



Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

1050 N. Highland Street, Suite 200A-N | Arlington, VA 22201

703.842.0780 | 703.842.0779 (fax) | www.accsp.org

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council

In-person Meeting

May 1, 2018 | 4:00 pm

The Westin Crystal City, 1800 S. Eads St, Arlington, VA

Calendar Link:

https://safis.accsp.org:8443/accsp_prod/f?p=552:15:::NO:15:P15_CAL_ID_1:2128

DRAFT AGENDA

1. Welcome/Introductions – Coordinating Council Chair Lynn Fegley
2. Public Comment – L. Fegley
3. Committee Consent – L. Fegley
 - a. Approval of Agenda (Attachment I) – **ACTION**
 - b. Approval of Minutes from October 2017 (Attachment II) – **ACTION**
4. ACCSP Status Report
 - a. Program Status – M. Cahall
 - b. Committee Updates – A. Dukes
5. Review and Consider Approval of FY19 Request for Proposals – M. Cahall (Attachment III) – **ACTION**
6. Accountability Standards – L. Fegley
7. Other Business
8. Adjourn – L. Fegley

Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.



Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

1050 N. Highland Street, Suite 200A-N | Arlington, VA 22201

703.842.0780 | 703.842.0779 (fax) | www.accsp.org

Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council Meeting

In-person Meeting

October 17, 2017 | 4:45 pm

Waterside Marriott Hotel, 235 East Main Street, Norfolk, VA

https://safis.accsp.org:8443/accsp_prod/f?p=552:15:::NO:15:P15_CAL_ID_1:1902

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE

Name	Partner	Phone	Email
Mark Alexander	CT DEEP	(860) 434-6043	mark.alexander@ct.gov
Tom Baum	NJ DFW	(609) 748-2020	tom.baum@dep.nj.gov
Bob Beal	ASMFC	(703) 842-0740	rbeal@asmfc.org
Robert Boyles (Chair)	SC DNR	(843) 953-9304	boylesr@dnr.sc.gov
John Carmichael	SAFMC	(843) 571-4366	john.carmichael@safmc.net
Joe Cimino	VMRC	(757) 247-2237	joe.cimino@mrc.virginia.gov
John Clark (Proxy)	DE DFW	(302) 739-9108	john.clark@state.de.us
Michelle Duval (Proxy)	NC DMF	(252) 808-8011	michelle.duval@ncdenr.gov
Jim Estes (Proxy)	FL FWCC	(850) 617-9622	jim.estes@myfwc.com
Lynn Fegley (Vice Chair)	MD DNR	(410) 260-8285	lynn.fegley@maryland.gov
Martin Gary	PRFC	(804) 224-7148	martingary.prfc@gmail.com
Patrick Geer	GA DNR	(912) 264-7218	pat.geer@dnr.state.ga.us
Jim Gilmore	NYS DEC	(631) 444-0430	james.gilmore@dec.ny.gov
Alan Lowther	NOAA S&T	(301) 427-8154	alan.lowther@noaa.gov
Jason McNamee (Proxy)	RI DEM	(401) 423-1943	jason.mcnamee@dem.ri.gov
Brandon Muffley	MAFMC	(302) 526-5260	bmuffley@mafmc.org
Derek Orner (Proxy)	NOAA	(301) 427-8567	derek.ornor@noaa.gov
Cheri Patterson (Proxy)	NH FGD	(603) 868-1095	cheri.patterson@wildlife.nh.gov
Sherry White	US FWS	(413)-253-8500	Sherry_White@fws.gov

Committee Members Not in Attendance: P. Keliher (ME DMR), B. King (DC FWD), D. Pierce (MA DMF), A. Shiels (PFBC)

Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.

Others in Attendance

Name	Title	Partner	Phone	Email
Thad Altman	Legislative Appointee	FL FWCC	(321) 409- 2022	Thad.Altman@myfloridahouse.gov

Welcome and Introductions (Chair R. Boyles)

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program Coordinating Council of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission convened in the Hampton Roads Ballroom V of the Marriott Waterside Hotel, Norfolk, Virginia, October 17, 2017, and was called to order at 4:30 o'clock p.m. by Chairman Robert H. Boyles, Jr.

Review and Approve Agenda (R. Boyles) – Attachment I

CHAIRMAN ROBERT H. BOYLES, JR.: Good afternoon everybody. I would like to call to order the meeting of the ACCSP Coordinating Council. My name is Robert Boyles; I've had the privilege of serving as Chairman of the Coordinating Council. Our first order of business is to seek your consent on the agenda; which was mailed out with the briefing materials.

I would point out that there was a social and economic data standards update that Ray Rhodes, my Sandlapper counterpart was to give. I think Mike is going to cover that under Committee Updates. Are there any other changes to the agenda, additions to the agenda? I see none; the agenda will be adopted by consent.

Public Comment (R. Boyles)

Next on the agenda, I dare somebody to come to the microphone and make a public comment. I'm sorry; I've always wanted to say that. I don't really mean that. It is the time on the agenda for the public who would like to address the Coordinating Council to make those comments; particularly if there are items that are not on the agenda. I'm a little saucy and spicy today you all, what can I say? Seeing no public comment; we'll move on next to status reports and turn it over to Mike.

Review and Approve August Meeting Minutes (R. Boyles) – Attachment II

The next item is approval of proceedings from our last meeting in August, 2017, again which were included in the briefing materials. Are there any additions or edits to those minutes? Seeing none; any objection to adopting those minutes as submitted? Then the minutes are adopted by consent.

ACCSP Status Report (M. Cahall) – Attachment III

- **Program Updates**

MR. MIKE CAHALL: We're going to go ahead and start with the bad news; which is that SAFIS suffered its longest outage in its history about three weeks ago. We were down for the better part of 36 hours, along with the rest of the Commission. We had a failure of the local loopback circuit of our internet provider, which has incidentally been the sole source of systems failure since we moved.

*Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information
on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.*

Needless to say, any of you who have tried to do battle with Verizon can understand how that is. What we're going to do is we're moving forward to implement a redundant internet connection using cable; believe it or not. It looks like what we're going to be doing is our hardware will already do the load balancing and automatic fail over. We're going to go ahead and install the second line going in through a relatively inexpensive Comcast cable line. We would enjoy significantly reduced performance; but at least we wouldn't be down for the period of time that we have problems. Our single source of failure for our internet connectivity has been consistently the Verizon local loopback; which is the last bit of this fiber network that we're connected to. It's allegedly state of the art, but it's also been by far and away the most problematic thing that we've had with the database system.

Moving on, we've got a couple of pilots that are wrapping up. The South Atlantic Fisheries Management Council pilot is wrapping up. It's been fairly successful, we think. The Council has asked us to go ahead and hold that pilot over and expand it; so that on January 1, hopefully we will be able to open that up to any of the permitted South Atlantic for-hire folks who want to use it, in order for them to continue it in an expanded pilot.

Also the South Carolina for-hire electronic trip reporting validation pilot is wrapping up. I believe the report is being written almost as we speak. The purpose of that pilot again, was to look at making sure that the data that we were actually collecting from these reports corresponded to reality; and also working on the math that would be required to potentially expand that sample.

Both of those pilots I think went relatively well. We've learned a great deal about both of them; in both of the areas. I think that we're going to be well informed as we move forward; especially with the potential expansions of the system. We did have the initial SAFIS design meeting about two weeks ago. It was very well attended.

We discussed in a good bit of depth the direction the system should be going in; reviewed the vision that we have for the system, as well as a ten-year vision, and also some general design principals. Eventually you all will be seeing the products from that group as they push through out process.

We are going to be reviewing the documents; putting them then to the IS Committee, and eventually they'll reach you. The intention here is for these documents to serve as guidance for the development effort. Just for your reference, this is a funded project through FIS, so we do have funds available to go ahead and do it.

I think, just to step back for a minute, the main point of the redesign is not to completely change the system as it is to streamline it, to homogenize it, to straighten out for lack of a better way to describe it, some of the curves that we've had to put into the system over the years, so that the design is a little bit more straightforward, and is more flexible.

We know that the demands on the system are going to continue to increase; and it's our goal to make it as flexible as possible. An example might be, I've got Lynn sitting right here, an example might be building the data feed to their system, which is collecting the majority of for-hire data in Maryland.

We would very much like to have facts feeding the SAFIS system in real time; so those data are made available to everyone that might need it. It's the kind of thing we're looking forward to doing in the future. As I talked a little bit before, we are also working with the Mid-Atlantic Council for their

Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.

mandatory electronic for-hire reporting. This is for all Mid-Atlantic species, and the regulations will be going into effect in March of 2018. We have sewed up the help desk, thanks to the funding that we received last year, and are working through the issues with GARFO and the Mid-Atlantic to make sure that we have support in place well in advance of the rollout date. As a reminder, ACCSP in and of itself will not be responsible for analyzing the data or doing any of the compliance or quota monitoring. We're going to be serving as a collection agency; and also as a central support point in the sense that we'll be funding the help desk and working with the help desk contractor to refine the help desk script, so that everybody knows.

For example, I'll pick on Lynn for just a minute. If someone from Maryland calls in and says, well how do I get on this thing? I say no, no, you call Maryland DNR; they use facts and that sort of thing, so that we can correctly direct folks that might call us to the appropriate personnel in the appropriate agency. It's going to vary widely; depending on the participation of each individual agency.

Also again, as I alluded a little earlier with the South Atlantic Council, mandatory electronic for-hire reporting is on the way. We are directly participating in a process they call the SEFHIER, whose initials have escaped me. Do you remember again what they are?

MR. JOHN CARMICHAEL: Southeast For-hire Electronic Reporting; I think that's it.

MR. CAHALL: That sounds right. This is a process that they've put together; in order to analyze their needs, and look at ways that they might approach solving the various and sundry issues that are presented in electronic trip reporting. We are participating in virtually all of their planning committees.

We don't really have a due date for that; but I think that they very much would like to have reporting in place no later than January 1, 2018. I believe the South Atlantic Council would like that to happen sooner; I'm not quite sure how that is all going to fall out. But at this point it looks fairly likely that we'll be assisting in that effort; in at least the same sense that we would be working with the Mid-Atlantic Council.

In terms of the social and economic module, we are making some progress. We did find previous work. I was reminded by Ray Rhodes that the report, which I had listed earlier as being in 1998, was actually 1996. We updated the data elements in that. That report has been reviewed by the Committee.

We do have a second call planned with the subgroup, which is scheduled for October 25; where they're going to be planning for the updated module. Essentially we're going to look at what kind of data elements could we essentially provide now; which will result in recommendations going back to the Operations Committee for potentially integrating into SAFIS, or potentially creating data products from data we already have.

Then additional data collection will have to be reviewed by the various and sundry other technical committees that might potentially be involved. We are making some forward progress on that. I want to thank Shanna especially from the Commission group; for helping us organize this and make it happen. We have a nice group of volunteers, and I think that's moving forward. This is very brief. You will get a great deal more information tomorrow at the workshop. I encourage all of you to attend. Do you have any questions for me?

- **Committee Updates**

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Okay Mike, no questions so we'll roll on into Committee Updates.

MR. PATRICK A. CAMPFIELD: I'm going to provide a quick summary of the Operations and Advisory Committee activities since we last gave you an update. Both committees met jointly during the third week of September. One of the major topics on our agenda was to again revisit the priorities of the RFP modules, catch and effort, biological, bycatch, and socioeconomic.

We had brought this up earlier in 2017. The committees needed more time to chew on the different options that had been developed by a workgroup; and at the fall meeting both groups agreed to make a significant change from FY '18 to FY '19, to essentially elevate the biological data to an equal and top tier with the catch and effort data, but retain bycatch and socioeconomic modules as secondary tiers.

Proposals can still come in, and will be scored. But catch and effort and effort and biological will have the highest potential for being supported. This was to reflect that now that the program is 15 years or so into funding projects, the catch and effort data coming in is a lot better than it was 15 years ago. Now we may be able to turn our emphasis to biological.

I just wanted to clarify, for the information you'll get next on the FY '18 proposal scoring, we are sticking with the current status with catch and effort elevated. Then in next year's cycle FY '19, we're recommending making this change. There were 12 proposals submitted in both the maintenance and new categories; in addition to the administrative grant proposal.

In total the eight maintenance proposals were about 1.1 million dollars in requests; and the four new proposals totaled about \$317,000.00, and the administrative grant came in at around 1.8 million. Among those proposals, both Ops and Advisors agreed and wanted to recommend to the Coordinating Council that one of the new proposals is not recommended for funding.

This is a proposal from the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, evaluating angler perception, handling practices, and maltreatment of smooth dogfish in the recreational fishery. In your supplemental materials there is a brief memo or letter describing why the committees did not support that proposal.

The next slide is the big picture on the FY '18 proposals and how they were scored and ranked by both the Advisory and Operations Committees. We could get into that in more detail. I did want to pass it to Jerry to provide a summary of the Advisory Committee comments.

Consider Approval of Recommendations of FY2018 Submitted Proposals (Operations Committee Chair P. Campfield and Advisory Committee Chair J. Morgan) - Attachment IV

MR. JERRY MORGAN: On behalf of ACCSP Advisors, I would like to thank our partner the great state of Virginia, for hosting the 76th ASMFC Annual Meeting; home of the world's largest naval installation, Naval Station Norfolk, and abutting the great Chesapeake Bay; known for its diverse marine habitat. This Mid-Atlantic haven is an ideal meeting place, since scoring and ranking proposals often involves this region. One of the new proposals submitted by Rhode Island DFW involves the Mid-Atlantic Region.

Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.

New Proposal 9, advancing fishery dependent data collection for black sea bass, in the southern New England and Mid-Atlantic Region, utilizing modern technology and a fishing vessel research fleet approach was scored highest. Since better data is needed to learn more about and effectively manage this highly mobile and increasingly popular fishery, we ranked it Number 1 as advisors. This was followed by new proposal N-11, vessel SAFIS integration development; submitted by South Carolina DNR, and ranked Number 2. N-11 would allow for data transfer of three ACCSP program priorities; catch and effort, bycatch, species interaction and social economic. From bluefins, vessel API, for-hire electronic data into SAFIS. Coming in with Number 3 ranking and a groundbreaking innovative proposal is Number 10; Rhode Island's Department of Environmental Management's voice recognition and headboat serving mobile application. The key item discussed was to identify and resolve any physical issues that could hamper an accurate transmission and recording of data collected.

Finally, it was agreed by consensus that proposal N-12, dealing with the handling and maltreatment of the recreational fishery of smooth dogfish, considered a coastal shark, had merit, would best be left to another funding source, and be reworked in order to better accomplish this goal. The concern was not that the study team would be intentionally engaging in questionable behavior.

The concern was that they would be present while a potentially illegal activity regarding maltreatment, mutilation of smooth dogfish was occurring under a project we approved and funded. That we felt would make for a bad perception and some very bad PR. Additionally, the usefulness of the limited scope and depth of data acquired would be less relevant in the whole scheme of things.

Notwithstanding the fact that ACCSPs core principals were not heeded. As mentioned previously, we believe the concept is a good one, should be proposed in a different way, and funded by another source. All maintenance proposals were similarly agreed upon; and based on in part, annual progress reports, funding was uniformly suggested for each. Recruitment and maintaining an acceptable number of advisors from our Atlantic Coast partners, continues to need work.

It is from this Committee that ideas and comments from the recreational and commercial fishing industry flow through ACCSP. Consequently, the advisors are in a never ending building mode. Any referrals from the recreational and commercial industry sent our way will be appreciated. Lastly, our outreach decal project incorporating ACCSP and ASMFC into one was well received. It looks as though we'll be undergoing another printing. Thank you for your time.

MR. CAMPFIELD: Thanks, Jerry. If we could just go back one slide please, again this is in your materials. It summarizes the scoring and ranking, both for the Operations and Advisory Committees, and then the average rank. That's how it broke down. The New Proposals group is at the bottom, with the South Carolina data transfer project being the highest ranked, and the Rhode Island voice recognition proposal and finally the research fleet fishery dependent proposal also out of Rhode Island.

The bottom line you can see is that if we stick with our funding split of 75 percent maintenance, 25 percent new, this would leave the last maintenance proposal, the Georgia trip ticket proposal below the line. However, at the bottom right you can see if we fund all three new proposals, we need to have about \$79,000.00 unspent.

That led to the Advisory and Operations Committee's recommendation to deviate from our 75/25 percent split, in order to fund all the maintenance proposals, to not fund the Mid-Atlantic smooth dogfish

Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.

proposal as we've mentioned. This would allow for all the maintenance proposals and three recommended new proposals to be funded. That is the preferred option from the two committees and recommendation to you on the Coordinating Council. There was a lot of discussion at the meeting a few weeks ago; so we did devise Option 2, if we wanted to stick with a 75/25 percent split. That would require a 2 percent roughly, or a small percentage cut to all the proposals, in order to still fund the Georgia trip ticket proposal. But again, both committees are recommending Option 1. That's all we have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Jerry, Pat, thank you; questions for Pat or for Jerry? Pat.

MR. PAT GEER: Pat, I just wanted to make sure that this priority is the FY '18 is the old method, correct, not the new method?

MR. CAMPFIELD: That's correct.

MR. GEER: Okay, and do you see any, well we don't exactly how much money we're going to get. But do you see any further cuts? A lot of times we do this and then we get another 2 percent cut or another 4 percent cut; you know because we don't get all the money. How confident are you that you're going to get the whole 3.5, I guess is what I'm asking.

MR. CAHALL: We're pretty confident that we're going to get fully funded. In addition, in general ST has been very kind to us when we've been even a few thousand short, and made up the difference. Right now we believe that the FIN line, which is where the majority of our funding comes from, is pretty much safe. I think we're going to be okay this year.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Dr. Duval.

DR. MICHELLE DUVAL: Yes Pat, could you please go back to the previous slide with the chart on it? I just want to make sure I understand this. Under a 3.35 million funding that is where the shortfall would come in?

MR. CAMPFIELD: That's correct. We've had a precedent where we fund, take of that 3.35 we fund the administrative grant and then the remaining amount we split 75/25. Under that setup, the Georgia proposal would be unfunded.

DR. DUVAL: We're just making a leap of faith that the program is going to be funded at 3.5, and maintain the 75/25 percent split?

MR. CAHALL: No, Dr. Duval. Even at 3.35, if we lift the 75/25, we'll have roughly a thousand dollars more than we need to fund these projects. I have to emphasize also that there is always a little bit of uncertainty; because until the decisions are made and the funding vehicles are established, we don't know exactly A, how much money we're going to have, or B, how much money is going to have to be tacked on to these various projects as they move through their different channels to get funded.

Some of these may incur an overhead fee from one of the grants office. Some, if they come through the Commission, there is also an overhead fee for the Commission, some may not. Some may be funded directly through NMFS. Basically anything less than a few percentage points, is very difficult to pin down,

until we have a final decision from this group exactly what should be funded. Then finally, once we've established exactly how all the funding vehicles are going to be utilized.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Further questions. Cheri.

MS. CHERI PATTERSON: I don't have any questions. I have a motion.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Jay.

MR. JASON McNAMEE: I apologize. I am going right back to Dr. Duval's question, because the math is not right in my head. You are saying that under the 3.35, if we went with the recommendation of the two committees, you would still be able to offset what is in pink up on the board there?

MR. CAMPFIELD: Yes that is correct. If we go with Option 1, we would fund all three of the new proposals listed on the board and all the maintenance proposals.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: This is going with Option 1, which is you're lifting the 75/25 percent split, correct? I mean I have some philosophical issues with that; because I think that is a little bit of the camel's nose under the tent. You know the spirit of ACCSP was that we would move things off of maintenance funding, and look towards funding new projects.

I appreciate that there were a variety of factors contributing to this particular shortfall like this, this year. But I'm concerned that if we do this once we're going to keep on doing it. I recognize that it all comes out in the wash. But I just see creep here, in terms of maintaining that 75/25 percent split, so I just had to register that concern.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Tom.

MR. TOM BAUM: If Pat or someone could give me a little clarification, as far as maintenance versus new. I see the Georgia project is under maintenance, and there was some maybe discussion that maybe it was a new project. If you want to clarify that I would appreciate it.

MR. CAMPFIELD: The Georgia representative and the state debated that; whether it should come in as a maintenance or a new project. Ultimately they decided to submit it as a maintenance proposal; because they've requested and received funding for their trip ticket program in several years in the past. That seemed fairly far afield from our current definition of a new proposal of one or two years of essentially brand new activity.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Okay, I've got Cheri then Brandon.

MS. PATTERSON: Just a little clarification from Mike, maybe. Georgia did submit this, but they submitted it for one year; is that correct? This would actually be considered the second year, even though there was a gap between the first year and this second year. It could technically be considered a new project.

MR. CAHALL: You're technically correct, and there was a good bit of discussion about that by the Operations Committee. But it was the decision of the Georgia Rep to submit it as a maintenance project.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Brandon.

MR. BRANDON MUFFLEY: Just to clarify, because this seems different than what I remember at the Operations Committee; and hence why the Operations Committee provided two alternatives. But you're saying under Alternative 1, we deviate from the 75/25, but all the new projects get fully funded under that scenario?

I didn't think that was how we were operating; that that Rhode Island proposal, the second Rhode Island proposal on sea bass would have had to have been cut, because we didn't have enough funds to cover all maintenance, if we allocated all of the funds to cover the maintenance projects. Did I miss something from when we met last month to now? Did something change? Because that's why I thought we provided two different alternatives for the Coordinating Council to consider.

MR. CAHALL: The issue was the fees. When I started to look at that it was just no way to make a rational estimate for how much the fees were going to be. They could be \$10,000.00, they could be \$50,000.00. It depends entirely on how they end up being funded and routed. Within this, because this is a very narrow financial window, and that's the reason you see slightly different numbers here, because these numbers.

I can tell you with reasonable certainty how much the fees are going to be for the Administrative Grant; because they are the same thing over and over and over again. But for all of these other things it is hard to tell. When we decided we wanted to display it as a level field, as opposed to trying to make a guess on how much these were all going to be. I'm reasonably confident that we will be able to fund all of these projects. It is within the realm of what has been going on for the last three or four years, with our back and forth with SMT.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Follow up Brandon and then Jay.

MR. MUFFLEY: You just assigned a flat administrative fee to all of those other projects, or you got rid of? Okay, thank you.

MR. McNAMEE: I wanted to jump back. I appreciated Dr. Duval's comments. I guess the way that I was looking at it. I sort of appreciate that we set that 75/25 split up ahead of time to do that in sort of an objective way; based on the philosophy of the program. In this case though, with the exception of a smooth dogfish, were we to accept the advice to not fund that one. There weren't additional proposals submitted, so in the end, in my view, it becomes just an accounting issue. There is a gap. No other competing proposals, and so for me it makes sense to accept that recommendation Option 1 for that reason.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: It's late in the day and my thought just ran away from my head. Oh, I know what I was going to say. I just want to make sure that my comments earlier, about the spirit of the 75 percent, 25 percent split are not in any way, shape, or form taken to mean that I do not support funding the Georgia project. I absolutely support funding Georgia's project. I guess maybe my question is, you know this recommendation for Option 1 was that a unanimous recommendation from the Operations Committee?

MR. CAMPFIELD: Sure. There was quite a lot of discussion about the 75/25 percent split. A number of voices among both committees that our long term intent is to maintain that; you know, promoting new proposals, and currently at the 25 percent level. As Jay mentioned, it really came down to the accounting this year.

But if we had received half a dozen new proposals, and most of them had merit, and we thought they were worthwhile. Then there would have been more debate, and perhaps different recommendations, and possibly to keep a maintenance proposal or two below the line. But that simply wasn't the case this year, with three new proposals that we thought were worth supporting.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: I have a question. I think it appears that we're trying to find a way to split the baby. You know maybe a question maybe from Bob. I mean we've got a new governance structure, and I noted the Administrative Grants got a body in it. It's been a while. I confess it's been a while since I've been in the office. Are we okay space wise? I mean do we have capacity, I guess is the question I've got?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ROBERT E. BEAL: We're pretty full in the office right now. We would have to be creative to shoehorn another body into the office right now. But you're right; there is a full-time employee in the Administrative Grant to help out with some of the data projects.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Any further questions, discussion? Bob.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BEAL: The other variable that's just come up in the last few days is we've heard from our insurance company that our health insurance premiums are going to go up 10 to 12 percent. I'm not really sure what that's going to mean to all of ASMFCs budget.

You know all the states are experiencing, all the businesses; everybody is experiencing the insurance premiums going up. There is going to be an added expense there. I haven't figured out exactly the magnitude of it; because we just got the word not that long ago. We are going to have to figure out where to find a few dollars to cover that as well.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: That's good information. This is where I think we are, and you all check me on this, please. We've got a consensus recommendation from our Advisors. This is how the projects split out. In contrast to some difficult discussions in years past, we don't have competing proposals. There is nothing, at this point I don't get a sense from anybody around the table. We want to fund what we've got here, in terms of projects.

I think Mike or somebody characterized it. This is as much an accounting exercise. We're not making programmatic priority decisions here. How does the Coordinating Council want to move? We've got an issue potentially with health insurance. We've got the question of administrative fees that we don't know about; and we've got state partners, ACCSP partners waiting for a decision from this group. Yes, Mike.

MR. CAHALL: In past years when we've been uncertain, the guidance that's been provided is essentially to fund these in priority order. When and if we run out of money is where we run out of money. In past years you have directed me to take that into consideration, when we do finally have our final numbers, when we send the allocations forward to National Marine Fisheries Service to move the money around.

We certainly could do that this year. I don't expect that in terms of the base funding for these, to have a shortfall. The health insurance will push the overhead up some. It's hard to say with assurance exactly how much that would be. But I think for the purposes of this discussion, certainly you could give me direction to fund these in their priority order; and cut it off when we run out of money, and report back to you, or work through the, what do we call the Executive Committee now, The Leadership Committee, to make those changes if necessary.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: All right Pat and then Michelle.

MR. GEER: Mike, if we go with Option 1, how far of a deviation are we talking about? Do you have any idea?

MR. CAHALL: A few thousand dollars, not much.

MR. GEER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Michelle.

DR. DUVAL: I guess if there is a concern about what is going to be available; and the somewhat uncertain nature of the fees. It seems like rather than funding things in priority order, which you know given the challenges of this year's process. It might be fairer to everyone, because this way someone wouldn't get left out, to think about more Option 2, where you're docking everybody a little bit of money off the top.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: Then in the Option 2, the 2 percent. That is for the maintenance proposals? Oh that would be for everything altogether.

MR. CAHALL: There is one element. If I send it across with an across the board cut, ST won't give us any extra money. If I send it across showing pain, they probably will. It's the truth of how things move. That is something that has to factor into the decisions, I think.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Wisdom, wisdom, wisdom, wisdom. Lynn Fegley.

MS. LYNN FEGLEY: I was just going to say that maybe the answer is to go with Option 1, and see what we get, and then propose the blanket cuts before we go to the priority order.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Cheri.

MS. PATTERSON: We've been in this place before; and we have also deviated from the 75/25 percent in the past. Precedence has already been set on that perspective. I am definitely leaning towards Option 1, and we have also presented a caveat that if there is a funding issue that that moves forward to the former Executive Committee of ACCSP, to have a discussion and make decisions based on that. That would be my recommendation moving forward with a motion.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Just for the record. I'm kibitzing with Mike here. The Leadership Team presently is Lynn Fegley, Bob Beal, me and John Carmichael. That's it. Those of you, whose names were just called, wake up. Bob.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BEAL: There is also a NOAA Rep and a Fish and Wildlife Service Rep on there. The Chair, the Vice-Chair, the immediate past Chair, me, and the two federal Reps, I believe is who is on the group.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: What is the pleasure of the Coordinating Council? Cheri. Yes Ma'am.

MS. PATTERSON: Then we can move forward with discussion. I would like to make a motion to move forward. I forgot my speed reading. I think it's the Management Policy Committee for ACCSP.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: While we're crafting this motion. Again I would like to thank the Advisors and the Ops Committee for bringing us to this place. This is a good spot to be. Trying to find ways to fund important projects, important efforts, and it's a nice position to be in, not having to choose and pick and choose necessarily winners and losers.

But I think clearly it is the desire of the Coordinating Council to well, we'll let Cheri read her motion. I'm sorry. I think it's clearly the desire of the Coordinating Council to adopt the recommendations of the committees; to the degree that resources are available. Of course with the big unknowns, in terms of administrative fees, health insurance, in terms of what that may cost the Administrative Grant as well.

Decision making uncertainty, but am I getting a sense, I would like to see heads nod in affirmative or a negative is that the consensus of where the group would like to go. Well let's see if we can put this in the form of a motion. Bear with us for just a moment.

MS. PATTERSON: I would like to place the **motion to fund all maintenance proposals, deviating from the 75/25 percent split. Do not fund the new proposal from the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council, and use the remaining funds on new proposals as recommended by the Operations and Advisory Committees. If there is a funding shortage the deciding body will be the ACCSP Management and Policy Committee.**

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: That's a motion by Ms. Patterson, do we have a second; **second by Ms. Fegley**, further discussion on the motion, Joe?

MR. JOE CIMINO: I appreciate all the work that goes into evaluating these proposals; and I wonder if, as Cheri mentioned, we've been in this place before. I wonder if there is a sense for those proposals that can't live with partial funding; and therefore would die versus those that could, so that in that process if two or three fall out but there is remaining funding and we know that one of those can live with partial funding if it would go there.

MR. CAMPFIELD: The committees discussed that as well; because that is an option that we've exercised in the past, to make relatively small cuts across the board, in order to get everybody funded at some level. There was agreement around the Operations and Advisory Committees table that those proposals could still get the bulk of their work done, and they could complete most of the activities. None of the proposals would be a full stop.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Further discussion on the motion? John.

MR. CARMICHAEL: I've always been a big fan of the 75/25, and I agree with Michelle about keeping the camel's nose from bringing his whole body inside the tent. I'm thinking though that there is a sunset coming up, right. Is that next year or the year after that they're going to start being ratcheted down; so the year after? I think that's going to affect some of the ones as Joe mentioned that kind of find taking a small cut to be a problem. Well they're going to be forced to take cuts on a lot of these, and that's certainly going to be a challenge when the time comes.

But I think we may be in the same situation next year; because we add some new proposals the last few years finally, thanks to that 75/25. Now we're starting to eat up more of the maintenance again. I think it's going to be a real interesting development when we start really forcing some of these longstanding projects to cut back.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Jay.

MR. McNAMEE: Mr. Chair, I'm going to ask you a process question here. I am a PI on the Black Sea Bass Project. Since this could potentially end up at another management body for a decision. I was wondering if I could offer some insight on that project. It's my understanding it was an item of discussion at the Ops Committee; and I wanted to clarify something. Okay, thank you. One of the reasons, and I don't know if this in fact affected their ranking.

But one of the discussion items with the Black Sea Bass Project was a lack of understanding of how that data might transfer into the stock assessment. We apparently didn't do a good job in the proposal of describing this. But we had a Steering Committee. That Steering Committee had both myself and Gary Shepherd, who is the Assessment Lead on it.

The data elements that we're collecting were in fact driven by the Assessment Lead; and I have also participated on that stock assessment in the past as well. I think given the closeness that we had to that is why we neglected to – it was obvious to us, but we should have recorded that in a more explicit way in the proposal – but I wanted to offer that insight, just for those deliberations, if it in fact ends up in that second step.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Further discussion on the motion. Dr. Duval.

DR. DUVAL: I'm going to go ahead and support this motion; but I just want it noted for the record that I'm supporting it reluctantly, because of the 75/25 percent deviation. I appreciate Cheri's comments that we've been in this place before. But if we don't move forward, if we continue to get ourselves on the spot, we're never going to move forward. As John stated, there are going to be some harsh realities coming up, once these, I guess the weaning off kicks in. I know some of the maintenance proposals had some increases over the years. Just let that be noted.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Further discussion. All right I'm going to read the motion one more time. The motion is to fund all maintenance proposals, deviating from the 75 percent-25 percent split. Do not fund the new proposal from the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and use the remaining funds on new proposals as recommended by the Operations and Advisory Committees.

If there is a funding shortage, the deciding body would be the ACCSP Management and Policy Committee. That motion was by Ms. Patterson; seconded by Ms. Fegley. All those in favor of the motion

please raise your hand, please. Thank you, put your hands down, any opposition? That motion carries unanimously.

Thank you all, good discussion, good conversations, important policy implications for how this group moves forward; particularly as the funding formulas and the forced weaning comes, as John referenced.

Chair/Vice Chair Elections

Next item on the agenda is Chair and Vice-Chair elections. We will take nominations for Chair first. Then I'll do this; nominations for Chair. Bob Beal.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR BEAL: I would like to nominate Lynn Fegley; from Maryland, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Nomination for Ms. Fegley, is there a second? Second by Tom Baum, I'm looking for a motion to close the nominations. John Carmichael makes a motion to close the nominations and by acclamation Ms. Fegley of Maryland is your new Coordinating Council Chair. (Applause) I'm sorry, I didn't call that question. All those in favor of that motion signify by raising your hand. Is there any opposition to the motion? That motion carries let it be known unanimously; Lynn, congratulations. Next nomination is open for Vice-Chair. Cheri.

MS. PATTERSON: Yes, I would like to nominate John Carmichael for Vice-Chair of ACCSP.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: Nomination for John, a second by Dr. Duval, and is that a motion to close the nominations Mr. Gilmore, and appoint by acclamation.

MR. JAMES J. GILMORE, JR.: Mr. Chairman, I was going to close the nominations and cast one vote for the old version of Pat Augustine in electing a Vice-Chairman, so congratulations.

CHAIRMAN BOYLES: All those in favor of that motion for John Carmichael as Vice-Chair, please raise your hand. All right thank you. John, again let the record reflect a unanimous vote. Congratulations to Ms. Fegley and to Mr. Carmichael.

Other Business

Is there any other business to come before the Coordinating Council? Seeing none; we will stand adjourned. Thank you all.

Adjourn

(Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 5:20 o'clock p.m. on October 17, 2017)

INDEX OF MOTIONS

PAGE 12: Motion to fund all maintenance proposals, deviating from the 75/25 percent split. Do not fund the new proposal from the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Management Council, and use the remaining funds on new proposals as recommended by the Operations and Advisory Committees. If there is a funding shortage the deciding body will be the ACCSP Management and Policy Committee.



Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

1050 N. Highland Street, Suite 200A-N | Arlington, VA 22201
703.842.0780 | 703.842.0779 (fax) | www.accsp.org

TO: ACCSP Coordinating Council and All ACCSP Committees

FROM: Michael S. Cahall, ACCSP Director 

SUBJECT: ACCSP Request for 2019 Proposals

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (Program or ACCSP) is issuing a Request for Proposals (RFP) to program partner agencies or Committees for FY19 funding.

The [Funding Decision Document](#) provides general guidance and includes information on proposal preparation, the project approval process, and the RFP schedule. Projects in areas not specifically addressed may still be considered for funding if they help achieve Program goals. These goals, listed by priority, are improvements in:

- 1a. Catch, effort, and landings data (including licensing, permit and vessel registration data);
- 1b. Biological data (equal to 1a.);
2. Releases, discards and protected species data; and
3. Economic and sociological data.

Project activities that will be considered according to priority may include:

- Partner implementation of data collection programs;
- Continuation of current program funded partner programs;
- Funding for personnel required to implement Program related projects/proposals; and
- Data management system upgrades or establishment of partner data feeds to the Data Warehouse and/or Standard Atlantic Fisheries Information System.

Proposals for biological sampling should target priority species in the top quartile (Attachment II) of the Biological Priority Matrix. Proposals for observer coverage should align with fisheries affecting the top quartile priority species (Attachment III) of the Bycatch Priority Matrix. Brief descriptions of current levels of biological or bycatch sampling by any of the Partners would be helpful to the review process. Projects for recreational catch and effort data should target the priorities set by the Recreational Technical Committee (Attachment IV).

New components to this year's Funding Decision Document can be found highlighted in light blue in the ranking criteria (Attachment VI).

Submissions must comply with Program Standards found [here](#). Timelines for the 2019 RFP are shown in Attachment V. Please consider using [this successful project proposal](#) as a template.

Proposals to continue Program-funded partner projects ("maintenance proposals") may not contain significant changes in scope (for example the addition of bycatch data collection to a dealer reporting project), and must include in the cover letter whether there are any changes in the current proposal from prior years, and if so, provide a brief summary of those changes.

Our vision is to produce dependable and timely marine fishery statistics for Atlantic coast fisheries that are collected, processed, and disseminated according to common standards agreed upon by all program partners.

Project submissions will be reviewed in accordance with the Funding Decision Document (Attachment I), ranking criteria (Attachment VI), and funding allocation. Current funding allocation guidelines are 75% for maintenance projects and 25% for new projects within the Program priorities. Additionally, a long-term funding strategy policy was approved requiring maintenance projects to be subject to a prior two-year average as base funding. A funding decrease will begin after year 4 of maintenance funding, with funds decreasing 33% each year starting in year 5 with no funding year 7. Overhead rates may not exceed 25% of total costs unless mandated by law or policy. Items included within overhead should not also be listed as in-kind match. The final decisions on proposals to be funded for FY19 will be made in October 2018. We strongly urge you to **carefully** review the Funding Decision Document, especially in reference to the budget template.

Project awards will be subject to funding availability. If there is a funding shortfall, adjustments may be made to awards in accordance with the Funding Decision Document.

Successful applicants will be notified when funding becomes available. Project Investigators will be required to report progress directly to the Program's Operations and Advisory Committees in addition to meeting the standard Federal reporting requirements.

Please submit initial proposals as Microsoft Word and Excel files no later than **June 11, 2018** by email to **both** Mike Cahall (mike.cahall@accsp.org) and Ali Schwaab (alexandra.schwaab@accsp.org). If you have any questions about the funding decision process, please contact your agency's Operations Committee member (<http://www.accsp.org/committees>), Mike Cahall (703-842-0781), or Ali Schwaab (703-842-0780).

RELEVANT ATTACHMENTS

[ATTACHMENT I Funding Decision Document](#)

[ATTACHMENT II FY 2018 Biological Priority Matrix](#)

[ATTACHMENT III FY 2018 Bycatch Priority Matrix](#)

[ATTACHMENT IV 2017 Recreational Technical Priorities](#)

[ATTACHMENT V Timeline for Proposal Review](#)

[ATTACHMENT VI FY 2019 Ranking Criteria Document](#)

Funding Decision Process
Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program
May 2018

The Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program (the Program) is a state-federal cooperative initiative to improve recreational and commercial fisheries data collection and data management activities on the Atlantic coast. This formal funding decision process has been developed to assist the Program committees in deliberations on funding of proposals intended to enhance timely implementation of the Program. The following process and proposal formats are provided as guidance to Program Partners.

The Coordinating Council has charged the Operations and Advisory Committees to review proposals and make funding recommendations to the Program Director and the Coordinating Council.

General Process for Setting Annual Program Priorities

The “Atlantic Coast Fisheries Data Collection Standards” provides the basic framework for implementation of the program by all Program Partners. The current Strategic and annual Operations Plans will be used to guide the determination of annual priorities.

Steps in the Funding Decision Process

1. Develop annual funding priorities, criteria and allocation targets (maintenance vs. new projects)
2. Issue Request for Proposals (RFP)
3. Review initial proposals
4. Provide initial results to submitting Partner
5. Review and rank final proposals
6. Proposal approval by the Coordinating Council
7. Notification to submitting Partner of funded projects and notification of approved projects to appropriate grant funding agency (e.g. NOAA Fisheries Regional Grants Program Office, “NOAA Grants”) by Partner
8. Operation and/or Executive Committees and Coordinating Council review and make final decision with contingencies (e.g. scope of work, rescissions, no-cost extensions, returned unused funds, etc.)

1. Develop Annual Funding Priorities, Criteria and Allocation Targets (maintenance vs. new projects).

Prior to issuing the Request for Proposals, the Coordinating Council will approve the annual funding criteria and allocation targets. These will later be used to rank projects and allocate funding between maintenance and new projects respectively. Starting in FY2016 a long-term funding strategy policy was approved requiring maintenance projects to be subject to a prior two-year average as base funding. A funding decrease will begin after year 4 with funds decreasing 33% each year starting in year 5 with no funding year 7.

2. Issue Request for Proposals

a. An RFP will be sent to all Program Partners and Committees no later than the week after the spring Coordinating Council meeting. The RFP will include the ranking criteria, allocation targets approved by the Coordinating Council and general Program priorities taken from the current Strategic Plan. The RFP and related documents will also be posted on the Program's website. The public has the ability to work with a Program Partner to develop and submit a proposal. All proposals MUST BE submitted either by a Program Partner, jointly by several Program Partners, or through a Program Committee. Principle investigators are strongly encouraged to work with their Operations Committee member in the development of any proposal.

b. All proposals must be submitted electronically to the Program Director, and/or designee, in the following standard format:

Applicant Name: Identify the name of the applicant organization(s).

Project Title: A brief statement to identify the project.

Project Type: Identify whether new or maintenance project.

- New Project – Partner project never funded by the Program. New projects may not exceed a duration of two years. Second year funding is not guaranteed, partners must reapply.
- Maintenance Project – Project funded by the Program that conducts the same scope of work as a previously funded new or maintenance project. These proposals may not contain significant changes in scope (e.g., the addition of bycatch data collection to a catch/effort dealer reporting project). They must include in the cover letter whether there are any changes in the current proposal from prior years, and if so, provide a brief summary of those changes.

Requested Award Amount: Provide the total requested amount of proposal. Do not include an estimate of the NOAA grant administration fee.

Requested Award Period: Provide the total time period of the proposed project. The award period typically will be limited to one-year projects.

Objective: Specify succinctly the “why”, “what”, and “when” of the project.

Need: Specify the need for the project and the association to the Program.

Results and Benefits: Identify and document the results or benefits to be expected from the proposed project. Clearly indicate how the proposed work meets various elements outlined in the ACCSP Proposal Ranking Criteria Document (Appendix A). Some potential benefits may include: fundamental in nature to all fisheries; region-wide in scope; answering or addressing region-wide questions or policy issues; required by MSFCMA, ACFCMA, MMPA, ESA, or other acts; transferability; and/or demonstrate a practical application to the Program.

Data Delivery Plan: Include coordinated method of the data delivery plan to the Program in addition to module data elements gathered. The data delivery plan should include the frequency of data delivery (i.e. monthly, semi-annual, annual) and any coordinate delivery to other relevant partners.

Approach: List all procedures necessary to attain each project objective. If a project includes work in more than one module, identify approximately what proportion of effort is comprised within each module (e.g., catch and effort 45%, biological 30% and bycatch 25%).

Geographic Location: The location where the project will be administered and where the scope of the project will be conducted.

Milestone Schedule: An activity schedule in table format for the duration of the project, starting with Month 1 and ending with a three-month report writing period.

Project Accomplishments Measurement: A table showing the project goals and how progress towards those goals will be measured. In some situations the metrics will be numerical such as numbers of anglers contacted, fish measured, and/or otoliths collected, etc; while in other cases the metrics will be binary such as software tested and software completed. Additional details such as intermediate metrics to achieve overall proposed goals should be included especially if the project seeks additional years of funding.

Cost Summary (Budget): Detail all costs to be incurred in this project in the format outlined in the budget guidance and template at the end of this document. A budget narrative should be included which explains and justifies the expenditures in each category. Provide cost projections for federal and total costs. Provide details on Partner/in-kind contribution (e.g., staff time, facilities, IT support, overhead, etc.). Details should be provided on start-up versus long-term operational costs.

In-kind - ¹Defined as activities that could exist (or could happen) without the grant. ²In-kind contributions are from the grantee organization. In-kind is typically in the form of the value of personnel, equipment and services, including direct and indirect costs.

¹The following are generally accepted as in-kind contributions:

- i. Personnel time given to the project including state and federal employees
- ii. Use of existing state and federal equipment (e.g. data collection and server platforms, Aging equipment, microscopes, boats, vehicles)

Overhead rates may not exceed 25% of total costs unless mandated by law or policy. Program Partners may not be able to control overhead/indirect amounts charged. However, where there is flexibility, the lowest amount of overhead should be charged. When this is accomplished indicate on the 'cost summary' sheet the difference between the overhead that could have been charged and the actual amount charged, if different. If overhead is charged to the Program, it cannot also be listed as in-kind.

Maintenance Projects: Maintenance proposals must provide project history table, description of completed data delivery to the ACCSP and other relevant partners, table of total project cost by year, a summary table of metrics and achieved goals, and the budget narrative from the most recent year's funded proposal.

Principal Investigator: List the principal investigator(s) and attach curriculum vitae (CV) for each. Limit each CV to two pages. Additional information may be requested.

3. Review initial proposals

Proposals will be reviewed by staff and the Operations and Advisory Committees. Committee members are encouraged to coordinate with their offices and/or constituents to provide input to the review process. Operations Committee members are also encouraged to work with staff in their offices that have submitted a proposal in order to represent the proposal. The review and evaluation of all written proposals will

take into consideration the ranking criteria, funding allocation targets and the overall Program Priorities as specified in the RFP. Proposals may be forwarded to relevant Program technical committees for further review of the technical feasibility and statistical validity. Proposals that fail to meet the ACCSP standards may be recommended for changes or rejected.

4. Provide initial review results to submitting Partner

Program staff will notify the submitting Partner of suggested changes, request responses, or questions arising from the review process (especially if a proposal initially fails to meet ACCSP standards). The submitting Partner will be given an opportunity to submit a final proposal incorporating suggested changes in the same format previously described in Step 2(b) by the final RFP deadline.

5. Review and rank final proposals

The review and ranking of all proposals will take into consideration the ranking criteria, funding allocation targets and overall Program Priorities as specified in the RFP. The Program Director and the Advisory and Operations Committees will develop a list of prioritized recommended proposals and forward for discussion, review, and approval by the Coordinating Council.

6. Proposal approval by the Coordinating Council

The Coordinating Council will review a summary of all submitted proposals and prioritized recommended proposals from the Operations and Advisory Committees. Each representative on the Coordinating Council will have one vote during final prioritization of proposed proposals. Projects to be funded by the Program will be approved by the Coordinating Council by the end of November each year. The Program Director will submit a pre-notification to the appropriate NOAA Grants office of the prioritized proposals to expedite processing when those offices receive partner grant submissions.

7. Notification to submitting Partner of funded projects and submittal of project documents to appropriate grants agency (e.g. NOAA Grants) by Partner.

Notification detailing the Coordinating Council's actions relevant to a Partner's proposal will be sent to each Partner by Program staff.

- Approved projects from non-federal partners must be submitted as full applications (federal forms, project and budget narratives, and other attachments) to NOAA Grants via www.grants.gov. These documents must reflect changes or conditions approved by the Coordinating Council.

- Non-federal partners must provide the Program Director with an electronic copy of the narrative and either an electronic or hard copy of the budget of the grant application as submitted to the grants agency (e.g. NOAA Grants).
- Federal Partners do not submit applications to NOAA Grants.

8. Operation and/or Executive Committees and Coordinating Council review and final decision with contingencies or emergencies.

Committee(s) review and decide project changes (e.g. scope of work, rescissions, no-cost extensions, returned unused funds, etc.) during the award period.

Scope of Work Change:

- a) Partners shall submit requests for amendments to approved projects in writing to the Program Director. The Coordinating Council member for that Partner must sign the request.
- b) When Partners request an amendment to an approved project, the Program Director will contact the Chair and Vice Chair of the Operations Committee. The Program Director and Operations Committee Chairs will determine if the requested change is minor or substantial. The Chairs and Program Director may approve minor changes.
- c) For substantial proposed changes, a decision document including the opinions of the Chairs and the Program Director will be sent to the Operations Committee and the ACCSP Leadership Team of the Coordinating Council for review.
- d) The ACCSP Leadership Team will decide to approve or reject the request for change and notify the Program Director, who will send a written notification to the Partner's principal investigator with a copy to the Operations Committee.
- e) When a requested major amendment is submitted shortly before a Coordinating Council meeting, the approval of the amendment will be placed on the Council Agenda.
- f) The Program Director will notify NOAA Grants of any change in scope of work for final approval for non-federal proposals, and the Partner will need to request a Change in Scope through Grants Online. Necessary communications will be maintained between the concerned Partner, the Program and NOAA Grants. Any changes must be approved through the normal NOAA Grants process.

Determination of contingencies for funding adjustments (e.g. rescissions):

The Program Director will be notified by NOAA Fisheries of any federal grant reduction. Such reductions may include, but are not limited to:

- Lower than anticipated amounts from any source of funding
- Rescission of funding after initial allocations have been made
- Partial or complete withdrawal of funds from any source

If these or other situations arise, the Operations Committee will notify partners with approved proposals to reduce their requested budgets or to withdraw a proposal entirely. If this does not reduce the overall requested amount sufficiently, the Director,

the Operations Committee Chair and Vice-Chair, and the Advisory Committee Chair will develop a final recommendation and forward to the ACCSP Leadership Team of the Coordinating Council. These options to address funding contingencies may include:

- Eliminating the lowest-ranked proposal(s)
- A fixed percentage cut to all proposals' budgets
- A directed reduction in a specific proposal(s)

No-Cost Extensions and Unused/Returned Funds:

If additional time is needed to complete the project, Program Partners can request a no-cost extension to their award period. Partners should let the Program know of the need for an additional time and then request the extension as an Award Action Request through NOAA Grants Online at least 30 days before the end date of the award.

In an effort to limit the instances in which funds are not completely used during the award period, draw down reports from the NOAA Grants offices indicating remaining grant balances will be periodically reviewed during each fiscal year.

While effort should be made to complete the project as proposed, if Program Partners find that they will not be able to make use of their entire award, they should notify the Program and their NOAA Federal Program Officer as soon as possible. Depending on the timing of the action, the funds may be able to be reused within the Program, or they may have to be returned to the U.S. Treasury.

Program Partners must submit a written document to the Program Director outlining unused project funds potentially being returned. The Partner must also notify their Coordinating Council member (if applicable) for approval to return the unused funds. If the funding is available for re-use within the Program, the Director will confer with the Operations Committee Chair and Vice-Chair and the Advisory Committee Chair, and then submit a written recommendation to the ACCSP Leadership Team of the Coordinating Council for final approval on the plan to distribute the returned money.

Necessary communications will be maintained between the concerned Partner, the Program, and NOAA Grants office. Any changes must be approved through the normal NOAA Grants process.

Relevant Deadlines

- April
 - Develop annual priorities and funding allocation targets.
- May
 - Distribute request for proposals

- June
 - Proposal submission – Proposals received after specified RFP deadline will not be considered for funding.
- July – August
 - Initial proposal evaluation - recommendations developed by Program staff, and Advisory and Operations Committees.
- August/September
 - Submission of final proposals – final proposals must be submitted electronically to the Program Director, and/or designee by close of business on the day of the specified deadline. Final proposals received after RFP deadline will not be considered for funding.
- September – October
 - Final proposal evaluation - recommendations developed by the Program Director, Advisory and Operations Committees.
- Late October/November
 - Coordinating Council approval of project proposals.

Guidelines

The following guidelines are intended to assist Partners in preparing proposals:

- The Program is predicated upon the most efficient use of available funds. Many jurisdictions have data collection and data management programs which are administered by other fishery management agencies. Detail coordination efforts your agency/Committee has undertaken to demonstrate cost-efficiency and non-duplication of effort.
- All program Partners conducting projects for implementation of the Program standards in their jurisdictions are required to submit data to the Program in prescribed standards, where the module is developed and formats are available. Detail coordination efforts with Program data management staff with projects of a research and/or pilot study nature to submit project information and data for distribution to all Program Partners and archives.
- If appropriate to your project, please detail your agency's data management capability. Include the level of staff support (if any) required to accomplish the proposed work. If contractor services are required, detail the level and costs.
- Before funding will be considered beyond year two of a project, the Partner agency shall detail in writing how the Partner agency plans to assume partial or complete funding, or if not feasible, explain why.

- If appropriate to your project, detail any planned or ongoing outreach initiatives. Provide scope and level of outreach coordinated with either the Outreach Coordinator and/or Outreach Committee.
- Proposals including a collection of aging or other biological samples must clarify partner processing capabilities (i.e., how processed and by whom).
- Provide details on how the proposal will benefit the Program as a whole, outside of benefits to the Partner or Committee.
- Proposals that request funds for Law Enforcement should confirm that all funds will be allocated towards reporting compliance.
- Proposals must detail any in-kind effort/resources, and if no in-kind resources are included, state why.
- Proposals must meet the same quality as would be appropriate for a grant proposal for ACFCMA or other federal grant.
- Assistance is available from Program staff, or an Operations Committee member for proposal preparation and to insure that Program standards are addressed in the body of a given proposal.
- Even though a large portion of available resources may be allocated to one or more jurisdictions, new systems (including prototypes) will be selected to serve all Partners' needs.
- Partners submitting pilot, or other short-term programs, are encouraged to lease large capital budget items (vehicles, etc.) and where possible, hire consultants or contractors rather than hire new permanent personnel.
- The Program will not fund proposals that do not meet Program standards. However, in the absence of approved standards, pilot studies may be funded.
- Proposals will be considered for modules that may be fully developed but have not been through the formal approval process. Pilot proposals will be considered in those cases.
- The Operations Committee may contact Partners concerning discrepancies or inconsistencies in any proposal and may recommend modifications to proposals subject to acceptance by the submitting Partner and approval by the Coordinating Council. The Operations Committee may recommend changes or conditions to proposals. The Coordinating Council may conditionally approve

proposals. These contingencies will be documented and forwarded to the submitting Partner in writing by Program staff.

- Any proposal submitted after the initial RFP deadline will not be considered, in addition to any proposal submitted by a Partner which is not current with all reporting obligations.

Reporting requirements

- a) Program staff will assess project performance.
- b) The Partner project recipients must abide by the NOAA Regional Grant Programs reporting requirements and as listed below. All semi-annual and final reports are to include a table showing progress toward each of the progress goals as defined in Step 2b and additional metrics as appropriate. Also, all Partner project recipients will submit the following reports based on the project start date to the Program Director:
 - a. Semi-annual reports (due 30 days after the semi-annual period) throughout the project period including time periods during no-cost extensions,
 - b. One final report (due 90 days after project completion).
 - c. Federal Partners must submit reports to the Program Director, and State Partners must submit reports to both the Program Director and the appropriate NOAA Grants office.
- c) Program staff will conduct an initial assessment of the final report to ensure the report is complete in terms of reporting requirements. Program staff will serve as technical monitors to review submitted reports. NOAA staff also reviews the reports submitted via Grants Online.
- d) Reports shall be submitted using the following format:
 - a. Semi-Annual(s) – Progress Reports: (3-4 pages)
 - i. Title page - Project name, project dates (semi-annual period covered and complete project period), submitting Partner, and date.
 - ii. Objective
 - iii. Activities Completed – bulleted list by objective.
 - iv. Progress or lack of progress of incomplete activities during the period of semi-annual progress – bulleted list by objective.
 - v. Activities planned during the next reporting period.
 - vi. Metrics table
 - vii. Milestone Chart – original and revised if changes occurred during the project period.
 - b. Final Report:
 - i. Title page – Project name, project dates, submitting Partner, and date.

- ii. Abstract/Executive Summary (including key results)
 - iii. Introduction
 - iv. Procedures
 - v. Results:
 - 1. Description of data collected.
 - 2. The quality of the data pertaining to the objective of the project (e.g. representative to the scope of the project, quantity collected, etc.).
 - 3. Compiled data results.
 - 4. Summary of statistics.
 - vi. Discussion:
 - 1. Discuss the interpretation of results of the project by addressing questions such as, but not limited to:
 - a. What occurred?
 - b. What did not occur that was expected to occur?
 - c. Why did expected results not occur?
 - 2. Applicability of study results to Program goals.
 - 3. Recommendations/Summary/Metrics
 - vii. Summarized budget expenditures and deviations (if any).
- e) A project approved on behalf of a Program Committee will be required to follow the reporting requirements specified above. The principle investigator (if not the Chair of the Committee) will submit the report(s) to the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee for review and approval. The Committee Chair is responsible for submitting the required report(s) to the Program.
- f) Joint projects will assign one principle investigator responsible for submitting the required reports. The principle investigator will be identified within the project proposal. The submitted reports should be a collaborative effort between all partners involved in the joint project.
- g) Project recipients will provide all reports to the Program in electronic format.
- h) Partners who receive no-cost extensions must notify the Program Director within 30 days of receiving approval of the extension. Semi-annual and final reports will continue to be required through the extended grant period as previously stated.
- i) Partners that have not met reporting requirements for past/current projects may not submit a new proposal.

- j) A verbal presentation of project results may be requested. Partners will be required to submit copies of project specifications and procedures, software development, etc. to assist other Program Partners with the implementation of similar programs.

Programmatic review

Project reports will inform Partners of project outcomes. This will allow the Program as a whole to take advantage of lessons learned and difficulties encountered. Staff will provide final reports to the appropriate Committee(s). The Committees then can discuss the report(s) and make recommendations to modify the Data Collection Standards as appropriate. The recommendations will be submitted through the Program committee(s) review process.

BUDGET GUIDELINES & TEMPLATE FOR PROPOSALS

All applications must have a detailed budget narrative explaining and justifying the expenditures by object class. Include in the discussion the requested dollar amounts and how they were derived. A spreadsheet or table detailing expenditures is useful to clarify the costs (see template below). The following are highlights from the NOAA Budget Guidelines document to help Partners formulate their budget narrative. The full Budget Guidelines document is available at:

http://www.greateratlantic.fisheries.noaa.gov/ob/grants/budget_narrative_guidance-04.09.2015.pdf

Object Classes:

- a. Personnel: include salary, wage, and hours committed to project for each person by job title. Identify each individual by name and position, if possible.
- b. Fringe Benefits: should be identified for each individual. Describe in detail if the rate is greater than 35 % of the associated salary.
- c. Travel: all travel costs must be listed here. Provide a detailed breakdown of travel costs for trips over \$5,000 or 5 % of the award. Include destination, duration, type of transportation, estimated cost, number of travelers, lodging, mileage rate and estimated number of miles, and per diem.
- d. Equipment: equipment is any single piece of non-expendable, tangible personal property that costs \$5,000 or more per unit and has a useful life of more than one year. List each piece of equipment, the unit cost, number of units, and its purpose. Include a lease vs. purchase cost analysis. If there are no lease options available, then state that.

- e. Supplies: purchases less than \$5,000 per item are considered by the federal government as supplies. Include a detailed, itemized explanation for total supplies costs over \$5,000 or 5% of the award.
- f. Contractual: list each contract or subgrant as a separate item. Provide a detailed cost breakdown and describe products/services to be provided by the contractor. Include a sole source justification, if applicable.
- h. Other: list items, cost, and justification for each expense.
- i. Total direct charges
- j. Indirect charges: If claiming indirect costs, please submit a copy of the current approved negotiated indirect cost agreement. If expired and/or under review, a copy of the transmittal letter that accompanied the indirect cost agreement application is requested.
- k. Totals of direct and indirect charges

Example budget table template. Budget narrative should provide further detail on these costs.

Description	Calculation	Cost
Personnel (a)		
Supervisor	Ex: 500 hrs x \$20/hr	\$10,000
Biologist		
Technician		
Fringe (b)		
Supervisor	Ex: 15% of salary	\$1500
Biologist		
Technician		
Travel (c)		
Mileage for sampling trips	Ex: Estimate 2000 miles x \$0.33/mile	\$660
Travel for meeting		
Equipment (d)		
Boat	Ex: \$7000, based on current market research	\$7000
Supplies (e)		
Safety supplies		\$1200
Sampling supplies		\$1000
Laptop computers	2 laptops @\$1500 each	\$3000
Software		\$500


Contractual (f)		
Data Entry Contract	Ex: 1000 hrs x \$20/hr	\$20,000
Other (h)		
Printing and binding		
Postage		
Telecommunications charges		
Internet Access charges		
Totals		
Total Direct Charges (i)		
Indirect Charges (j)		
Total (sum of Direct and Indirect) (k)		

Appendix A: Ranking Criteria Spreadsheet for Maintenance and New Project

Ranking Guide – Maintenance Projects:

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort Biological Sampling	0 – 10 0 – 10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according priority matrices.
Bycatch/Species Interactions Social and Economic	0 – 6 0 – 4	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

Project Quality Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Multi-Partner/Regional impact including broad applications	0 – 5	Rank based on the number of Partners involved in project OR regional scope of proposal (e.g. geographic range of the stock).

> yr 2 contains funding transition plan and/or justification for continuance	0 – 4	Rank based on defined funding transition plan away from Program funding or viable justification for continued Program funding.
In-kind contribution	0 – 4	1 = 1% - 25% 2 = 26% - 50% 3 = 51% - 75% 4 = 76% - 99%
Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness	0 – 4	1 = Maintain minimum level of needed data collections  4 = Improvements in data collection reflecting 100% of related module as defined within the Program design. Metadata is provided and defined within proposal if applicable.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 3	Ranked based on additional module data collection and level of collection as defined within the Program design of individual module.
Impact on stock assessment	0 – 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved stock assessments.

Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness


Ranking Guide – Maintenance Projects: (to be used only if funding available exceeds total Maintenance funding requested)

Ranking Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Achieved Goals	0 – 3	Proposal indicates project has consistently met previous set goals. Current proposal provides project goals and if applicable, intermediate metrics to achieve overall achieved goals.

Data Delivery Plan	0 – 2	Ranked based if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.
Level of Funding	-1 – 1	-1 = Increased funding from previous year 0 = Maintained funding from previous year 1 = Decreased funding from previous year
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	-1 = Not properly prepared 1 = Properly prepared
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

Ranking Guide – New Projects:

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort Biological Sampling	0 – 10 0 – 10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according priority matrices.
Bycatch/Species Interactions Social and Economic	0 – 6 0 – 4	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

Project Quality Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Multi-Partner/Regional impact including broad applications	0 – 5	Rank based on the number of Partners involved in project OR regional scope of proposal (e.g. fisheries sampled).
Contains funding transition plan / Defined end-point	0 – 4	Rank based on quality of funding transition plan or defined end point.
In-kind contribution	0 – 4	1 = 1% - 25% 2 = 26% - 50% 3 = 51% - 75% 4 = 76% - 99%
Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness	0 – 4	1 = Maintain minimum level of needed data collections  4 = Improvements in data collection reflecting 100% of related module as defined within the Program design.

		Metadata is provided and defined within proposal if applicable.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 3	Ranked based on additional module data collection and level of collection as defined within the Program design of individual module.
	0 – 1	
Impact on stock assessment	0 – 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved stock assessments.

Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Innovative	0 – 3	Rank based on new technology, methodology, financial savings, etc.
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

Biological Sampling Priority Matrix

Created in February 2017
For FY2018

*Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information
on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.*

Biological Review Panel recommends:



- Species in the upper 25% of the priority matrix should be considered for funding.
- Sampling projects which cover multiple species within the upper 25% are highly recommended.

Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.

Biological Review Panel recommendations

based on matrix*:

* UPPER 25% OF MATRIX

New Species																
Species	Overfished	Overfishing	Most Recent Stock Assessment	Current/Next Stock Assessment	Council Priority	ASMFC Priority	State Priority	NMFES Priority	Fishery Managed	Sig. change in landings w/in 24 mo	Sig. change in mgmt w/in 24 mo	Adequacy of level of sampling	Stock Resilience	Seasonality of Fishery	TOTAL	
Atlantic halibut <i>Hippoglossus hippoglossus</i>	U	U	2015	2017	4.0	0	1.1	4.0	1	5	1	4	5	3	28.07	
Atlantic Smooth Dogfish <i>Mustelus canis</i>	N	N	2015		3.0	3	1.3	3.0	1	3	3	3	2	3	25.29	
American Eel <i>Anguilla rostrata</i>	Y	Y	2012	Update 2017	0.0	5	3.5	0.0	1	1	5	4	5	1	25.50	
American Lobster <i>Homarus americanus</i>	N	N	2015		0.0	5	2.6	3.0	1	1	3	3	4	1	23.57	
Atlantic Menhaden <i>Brevoortia tyrannus</i>	N	N	2015	Update 2017	0.0	5	2.1	3.0	1	1	5	2	3	1	23.14	
Black Sea Bass <i>Centropristis striata</i>	N: MA N:SA	N: MA N:SA	2016	2017	5.0	5	3.4	5.0	1	1	4	3	3	1	31.36	
Bluefin Tuna <i>Thunnus thynnus</i>	Y	N	2014	2017	0.0	0	1.6	5.0	1	5	5	3	3	1	24.64	
Blueline Tilefish <i>Caulolatilus microps</i>	N	Y	2013	Benchmark 2017	5.0	0	1.1	5.0	1	3	5	4	3	3	30.14	
Cobia <i>Rachycentron canadum</i>	N	N	2012	2020	5.0	4	1.4	3.0	1	1	3	4	3	3	28.36	
Dolphin <i>Coryphaena hippurus</i>	U	U			5.0	0	1.3	3.0	1	3	3	3	1	3	23.29	
Gag Grouper <i>Mycteroperca microlepis</i>	N	N	2014	2020	5.0	0	0.9	4.0	1	1	2	3	4	3	23.93	
Gray Triggerfish <i>Balistes capriscus</i>	U	U	2016		5.0	0	1.0	4.0	1	5	4	4	2	3	29.00	
Red Drum <i>Sciaenops ocellatus</i>	U	N	2017		1.0	5	1.2	1.0	1	5	0	3	3	3	23.21	
Red Grouper <i>Epinephelus morio</i>	Y	Y	2010	2017	5.0	0	1.0	4.0	1	1	0	4	4	3	23.00	
Red Snapper <i>Lutjanus campechanus</i>	Y	Y	2016		5.0	0	0.7	5.0	1	1	1	2	5	5	25.71	
Scamp <i>Mycteroperca phenax</i>	U	U		2020	5.0	0	0.9	3.0	1	1	3	4	4	3	24.86	
Snowy Grouper <i>Epinephelus niveatus</i>	Y	N	2013	2019	5.0	0	1.1	5.0	1	3	4	4	5	3	31.14	
Spanish Mackerel <i>Scomberomorus maculatus</i>	N	N	2012	2019	5.0	2	1.4	4.0	1	1	3	3	2	1	23.36	
Tilefish <i>Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps</i>	N: MA N:SA	N: MA Y:SA	2016		5.0	0	1.7	4.0	1	1	2	4	4	3	25.71	
Winter Flounder <i>Pleuronectes americanus</i>	Y: GB U: GOM Y: SNE/MA	Y: GB U: GOM Y: SNE/MA	2016	Update 2017	5.0	2	2.4	5.0	1	3	0	2	4	1	25.43	
Winter Skate <i>Raja ocellata</i>	N	Y	2016		4.0	0	0.9	3.0	1	5	1	3	5	1	23.86	

Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.

Bio-sampling Priority Matrix



		Biological Sampling Adequacy	
		Adequate (0 - 2)	Inadequate (3 - 5)
Averaged Priority Columns	High (≥ 3.0)	Winter Flounder	Black Sea Bass - Cobia - Spanish Mackerel
	Low (< 3.0)	Red Snapper - Atlantic Menhaden	Atlantic Halibut - Atlantic Smooth Dogfish - American Eel - American Lobster - Bluefin Tuna - Blueline Tilefish - Dolphin - Gag Grouper - Gray Triggerfish - Red Drum - Red Grouper - Scamp - Snowy Grouper - Tilefish - Winter Skate

Grouping of species in upper 25% of total matrix score, based on sampling adequacy and average priority (average of ASMFC, Council, NMFS and State priorities).

- Red Snapper and Atlantic Menhaden are being sampled adequately and have low priority so additional sampling is not needed.
- Projects that target multiple upper quartile species should be given a higher priority.

Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.

Bycatch Sampling Priority Matrix

Created in February 2017
For FY 2018

*Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information
on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.*

Top Quartile of Bycatch Matrix Suggestions

	<u>Sig. Change in mgmt w/in past 36 mo</u>	<u>Amt of reg discards</u>	<u>Amt of non reg discards</u>	<u>Prot Spp Interactions</u>	<u>Score</u>
<u>Combined Fleets</u>					
Mid-Atlantic Gillnet	3	4	2	5	14
Southeastern, Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico HMS Pelagic Longline	3	4	1	5	13
New England Extra-Large-Mesh Gillnet	0	4	2	5	11
South Atlantic shrimp Trawl	0	4	2	5	11
South Atlantic, black sea bass Pot	3	2	1	5	11
New England Otter Trawl	1	4	2	3	10
Mid-Atlantic Pound Net	1	4	2	3	10
American Lobster Pots - SNE	1	2	1	5	9
New England Gillnet	1	2	1	5	9
Mid-Atlantic Small-Mesh Otter Trawl, Bottom	1	4	1	3	9
South Atlantic Otter Trawl	0	4	2	3	9
Mid-Atlantic Eel Trap/Pot	1	2	1	5	9
New England Fish Pots and Traps	3	2	1	3	9
New England Floating Trap	1	2	1	5	9
South Atlantic Large Mesh Gillnet	0	4	2	3	9
Mid-Atlantic Bottom Longline	3	2	1	3	9
Southeast Calico Scallop Trawl	0	2	2	5	9
South Atlantic small mesh gillnet	1	2	1	5	9

Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.

Additional Fleets of Importance



- Mid-Atlantic Purse Seine: Menhaden
- HMS species, South Atlantic dealer data not included in Trips dataset
- Pelagic Longline Fleet reports via logbooks which are not in the Trips data
- Snapper Grouper H&L Fleet: volatile and have bycatch issues

Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.



Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

1050 N. Highland Street, Suite 200A-N | Arlington, VA 22201

703.842.0780 | 703.842.0779 (fax) | www.accsp.org

ACCSP Funding Prioritization of the Recreational Technical Committee

July 2017

The Recreational Technical Committee sets the recreational data collection priorities for inclusion in ACCSP's annual request for proposals (RFP). In 2017, the committee opted to use its Atlantic Coast Recreational Implementation Plan priorities as the recreational data priorities for ACCSP's annual funding process. The prioritized list of data needs, which were reviewed and approved by the ACCSP Coordinating Council, is provided below:

- 1. Improve precision (PSE) of MRIP catch estimates**
- 2. Comprehensive for-hire data collection and monitoring**
Improved recreational fishery discard and release data
- 4. Biological sampling for recreational fisheries separate from MRIP APAIS**
- 5. Improved spatial resolution and technical guidance for post-stratification of MRIP estimates**
- 6. Improved timeliness of recreational catch and harvest estimates**

Our vision is to be the principal source of fisheries-dependent information on the Atlantic coast through the cooperation of all program partners.



Atlantic Coastal Cooperative Statistics Program

1050 N. Highland Street, Suite 200A-N | Arlington, VA 22201
703.842.0780 | 703.842.0779 (fax) | www.accsp.org


This list includes dates for fiscal year 2018 in preparation for FY2019 funding. If you have any questions or comments on this calendar, please do not hesitate to contact Ali Schwaab, ACCSP Program Manager, at alexandra.schwaab@accsp.org.

March 1:	Start of ACCSP FY18
Week of April 30:	ASMFC Meeting/ACCSP Executive Committee Meeting and Coordinating Council Meeting; ACCSP issues request for proposals - Alexandria, VA
June 11:	Initial proposals are due
June 18:	Initial proposals are distributed to ACCSP Operations and Advisory Committees
Week of July 9:	Review of initial proposals for ACCSP Operations and Advisory Committees (webinar)
Week of July 23:	Feedback submitted to principal investigators
August 13:	Revised proposals due
August 20:	Revised proposals distributed to ACCSP Operations and Advisory Committees
Week of August 27:	Preliminary ranking exercise for Advisors (webinar)
September 24-25:	Annual Advisors and Operations Committee Joint Meeting (in-person; location TBD)

Our vision is to produce dependable and timely marine fishery statistics for Atlantic coast fisheries that are collected, processed, and disseminated according to common standards agreed upon by all program partners.

Ranking Guide – Maintenance Projects:

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort	0 – 10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according to priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0 – 10	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0 – 6	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according to priority matrices.
Social and Economic	0 – 4	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

Project Quality Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Multi-Partner/Regional impact including broad applications	0 – 5	Rank based on the number of Partners involved in project OR regional scope of proposal (e.g. geographic range of the stock).
> yr 2 contains funding transition plan and/or justification for continuance	0 – 4	Rank based on defined funding transition plan away from Program funding or viable justification for continued Program funding.
In-kind contribution	0 – 4	1 = 1% - 25% 2 = 26% - 50% 3 = 51% - 75% 4 = 76% - 99%
Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness	0 – 4	1 = Maintain minimum level of needed data collections  4 = Improvements in data collection reflecting 100% of related module as defined within the Program design. Metadata is provided and defined within proposal if applicable.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 3 0 – 1	Ranked based on additional module data collection and level of collection as defined within the Program design of individual module.
Impact on stock assessment	0 – 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved stock assessments.


Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Properly Prepared	-1–1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

Ranking Guide – Maintenance Projects: (to be used only if funding available exceeds total Maintenance funding requested)

Ranking Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Achieved Goals	0 – 3	Proposal indicates project has consistently met previous set goals. Current proposal provides project goals and if applicable, intermediate metrics to achieve overall achieved goals.
Data Delivery Plan	0 – 2	Ranked based if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.
Level of Funding	-1 – 1	-1 = Increased funding from previous year 0 = Maintained funding from previous year 1 = Decreased funding from previous year
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	-1 = Not properly prepared 1 = Properly prepared
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness

Ranking Guide – New Projects:

Primary Program Priority	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Catch and Effort	0 – 10	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according to priority matrices.
Biological Sampling	0 – 10	
Bycatch/Species Interactions	0 – 6	Rank based on range within module and level of sampling defined under Program design. When considering biological, bycatch or recreational funding, rank according to priority matrices.
Social and Economic	0 – 4	
Data Delivery Plan	+ 2	Additional points if a data delivery plan to Program is supplied and defined within the proposal.

Project Quality Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Multi-Partner/Regional impact including broad applications	0 – 5	Rank based on the number of Partners involved in project OR regional scope of proposal (e.g. fisheries sampled).
Contains funding transition plan / Defined end-point	0 – 4	Rank based on quality of funding transition plan or defined end point.
In-kind contribution	0 – 4	1 = 1% - 25% 2 = 26% - 50% 3 = 51% - 75% 4 = 76% - 99%
Improvement in data quality/quantity/timeliness	0 – 4	1 = Maintain minimum level of needed data collections  4 = Improvements in data collection reflecting 100% of related module as defined within the Program design. Metadata is provided and defined within proposal if applicable.
Potential secondary module as a by-product (In program priority order)	0 – 3	Ranked based on additional module data collection and level of collection as defined within the Program design of individual module.
	0 – 1	
Impact on stock assessment	0 – 3	Rank based on the level of data collection that leads to new or greatly improved stock assessments.

Other Factors	Point Range	Description of Ranking Consideration
Innovative	0 – 3	Rank based on new technology, methodology, financial savings, etc.
Properly Prepared	-1 – 1	Meets requirements as specified in funding decision document Step 2b and Guidelines
Merit	0 – 3	Ranked based on subjective worthiness