving the data collection from paper based to using tablets; so electronic data collection for the APAIS state samplers. There are about 154 right now, staff across the states from Maine to Georgia that are doing this. We've got tablets. The hardware specced out with support contracts. We've got software out in the field for testing right now.

It is covering all of the core requirements; and of course now that we have more eyes on it, because it's in all of the states, we're getting some feedback in a few of the minor logic and bug things that are actually pretty quick to change. But along with that we're going to be doing training for the South Atlantic states December 4 through 6, and put it in the field in North Carolina in January.

This will get rolled out throughout all the Atlantic states; at a little bit of a staggered timeline. Mid-Atlantic training is in January, to get ready for March sampling. The North Atlantic training is in late February, to get ready for March sampling, and of course North Carolina and Maine start sampling in May. It's coming along really well.

It does minimize kind of those translations and completely eliminates the scanning errors. It provides a lot of entry data checks to improve those data quality things; and it eliminates between two and sometimes three weeks lag in

mailing the forms back and forth, and being able to review the data.

These kinds of process improvements in efficiencies should allow folks to spend a little bit more time reviewing the data; and focusing on the interviews. We do expect this automation to save a lot of non assignment staff time; both in the states and at ACCSP. We've certainly recognized it will take a little time to get used to.

But, for those who have spent more time with it so far, they really think they can get the similar time of completing an intercept on that compared to on paper. We're pretty excited about that. I'm just going to show you one screen and that's this. It actually downloads all of the assignment information to the tablet; so if it's a headboat assignment it's highlighted in yellow, if it's a site assignment, it's just has the white background.

But, normally we've been distributing this over the internet or a downloaded file; and the interviewers have to write in all of these things on every sheet. Those are the translation or transcription things that are easy to get wrong and cause discrepancies, even though it's just copying the information.

All that stays in here; they type in their start and stop times, and it leads them through the interviews question by question, and allows interviewing folks with a group. We are pretty excited about this; and looking forward to feedback from all of your state staff. We've gotten some already; and looking forward to more as the process goes on.

The way things are configured; it's actually very easy for us to update the software and push that out to all 150 or so eventual tablets from a central location. All of those kinds of processes we've been thinking about; to make things as smooth as possible out in the field. It downloads all these things connected to Wi-Fi, but it works offline out in the field. It makes things a little easier and a little bit less expensive as we go. The next item, since state

conduct of the past, dockside interviews have been going so well, there are three states right now that are doing state connect of the for-hire telephone survey; those are Maine, North Carolina and Georgia. We had some conversations with MRIP staff and the ability to do the for-hire telephone survey CATI, the call assisted telephone interview.

We're developing that program right now to let those three states that are already funded through ASMFC; to use that tool in 2019. That's going to be our kind of test and learning year. There is potential, the ASMFC Executive Committee discussed this a little bit in August; for all states to move forward with this.

But that potential is dependent upon MRIP approval and a decision by the Executive Committee. That is going to be upcoming in other venues. It does increase the kind of state contacts and relationships with the fishermen. There are more direct changes to the vessel directory; so a lot of how the sampling is done relies on maintenance of a list of vessels that are fishing.

Right now there are two and sometimes three entities that are having input into that and that causes a little bit of confusion at times. Having one group doing both of these surveys, and having input to the vessel directory is an improvement that many of the states have spoken up as they want to move forward towards.

It does add some potential for some other flexibility as the for-hire logbooks are implemented. Speaking of logbooks, one of the things the Recreational Technical Committee has been working on is a comprehensive for-hire program; and that's defining something beyond the current MRIP for-hire telephone survey for effort, and the APAIS intercepts for catch.

The intention here as a work in progress is to include headboats and charterboats, federal vessels in federal and state waters. They've completed their outline. The document is kind

of in working process with the Committee at the moment, and it is kind of on the major guidance timeline. The Comprehensive Plan document needs to be fleshed out a bit more. That is not going to be done until probably 2020.

But, with the goal in the Implementation Plan that we wrote for 2018-2022, to kind of get this program peer reviewed and ready for implementation by about 2022. That does not exactly line up with the implementation of for-hire logbooks; extending beyond the Mid-Atlantic to the South Atlantic and Gulf, but it does include kind of the MRIP process points of what becomes the official estimate, how might validation occur, and things like that.

I'll end with this graphic. We've shown it to you guys before; but it's basically the idea, without getting into any particular data collection program, of saying the green on the right is kind of land-based issues, so dockside validation. The purple or blue on the left was kind of on the water ideas.

But, if you follow it around the top edge, it would suggest that APAIS or a dockside catch validation connected with a fisherman logbook could come up with some math to use the logbook for catch and effort. Then that piece from the top half would be added together with those vessels that do not have a logbook; doing some sort of a survey similar to the for-hire telephone survey, and still having the dockside interviews done. The idea would be to have some compatibility; some flexibility for different programs to occur, but then to add that logbook frame of vessels to the survey frame of vessels.

Because we recognize that while the federal vessels are likely to have mandatory for-hire logbooks soon; there are many state vessels, and in most cases it's between 50 and 60 percent of the vessels per state that are state only that some sort of a survey component to cover the state vessels as well would need to be added together. There's a lot of math; there are a lot of details that we still need to work

out. We're not picking on a particular program; but this is the larger vision that we're working towards. With that I will move on.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: At this point are there any questions on what we've heard so far? John.

MR. JOHN CLARK: Geoff, with the tablets that they're going to be using in the field. Now that you're not going to have to be writing down on paper and doing all that will this increase the number of surveys you think they could do out in the field? Does the tablet upload immediately when they save; or is this being stored on the machine and then all have to be downloaded back at the office?

MR. WHITE: The tablets at the beginning are expected to have about the same number of interviews that they will be able to complete; as folks are learning how to navigate through it. I think the potential for getting more intercepts done by interviewing groups of anglers; there are some special ways the questions are asked, is very much there. In terms of how the data become uploaded, the assignment is done offline.

There is some time allowance for editing afterwards; and then once they're in Wi-Fi range they actually select the assignments that they're ready to upload, and push that back to the Server at ACCSP. The initial idea is to have that done on Fridays and Mondays; so you never have more than four days of data on the tablets, because that could potentially be lost. But eventually when folks are ready they could submit it as soon as the day after they finish the assignment.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Jay.

MR. JASON McNAMEE: I had kind of a similar thought with John. While I understood your answer at an individual event, I'll call it; you probably couldn't do too many more. But I'm thinking about what our folks do; and I think they dedicate like a day for scanning and maybe more. Could that time be converted into additional field sampling; so that might be a

way to get more efficient and increase the interviews?

MR. WHITE: That is exactly what we hope happens. We're not forcing that. But I think as folks learn that they're saving some staff time in reviewing the forms and sending them back up; there are tools already to review the data once it's been uploaded. But the way the survey runs is a cooperative agreement. There are approved budgets; and if you find that you can do more assignments with the staff and budget that you have, it's simply a request to NOAA to say give us five more assignments this month. Then it gets processed and taken as well.
CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: That's great. Dan.

MR. DANIEL McKIERNAN: Yes, my questions are for Mike Cahall. Mike, earlier in your presentation you mentioned a reporting feature that would create a report if a vessel had permits in multiple jurisdictions; NMFS and Maryland. Would it also be able to do multiple states?

MR. CAHALL: Yes. Our vision is that when you log into the system, we know who you are and what you're permitted to do. When you tell us what kind of trip you're about to take; we'll look into our permits database and say okay this report is going to be required in multiple states. I have to take the requirements of the different states; merge them together, and provide a report that has all the pieces for both states.

MR. McKIERNAN: Yes that comes to mind with like the menhaden fleet that does move from state-to-state. I have another question. On the eTRIPS that Connecticut was described as adopting for their shellfish fishery. Would that have an area fished component to show resolution about where they were actually fishing?

MR. CAHALL: That's actually the modification we have to make; because we're changing the area fished to the shellfish area. But yes.

MR. McKIERNAN: Could it be done on an even finer scale; like on an eelgrass bed; that if you wanted to protect?

MR. CAHALL: Yes. Our goal eventually is to get away from using individual coding schemes to show area and request lat/long. But yes we can. We can take it down to a pretty fine grained resolution. Again, if you think about it for just a moment, if you're using your tablet to do the report, it knows right where you are; and if we record your lat/long then we can translate those back into the areas. We're working on a mechanism to do that right now.

MR. McKIERNAN: For the habitat folks; you know we've tried to work with our state waters clam dredgers, and wanted to keep them out of eelgrass. They've told us; well tell us where the eelgrass is, and we'll stay out of it. I think there would be some real opportunities there.

MR. CAHALL: We look forward to looking at how we might do that.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: I just had one thing to add to that; and we're still figuring this out in Maryland, and there might be people around the table who know more about this than I do. But apparently there is a coastguard requirement for AIS to be in use on most but the smallest vessels, even in state waters. That is kind of an interesting upcoming thing that we should maybe keep our eye on for this sort of fine grain resolution.

Then I had one more thing. Also, we had a situation in Maryland where we had one of our most productive headboats decline to participate in the survey. The captain felt that the information was causing detriment to some friends of his, particularly more to the north. It was either New Jersey or New York, I can't remember. But one of the things that our field interviewers were requesting were some consistent talking points to provide to people who had hesitation about participating in the survey; so that all of our interviewers up and down the coast are providing a similar message about how declining to participate doesn't

actually help. It's going to make things worse in the long run. I had a conversation with Geoff and Mike about that. If that would be helpful to your interviewers just let us know. Okay, Jay.

MR. McNAMEE: My question for you; and you very well may have said this, so I apologize if I missed it. One thing I was wondering about is the new reporting requirements for lobster; so things like the ten minute squares. How is that coming along? How I understood it was you guys were basically prepared; the states were not, so just your sense of how that is going from ACCSP standpoint.

MR. CAHALL: SAFIS eTRIPS Mobile is already collecting lobster data; in fact from Rhode Island, and is capable of doing basic lobster trip reporting right now. There are a few things that are in the list of the data elements for the management plan that are not part of the ACCSP standards; so they're not incorporated into the trip reporting system right now.

But most of them could be covered by the redesign work that we're talking about doing. Our mechanizing and I think the way that we're going to propose moving forward with location tracking is to collect lat/long using the onboard GPS systems, and then translating them back. Right now there has been some work going on at the Southeast Science Center doing precisely that; using some really whiz bang tools, it's got us all kind of geeked out about it.

I think we're going to be able to do that; because essentially you're going to plug your lat/long into it, and it will come back with what square are you in or that sort of thing. That way we would use a universal standard of lat/long that we could theoretically spit back at the lobster management area or a NMFS grid or whichever the reporting requirements are.

In terms of the lobster trip reporting, I've been sitting on both of the Committees that are doing that; the location and then also the reporting tool. I think that the SAFIS eTRIPS tool is capable of providing the lobster reports

pretty quickly and fairly easily. But there is a lot of desire to have other options.

We're certainly (what's the right word) sympathetic to that. Our intention is to provide a data exchange interface; and API that will allow other vendors to provide data for those reports. The eTRIPS Mobile tool will be, I'm certain, modified to be able to meet the requirements of the FMP. Then the next question is going to be are there going to be other vendors that are going to want to get in there and do it? We will certainly work with them to make it work.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Okay seeing no further questions. Oh, John, sorry.

MR. CLARK: If this had come up at a previous meetings about the for-hire telephone survey, Geoff, and if this has already been answered at a previous meeting I apologize. But I know one of the frustrations was that they were being called several times; the charterboat captains and they were not very happy about that. Does this eliminate the duplication?

MR. WHITE: Not immediately. Part of the design is actually if they don't contact the captain on the first try to make up to ten attempts. That is part of the survey design; and is not expected to change. The question of if I'm already filling out a logbook, do I still need to get the telephone call. There are certainly folks at MRIP that are looking into what are those requirements. I don't expect that to change in 2019. But there is definitely flexibility to discuss how that happens.

MR. CAHALL: I would add that we're really sympathetic to that problem; and that one of our priorities in working with MRIP is just figure out the best way to eliminate multiple reporting paths.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Okay, Committee updates.

OPERATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT

MS. NICOLE LENGYEL: My name is Nicole Lengyel; I serve as the Vice-Chair for the Operations Committee. The Advisory and Operations Committee had their joint annual meeting in Savannah, Georgia this year; September 25-26. I'm going to be brief now; because each of these three items we're going to discuss in further detail later on in the presentation.

But, we mainly discussed three items. We first reviewed and ranked all the project proposals; maintenance and new proposals. We had some really good discussions on them. We then met separately; discussed all the rankings as a Committee, then came back to the full group, discussed our individual rankings, and then our average rankings and made our FY19 recommendations, which will be coming up later in the presentation.

We also discussed the Funding Horizon; and this item refers to the long term funding strategy that the Coordinating Council approved back in 2015. Again, I won't discuss it here because we have some slides coming up later. The last thing we discussed was the data accountability and confidence issue.

This was a good discussion. It was pretty interesting as well; because I believe some Committee members weren't aware that this is even an issue. But it was brought up that when data are submitted to ACCSP they're often submitted by a partner or by one individual; and then later they're validated by other staff members within the partner's organization, through the stock assessment process.

That was one concern that the data are being submitted by one staff member and validated by another staff member or several staff members. Some other concerns were the confidence in the actual data that is being submitted. What sorts of measures are being taken place to validate that data? Some states are already doing small things; but there was a larger discussion about what states should and could be doing into the future to validate data going forward. Again, we're going to discuss this in more detail later on in the presentation.

MR. CAHALL: Before we move on; because the next thing we're going to be looking at is, never mind. The Biological Review Panel is getting ready to fill out their matrix; they do that on a biannual basis, as you may recall. They have an annual in-person meeting scheduled for February. They're also working on a resilience factor project. My understanding is that is nearly finished; and they're also working towards a conversion factor project. I might comment that conversion factors are going to be worse of a problem as time moves on; because one of the things that we have already come up with is that the commercial factors that are in use are often of unknown source, and unknown quality, and unknown age.

When we've gone back and done some reviews; where we've had enough money to go ahead and run a project and pull examples of Y species, and actually do some calculations, sometimes they're pretty good and sometimes they're not. I think that this is eventually going to lead to some kind of wider research that someone, probably us, are going to have to do; in order to potentially create conversion factors for maybe the most heavily used species.

We found that in the research end it's been written up. I'm not exactly sure whether we put it up online or not; but I know we have the results of the project. In some cases the differences are minor, but in other cases they are not. It could potentially have some impacts; and it's one of the reasons we haven't been pushing on it too hard.

Frankly, you know we've had enough on people with the changes in the recreational estimates at this point; and we didn't really want to push too hard. It's also potentially going to be expensive; because it's going to require a good bit of biological research, and measuring and all that kind of thing in order to accomplish.

But, I do think that it is something that we're going to have to consider in the future. Once I have some feedback from what the Biological Review Panel wants us to do; we may be coming back, not this year but next year, requesting some money to actually do that because it is eventually going to have to happen one way or the other, I think.

BYCATCH COMMITTEE REPORT

MS. LENGYEL: Moving on to the Bycatch Committee, they're also reviewing their matrix. They also will be having a February 2019 meeting; not in person. There is a lot of overlap between these two committees. Then you would see these matrices next year in the funding position process. Moving on to Recreational Technical Committee, do you want to do the Rec Tech Committee?

MR. WHITE: I can. Most of these items we actually already touched on. If you have any questions on these items feel free to ask me afterwards.

MR. CAHALL: I think one comment I want to make is that we've been making a transition from the Rec Tech Committee being largely an advisory group to a body that's actually helping us set policy. The MRIP program has been very serious about incorporating fisheries information networks into their decision making process.

It's been a little bit of a culture shock for the Committee; but I also (Geoff's laughing, because it has been) but it's actually working. I think that over time it's going to build a much stronger partnership; and they'll have a program on the Atlantic Coast that better reflects the requirements of our program partners.

I would say that this transition has gone about as smoothly as we could have hoped for. I can quickly on standard codes. As I said before working on the common names, North Carolina got a new gear. An oyster cage, what's an oyster cage? Then we're adding some

additional codes as you can see. This is very typical of the kinds of things that we do. We'll have requests to better categorize bycatch or yes, it was seized by law enforcement, but why, and those kinds of things; so moving on to the proposal summary.

CONSIDER FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FY19

MS. LENGYEL: Okay for the FY19 Proposal Summary, we received 14 proposals for FY19. Eight of those were maintenance proposals; totaling just under 1.2 million dollars. Five new proposals, totaling about $500,000.00 and the Admin Proposal was about 1.8 million dollars. Up here you have the FY19 proposal rankings.

I'm going to point to the screen on my right to help clarify what you're looking at here. We have the proposals listed here; and the few first maintenance proposals are not up here, just for space we cut them out. But they are there. You have the Operations ranking followed by the Advisors ranking and the Average ranking of those two Committees. You then have the cumulative based cost; which is what we discussed at the meeting.

MR. DOUG HAYMANS: Do we have this as a PDF Page Number that we can go to; because I cannot see that?

MS. LENGYEL: Yes, sorry it's a little tough to follow; a lot going on.

MR. CAHALL: While we're waiting for it, unfortunately usually our Chair of the Advisory Committee is able to attend these meetings and participate in the discussion. Unfortunately, his son had to have some fairly serious surgery and he was unable to be here. Jerry asked if we could read out a statement from the Advisors to the Committee.

"Good afternoon this is Jerry Morgan; Advisor's Chair from Connecticut. On behalf of the Advisors, I would like to thank the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation for hosting this year's annual

meeting; and the Commissioner's consideration for allowing this call in. I have attended all meetings from Maine to Florida; yet due to a medical emergency and of all the meetings to miss; it is unfortunately I must miss the in-person one closest to home.

The Advisor's met this year in conjunction with Operations at the annual meeting; whereby FY19 proposals submitted by ACCSPs partners were reviewed, discussed in detail, and ultimately scored and ranked. All maintenance proposals were ranked fairly consistently by the two committees; and the Advisors concurred with the final ranking.

The new proposals were tighter in their scores and ranking (Advisors rankings you'll see up there when you're able to actually see them). In consideration of the Maritime Law Enforcement Proposal, we were given an in-depth presentation by Lieutenant Warren Fair of the Living Marine Resource Division, United States Coastguard, and Sergeant Cindy Miller of Georgia's Law Enforcement Wildlife Resources Division, followed by a question and answer session.

Afterward there was a discussion as to whether or not this proposal was to be scored as catch and effort or other; which in all probability led to the spread and ranking between Advisors and Operations. Advisors ultimately felt that fisheries would best benefit if it was scored within the Catch and Effort module. The year 2018 gave Advisors pause once again to evaluate its Committee membership and its turnover. Exit interviews suggested that the time required distance of travel and conflicts of other committees and councils, coupled with the times of year meetings fell, were contributing factors in that Advisors are volunteers, and often sacrifice income to participate.

It was determined these regions should be taken into account; in addition to our guidelines when reviewing new candidates. We certainly can use and appreciate as many referrals as possible. Our normal meetings took place,

including updates on FY18 projects, three caps on evaluating and scoring FY19 proposals, review of new and existing maintenance proposals as well as review of requests for proposals, and our funding document.

Additionally this Chair as usual, has attended all Operations and committee meetings throughout the year as required; and relates substandard meeting materials to members. Finally, informing and reaching out to the recreational for-hire and commercial fishers remains an ongoing effort through multi-media; including print, radio, personal interaction, and social media especially when new programs, policies, and regulations are put in place or other relevant events/announcements surface.

In short, Advisors attempt to promote ASMFC/ACCSP by bridging the gap between fishers and the science-based fisheries management community through active participation in social outreach. Thank you for your attention." Hopefully most of you should have the PDF by now. Okay cool, great.

MS. LENGYEL: Okay, so I will go ahead and explain what you're looking at. Going from left to right we have the project name, followed by the partner. We then have for Operations and Advisors the score and the rank that the proposals fell out in. Then we have the average of those two scores and ranks.

We also have two funding scenarios up here; one is the 3.35 million, and one is the 3.5 million scenario. Here you're looking at the cost of each project; and then the cumulative cost going down. I'll note that here the cumulative cost does not account for the administration fee; and here the cumulative cost does.

There is going to be slightly different results there; but the Operations and Advisors talked about these rankings without that admin fee, so that's what I'm going to discuss now. The maintenance proposals, if we maintain the 75/25 split, all maintenance proposals with the base funding would be funded for 2019. Then

when we look at the new proposals, there were two proposals that fell short.

The mobile application to assist Maritime Law Enforcement, with fisheries enforcement submitted by Rhode Island and Georgia, fell short as well as the economic and social analysis for North Carolina. The Committees discussed both of these proposals; and felt both of these proposals did have merit. I'll note again that when we discussed these rankings, we discussed it without the admin fee, which would have resulted in all maintenance proposals being funded with the 75 percent split; and then just the two last proposals here in red under the new proposals not being funded. Over here, when we add in an up to 5 percent administration fee, things changed slightly. One of the maintenance proposals would fall short of some funds; and then another one of the new proposals would be short as well. But again, we discussed it without that NOAA fee; just because we're not certain if there will be a fee, and what it will be, but it could be up to 5 percent.

Advisors and Operations are recommending funding proposals at the presented base average rankings with the 75/25 percent split; and the two new projects that may not be funded are the North Carolina Socioeconomic and the Georgia/Rhode Island Law Enforcement, and again the Committees discussed both of those projects and felt that both of them did have merit. I'll take any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Cheri.

MS. CHERI PATTERSON: I have a couple questions; and I don't know quite who to point it out to. One of them is under the Rhode Island DEM you don't have any overhead taken out. You don't have the 5 percent overhead for Rhode Island taken out. It's my understanding that any NOAA proposals generally don't get charged that 5 percent interest; but why would Rhode Island not be charged that 5 percent overhead?

MR. CAHALL: You're talking about in the proposal itself or in the spreadsheet?

MS. PATTERSON: Spreadsheet.

MR. CAHALL: Because they historically know that they haven't been. I'm trying to remember exactly how the funds are distributed. Part of the problem here is that there are three different directions money can move. If money moves through the Commission, it moves through the Commission's Cooperative Agreement; which has a certain set of overheads that are associated with it that are right now a little bit in flux.

Then if money moves out directly within NOAA, it's just a transfer and there is no overhead incurred at all; which is why when NOAA does their own contract work they're moving something internally, you don't see those fees. Then when they go out through the Grants Offices there is typically a fee.

The issue here with the fee is they are absolutely uncertain as we sit here. We do not know whether they're going to be charged or not; and we cannot be confident 100 percent of what the Commission's overhead rate would be either. Because the Commission has also just completed an audit, and there will be recommendations by the auditors for changes, there usually are.

We don't really know; and the, for lack of better words used, the slack of these fees would account for paying for all of these projects. In the best case scenario there is enough money to fund everything. In the worst case scenario, as you can see here, we would be forced to not fund a few of these projects. I'm not sure why they're not there. I know why they're there for the at-sea, because that's an internal transfer. But I don't know exactly why they're not there, but again it would be what about $33,000.00 if they're charged.

MS. PATTERSON: In addition to that I had mentioned that NOAA usually does not charge that 5 percent overhead; at least in the past, for

their proposals. Does that also include the Science Center, because it looks like you've got a 5 percent tally for the overhead on this last maintenance proposal; when generally in the past we haven't been held to that which would help, I would think.

MR. CAHALL: It depends on how it's done. Again, those determinations on how they're done, the last one that we did the money came through the Commission; and they hired contractors to do it with funds that were provided through the Commission. Again, the fees that you're looking at here are basically, they're our best guess at the worst case scenario.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Because these fees are causing consternation, do we have any sort of timeline as to when we'll know whether they be charged? Because I think we have a few options here. We could go ahead and approve the funding as it's laid out here; so that in the worst case scenario there would be a couple of proposals that don't' get funded.

In the best case scenario we would have most everybody funded; or we can go down the road of trying to reorder some priorities, or we could ask for submitters to try to trim down their proposal cost to supply money to those unfunded proposals. There are three options there. The first one relies on really just hoping things work out; which they might. But it would be nice to know when we would know.

MR. CAHALL: Do you want to take this Alan or should I?

MR. ALAN LOWTHER: I'm willing to give it a try. Last year we didn't' know exactly what was going to happen with the Grants fees until very late in the funding cycle. I don't know if anybody in here knows exactly when it was; but I think it was like April. It was quite late. There was a new model last year for how that would be done.

My hope is that it will be done sooner; and that perhaps I can go back, send an e-mail tonight

and say hey, when is that going to be decided, and maybe there will be some clarity on that. But I don't know. Last year the situation was a little better; where the Southeast Grants Office did not charge any overhead.

Then there was a complicated formula that limited what the GARFO Grants Office was able to charge; but it was less than 5 percent. Hopefully those will be indicative of what happens this year and it won't be any worse. I don't know. I can try to find out as soon as possible; that's all I can do.

MR. CAHALL: Not to add any further confusion. We're not exactly sure how much the Fin Line is going to have in it either; it's usually pretty close to two million dollars, sometimes it's a little more, sometimes it's a little less. The ACFCMA Line is steady; but the portion of our budget that comes from the Fisheries Information Network budget can vary, and we don't know exactly what that's going to be until the ST gets their budget.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Cheri and then Bob.

MS. PATTERSON: Okay, this goes to Nicole. You've got two projects I have some questions about from the perspective of when you ranked; and they're the last two on the new category. I understand that you've got the Law Enforcement Mobile Application Development under – not you but – under catch effort.

Was there conversation about that at the Ops level as to how much of a stretch catch effort is for that particular application; and whether a socioeconomic proposal, which is on the ranking scope, would be underneath something that's kind of sketchy on a catch effort perspective?

MS. LENGYEL: There was a long discussion on this proposal. There was a lot of interest in this proposal I'll say. The Committee thought it had a lot of merit; but we did struggle with that exact problem, what it exactly fell into. There were several Committee members that felt it was more appropriate to be a socioeconomic

study, and some members felt that it could fall under catch and effort.

Based on our discussion, we left it up to the individual Committee member to rank it how they saw fit. We did discuss how it could potentially fall under each one of those. But essentially what it comes down to is a partner will submit a proposal; and they'll put in the proposal what they think the proposal is, whether it's a primary socioeconomic, catch and effort, but ultimately it's up to the Operations Committee member.

If they feel strongly it doesn't fall within that module; they can rank it as a different module. We also have a merit category; so for proposals that don't necessarily quite meet a strong module, it's kind of in that in-between. We can use that merit category to help with the points if we really think it has a lot of merit going forward. It was left up to each individual Committee member on how they wanted to rank it.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Bob.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ROBERT E. BEAL: I was just kind of going backwards to the overhead issue. The Commission's overhead rate, I think the Administrative Grant was calculated at 15 percent. I anticipate that's going to drop a few percentages point. That may make up, 30 some thousand dollars, $40,000.00; and we should be done with those new overhead calculations in the next couple months, so hopefully by the end of the year.

We'll be able to do it. But I don't know, I'm not sure how many of these potential projects will go through ASMFCs Administrative Program. I'm not sure how many of these projects are going to be affected by the ASMFC overhead rate change. I know the Administrative Grant will, obviously, but I'm not sure about the others.

I think the complicating factor, as Alan mentioned, is the regional overhead rates have been zeroed out in the Southeast, significantly

reduced in the Northeast. It's kind of the overhead at Headquarters is different. I think there are a lot of moving parts here. It's going to be kind of tricky to wrap our brains around. But I think we're just going to have to come up with some ranking; and as dollars become available, you know we start going from the top down and fill in.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Doug.

MR. HAYMANS: Just curiosity. How often have Law Enforcement Agencies applied for ACCSP funding? How often have they been successful? It would seem, I mean this is two agencies, north and south that are applying. That ought to get a little extra merit for law enforcement.

MR. CAHALL: To my knowledge, and this is my 19th go round with this, this is it. It's the first time we've ever seen it. I'm going to be honest with you; it generated a lot of stir at the Operations Committee. Everybody got really excited about it; because that concept is really cool the ability to have the regulations that you're supposed to be enforcing right at your fingertips, automatically entered and updated, is a very powerful concept.

In a small pilot trial as they proposed, it might be viable. To be honest with you though, expanding it out is substantial. As long as you just have one agency or one or two agencies working in there and putting their stuff in, it's not so bad. But if suddenly you're doing it on a coastal basis; or you expanded out to include both regions, the overhead of maintaining it on a very large scale could be significant.

Nonetheless, I would suggest that Operations Committee was it took up a huge chunk of the discussion; because they got very excited about it, and because of the possibility of eliminating a lot of confusion about just what you're supposed to be able to catch when. Also, the argument that the Coast Guard guy made was pretty compelling.

I mean they're doing it with a book; and he's manually entering things in, and they're clipping

pages in and out of the book. It's very 1962. I think it did stir up a lot of discussion; and again, it's completely up to the discretion of this Committee to decide what to fund and what not to fund.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Doug, follow up.

MR. HAYMANS: Yes, just as a follow up. Yes, in a former life I helped Sergeant Miller maintain the job aids for all 23 Marine Officers in Georgia; and so from that aspect I'm really interested in seeing that become electronic. It also, the whole aspect of it logging with other states about boardings and coast guard boardings, and we can see. I just think it's worth more consideration for $60,000.00 bucks.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Nick.

MR. NICK POPOFF: Mike, could you project on what you were mentioning about future cost if this were to be expanded out? I mean that's a little concerning to think about what it could be to constantly update a mobile App. I'm just curious if you discussed that.

MR. CAHALL: We did. I think that – just project out into the future – this tool itself is relatively simple. You know it will have regulations in it, and effective dates, expiration dates. In terms of providing the software and all of that it's relatively straightforward from a purely programming standpoint. If individual jurisdictions want to participate in it, they would have to dedicate some staff time to maintain their regulations in the system. The way I would see it is that similar to the Administrative Switchboard I was discussing about SAFIS earlier. You might have someone in your jurisdiction that is responsible for maintaining the catalogue of regulations that would be provided to the tool.

It would be up to whichever agency wanted to participate. But I could see it being a substantial effort if you're talking about the total number of hours that would have to be devoted to maintaining it coastwide. But it would be spread amongst the agencies that

wanted to participate, it seems to me. That certainly was their concept.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Lewis Gillingham.

MR. LEWIS GILLINGHAM: Mike, if a state maintains their site couldn't you just link to that state site for those regulations?

MR. CAHALL: We had exactly this discussion; and the short answer is if your state maintains them in such a way as we can, we could.

MR. GILLINGHAM: Well, we do and it's out there for the public, and there is an App for that.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Okay, we're going to take just a couple more on this. Nick.

MR. POPOFF: Yes, Maine has our stuff online; but I'm curious, like what is the format though? Just if we're going to go down that road what would it be?

MR. CAHALL: If I had to make a quick guess it will be a very simple database; that would keep track of effective dates and potentially species, and some verbiage that would be whatever the text of your regulation is and a regulation number, and then which partner it is, of course. Then the system itself, you would tell it where you are and it would pull back whatever relevant regulations are there then. I don't think the format is necessary to be all that complex. I don't have direct experience with it; but someone does. How complicated is that stuff?

MR. HAYMANS: I think the regulation portion of this is the easiest part. I mean you're talking about what we created as a job aid was basically a book of everything from yes, fishing regulations for the state and feds, but also the complete federal packet for making a case. I mean all these things are in there.

But to me what I saw is the ability to see when a vessel has been checked; or has it had previous violations. Is a vessel from another state's

registration up to date, all those sorts of things that I think would be part of the access that this officer would have on the water. You know from our trawl industry, I mean we see boats from about eight other states.

It's kind of difficult when an officer is on the water to be able to tap into that. I don't know, this being the first time I've sat at this Coordinating Council. I don't know what the right mechanism is to argue for funding of a project that wasn't approved. But I would like to argue for it.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Again, for the sake of time. This is a good discussion and I appreciate that. There is some debate over the position of this particular proposal under Catch and Effort. We have a choice. The Operations Committee I know spent hours, days in deliberative conversation about all of this.

We can let their recommendation stand and let the funding fall where it may; or if it's the will of the body we can have the conversation about switching around some orders, or trying to reallocate some funds, having the proposal submitters try to adjust their budgets, and with that Cheri.

MS. PATTERSON: Well actually I would like to make a motion.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Please do.

MS. PATTERSON: I would like to move to fund the proposals as ranked by the Ops/Average columns and that if there are any further needs to have funding discussions after the overhead and such has been determined better that that go to the Coordinating Council, whatever that subcommittee is called now. Yes, formally known as the Executive Committee. There you go.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: I have a second by Jay McNamee. Okay, I'm going to read it into the record. Okay, is it good? The motion is to fund all, nope. I think it is maintenance and new. Okay, the motion is to fund the proposals as

ranked by the Operations Average columns, and if there are any further needs for funding discussions after the overhead rates have been determined, then that decision will be left to the ACCSP Management and Policy Committee. Motion made by Cheri Rogers, second by Jay McNamee. Is there any discussion on this? John.

MR. JOHN CARMICHAEL: I presume this will be to resolve any shortcoming that might be in the 75 percent maintenance as well as perhaps fund some projects that are the lower ranked ones in the new, which I think the Law Enforcement App is sounding like a pretty high priority; based on the feedback I got from the Ops Committee as well in the discussion here.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: That would be my presumption. Cheri is that your intent?

MS. PATTERSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Andy.

MR. ANDREW L. SHIELS: Yes I have a question. As I read the motion, am I to understand that the spread sheet that we saw that Cheri's motion is only the left hand column. There are three columns; there is Operations, there was Advisors, and there was an average. Is it the Operations and the Average or was it the Operations, the Advisors that were average? Which one of those ranking columns is it, thank you?

MS. PATTERSON: They're both the same. The Operations and the Average Ranking columns are the same. You could just pare it down to average ranking column.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: I think maybe the simpler way to ask that question is the spreadsheet would maintain the order that we have just been presented. Does that answer your question, Andy? Yes. Dan.

MR. McKIERNAN: I'm a little confused. There were three projects that didn't make this cut if this goes forward. If there is some nominal

amount of money remaining after most of them are funded, which project then gets funded? How are the three that didn't make the cut, how do they compete amongst each other?

MS. PATTERSON: According to the ranking.

MR. McKIERNAN: But they're in separate sub categories.

MR. CAHALL: I'm sorry. It would be in accordance with the 75/25 percent split; which is the standard policy, and then in order. Now the Management Policy Committee has the authority to change that split if they choose to. I think what I'll do. If you approve this motion I'll take this as guidance that if we run into any other situation, a situation other than just a flat, we run out of money as we show here, we'll convene the Committee and discuss it. Yes?

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Is everybody clear on how this would work? What's going to happen is the total funding amount, whether it's 3.35 or 3.5 million, will be split into the 75/25, 75 for maintenance, 25 for new. Then the funding will go down the sheet as you see it. With the 75 percent of the funding for maintenance, if the worst case scenario happens, the Southeast Fisheries Science Center aging will be as I read it, $164,000.00 short of what their proposal asks.

Then we go again to the new proposals; 25 percent of the total funding, work our way down and in the worst case scenario those bottom three are going to be impacted. That's the point when we would have those further discussions as Cheri mentioned. I would think that would be the point where we could offer an opportunity for proposal submitters to maybe do some adjusting on their budgets to see if we can get more people under the tent.

Does that clarify for everyone? Is there anymore discussion? Is there any opposition to this motion? Seeing none; the motion carries. Okay so the next thing on our agenda, I believe, moves us on to the policy for decrementing funding for maintenance

proposals; clarifying how we're handling that process. Mike.

CLARIFICATIONS TO FUNDING DECISION PROCESS

MR. CAHALL: As we begin to look at how we're going to implement these cuts; it became apparent that there is a little bit of confusion on exactly how we needed to move forward with it. Basically there is some confusion about what to use as the average for the base. Whether or not it was the first two years, it was the most recent two years, and there was a lot of back and forth on the Operations Committee again, and the recommendation.

Then we ran some of the numbers; and it really turned out that there wasn't a huge significant difference in whichever ones we used. The suggestion from our representative from Virginia, Ms. Stephanie Iverson, who is one of the better diplomats on the Committee, she suggested that we do the least amount of harm that we can; and that we adopt a policy of using either the prior two years average as the base, or all four of the years as the base, whichever does the last harm. We needed some clarity around making sure that we had the right numbers to provide; because at the beginning of the RFP process next year presumably we're going to have to warn the maintenance projects that they're going to have to be able to handle it. The idea here is that the prior projects aren't going to get penalized; and that folks who have successfully reduced their costs over the four years aren't overly penalized.

Those that were not able to also don't get penalized; the idea was to try and level the playing field. When we ran all of the numbers it didn't make a huge amount of difference to the bottom line to the program. Between the average of the folks that had cut their budgets and those others who had not, it worked out to be about the same to the program, but less harmful to the individual budgets.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: The action that we need at this point is whether or not it is the will of the

group to accept the recommendation of the Operations Committee on this matter. You know there was intent, I think years ago, to cap these maintenance projects. But it's not quite worked out that way; so I think what they've come up with is a very reasonable compromise, so I'll throw it out for discussion. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I think it does seem like a pretty good compromise. I know they talked about this a lot. I remember being on the Operations when this idea was first being thrown out; and starting to ratchet this down. It was probably an oversight back then to not have decided what your baseline would be when this day came when you started getting cuts. It seems like that is a pretty fair way to go about it. I looked at the history that was shown and some of the documentation of the projects that are on the board here; and what their history was. It seems fairly fair.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Cheri.

MS. PATTERSON: Well seeing that I was part of this development. I think when, well I know. When we were having this discussion we were anticipating starting from their last proposal and going down from there. But I can understand the panic with states; and the sympathy with the states that have been trying to reduce over time. I'm not opposed to this; knowing what we had decided and developed in the past.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Does anybody else have any comments on this? Would anybody like to make a motion? John Carmichael.

MR. CARMICHAEL: **So I will move that we support the Operations and Advisory Committees recommendation to apply the 33 percent funding cut for Year 5; whichever is larger prior to your average based funding or the average funding received during the allotted four years of full funding**. Thank you for that write up.

MS. DEE LUPTON: I second it.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Second by Dee Lupton; thank you, Dee. Okay, I'm going to read that back into the record. The motion is to approve the Operations and Advisory Committees recommendation to apply the 33 percent funding cut for Year 5 to whichever is larger; the prior two year average base funding or the average funding received during the allotted four years of full funding.

Motion by Mr. Carmichael; second by Ms. Lupton, is there any discussion? It's a hot topic. **All right, is there any opposition to this motion? Okay seeing none; the motion carries, thank you.** Last but not least, this is some wrap up business from our meeting, I believe maybe two cycles ago. I'll pass this one on to Mike.

MR. CAHALL: It has actually ended up being a bunch of different issues; when we actually started to do the analysis of the requests that we had. There are two or three different pieces here; and it really does come down to increasing consistency in the data and also some consistency in process, and also looking at how individual agencies are verifying information that is provided to them in accountability of the data submitters.

I need to address each of the issues separately; because it did turn out to be that way. We've had some problems in closing gaps in data provision for stock assessments and management actions. We've had a couple of species that had fairly complex data interplays; and it caused a lot of confusion as we went back and forth; trying to make sure that we got clean data.

I think we've largely resolved the issues. In many respects it worked out pretty well. It improved the working relationship between ACCSPs folks and the folks over to ISFMP and Science. They are coordinating together a whole lot better than they were before. It is more a matter of just digging new channels for folks to get their jobs done.

What we really are working now is using consistent data contacts for different information sources; working directly with Technical Committee members if we needed to, and also working with the FMPs as they work forward about identifying where the data are going to come from to be used in the plans, and those kinds of things.

Making sure that ACCSP has all of the best current data, there will be occasions where we'll get a dataset that is fed as part of our regular data warehouse feed; and then of course it's updated, and it's not due back to our data warehouse until we get the next data update. But we might find that a Technical Committee has requested additional data; and they may have better data than we do. Well, we're thrilled about them having better data; but we need it too.

We're working to close this; and I think it's actually going very well. I think it's more a matter of getting folks into the habit of working together a little bit more closely; and it is all part of the growing pains of the program being integrated and more tightly into the Commission. A way we've been making this easier is we've been working hard with the other folks in the Commission; to make sure they understand what we do, and how it works, how we have information and what the data sources are.

I think that in most of the times you have issues like this, you end up solving them by talking to each other; and that's what's happening. I'm very pleased at how well that has gone; and the kind of interaction that I'm seeing between my folks and the folks in the other divisions of the Commission. I think even Bob's happy.

One of the other things that came through as we were working in the middle of sort of this maelstrom of for-hire reporting is that there is a lot going on; and none of the agencies are directly talking to each other. This is especially true, unfortunately inside our friends at National Marine Fisheries Service; where we have Regional Offices that don't routinely communicate with one another on what they're doing.

Couple that with the Councils, who may or may not have exactly the same agenda that the Regions and Science Centers do, and then the states that are potentially impacted. You have a lot of room for confusion. What we did was that it occurred to me after I don't know how many SEFHIER calls I had been on.

Maybe the smart thing to do would be to convene just an ad hoc group of folks that were involved in all of this, and talk to them a little bit about was there something we could do to improve coordination? Not necessarily try to get people to do things differently, but just to make sure everybody knew what was going on.

That preliminary call went really well; and there was good consensus around the call that this would be a good thing to do. What we would like to do is form an informal; I don't know whether you want to call it a working group. It doesn't have a specific agenda yet; other than to convene on a regular basis, maybe quarterly, and to talk about what's going on.

You know what are you, North Carolina, doing; and you're updating your systems? We know that it's a moving target. What are you doing that's changing, and how's that working for you, and what have you learned? What are we going to be doing with the Gulf States, and how are we going to integrate those permits?

What's going to happen? I know that GARFO has initiative underway where they're thinking about changing to gear-based reporting; well what does that mean and what are the impacts, those kinds of things? It's been a long time since we've formed a new committee; and no one was 100 percent sure we needed the Coordinating Council to approve it. But we certainly wanted to bring it to your attention; and get some feedback from you guys on what you thought.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Does anybody have any thoughts on this? Maureen. Not Maureen, sorry, Cheri.

MS. PATTERSON: I think it's a good idea. I think we've gotten to the point where we want to be assured that the data is being used correctly and it's aligned correctly. I think that this is important.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: I guess my question to you; Mike would be what do you need from this group? Is this something where you are thinking you'll reach out to the states? Do you need a representative from each state? Give us a little bit of an "ask" in terms of what precisely you need from us.

MR. CAHALL: I think what we would need is a representative from; I think yes probably a representative from each state, and a representative for the regions. It's a fairly large Committee, I think, which is one of the reasons we wanted to keep it informal. What we would do is probably send out an e-mail to the Operations Committee members; and solicit input, hey who would be appropriate from your group to invite to join us in this conversation?

I think that that is the best way to frame it; it's conversation. What are you doing; and it gives you an opportunity to talk to us about what's going on in your own states or your own regions, and how others would benefit? I think that is what we would request; and if you can't you can't, and if you can you can.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: I have Joe Cimino and then Cheri.

MR. JOE CIMINO: I think it's a great idea. I think Council staff should probably be involved, you know reached out to. That may cover Regional offices as well; they may have enough interaction there. Okay Mike, I'll trust those eyebrows okay. In that case then, maybe the Regional Offices need to be involved as well. I get a nod from John too.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Cheri.

MS. PATTERSON: Would this be something that the Com Tech could start with? I know that they're not completely manned by Councils and such. But I'm wondering if we should start out with members of the Com Tech, and work our way to fill gaps.

MR. CAHALL: We could certainly suggest that. My thought was that we would send something out to Ops and say hey. If you want we could certainly say we can start with the Commercial Technical representation. But I think the Commercial Technical Committee is primarily intended to set standards. I don't know how much someone who is talking about measurement standards might know about what is in the planning for new systems deployment and data collection projects.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Dee Lupton.

MS. LUPTON: I think going through the Com Tech is where I would start off; listening to the discussion back in February it was more about quality of commercial data. What rang in my head is when we first designed the ACCSP we had a whole section on validation. I went back and looked at the program design.

I think maybe we need to review that program design, not review the program design, but review those data and maybe even remind some people this is what we're supposed to be doing to help validate data, and then grow from there. Because I think the discussion was also how to validate.

Because data are more electronic, and you know it's going in and maybe it doesn't have as much editing, kind of what we were talking about earlier with MRIP and tablets. That is where I thought this discussion was going. I think Ops and others went a little further. That was my original thought was Com Tech; and start with the validation part of the program design, and see where we go from there. It's just a thought.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: I appreciate that; and I think it's always easy to start with a group that

you've already got, rather than try to start fresh. Maybe that's an avenue to pursue. I wonder if it would be helpful, maybe for staff, I know it's informal, but just put together a little charge of what this group would be responsible for and send it around so everybody is aware. With that Dan, did you?

MR. McKIERNAN: Yes, I think Dee just made a good point; because we went right past the previous issue; and I'm still confused as to what the actual issue was. The solution was talk more. But it seems to me, and it happened in Massachusetts. Let me understand if this is true. The data gets into SAFIS; it gets a Technical Committee member say dump me the data, the data gets dumped, they look at it and they are horrified, because the data is terrible.

Then the data didn't get fixed back into SAFIS; in other words it just got reported in the Annual Compliance Report. Was that the complaint that there wasn't coordination between the species expert and the SAFIS folks within the state; because that's auditing, and I think that's kind of what I thought would be a good thing to talk about?

MR. CAHALL: That's one of the issues; and the accountability issue that Dee brought up is actually the next slide. The notion of this Data Collection group, the Data Collection Committee, is more a coordinating collaborative body to talk about what is going on. Your issue also does occur; but the data that we provide back to use in stock assessments, and stock assessments come from our data warehouse generally, not usually from SAFIS. Unless somebody needs to know what happened yesterday, we don't generally pull data from SAFIS.

Those are the kinds of problems that we've run into; where the data that's submitted for compliance report isn't in alignment with the data that we have in our data warehouse. Given the timelines that we've seen in some of the compliance reports no one is surprised. But those are the kinds of things that we've been looking at; and working to resolve. There have

been varying different problems; depending on which agency you're talking about, and the personalities that are involved.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Then it's fair to say there seems to be two issues here; one is the accountability, oh three. Okay well I mean the accountability side that we talked about. I think that totally fits in with the Com Tech; and that seems like a more manageable issue, because at least we know the general data sources that they exist, and you know the problem. Then I see you sort of hinted at SEFHIER in this coordination; when SEFHIER gets back at the for-hire reporting initiatives that are underway in Gulf, South Atlantic, and Mid-Atlantic.

Clearly we could have all benefited from better coordination when those got started, and maybe more guidance from the Agency level, so we could have been more consistent and better achieve single report dream that we all have. That's a bigger problem; and I think that probably screams for a different group of people being involved. I think ACCSP is the right place to try and get that done; because all the players are here crossing all of those different boundaries that we work in.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Thanks, John. I'm going to just back it up and break it down one more time. There are three very independent issues that are; well there are three issues that are separate but related, rather than very independent. The first is this idea of the information that is coming from the states to ACCSP; and sometimes those data are inconsistent, depending on who within the Agency is contacted, the timing of the compliance report, all of those sorts of things.

That is one; the second is what John was just talking about with the consistency in data structure, what have you, among groups. Then the third one is the slide that Mike is going to move on right now; which is the accountability piece, which is are the data that we're getting from whoever we're getting it from, actually

reflective of what is happening on the water, and what are some of the things that we can do to ensure that the reporting itself is as good as it could be. Hopefully that clarifies a little bit it's the three.

MR. CAHALL: It goes right to what Dee said; and I think Dee is right.

MS. PATTERSON: You concur that it should start with the Com Tech and morph from there as needed.

MR. CAHALL: I do. We did have one charge that we dropped the ball on after the last Coordinating Council meeting; which was to do the survey and find out exactly how much validation is being done by each individual jurisdiction, so that we have a starting point. We've already gone ahead and started to get that going. We didn't really realize we dropped the ball until it was too late to get it done in time for this meeting.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Alan.

MR. LOWTHER: My only hesitance in starting with Com Tech is that the thing that got me the most excited about this topic was the idea of addressing what John was talking about; and the different recreational reporting requirements going on, and if there had been some coordination up front, maybe we could have saved a lot of pain for everybody. I don't know that starting at Com Tech would have helped to address that problem. Maybe we're not talking about one group. Maybe we're talking about two.

MR. CAHALL: That's exactly what I'm proposing.

MR. LOWTHER: We can start with Com Tech, but I don't know, I just wanted to make sure we get to the group that got me excited about the topic.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Yes, I think to me it sounds like we've got, at the risk of committeeing ourselves to death, I think it's two groups. I think at this point the best course forward would be for Mike and his team to go back and write up these charges for these groups, so that we specifically understand where they're going. Send that around so we have a clear direction forward. That would be my recommendation. John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Let's call them like Ad Hoc Working Groups and write up a charge for each of them; so then we get a sense of what's expected from them. People know this isn't something they might be on for perpetuity, but it should have a limited window.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Does anybody take objection to that course of action; anymore discussion on this? Bob.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BEAL: Definitely not an objection. Mike, you're envisioning these meetings just being teleconference. We don't need to worry about the Admin budget being adjusted, right? Okay.

MR. CAHALL: I think at this time it will just be teleconference. I mean the last call we ran it took about, a few of you were on it, and you were on it. It took 45 minutes. It wasn't bad. Actually, some interesting questions got answered by folks who had them. I don't envision the new group being a huge burden.

There is no problem at all taking this accountability issue, basically it's ticking right down this slide to Com Tech, because it also applies to recreational trips as well. One of our challenges is going to be is the VTR is the VTR; whether it's a recreational one or a commercial one, and there is going to be a lot of overlap back and forth. We may have to have some liaison work going on between the Committees.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Okay, well we are coming up on the five o'clock hour. Is there anybody with other business? Cheri.

MS. PATTERSON: I just would like to recommend that in the future when we have these meetings; where we're looking at these

proposals. That you produce that table that you had up, and give it to us in meeting materials well ahead of time. I would personally like it in an Excel format; in case we want to be playing with numbers, and coming up with recommendations.

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Absolutely. Thank you, Cheri. Lewis.

MR. GILLINGHAM: Lynn that was exactly my comment, just if you could get. That would have been so useful; maybe not in the original, but supplementary information. That would have helped a lot; 400 pages, what are 401 pages? Not a problem.

ADJOURNMENT

CHAIRMAN FEGLEY: Absolutely, it's a fair point. We'll make sure that happens. Is there anybody who would be opposed to adjourning? Okay, meeting adjourned.

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 5:00 o'clock p.m. on October 24, 2018)