

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SHRIMP MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Hilton Bayfront and Virtual

St. Petersburg, Florida

November 4, 2024

VOTING MEMBERS

- 10 Chris Schieble (designee for Ryan Montegut).....Louisiana
- 11 Kesley Banks.....Texas
- 12 Billy Broussard.....Louisiana
- 13 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 14 Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
- 15 Michael McDermott.....Mississippi
- 16 Jason Osborne.....Mississippi
- 17 Anthony Overton.....Alabama
- 18 John Sanchez.....Florida
- 19 Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi
- 20 Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

- 23 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
- 24 J.D. Dugas.....Louisiana
- 25 Troy Frady.....Alabama
- 26 Tom Frazer.....Florida
- 27 LT Jackson Morton.....USCG
- 28 C.J. Sweetman(designee for Jessica McCawley).....Florida
- 29 Ed Walker.....Florida
- 30 Troy Williamson.....Texas

STAFF

- 33 Max Birdsong.....Social Scientist
- 34 Assane Diagne.....Economist
- 35 Matt Freeman.....Economist
- 36 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
- 37 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
- 38 Sarah Gardiner.....Fishery Biologist
- 39 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 40 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
- 41 Kathy Pereira.....Meeting Planner & Travel Coordinator
- 42 Ryan Rindone.....Lead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
- 43 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 44 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director
- 45 Camilla Shireman.....Administrative & Communications Assistant
- 46 Verena Wang.....Fishery Biologist

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

1 Kyle Dettloff.....NOAA
2 Dave Gloeckner.....NOAA
3 Tim Griner.....SAFMC
4 Frank Helies.....NOAA
5 Clay Porch.....SEFSC
6 John Walter.....SEFSC

7
8
9

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Motions.....
4
5 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of August 2024 Minutes..... 4
6
7 Action Guide and Next Steps..... 4
8
9 Draft Shrimp Framework Action: Modification of the Vessel Position
10 Data Collection Program for the Gulf of Mexico Shrimp Fishery.. 6
11
12 Adjournment 48

13
14 - - -
15
16
17
18

TABLE OF MOTIONS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

PAGE 36: Motion to adopt the language in Action 1, Alternative 1, per the IPT's recommendation. [The motion carried on page 36.](#)

PAGE 38: Motion to approve the revised language in Action 1, Alternative 3, with the recognition that the funding is currently unavailable. [The motion carried on page 41.](#)

PAGE 45: Motion to approve the following language in Action 1, Alternative 2. Alternative 2 is implement a vessel monitoring system (VMS) requirement for the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) shrimp fishery that provides, at a minimum, archived position data compatible with the SEFSC's shrimp effort algorithm to a NMFS server. If selected by the Science and Research Director (SRD), the owner or operator of a vessel with a Gulf shrimp moratorium permit (SPGM) would be required to install a type-approved VMS unit (50 CFR 600.1501). [The motion carried on page 48.](#)

- - -

1 The Shrimp Management Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery
2 Management Council convened at The Hilton Bayfront in St.
3 Petersburg, Florida on Monday morning, November 4, 2024, and was
4 called to order by Chairman Chris Schieble.
5

6 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**
7 **APPROVAL OF AUGUST 2024 MINUTES**
8 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**
9

10 **CHAIRMAN CHRIS SCHIEBLE:** I would like to call the Shrimp
11 Management Committee to order. The members of the committee are
12 myself, as the chair, Dr. Overton is the vice chair, Dr. Banks,
13 Mr. Broussard, Mr. Donaldson, Mr. McDermott, Mr. Osborne, Mr.
14 Geeslin, Mr. Sanchez, General Spraggins, and Mr. Strelcheck. All
15 committee members are present here today.
16

17 The first item on the agenda is the Adoption of the Agenda, Tab D
18 Number 1. Does anyone have any other business they would like to
19 add to the agenda? No other business. Is anyone opposed to
20 adopting the agenda as written? No opposition. The agenda is
21 adopted.
22

23 The next item is Approval of the August 2024 meeting minutes, Tab
24 D, Number 2. Are there any additions, deletions, or edits to those
25 minutes from the last meeting? Mr. Donaldson.
26

27 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** I noticed that my comments about the
28 commission overhead, when we were talking about that, on page 17,
29 that my comments were not audible. I mean, Dr. Frazer mentioned
30 it, in his comments, that it was 3 percent. Do we need to add
31 that, or is it okay as it is?
32

33 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** I wasn't sure what it meant by inaudible, when
34 I read that.
35

36 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** I'm sorry, and did you want us
37 to fix that in the minutes?
38

39 **MR. DONALDSON:** Well, I'm just asking. Do we need to fix that or
40 --
41

42 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMONS:** I think we should.
43

44 **MR. DONALDSON:** It's line 32 and 33 on page 17. Just state that
45 the commission takes about a 3 percent overhead rate.
46

1 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. With that addition, is anyone opposed
2 to adopting the minutes as written? No one opposed. The minutes
3 are adopted as presented in the briefing book, with the addition
4 from Mr. Donaldson, or correction from Mr. Donaldson. Next on the
5 agenda is the Action Guide, Tab D, Number 3. Dr. Freeman, can you
6 run us through that please?
7

8 **DR. MATT FREEMAN:** Certainly, Mr. Chair. The next agenda item is
9 the draft framework action. For this item, the committee will be
10 presented with an updated draft framework action to transition the
11 Gulf Shrimp fishery from the expired CELB to a new device
12 collecting vessel position data for the purpose of maintaining
13 effort estimation.
14

15 Staff will review draft alternatives as well as proposed changes
16 from the interdisciplinary planning team. Staff from the Southeast
17 Fisheries Science Center will then present information on
18 historical and current coverage of the Gulf shrimp fishery with
19 CELB devices, along with information on sample design and on cost
20 estimates to both industry and NMFS under Alternatives 2 and 3 in
21 the draft framework action.
22

23 The committee will also be provided with a brief update on the
24 number of valid and renewable permits for the federal Gulf Shrimp
25 fishery. The committee should ask questions, consider adopting
26 the proposed modifications to the alternatives, and provide staff
27 with further direction for the draft framework action.
28

29 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Dr. Freeman. I guess that leads us
30 into your presentation, correct?
31

32 **DRAFT SHRIMP FRAMEWORK ACTION: MODIFICATION OF THE VESSEL**
33 **POSITION DATA COLLECTION PROGRAM FOR THE GULF OF MEXICO SHRIMP**
34 **FISHERY**
35

36 **DR. FREEMAN:** Yes, sir. Okay. Bernie, can we go ahead to the
37 next slide? Perfect. So an outline, and we'll be reviewing the
38 purpose and need statements. Those have not changed since the
39 committee last saw the document.
40

41 Next, we'll discuss the proposed changes from the IPT to
42 Alternatives 2 and 3, review some of the differences between those
43 two alternatives, and then discuss a tentative timeline for
44 development of the document, and then, following my presentation,
45 we have a joint presentation from Dr. Gloeckner and Mr. Dettloff,
46 and so I can entertain questions during and at the end of my

1 presentation, but I would note that some of these -- Some questions
2 that may arise may be answered by the following presentation, and
3 so there may be certain things I defer to on.

4
5 Okay. Bernie, if we can move ahead. Like I said, this has not
6 changed from the last iteration. The purpose of the framework
7 action is to transition from the expired 3G cellular electronic
8 logbook program to a system that would maintain the council's and
9 NMFS' scientific ability to estimate and monitor fishing effort in
10 the Gulf shrimp fishery, while minimizing the economic burden on
11 the industry, to the maximum extent practicable.

12
13 The need is to base conservation and management measures on the
14 best scientific information available and to minimize bycatch, to
15 the extent practicable, as required by the Magnuson-Stevens
16 Fishery Conservation and Management Act and minimize interactions
17 with protected species, as required by the ESA.

18
19 Action 1, and this is a one-action document, for committee members
20 who have not seen this document before. Of note, the types of
21 data and the amount/timing of data collection would not vary
22 between alternatives, and so that's sort of the key point of that
23 particular note.

24
25 Moving forward into the next slide, Alternative 1, I'll note here
26 that we've got basically sort of like a track changes on, to
27 reflect the recommendations from the IPT, and, again, for the sake
28 of the public, as well as committee members, again, the composition
29 of the IPT is council staff, SERO staff, as well as Science Center
30 staff that participate in this discussion.

31
32 We have some strikethrough language here, removal of the sentence
33 that says, or portion of the sentence that says, "prior to November
34 7th, 2020, the owners or operators of selected vessels were
35 responsible for the cost of cellular service necessary to transmit
36 the data. Currently, because 3G transmission is no longer
37 possible." That portion is being removed.

38
39 If we move forward, the way I've sort of laid this out is sort of
40 in three slides for each of the three alternatives, showing what
41 the proposed changes are, a cleaned-up version, which is what this
42 next slide is, and then, if we move forward one more, for each of
43 the three alternatives, a rationale from the IPT.

44
45 The rationale for the proposed changes to Alternative 1 was not to
46 remove it completely from the document, but just recognizing that

1 what was contained there would really be more appropriate in the
2 discussion and/or in the economic analyses.

3
4 We move forward again, unless there's any questions, to Alternative
5 2. Here, noting some of the things that the IPT is recommending,
6 removing the word "cellular" from that first line, and so, in
7 essence, allowing for VMS that either uses cellular or satellite
8 transmission.

9
10 Looking a little bit further into that fourth line, removal of the
11 word "shrimp" from "vessel", and just to note that there are
12 vessels that operate in other fisheries, and so it would simply be
13 any vessel that holds that Gulf shrimp moratorium permit, and then,
14 lastly, adding some additional language, noting that, if satellite
15 VMS were to be utilized with a particular vessel, that data is
16 automatically transmitted, whereas, if it's cellular, that vessel
17 position data is archived and then transmitted when back within
18 cellular range.

19
20 Bernie, if we move forward, that shows the text with those changes
21 adopted, and then, if we move forward one more slide, the rationale
22 for each of those, and this has been documented in the draft
23 framework action before, but there are some vessels that hold a
24 SPGM permit that operate in other fisheries that require the
25 satellite VMS, and so, as a result, the IPT viewed it as being
26 burdensome to require those vessels to, in essence, have two VMS
27 devices onboard if we only allow for cellular, as well as then
28 having to pay two transmission fees, both cellular and satellite.

29
30 The IPT viewed this as allowing those owners and operators to have
31 a choice of which device they wanted, basically what they viewed
32 as being most cost efficient.

33
34 As I noted, the portion that referred to archived position data,
35 that was removed earlier in the alternative, as that would depend
36 on if cellular or satellite VMS is utilized, and so that reference
37 to the archived position data has been added, towards the end of
38 the alternative, specific to use of cellular VMS.

39
40 The next bullet point, removing the text of "shrimp" pertain to
41 the vessels as well as whether it's valid or renewable. Upon
42 feedback on the IPT, it was simply that was not needed to specify
43 that. Again, that's a matter of any owner or operator, of any
44 type of vessel that has a SPGM permit, could potentially be
45 selected by the Science and Research Director.

46

1 We did add one last bullet point, and, as I'm sure everyone is
2 aware, with the back-to-back hurricanes, we acknowledge that we
3 may have some slight additional wordsmithing of those last two
4 sentences, in terms of the cellular or satellite VMS and whether
5 it's archived or automatically transmitted, and so we just want to
6 sort of note that, that it is possible that in the next iteration,
7 there may be some additional minor wordsmithing there.

8
9 Moving forward to Alternative 3, I'll note here as well, in
10 discussions with the IPT, Alternative 2 may look like it was sort
11 of heavy-handed, in terms of strikethrough text as well as new
12 text. Alternative 3 was viewed, by the IPT, as sort of being the
13 industry-preferred, or industry-driven, alternative that we
14 received a lot of feedback on.

15
16 Alternative 3 was -- We tried not to do much tweaking to it, in
17 essence, and so, here, the changes are removing the words
18 "electronic logbook" and simply referring to it as a "VMS". We've
19 heard, from NMFS that, you know, you call it an ELB, but, at the
20 end of the day, it would still be, for all practical purposes, a
21 VMS device.

22
23 You'll notice here that we left that it's only cellular, and that's
24 because we have heard from industry, during AP meetings, that that
25 would be their preference, is to only allow for cellular, and so
26 we did tweak it for Alternative 2, to allow for cellular or
27 satellite, but, given that industry would prefer only cellular, we
28 left that language for Alternative 3.

29
30 Again, we removed the word "shrimp" with "vessel", as well as that
31 reference to valid or renewable for the SPGM permit, and then,
32 lastly, there was a motion, at the April meeting, that switched
33 from the non-OLE -- Well, actually it went from a NMFS server to
34 Science Center or Office of Science and Technology, and so, after
35 bringing that motion back to the IPT, and getting them to weigh-
36 in on it, it was decided that that was a little too prescriptive,
37 and so it would be better simply to state that it would be a NMFS
38 server that did not transmit that data directly to and be housed
39 by OLE, because, again, that was the main thing we were hearing
40 from industry, was, due to the nature of the data, and that it's
41 for the purpose of scientific data collection, rather than
42 enforcement, they didn't want OLE to be the one housing that
43 server.

44
45 Then the last sentence is simply just some slight wordsmithing,
46 and so it still retains the same context, but, rather than saying

1 what it's not going to be doing, simply saying that it would be
2 type approved through a process external to 50 CFR.

3
4 Bernie, if we can move forward, this would be the language of the
5 alternative with those track changes accepted, and, moving forward
6 one more time, this goes through the rationale, which I believe I
7 talked through as we looked at those track changes for Alternative
8 3.

9
10 Moving forward one more slide, this table is also new to the
11 document itself. It outlines some of the primary differences
12 between Alternatives 2 and 3. Again, this would be under the
13 impression that the IPT changes are approved by the committee and
14 the council. That's currently the way the discussion is worded
15 for the document, and so, in terms of the allowed data transmission
16 type, Alternative 2 would allow both cellular as well as satellite
17 transmission. It would be up to each vessel owner or operator to
18 decide what best suits them.

19
20 Alternative 3 would only allow for cellular. Alternative 2, the
21 data recipient would be a NMFS server, through the 50 CFR process,
22 and so, as it stands, that would go to NOAA OLE. Alternative 3
23 would send that data to a non-OLE NMFS server, with the asterisk,
24 and, again, this has been noted in previous iterations, that OLE
25 would still have access to that data, even if it's not housed
26 within OLE.

27
28 There is VMS device reimbursement available. Alternative 2,
29 because it would follow the national VMS process outlined in 50
30 CFR, they would be eligible, the owner-operators, to receive
31 reimbursement for the purchase of the VMS device. Alternative 3,
32 because that process would be external to 50 CFR, they would not
33 be eligible for reimbursement.

34
35 Then, lastly, the question of whether or not there would be
36 additional costs to NMFS, to the agency, from not utilizing the
37 existing 50 CFR process under Alternative 2, and, obviously,
38 because it's using 50 CFR, there would not be additional agency
39 costs, and then, with Alternative 3, because some of these
40 processes would, in essence, be duplicated, there would be
41 additional agency costs.

42
43 Those will be, as the document is filled out more, would be
44 detailed in Chapters 3 and 4, and, in the next presentation, Dr.
45 Gloeckner and Mr. Dettloff will be providing -- They'll be covering
46 that aspect in their presentation shortly as well, and so, Bernie,

1 if we can move forward one more slide.

2

3 The tentative timeline and next steps would be to bring the draft
4 framework action back to the council in January. We would like to
5 prepare Chapter 3 for that meeting, as well as discuss with the
6 IPT the preparations for Chapter 4. Ideally, we would have both
7 Chapters 3 and 4 for January. Like I said, that will be subject
8 to IPT discussion.

9

10 If Chapter 4 is prepared, the committee could consider selecting
11 their preferred alternative, based on those analyses, and then,
12 following Mr. Dettloff and Dr. Gloeckner's presentation, the
13 committee may want to consider a motion, or motions, and we can do
14 it individually per alternative, if you prefer, to adopt any or
15 all of IPT's recommendations for Alternatives 2 and 3.

16

17 Then, lastly, in addition to the regular Shrimp AP meeting that
18 would be held in March in 2025, where we discuss items like the
19 Texas closure, we would appreciate input on if the committee would
20 like an additional meeting convened for the Shrimp AP prior to the
21 January 2025 council meeting, if possible.

22

23 I'll note I sent, sort of in advance, a doodle poll, last Monday,
24 to the Shrimp AP, noting that I would be asking the committee if
25 that would be their preference, and I put forward some tentative
26 dates in December and January, to see their availability. I asked
27 that they fill that out by close of business this Wednesday, so
28 that I can report to the council, during the Shrimp Committee
29 report, the results.

30

31 I also sent out a reminder email yesterday to the AP of that, and
32 just to note that, as of now, of the fourteen AP members, we've
33 had nine respond and, several of those dates, all nine of those AP
34 members are available, and so it does seem likely that, if the
35 committee and council would like for us to hold a Shrimp AP
36 meeting, focused on this presentation, as well as the presentation
37 that Mr. Dettloff and Dr. Gloeckner are going to provide
38 momentarily, we would have potentially several dates that we could
39 select from to do that prior to the January meeting. I will stop
40 there and see if there's any questions or discussion.

41

42 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** All right. Thank you, Dr. Freeman. I don't
43 think I've seen that much red ink since the first draft of my
44 master's thesis, and so there's a lot going on here in this
45 document. We probably should work through this a little bit
46 carefully, and so does anybody have any questions so far? Mr.

1 Osborne.

2

3 **MR. JASON OSBORNE:** I'm just curious, and what's the opposition to
4 including satellite?

5

6 **DR. FREEMAN:** So we have heard the issue of costs that satellite
7 devices are more expensive. I would envision, putting on my
8 economist hat, that, unless a vessel is operating in a fishery
9 that requires it, I would assume people would select the cheaper
10 device, which currently appears to be cellular VMS.

11

12 As far as industry opposition, like I said, I think there's just
13 some concerns. I think there's potentially some concerns that, if
14 it's an option that maybe no cellular devices get approved, and
15 so, in essence, they may be sort of pigeonholed into only having
16 satellite VMS as options, and so I think that's just a concern
17 that industry faces.

18

19 **MR. OSBORNE:** So the theory being that camel's nose is under the
20 tent, and, if we add satellite now, then, later, we're going to
21 take away cellular?

22

23 **DR. FREEMAN:** Well, I wouldn't say that it would necessarily be
24 taking it away, but that simply there may not be any cellular
25 devices that get type-approved for them to select from. They could
26 still be type-approved, but whether or not they actually do get
27 type-approved, and that would be a concern.

28

29 I will add, as well, that, so far, as part of the Early Adopter
30 Program, where devices are being placed on vessels in the Gulf
31 with these type permits, all those devices, all three that they
32 can select from, are cellular VMS devices, and so I would assume
33 that would be a promising thing, that, if those are what's being
34 currently used in the Early Adopter Program, that those then would
35 be type-approved, should this move forward with Alternative 2,
36 where cellular and satellite are options.

37

38 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Yeah, Dr. Froeschke and then Mr. Strelcheck.

39

40 **DR. JOHN FROESCHKE:** Just the other thing is just the functionality
41 of how these work, where this is intended as a data collection
42 tool, and the cellular-based ones collect data all the time, but
43 they don't transmit it until you return nearshore, in a batch,
44 whereas the satellites would be continuously collecting and
45 transmitting that data in real-time, and, you know, that's a
46 functional difference that I think some shrimp fishery

1 participants have a preference on one way or the other.

2
3 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Strelcheck.

4
5 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** So, first, I wanted to voice support for the
6 alternatives and the changes that were made by the IPT. I guess
7 the one recommendation I have is on Slide 8, with the additional
8 red text that's being suggested.

9
10 I feel like that's more of an item that can be included in the
11 discussion section of the action and alternatives, rather than
12 actually including it directly in the alternative, and so I would
13 want to, obviously, hear the council's perspective on that. I
14 know we're trying to kind of make it front and center, for the
15 industry to understand what would be required or not and how that
16 data would be transmitted.

17
18 In terms of the change to from cellular to just vessel monitoring
19 systems, right, and so, like Matt said, and I think he said it
20 well, and I think it's an economic decision here, right, but this
21 provides some additional flexibility, actually, to the industry,
22 in terms of the types of units they could choose from. We have,
23 right now, 1,360, approximately, shrimp permits. Of those, 465
24 have other permits, and, of those, 113 are required to carry some
25 sort of VMS currently.

26
27 Now, the VMS currently is satellite, for either reef fish or rock
28 shrimp. They could choose to use that for meeting their Gulf
29 requirements. Economically, it might be more expensive for them
30 to meet their Gulf requirements by using that, and so they might
31 choose to get these cellular-based VMS onboard their boat, and
32 have two VMS devices, but, to me, this is just a flexibility
33 measure.

34
35 Then, in terms of the concerns that were shared about the industry,
36 you know, concerned about, well, what if cellular devices aren't
37 approved, or if they go away, and I think we can demonstrate,
38 through our intent, that our goal here is to provide as cheap of
39 devices as possible for them to utilize and meet our goals and
40 objectives for data collection, and so, going forward, that is
41 going to continue to be our intent, and goal, to continue to
42 maintain cellular devices, and, if that changes, for some reason,
43 we could be back at this table discussing what changes need to be
44 made to the program at that stage.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Any further

1 questions? Mr. Sanchez.

2

3 **MR. JOHN SANCHEZ:** I think this framework made a lot of substantial
4 track changes, from these recommendations from the IPT, and I, for
5 one, would feel a lot better if we let the Shrimp AP weigh-in.
6 Does anybody know if they're available, as a group, to meet before
7 January so we can get some feedback from them before we proceed
8 down this road with all these changes?

9

10 **DR. FREEMAN:** Yes, sir. So the doodle poll that I sent out last
11 Monday was in anticipation that the committee may like some
12 feedback from the AP on these proposed changes. Tentatively, what
13 we may wind up doing is providing a presentation, similar to what
14 I've got today, along with the presentation from Dr. Gloeckner and
15 Mr. Dettloff as well, and we have dates proposed for December and
16 in January, both months of which would occur before the council
17 next meets, and it appears, so far, that we would have a quorum
18 for dates in both months, and so we could certainly accommodate
19 getting feedback from the AP before the council next sees the
20 document.

21

22 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Sanchez.

23

24 **MR. SANCHEZ:** That would be my preference, and, you know, we could
25 wait until Full Council maybe, and make a collective decision, or,
26 if we need a motion for no action until the Shrimp AP weighs-in on
27 this, I would be glad to make that now, if that's necessary.

28

29 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Go ahead, Dr. Freeman.

30

31 **DR. FREEMAN:** So I will note one thing, just for consideration,
32 is, if the committee wants to wait until AP feedback to consider
33 adopting any of these changes, versus potentially adopting some or
34 all of these changes and then receiving AP feedback, is it would
35 delay development of the document, because the IPT would need to
36 wait to see what the committee has determined.

37

38 So, you know, if the committee directs the IPT to work forward on
39 Chapters 3 and 4, with language as it stands, we could certainly
40 do that, you know, or, if you want to adopt some of it, and wait
41 on some of it until there's AP feedback, but we would certainly
42 need some direction, in terms of preparing the document, you know,
43 and consider how that may affect the action schedule.

44

45 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay, and so, for development of Chapter 3 and
46 4, you need the council committee, at Full Council, to really

1 decide if we are going to move forward with this language, as
2 drafted, with the IPT edits, right, but the Shrimp AP could still
3 subsequently meet at that point, and make recommendations, or a
4 motion from them to the council, for adjusting language.

5
6 How much would that change the timeline on this? I know, you know,
7 we've been batting this around for three years now, or more, and
8 there's some urgency to try to accomplish this, because of the
9 biological opinion, and where we're at with the timeline on that,
10 and I know Dave probably doesn't want to continue dealing with
11 retrieving chip cards forever from the fleet, and so we've got to
12 kind of move on this.

13
14 If the timeline currently is to go final by April, with that course
15 of action, would that still be possible, or are we looking at a
16 June final then?

17
18 **DR. FREEMAN:** So if -- Whatever analyses the IPT does for the
19 January meeting, if the language of the alternatives does not
20 change at the January meeting, I think we could be on track for
21 April. However, if the language of the alternatives changes in
22 January, then analyses would have to be redone. If I had to hazard
23 a guess, I would say that would push us back one meeting, and
24 hopefully not two, but, obviously, again, Chapters 3 and 4 would
25 have to reflect any updates of the language of the alternatives.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay, and so, if there were changes,
28 theoretically, we could skip the April meeting with the Shrimp
29 Committee and go to the June meeting then for final. Is that the
30 potential?

31
32 **DR. FREEMAN:** So, if I'm following correctly, you're saying, if
33 the language were to change in January, and I would have to think
34 about that. I'm looking at Dr. Simmons, just because I'm trying
35 to think about the impacts, in terms of what the public hearing
36 draft would look like, given that the analyses contained would
37 have to be updated.

38
39 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Does it get a public hearing draft?

40
41 **DR. FREEMAN:** Sorry. Could you say that again?

42
43 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Does it get a public hearing draft?

44
45 **DR. FREEMAN:** Well, I guess, sorry, and to receive public feedback.

46

1 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Well, I mean, I think we want stable
2 alternatives, so that we can draft the rest of the document, and
3 I think we're just spinning our wheels, and wasting resources,
4 until we get some solid alternatives that the AP and the council
5 is comfortable with, and I think, right now, I guess there's a
6 disconnect in that, and we've got to get that sorted out. Until
7 then, we're just wasting our time, I think.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Geeslin and then Mr. Strelcheck.

10
11 **MR. DAKUS GEESLIN:** I guess, back to Mr. Sanchez's point, these
12 are -- I don't know if these changes coming out of the IPT are
13 typical or not, but they strike me as certainly significant. I
14 think we would be remiss not to circle back and hear from the AP,
15 at least get their take on where the -- I've got to believe they
16 put a lot of thought, and effort, into developing these
17 alternatives. We've got a lot of changes here. I think before -
18 - If John made the motion, I would support it. I would like to
19 hear from the AP before we move forward with this.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Mr. Geeslin. I agree with
22 that. I think, you know, at this point, the makeup of the AP has
23 now changed. We've populated that with some new members, that
24 have not really had a chance to see all this, or go through this
25 process, for the past three years, and so it probably would be
26 good for them to get a view on this, at least a review, and maybe
27 get up-to-speed on all of that and potentially give us some
28 feedback on the language changes as well. Mr. Strelcheck and then
29 Mr. Donaldson.

30
31 **MR. STRELCHECK:** So I'll be brutally honest. I'm always supportive
32 of industry input, right, but most of you are either appointed to
33 make tough decisions or you're representing your state to make
34 tough decisions, and we continue to go around this table, with so
35 many of our issue, and kick the can down the road, and, what we
36 were shown today, I'm proud of what the staff has done.

37
38 We've empowered our staff to try to bring input back to us. They're
39 the ones working on this 365 days a year. We're working on this,
40 you know, every council meeting, right, and they provided, I think,
41 a lot of great input.

42
43 It does not, in my view, change any of the intent of what we were
44 considering months ago, with the exception of the change from
45 cellular to all VMS units, right, and so I don't understand what
46 we're going to get out of an advisory panel, at this point, that

1 we don't already know, that isn't already in front of us to make
2 a decision.

3
4 It seems like the edits are actually fairly straightforward, and
5 we can either agree with them, or disagree with them, or tweak
6 them, and then have the team move forward with January, and, if we
7 want to get input from AP at that point, great. If we want to
8 wait until after January, when we select preferreds, great, but
9 let's move some things forward.

10
11 This has been lingering for a long period of time, and I'm just
12 not convinced we're going to get a lot of new information from the
13 advisory panel that we haven't already heard, and we really haven't
14 dramatically changed things, based on the edits to the
15 alternatives.

16
17 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Mr.
18 Donaldson.

19
20 **MR. DONALDSON:** Thank you. I appreciate the industry's concerns
21 about this, and my biggest concern, as you pointed out, Mr. Chair,
22 is we were tasked with collecting the tickets, or the chips, for
23 about a year, and we're going on year-four now, and I'm concerned
24 about dragging this out.

25
26 However, I understand there's a lot of consternation within the
27 industry, and, if we could have an AP meeting prior to the January
28 council meeting, I think that might be a good approach, but I would
29 really like to be able to take final action in April.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Dave. I guess this question may be
32 more for Mara, or anybody over there, but, in the rulemaking
33 process, if this were to go final in April, when would the actual
34 implementation possibly take place for this action? Like 2026, is
35 I'm guessing?

36
37 **MR. STRELCHECK:** The Science Center will be up here to present
38 here after lunch, and so we can talk more about this, but, you
39 know, rulemaking typically takes six-plus months. We need,
40 obviously, some time for vessels then to acquire the devices and
41 have them installed on the vessels, and so we are going to be into,
42 obviously, 2026 at that point. When exactly, I can't really say
43 for certain.

44
45 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, and so maybe an additional
46 two or three months wouldn't really, you know, break the bank.

1 Dr. Froeschke.
2
3 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Just a follow-up on that. Would the type-approval
4 process have to occur prior to us implementing this, or could it
5 be perceived as-is?
6
7 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Sorry, and we were doing a sidebar conversation,
8 but, between the time the council takes final action and when final
9 rulemaking is completed, and I believe that's how we've done it in
10 the past, where we've worked on the type-approval process, so that,
11 when the final rule is implemented, those devices are available
12 for use. It doesn't mean that other devices can't be approved
13 thereafter, but we would want to provide a set list that could be
14 purchased under the reimbursement program.
15
16 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Any further questions, or comments?
17 Mr. Sanchez, are you prepared to make a motion now, or would you
18 rather hold off until Full Council?
19
20 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I make a motion that we have no action until the AP
21 convenes and gives us some direction on these items, and then
22 hopefully it doesn't reduce the timeliness of, you know, bringing
23 this thing to a landing too much, but we've waited this long, and
24 let's get it right. This industry is on the ropes, and I would
25 like to give them that opportunity, and so I make a motion for no
26 action.
27
28 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Second from --
29
30 **MR. OSBORNE:** Just for clarification, if you're saying that -- If
31 we're demanding that we can't make an action until the AP meets,
32 what if the AP can't meet until after April?
33
34 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** We could just add "or the January meeting" to
35 the motion, right?
36
37 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Sorry?
38
39 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Just add "or take action at the January
40 meeting" to the motion, correct?
41
42 **MR. SANCHEZ:** You know, the way I see it, until we hear from the
43 AP, I don't -- I don't feel comfortable moving forward. There's
44 been substantial changes, and I would really like their feedback,
45 and so I don't have a crystal ball.
46

1 I'm assuming we're going to have a January meeting. We heard
2 there's a doodle poll indicating the AP will be able to gather in
3 a quorum, but, you know, who knows, and we might have another nine
4 hurricanes from here to then, and I don't know.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Simmons.

7
8 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so I
9 apologize. I was trying to get my hand up before the motion got
10 on the board, but we do have another presentation that we haven't
11 gotten to yet, and so I don't know if you're willing to entertain
12 -- If we could wait until we get through that presentation after
13 lunch, and then we circle back to this motion, at least, so we get
14 the whole picture for shrimp right now.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Would you be okay with that, Mr. Sanchez, if
17 we table this until after the presentation?

18
19 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I'm not opposed. I'll be happy to bring it up then.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay.

22
23 **MR. J.D. DUGAS:** All right. Thank you, Mr. Schieble. We're going
24 to take our break and reconvene, after lunch, at 1:40.

25
26 (Whereupon, the meeting recessed for lunch on November 4, 2024.)

27
28 - - -

29
30 November 4, 2024

31
32 MONDAY AFTERNOON SESSION

33
34 - - -

35
36 The Shrimp Management Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery
37 Management Council reconvened at The Hilton Bayfront in St.
38 Petersburg, Florida on Monday afternoon, November 4, 2024, and was
39 called to order by Chairman Chris Schieble.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** I would like, at this point, to call the Shrimp
42 Committee back to order, and we have a more item on the action
43 guide, correct, and the presentation, and is that right, Dr.
44 Freeman?

45
46 **DR. FREEMAN:** Yes, sir, and so the next presentation was included

1 in that first action guide items, and so I believe Mr. Dettloff is
2 to start off first with the presentation.

3
4 **MR. KYLE DETTLOFF:** Okay. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Kyle
5 Detloff. I'm a statistician at the Southeast Fisheries Science
6 Center, and I'm going to be giving the first-half of this
7 presentation on survey design and estimated cost for position
8 recording devices in the Gulf of Mexico shrimp fleet, and then
9 Dave will be giving the second-half of the presentation, on more
10 of the cost considerations.

11
12 A brief history of the original vessel selection for units selected
13 by LGL to carry ELB units. The original sampling frame was shrimp
14 vessels permitted to fish in Gulf of Mexico federal waters as of
15 December 31st, 2004, and those that reported landings in either
16 2003 or 2004, which was a total of 2,104 vessels, and so,
17 ultimately, over the course of that program, between 2005 and 2013,
18 577 vessels had transmitted some kind of effort data.

19
20 The stratification was done geographically across nine zones,
21 based on port, and so the majority of landings, for any given
22 vessel that came from a given port, that vessel was assigned to
23 that geographic region of the nine. Five out of those nine zones
24 were further stratified into ice and freezer vessels, for the five
25 that had a significant number of both of those types of boats, and
26 so those five strata split into two, for ten, plus four, for the
27 remaining total of fourteen strata.

28
29 The number of samples within each stratum was based on the
30 proportion of total offshore landings that had occurred in 2003
31 and 2004, with twice the amount of weight assigned to the 2004
32 landings, and so the vessels that would not participate in the
33 original random selection were replaced with an alternate
34 randomly-selected vessel, and so the intent of the selection was
35 to be random, although there were cases where vessels could opt
36 out.

37
38 Then, if problems physically arose at the dock, with installation
39 of vessel of units on one of the randomly-selected vessels, the
40 workers would seek out another volunteer vessel that happened to
41 be around to complete their installations for the day, and so the
42 selection by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center that was
43 conducted in 2014, when the program was taken over from LGL,
44 followed the similar stratification, geographic logic based on the
45 nine ports, weighted according to landings, just without the ice
46 and freezer component. I think that was removed.

1
2 In 2014, there were 500 vessels initially selected, followed by
3 100 additional vessels selected in 2018, and that totaled to be
4 about 40 percent of the permitted fleet.

5
6 The current state of vessel coverage, as of October 2024, the Gulf-
7 wide coverage, based on valid and renewable SPGM permits, is 32
8 percent, or 397 boats, out of 1,257 vessels with a valid or
9 potentially renewable permit. In 2023, we received effort data on
10 chips from 27 percent of the active vessels, or 176 vessels, out
11 of 651 vessels, that reported shrimp landings offshore.

12
13 This receipt of data is down substantially from pre-2020 loss of
14 3G, when we were getting closer to 60 percent coverage of the
15 active offshore fleet, and we're now down closer to about 30
16 percent of the active fleet that we're actually receiving chips
17 from.

18
19 The current effort estimation methodology, based on the current
20 data collection, relies on these assumptions, because we're
21 working with a subset of the fleet, and we're also classifying
22 effort from ten-minute pings, with some need to classify that as
23 either effort or non-effort steaming, transiting behavior,
24 whatever else there may be, and so the first two assumptions relate
25 to the classification of the actual effort on vessels with units.

26
27 Number one is that the devices are, and that should say
28 "capturing", actually, and not "representative", and so they're
29 capturing all fishing activity for any given vessel, meaning that
30 we're assuming that the unit is on and transmitting at all times.
31 We're assuming there's no systematic bias in the classification of
32 effort, that we're neither over-classifying or under-classifying
33 what is actually trawling effort, based on the ten-minute pings,
34 and Assumptions 3 through 5 relate to the need to scale what we do
35 classify as effort from vessels with boxes up to the fleet as a
36 whole, based on landings.

37
38 The assumptions necessary for that are that the catch per unit
39 effort of vessels with ELBs onboard is representative of the total
40 fleet, that the spatial distribution of ELB vessels is
41 representative of the total fleet within the strata at which the
42 estimates are being scaled up, and, finally, that reporting of
43 landings is similar between ELB and non-ELB vessels, meaning that
44 people with both with and without ELBs are equally likely to report
45 their landings on a trip ticket.

46

1 Like I mentioned, those Assumptions 3 through 5, those would be
2 eliminated under a census, because we would be getting a complete
3 picture of the actual effort of the fleet from boxes, without any
4 need to rely on the landings to scale.

5
6 Looking into some of these assumptions, particularly notable here
7 is the divergence you see in the two lines beginning in 2021, when
8 we transitioned over to chip collection for the effort. This is
9 a figure that's showing, in the red line, the proportion of vessels
10 that only report landings in one-half of the year or the other,
11 and so only January to June, or only July through December.

12
13 It has hovered around 10 percent, and maybe taking up slightly,
14 closer to 20 in 2022, but the divergence from the red and the blue
15 lines is indicative of the fact that we may not be receiving
16 complete effort data from the chips, being that there's two
17 collections throughout the year, and we are potentially only
18 receiving one of those chips back for the vessels, resulting in a
19 higher proportion of vessels that are reporting effort only for
20 the first half of the year, or only for the second half of the
21 year, in relation to the number that are doing that for landings.

22
23 Looking into the spatial and temporal representation of vessels
24 with ELB units, the general conclusions are that the percentage of
25 landings, as reported by area, quadrimester, being the year divided
26 into three chunks of four months, and species have generally
27 remained constant through modern time, 2014 through 2022. The ELB
28 proportional coverage has remained relatively steady through time.

29
30 Even though the overall receipt of effort has declined, the
31 proportion coverage across the Gulf, in space and time, has
32 remained relatively steady, and there is fairly consistent
33 representation of ELB landings by time of the year, meaning that
34 the vessels with ELBs are reporting landings in similar proportion,
35 when divided out by the three four-month periods, as vessels
36 without ELBs.

37
38 What we did find is that Area 3, and I'm going to show a map of
39 these areas on the next slide, but that's Stat Zones 9 through 14,
40 which is Alabama, Mississippi, and eastern Louisiana, is generally
41 underrepresented by ELB units, in relation to Areas 4 and 5, and
42 so that is generally underrepresenting white shrimp, in relation
43 to brown shrimp, partially -- Probably a lot of that is due to
44 where, in relation to depth, distance offshore, the offshore,
45 further offshore, fleet is potentially overrepresented in ELB
46 units, compared to the more inshore, nearshore white shrimp fleet.

1
2 We see that pink shrimp, in the Tortugas, is generally well
3 represented, ELB versus non-ELB, and so, the scaling-up process we
4 have currently for the effort estimation procedure, it accounts
5 for this unequal representation among these coarse scale strata,
6 but still, fine-scale within strata, we're having to assume that
7 the ELB fleet is representative of the total fleet.

8
9 These are just the five aggregate areas I mentioned that we're
10 using landings to scale effort. This was based on a cluster
11 analysis of which stat zones are generally encompassed on any given
12 trip, because these trips span multiple stat zones, and we're only
13 getting a single stat zone reported on a trip ticket, and so it's
14 necessary to aggregate in this way to get a picture of where the
15 activity may have actually been occurring throughout the duration
16 of an entire trip.

17
18 Digging into the equal CPUE assumption for ELB versus non-ELB
19 vessels, one way to look at that is to look at the average number
20 of nets, based on the annual landings and gear survey that's
21 conducted once a year, and it's sent to the entire fleet, and any
22 given vessel will report the number of nets that they are fishing
23 with for that year, or at least the most common number of nets
24 they're using to fish, either two or four, and, averaging those
25 numbers out between the ELB and non-ELB fleet, we see that the ELB
26 fleet is consistently fishing with a greater number of nets than
27 the non-ELB, closer to 3.75 ELB, versus 3.25 non-ELB, suggesting
28 that that equal CPUE assumption is being violated.

29
30 As you would expect, a higher CPUE with a higher number of nets,
31 and so we're in violation of that one a bit, and that is to be
32 expected, based on how the sample was originally selected, being
33 weighted toward those vessels with the greatest number of landings.

34
35 If we were to select a sample today, out of the current 1,257 SPMG
36 active or renewable permits, which is that red-dashed line at the
37 top, and we look back at vessels that have actually reported trip
38 ticket landings cumulatively back in time, based on looking back
39 as far as 2014, within the last ten years, only 86 percent of those
40 vessels have actually reported landings through the trip ticket
41 program at some point. If we look at just 2023, that proportion
42 is lower, and then the years are counting back like that, because
43 each one is an additional year, looking back in time.

44
45 If we look back at both 2022 and 2023 data, the proportion would
46 be slightly higher, and so forth, all the way back to 2014, but

1 the point of this figure is that, even if we're looking all the
2 way back to 2014, and using the trip ticket landings data that we
3 would be using as a sampling frame to select a sample, we still
4 would not have complete data for the entire fleet that we would be
5 selecting from, either due to potentially latent permits, or simply
6 nonreporting, or incorrect vessel ID. It could be any or all of
7 those issues going on there.

8
9 Among the 171 vessels that have not reported any landings since
10 2014, but do have a currently active permit, 92 percent of those
11 vessels have never held an ELB, meaning the assumption that we are
12 getting landings to be equally likely to be reported by ELB
13 vessels, non-ELB vessels, is probably not being met, based on that
14 92% figure there. It appears that the ELB fleet, for whatever
15 reason, is more likely to be reporting their landings through trip
16 tickets, which is a critical assumption for the scaling to the
17 fleet.

18
19 So, for conclusions, we are -- Ever since the end of 3G, the
20 increase in partial year effort data we've been receiving, relative
21 to partial year landings, indicates we are likely not receiving
22 complete chip data within any given year, which would cause effort
23 estimates to be biased downward.

24
25 That's partially what's driving the much lower estimates we've
26 seen in the past couple of years. Also, ELB coverage has remained
27 relatively constant through time across strata, but some of those
28 strata are not proportionally represented in a current sample, and
29 so this representativeness could be addressed, at least at an
30 instant in time, with a new sample, but that sample is only valid
31 at the time of selection and may not remain valid into the future.

32
33 Another complication with that is that the sample would only be
34 drawn based on the 86 percent of vessels with valid permits that
35 have actually reported landings in the past ten years, allowing us
36 to inform some type of selection, and then, finally, the equal
37 CPUE assumption, based on the number of nets and the equal
38 likelihood of reporting landings, Assumptions 4 and 5, there's
39 also evidence that those are likely not being met, with both of
40 those things potentially biasing effort estimates downward.

41
42 A new sample could potentially alleviate the issue of unequal CPUE,
43 if there were no weighting done upfront, but the fact that vessels,
44 for whatever reason, with ELB units may be more likely to report
45 landings would remain a critical problem, in terms of using
46 landings to-scale.

1
2 To mitigate these issues, a census would be the most
3 scientifically-defensible data collection approach. All vessels
4 would be part of the selection process, the picture of effort you
5 get, and the heat map would be the heat map, and there would be no
6 need to scale at these, using landings at a much coarser level.
7 You would be able to take advantage of the entire fine-scale ELB
8 data fleet-wide and not have to rely on landings data.

9
10 Also, speeding up the availability of effort estimates when we're
11 getting data, effort data, in real time, rather than producing
12 large delays, based on final trip ticket landings to become
13 available to generate estimates for the next year.

14
15 It would provide complete spatial coverage that is representative
16 in space, representative in time. The issue of potentially over-
17 representing brown shrimp offshore, and under-representing white
18 shrimp inshore, that would be eliminated, and, as an additional
19 benefit, it would help to determine the number of permits that are
20 latent, versus those that simply aren't reporting trip ticket
21 landings, or other reasons that we're not able to find a match in
22 the landings data.

23
24 This recommendation was also the primary recommendation of the
25 Center of Independent Experts review of the shrimp effort
26 estimation methodology, based on their review that we received
27 earlier this year, and so, at this point, I'm going to turn it
28 over to Dave to get in more of the cost estimates.

29
30 **DR. DAVID GLOECKNER:** Thanks, Kyle. I'm Dave Gloeckner. I'm the
31 Division Director for Statistics at the Center, and I'll be
32 covering some of the cost estimates that we generated.

33
34 Just to go over how we determined some of the industry costs, we've
35 got three units in the Early Adopter Program, the Zen VMS, which
36 costs \$1,095, with cellular service at \$99 a year, the Nemo VMS,
37 at \$574 a year, or total for the unit, and then \$175 a year for
38 the cellular service. The Boat Command was \$199 for the unit and
39 \$179 a year for the cell service.

40
41 Some of our cost assumptions, we use the middle value of the unit
42 and cell service to generate costs, and so, for the devices, we
43 had \$199, \$574, and \$1,095, and so we used the middle value of
44 \$574. For the annual cellular service, we had \$99 a year, \$175 a
45 year, \$179 a year, and we used \$175 for our estimates. The annual
46 installation cost was estimated at \$300, or the initial estimation

1 cost.

2
3 Total cost to the industry will be lower for any Early Adopter
4 units that are approved under Alternative 2, and so discussion
5 with vendors indicates they all intend to submit these for fishery-
6 specific type-approval. This assumes all vessels will eventually
7 be selected, and will need a unit, either in the initial sample or
8 subsequent resampling. We're calculating costs on all permitted
9 vessels, so this mimics a census approach over time.

10
11 The industry costs, total costs were based on current active
12 permits. Costs will be less if owners select a lower-cost option,
13 other than the middle value that we chose. Alternative 2 is the
14 VMS system. This would offer device cost reimbursement, through
15 the NMFS VMS program. When utilizing the reimbursement program,
16 cellular VMS devices are reimbursed at up to \$950 per unit, and
17 satellites at \$3,100, but, if we have cellular and satellite both
18 allowed, the reimbursement would choose the lesser of the two, and
19 so that would be \$950 a unit. Next slide.

20
21 The industry costs end up being, for the first year, \$500,175,
22 and, for Alternative 3, the punchline there is \$1,104,597 for that
23 first year. We've got two main categories of costs for the center,
24 census versus subsampling and VMS system versus a duplicate VMS
25 system at the center.

26
27 Census versus subsampling, the census approach will have lower
28 costs. It doesn't need a survey statistician to oversee the design
29 of resampling, and so that's around \$250,000 a year. Building a
30 VMS-like system at the center would increase costs to operate and
31 maintain the system. Most of that cost is IT-specific, the
32 increased costs to operate a help desk, contracting, type-approval
33 process, data sharing, data interface, and secure transmission,
34 and so the cost slides have the following caveats, based on FTEs,
35 and so hiring IT contractors can be much more, and a portion of
36 the costs are required to maintain a system, once developed.

37
38 As far as the VMS-like monitoring additional costs, so our
39 strategic plans at the DOC, NOAA, and NMFS level emphasize
40 enterprise-level data management systems and eliminating
41 duplicative or stovepipe data systems.

42
43 The additional costs and considerations that were elaborated by
44 the VMS program was VMS legal staff authorizes requests for data
45 access and dissemination to the VMS data, and so, right now, we
46 don't do that. VMS utilizes forms for all requests that are

1 reviewed by OLE GC, and so, for example, state law enforcement,
2 under JEA, could obtain access, similar to NOAA OLE, but a state
3 manager access would require a review for applicability under MSA,
4 and so a VMS-like system would incur additional costs to us for
5 that legal review, at around \$30,000 a year.

6
7 The center also would need to increase its Federal Information
8 Security Modernization Act compliance and privacy impact
9 assessment levels, government mandates that are based on the type
10 of data collection, or the type of data collected and stored in a
11 data system owned by the government. One-time costs may take up
12 to a year to implement, depending on how complex it ends up being,
13 at around \$200,000 for that year.

14
15 Additional costs, a little bit more specific, would require
16 creation of a graphical user interface, or a GUI, for use by Office
17 of Law Enforcement, Coast Guard, and state JEA. 16 USC allows for
18 access to data with or without a warrant or other process from
19 vessel monitoring systems for any officer who is authorized to
20 enforce the regs. There are considerable costs to the center, as
21 it requires security measures, data transmission, and summary
22 reporting and graphic depictions, and so we estimate around
23 \$300,000 to start up and \$100,000 a year in maintenance.

24
25 We also have to hire a help desk staff. This assists with unit
26 activation, and so, if a unit is registered, and showing in our
27 system associated with permit and vessel, we have to check all
28 that and work with vendors on any software upgrades over time, as
29 security standards change, work with fishermen to troubleshoot a
30 failing unit, and assist with data requests. The estimated cost
31 for this is around \$250,000 a year, and so potentially increasing
32 costs in years that require a software upgrade to keep up with the
33 secure transmissions.

34
35 We also have a device type-approval that we'll have to implement,
36 and so type approvals are by fishery, for those fishery
37 requirements. The approval can only happen after the requirement
38 is final. The vendor must request a type-approval for each
39 fishery. The cost incurred per unit from a vendor is \$30,000 to
40 \$60,000 per unit on VMS programs.

41
42 VMS utilizes a contractor for all type-approvals. Under
43 Alternative 3, we would make -- The Southeast Center would need to
44 develop their own process and create their own contract that
45 duplicates an existing government contract, in essence paying
46 twice for the same work. This may not meet standards for our

1 government contracting but, if it does, the estimated cost would
2 be around \$300,000. This one is the punch line, and so the total
3 program costs including --
4

5 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** We have a question for you. Mr. Sanchez.
6

7 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I have a question for you. Do you have any idea --
8 I'm not seeing the monthly costs estimates, the monthly fee for
9 the VMS units satellite that ping six times. Do you have any idea
10 what that's going to cost?
11

12 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Divide by twelve. We give the cellular cost with
13 annual, and so you can just divide the annual cost by twelve to
14 get a monthly cost.
15

16 **MR. SANCHEZ:** (Mr. Sanchez's comment is not audible on the
17 recording.)
18

19 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Not for the satellite? I don't think we have that.
20 We did have a cost, from one vendor, that was -- If somebody is
21 using satellite and cellular, it was \$349 per year, but I don't
22 think we have that included here, but it's just an estimate.
23

24 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Thank you.
25

26 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Yes. So the total Southeast Center costs are --
27 For Alternative 2, the first year would be \$272,500. Ongoing costs
28 would be \$241,000. If we look at the industry costs, that's
29 \$500,000 for the first year and \$219,000 for ongoing costs, and so
30 a total, for the program, for Alternative 2, is \$772,675 to start
31 the first year, and ongoing costs would be \$460,975 a year.
32

33 For Alternative 3, we're looking at total Southeast Center costs
34 of \$1,567,500, and the industry costs would be \$1,104,597, for a
35 total of \$2,672,097 just for the first year. For ongoing years,
36 we're looking at ongoing costs, for the center, of \$781,700 to
37 \$841,700. Ongoing industry costs would be \$219,975, and so that's
38 not different between Alternative 2 and 3, and so the total costs
39 we're seeing here is, for ongoing Alternative 3 maintenance, is
40 \$1,016,075 to \$1,671,675. Is that the last one, I think? Yes.
41 All right.
42

43 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Great. Thank you, Dr. Gloeckner and Mr.
44 Dettloff. I appreciate the presentation. It was very detailed
45 and informative. Do we have some questions from the committee for
46 either presenter? Dr. Simmons.

1
2 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for
3 the presentation, and so I probably should know the answer to this
4 one. On Slide 19, when we're talking about the device type-
5 approval process, we're kind of calling out Alternative 3 here,
6 but do we have a type-approval process for this fishery under
7 Alternative 2?

8
9 **DR. GLOECKNER:** There is a type-approval process in the VMS
10 program, but it has to be specific to each fishery, and so there's
11 going to be certain requirements for this fishery that I believe
12 we have to set forward and establish for those units that operate
13 in the shrimp fishery.

14
15 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** So, potentially, these costs could
16 apply to both Alternative 2 and 3, potentially, depending on what's
17 approved in the fishery.

18
19 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I don't think that's the case. I think Alternative
20 2 is going to be covered under the contract for the VMS program.
21 Alternative 3 would require that we set up our own separate
22 contract, at probably just as much a cost to us as the VMS program
23 already pays for what they do approve for type-approval.

24
25 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Okay, and so NOAA OLE would have to
26 approve it then, and so that's why the cost is different, but there
27 is a cost to the agency, and just maybe not directly, but via NOAA
28 OLE for that process, because we don't have one for that fishery
29 right now.

30
31 **DR. GLOECKNER:** There's going to be a cost, but there's going to
32 be a duplication in the cost if we go with 3.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Mara, you have a hand up? No? Okay.
35 Dr. Simmons.

36
37 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Okay, and so just one more question
38 on the type-approval process. Have you all thought about, and I
39 think we have discussed, if you're using the Early Adopter Program,
40 that process would -- Could it be used for this type-approval?
41 It's a contract, and it's going to Gulf States, and they're putting
42 devices on there. You listed those devices, earlier in the
43 presentation, as potential costs. Is that possible under this
44 program?

45
46 **DR. GLOECKNER:** That goes through a type-approval process, or are

1 you saying that the Early Adopter Program would be the type-
2 approval process?

3
4 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Could you use the Early Adopter
5 Program as your type-approval process for this fishery?

6
7 **DR. GLOECKNER:** That might take some more discussion with
8 Headquarters.

9
10 **DR. WALTER:** One problem with that is that the type-approval
11 process would need to be perpetual, because there would always be
12 new units that would be seeking type-approval, and we don't specify
13 that it's only a certain type of unit, or only a certain brand of
14 units would be applicable. It's we set -- The agency sets the
15 specifications for what those units would need to make, or to be,
16 and then they could apply for that. That's the way the process
17 works.

18
19 The Early Adopter Program, presumably, is not a perpetually-funded
20 program. Could it be used for this? Yes, but that would be for
21 the units who -- The vendors who would then seek type-approval.
22 Potentially, the funds there could be reprogrammed for that.
23 However, that would come at the cost of purchasing units,
24 installations, and the coverage to get as much units on vessels as
25 is currently being done now. Thanks.

26
27 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Good point.

28
29 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Dr. Walter. We have Mr. Sanchez
30 and then Mr. Geeslin.

31
32 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Thank you. I was assuming, earlier, when we were
33 discussing the cellular/satellite combo, and we were provided with
34 an estimate of a monthly, and it sounded kind of low, and so I'm
35 thinking it was probably based on the cellular, when you're within
36 cell range, and so what happens to that cost when you get out in
37 the satellite range? Does it do nothing? Does it kick into the
38 satellite, or does then the satellite kick in and so does the fee
39 associated with that?

40
41 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I think the description I got from the vendor was
42 that when it was in cell range, it would use cellular. When it
43 was outside of that, it would use satellite, which is why you see
44 a reduction in the amount of money, and so a purely satellite-
45 based unit is probably going to be much more.

46

1 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I guess, but, if you're white shrimping, and you're
2 in cell range, okay. When you go do something different, and
3 you're further in satellite range, I can't see the cost being down
4 using that satellite. I've got to see it go up, honestly, and
5 then I got to think too that it seems like, before, in the past,
6 we've looked at different equipment applications for this, the
7 VMS, you know, cell, satellite stuff, and tested it as an industry.

8
9 Given the variety of some of these options that were tested, I've
10 also got to think that some of them lent themselves more so for
11 gathering the type of data that you're after than others. Are we
12 aware of which ones work best, according to, I guess, history, and
13 experimenting with these things with the industry, in
14 collaboration with stuff that's been done before, probably by Dr.
15 Gallaway and stuff.

16
17 You know, I don't know, right now, based on all this, if we've
18 really gotten this dialed-in, what this is really going to cost to
19 the industry and what the equipment options are that are going to
20 get you the type of reporting that you actually want, and that's
21 why I was kind of pumping the brakes earlier, is all, but thank
22 you. I guess it's more of a comment than a question. You answered
23 my question. Thank you.

24
25 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Geeslin.

26
27 **MR. GEESLIN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Just an observation, as I'm
28 listening to your presentation. I appreciate all the information.
29 There's a lot here, but, also cross-walking with Dr. Freeman's
30 presentation, on Slide 14, which articulates the differences
31 between Alternatives 2 and 3, and I'll make two notes here. In
32 Alternative 2, there is a reimbursement available, through another
33 mechanism. In Alternative 3, there is not.

34
35 There is additional cost to the agency with Alternative 3, and
36 Alternative 2 there is not. Flipping back to your presentation,
37 and going to the last, to the monitoring cost, I've got to ask
38 this. Alternative 3 is considerably more expensive, one, and maybe
39 this is a Dr. Walter question, do we have the money available to
40 do that? Two, is it workable?

41
42 **DR. WALTER:** No, we do not have the funds appropriated for
43 Alternative 3.

44
45 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** I'll follow-up with that then, Dr. Walter.
46 So, if we don't have the funds appropriated with it, then is

1 Alternative 3 a viable alternative, in its entirety, or are you
2 saying it's unable to move forward? In other words, if the council
3 were to pick that as preferred, and it goes to final action, is
4 that even worth going through that process then? If the funds are
5 out there for this part of an alternative, it would have to end up
6 being basically rejected and come back to the council, correct?
7

8 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I want to be careful not to be pre-decisional
9 here, right, and so I think this is the first opportunity you've
10 had to actually look at the administrative costs of the program
11 and lay that out. We haven't, obviously, written this into the
12 amendment.
13

14 I think it's a healthy comparison, right, to be able to evaluate
15 what it would cost the government, but the bottom line is we can't
16 obligate ourselves, as a government, to incur costs that we can't
17 pay, right, and so, ultimately, at the end of the day, if the
18 council said this is our preferred alternative, and submitted this
19 for review and consideration by the Secretary, we would have to
20 weigh that in our decision as to whether to approve or disapprove
21 the amendment.
22

23 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Osborne.
24

25 **MR. OSBORNE:** On that same line of thought, do you have the funding
26 for Alternative 2, either authorized or appropriated, and, if so,
27 I mean, I guess, what pot of money would this come out of? Is
28 this a reprogramming of existing funds?
29

30 **DR. WALTER:** So, if you'll note, Alternative 2 has a cost of about
31 \$250,000 for the agency, which is about the cost of one additional
32 person to do that program administration, and we do have the costs
33 for that within our base allocation of funding, and so that would
34 be cost-neutral to the center, and then cost neutral to the agency
35 as a whole, because of the funding that supports the existing VMS
36 program.
37

38 **MR. OSBORNE:** And the cheapest option for industry. It utilizes
39 the reimbursement program for VMS.
40

41 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Do we have any more questions for either
42 Dr. Gloeckner or -- I'm seeing none. Sorry. Dr. Walter.
43

44 **DR. WALTER:** I'm not on your committee, and so thanks for the
45 recognition. I wanted to thank Dr. Gloeckner and Mr. Detloff for
46 the presentation. I thought it was very well done and helped us

1 clarify where we are, and I'm trying to wrap my head around what
2 we just learned here through this process, which we were requested
3 to explore the costs of both Option 2 and Option 3 and bring costs
4 to the agency and costs to the industry to the table and to this
5 council.

6
7 The purpose of this framework action is to implement a new effort
8 collection program while minimizing costs to the industry. I think
9 it seems clear that there's certainly one alternative that has
10 much less cost to the industry than the other, and that's largely
11 because of the reimbursements from VMS.

12
13 I think, in terms of a decision space, minimizing costs to the
14 industry, there's certainly that Alternative 3 that has the least
15 cost to the industry. The other things we learned was that the
16 costs of doing business here are pretty substantial, and there's
17 a couple of things that have occurred that we didn't have when the
18 3G ELB was put into place.

19
20 One was something called FISMA, Federal Information Security
21 Management Act, which was reauthorized in 2014, and substantially
22 strengthened, because of the need for data security and integrity.
23 That raises the cost of doing business to the center pretty
24 substantially.

25
26 The other costs, as you can see, would be standing up a type-
27 approval process, the help desk, and the other additional things
28 that would be needed to that, and so I think that's where these
29 costs are really ramped up for Alternative 3, versus Alternative
30 2, and so I think that's -- We've got that information. It's, I
31 think, going to be helpful for the decision space.

32
33 I think the other thing, that we haven't really talked about, was
34 the adequacy of a sampling design that would include, at least
35 minimal, all vessels that are part of the fishery to be potentially
36 representative and to be included in the sampling. That's kind of
37 a basic thing that we do for all of our observer coverage, and the
38 previous 3G -- I note that there was an issue there that vessels
39 could opt out of being part of it, and so there were vessels that
40 probably never got 3G units, because they said they didn't want
41 them, and that kind of violates representativeness.

42
43 There's also a little bit of fairness and equity issue concerns
44 there with something like that, but I think the argument, based on
45 representativeness and the scientific merits, would say that all
46 vessels should be part of the selection process, and, to the extent

1 that the coverage would benefit from census, I think that is also
2 scientific merits, and so I just want to say, in terms of the
3 thought process that went into why originally the census was what
4 was costed out, and, eventually, all vessels would get units.
5 Thank you.

6
7 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you. Dr. Frazer.

8
9 **DR. TOM FRAZER:** Thanks, Chris. I'm not on the committee. I just
10 have a more general question for Matt, I think, and so I'm just
11 trying to wrap my head around the cost. The last estimate that I
12 saw for the economic value of the shrimp fishery, at the moment,
13 was \$200 million. How much of that is attributed to the federal
14 fishery?

15
16 **DR. FREEMAN:** I'm so sorry. Could you repeat your question?

17
18 **DR. FRAZER:** What's the economic value of the federal shrimp
19 fishery?

20
21 **DR. FREEMAN:** I don't have that at-hand. I could work to have
22 that by Full Council.

23
24 **DR. FRAZER:** All right. Thanks, Matt.

25
26 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Any further questions for our presenters? Dr.
27 Walter.

28
29 **DR. WALTER:** I do have that number. There's an article that was
30 in *National Fisherman* on U.S. wild-caught shrimp as a sustainable
31 choice, and so there's actually -- I think it says, in 2022, that
32 the Gulf wild-caught shrimp sales were \$329 million in 2022,
33 dropping to \$204 million in 2023, which suggests that this fishery
34 is not in good financial shape, that the prices that the shrimp
35 fishermen are getting are lower, and then they are certainly
36 experiencing some severe economic hardship.

37
38 I'll note the article certainly tries to play up the sustainability
39 of that fishery, and the many sacrifices that the industry has
40 gone through for bycatch reduction, and tries to promote
41 consumption of wild-caught shrimp, particularly in the Southeast.
42 but those are the dollar values, and, unfortunately, they paint a
43 grim picture, but, as we've noted to this group, our Shrimp Futures
44 Project, that's part of the National Seafood Strategy, is designed
45 to be able to try to turn the corner on some of these hardships
46 the fishery is facing. Thanks.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** I think we're going to get an update on the
3 National Seafood Strategy, I think, Thursday, correct, and so that
4 may help us with this discussion. Dr. Frazer, you had a response
5 to that?
6

7 **DR. FRAZER:** Yes, and I think I saw those same numbers, John. I
8 guess that's the reason I was asking. I wasn't clear if that 38
9 percent reduction between 2022 and 2023, right, and the \$200
10 million figure, whether or not that was for the entire shrimp
11 fishery, including the state fisheries. I'm just looking for the
12 federal number.
13

14 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** While he's digging for that, from a Louisiana
15 perspective, I know our landings this year in state waters are
16 pretty low. They're probably one of the most lowest years of
17 recorded landings we've had, and it's not because there's no
18 shrimp. Our independent samples can verify that there's plenty of
19 shrimp within the system. Typically, it's because of the
20 economics. The boats are tied up to the dock. They're not fishing,
21 and so it validates the argument, or the discussion, within federal
22 waters as well.
23

24 If we don't have any more questions for our presenters, we'll move
25 back to the document, to look at the language, correct, Dr.
26 Freeman, and then we can work through that. Thank you, Dr.
27 Gloeckner and Mr. Dettloff. If we could pull the document back
28 up.
29

30 **DR. FREEMAN:** Thank you, Bernie. Bernie, if you could advance to
31 Slide 5. Back one slide, if you don't mind. So, thinking about,
32 you know, different approaches, as far as IPT's recommended
33 language, one option that the committee may want to consider,
34 rather than sort of tackling this in bulk, would be to simply look
35 at these three alternatives individually and consider, you know,
36 whether to adopt all of the IPT's recommended changes, or perhaps
37 a subset.
38

39 If the committee would like to entertain that idea, you know, we
40 could start with the no action alternative, which I think we've
41 heard certainly does not have a long-term viability, and so that
42 may be the easiest of the three to tackle and to consider whether
43 or not to approve all or some of the IPT's recommended changes,
44 and so I will stop there, for a moment, and see if the committee
45 would like to entertain that and consider what's recommended in
46 Alternative 1.

1
2 I'll just add, again, the strikethrough language here with
3 Alternative 1 -- That's not being removed from the document itself.
4 That would simply just be moved into the discussion portion related
5 to Alternative 1.
6
7 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Dr. Freeman. So, looking at
8 Alternative 1, there are substantial changes, as you mentioned,
9 and that context, or language, will be moved into the description
10 of Alternative 1 later in the document, correct and so would the
11 committee entertain a motion for adopting this language, as drafted
12 by the IPT for Alternative 1? Mr. Strelcheck.
13
14 **MR. STRELCHECK:** So moved to adopt the IPT's recommended language
15 for Action 1, Alternative 1.
16
17 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Can I get a second from someone?
18
19 **MR. MCDERMOTT:** Second.
20
21 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Here we go. The motion is to adopt the
22 language in Action 1 for the edits from the IPT. I'm sorry.
23 Alternative 1, Action 1. Mr. Strelcheck.
24
25 **MR. STRELCHECK:** While we're waiting to vote, just my rationale is
26 what you explained, Chris, right, that this is essentially cleaning
27 up some of the language. This does not change the intent of what
28 was proposed. It's just a simplification of the alternative, and
29 the text that's being removed will still be maintained from the
30 document.
31
32 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Correct, and further consideration for these
33 motions can be done there in Full Council as well. Mr. Sanchez.
34
35 **MR. SANCHEZ:** This one, I'll give you, Andy, but this may be as
36 far as I go.
37
38 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** It was seconded by Michael McDermott. Okay,
39 and so we have a motion on the board. **Anyone opposed to the motion**
40 **as written? Seeing none, motion passes.**
41
42 **DR. FREEMAN:** So, perhaps working from least to most difficult, I
43 would propose tackling the language for Alternative 3 next, given
44 that that has fewer modifications than Alternative 2, but at the
45 committee's pleasure.
46

1 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** I thought we were on a roll, but I see no
2 problem with that, and so let's pull up Alternative 3.

3
4 **DR. FREEMAN:** Sure, and, once we get to that, I'll walk through
5 those changes. Thank you, Bernie. So, as a reminder, here we are
6 retaining the industry's preference for only cellular
7 transmission, and so the modifications here would be to refer to
8 the ELB devices as VMS devices, and, again, that was primarily on
9 recommendation from NMFS that, at the end of the day, that is what
10 those devices are.

11
12 They are vessel monitoring systems, and then the other changes are
13 to remove the text of "shrimp" as a descriptor for the vessels and
14 "valid or renewable" as descriptor of the permits, simply as they
15 are not needed, and it's simply a matter of an owner or operator
16 of any vessel with a SPGM that may be selected.

17
18 Lastly, there was a recommendation to revert back to the previous
19 iteration that was before the committee in April to simply refer
20 to the servers as being a non-OLE NMFS server. Otherwise, it may
21 limit potential future changes where the data may be stored, which
22 would, in essence, require an additional document any time that
23 data may need to move, and then the final part simply -- It's
24 really not changing the meaning of the alternative, but simply
25 stating that the process for type-approval is external to 50 CFR,
26 and so just sort of phrasing it from sort of a negative sentence
27 more to a positive here, and this is how the process would occur.
28 If there's any questions about particular items, we can discuss
29 and entertain those.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Mr. Osborne.

32
33 **MS. OSBORNE:** I guess I'm not disagreeing necessarily with the
34 language but we're voting on something that, if we pass it, there's
35 no funding to actually implement it, and so why are we even
36 considering it?

37
38 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** That's a good question. Mr. Strelcheck.

39
40 **MR. STRELCHECK:** The brief history of why we're considering this
41 is that the shrimp industry has very strongly come out in support
42 of an option like this, and this was, obviously, the first meeting
43 where we've been able to share some of the economic costs to the
44 agency, and the industry, with regard to what it would cost all of
45 us, and so your suggestion, or comment, you know, we could move
46 this to Considered but Rejected.

1
2 I don't think I would recommend that at this point, especially if
3 we're going to convene the Shrimp AP, but the rationale certainly
4 strongly supports not selecting this as the preferred.

5
6 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Any other comments, or questions, regarding
7 the language in Alternative 3? I would say that one of the things,
8 or topics, that seem to stick very consistently with the AP reviews
9 of this document, over multiple iterations, was that this data was
10 to go to a non-OLE server, and it specifies that in this action,
11 where the Action 2 does not.

12
13 It's just going straight to the NMFS servers, and the industry
14 feels like that is sort of an impingement on them, if it's going
15 to an OLE server to start, because, essentially, they view it as
16 a law enforcement issue, to where that data is being presented,
17 even though law enforcement has access to it on the backend, and
18 it would be going into a server for scientific data purposes for
19 shrimp effort, in the frontend on this action, or, sorry, this
20 alternative, versus Alternative 2, and so that's the primary
21 difference.

22
23 Any other conversation about this? Do we have any motions for
24 Alternative 3, or do we want to push this to Full Council before
25 we have a discussion it? Mr. Strelcheck.

26
27 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I like getting work done in committee, and so
28 I'll make a motion to approve the recommended changes to Action 1,
29 Alternative 3.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. We have a motion to approve the language
32 written in Alternative 3. Do I hear a second from anyone? All
33 right. Well, I'll second for discussion. At least we can bring
34 this back in that forum, in Full Council. Mr. Sanchez.

35
36 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Thank you. I would speak against this, just because
37 of all the strikethroughs and the red ink and what I said before.
38 The prior motion, that was fine, and it seemed benign enough, and
39 we could take a look at that. My preference would be to leave
40 this and just let's have the Shrimp Committee come back in, the
41 Shrimp Advisory Panel, and help us wordsmith this and get it where
42 it needs to be.

43
44 I'm just not comfortable. I think too much was done, in terms of
45 substantive changes by the IPT, and I don't think the shrimp
46 industry would be onboard with this right now. I would feel much

1 better about proceeding with things that are going to affect that
2 industry with their weigh-in one more time. Thank you.

3
4 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Mr. Sanchez. I agree with what
5 you're saying. I would hope that the goal of this committee, by
6 the time we come through Full Council on Thursday with this, is
7 that we send it back, in this form, to the AP, for them to review
8 and potentially give us some motion of a language to look at when
9 we get to our January meeting. Mr. Strelcheck, you had your hand
10 up?

11
12 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and certainly I'm supportive of the AP
13 weighing in. I don't view it the same way as John does, that these
14 are substantive changes. We're changing the terminology from ELB
15 to cellular VMS. It's a semantics issue. They're the exact same
16 devices, and this is more consistent or consistent with the
17 terminology the Fisheries Service already uses for these devices.

18
19 Then, in terms of the change from Science Center and Office of
20 Science and Technology to a non-OLE server, that obviously broadens
21 it, in terms of flexibility within the Fisheries Services, as to
22 where that data could go, beyond just two specific instances of
23 that data delivery, and so I don't view these as substantive
24 changes, and I think it's easily within the purview of this
25 committee to be able to make this decision.

26
27 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Geeslin.

28
29 **MR. GEESLIN:** I guess I'm struggling with what Jason pointed out,
30 that we don't have the funding available, and not wanting to go
31 all the way to a Considered but Rejected, and maybe offer a
32 friendly amendment to include "with the recognition that funding
33 is currently unavailable" to the end of that.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Strelcheck, are you in favor of that
36 language change?

37
38 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I do not. I think that's appropriate for the
39 discussion of that alternative, but I don't think it's appropriate
40 for inclusion in the actual alternative itself.

41
42 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Geeslin, would you want to make a
43 substitute motion instead?

44
45 **MR. GEESLIN:** So, with that, I will make a substitute motion to
46 approve the revised language in Action 1, Alternative 3, with the

1 recognition that funding is currently unavailable.

2
3 **MR. OSBORNE:** I second that.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** It's seconded by Mr. Osborne. Dr. Simmons.

6
7 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. The funding
8 for the agency to completely administer this alternative is not
9 available, but there are some funds from the Early Adopter that
10 could defray either one of these alternatives, which we still have
11 to fully flesh out in the document, right?

12
13 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** I guess that would be a question for maybe Dr.
14 Walter, and he hopefully will help.

15
16 **DR. WALTER:** Yes, there are funds available, but it really wouldn't
17 do much to offset the long-term cost of Alternative 3, and I think
18 where -- I don't know that it would be enough to really sway the
19 difference between 2 and 3, given what we saw, and it definitely
20 would not, and so if you want to say that some funds could be
21 reallocated from the Early Adopter, it doesn't seem -- I'm not
22 sure it fits here in the motion.

23
24 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Dr. Walter. Mr. Strelcheck.

25
26 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Further to the point, I mean, we're talking about
27 funds being insufficient to administer the program as proposed,
28 but it's not just the agency, right? It's the industry, where the
29 costs would be higher for the industry if we selected this
30 alternative, which is not captured in Mr. Geeslin's motion.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you. Mara.

33
34 **MS. LEVY:** So I feel like, from the discussion, this motion is
35 about adding that language to the alternative, although that's not
36 clear, but, if that's the intent, right, these alternatives are
37 supposed to indicate what the council wants to propose doing, which
38 has got nothing to do with whether there's funding.

39
40 I mean, yes, it should be clear that, to implement any of these
41 things, there needs to be appropriate funding, and, right now,
42 there is not funding for Alternative 3, but it really is not part
43 of the action alternative, because it's not something related to
44 what you're recommending be put in place, right? It's a fact that
45 needs to be acknowledged, I guess.

1 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Yes, and I agree with that, Mara, and I think,
2 you know, we're trying to head in the right direction, as a
3 committee here, for choosing the language in these alternatives
4 that's at least going to be viable, when we go down -- If the
5 council ends up picking this as a preferred, ultimately, and it's
6 not viable, and so it seems like a waste of time, right? We're
7 trying to, you know, pick and choose our way through this, as best
8 we can, and so I understand what you're saying.

9
10 Any further discussion on the substitute motion we have on the
11 board to approve the revised language in Action 1, Alternative 3,
12 with the recognition that funding is currently unavailable? **Do we**
13 **have any opposition to this motion in the board? Seeing none, the**
14 **substitute motion passes.** Dr. Freeman, do we want to tackle
15 Alternative 2? We seem to be rolling pretty good.

16
17 **DR. FREEMAN:** Sure. I'll give Bernie just a second, and we'll
18 move over to Alternative 2. Thank you, Bernie. With the proposed
19 changes for Alternative 2, the first item here is that there is a
20 strikethrough in the word "cellular" in that first line, and so,
21 in essence, allowing for either type of transmission, either
22 cellular or satellite, again keeping in mind that there are some
23 permit holders operating in fisheries where they're already
24 required to have satellite VMS.

25
26 It's not requiring other individuals to select satellite. They
27 can determine, as with many things, what is best for their
28 particular vessel, whether it's cellular or satellite.

29
30 The next key thing, which we covered in Alternative 3, is removal
31 of the word "shrimp" is a descriptor for vessel as well as "valid
32 or renewable" in describing the permit. Again, very similar to
33 Alternative 3, or, well, identical to Alternative 3, it's a matter
34 of any owner or operator of any vessel with a SPGM permit that may
35 be selected.

36
37 Then there was some description, as far as the position data being
38 archived, that has a strikethrough, and then some proposed text,
39 at the end, relating to how that data is being transmitted, whether
40 it's automatically, if it's using satellite VMS, or if it's
41 archived and then transmitted once in cellular range.

42
43 I believe there was mention, prior to lunch, of whether or not
44 that portion of the text perhaps could be moved to the discussion,
45 and I think that, if that's still an interest of the committee,
46 that is, I think, something reasonable that we could bring back to

1 the IPT for further discussion as well. Here, regardless of the
2 method used, whether satellite or cellular, though we retained the
3 previous language that the data would be transmitted to a NMFS
4 server.

5
6 I think that captures the changes are outlined here, but, if
7 there's specific questions on certain portions of the language,
8 just let me know and I will address those.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Dr. Freeman. Do we have any
11 questions, or discussion? Mr. Donaldson.

12
13 **MR. DONALDSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. So, Matt, was there
14 discussion on rationale for keeping it in the action, and not
15 putting in the discussion, by the IPT, the highlight, the red
16 portion? Did you guys discuss, or did the IPT discuss, that at
17 all?

18
19 **MR. FREEMAN:** We did not. That was, to be honest -- So the IPT
20 discussion, acknowledging that we had originally left that
21 descriptive "archiving", and that wouldn't be appropriate if
22 satellite was chosen, and so there were some decisions that were
23 tossed around, or thoughts tossed around, in terms of how to best
24 describe that, and so it was more a matter of making sure we
25 captured it.

26
27 I think additional discussion could certainly take place of whether
28 or not that description needs to be in the alternative itself,
29 versus so long as it's captured in the discussion, if that may be
30 the more appropriate place for that. I feel like the IPT would be
31 receptive to something.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Froeschke.

34
35 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Just to kind of add onto that, I mean, I was
36 involved in a lot of those discussions, and some of the things we
37 were trying to -- Whether it was IPT or members thereof, meaning
38 we were really trying to think hard about how, if this was put
39 forward, how it would actually work, and so some of this -- We
40 started asking these questions internally, of, well, how would
41 this work, if we added satellite, and so we were just trying to be
42 clear, and, given how we plan to present this information, we
43 didn't want to bury things in the discussion, if they weren't
44 apparent.

45
46 We were trying to make it front and center. If it needs to go to

1 in the discussion, I mean, I think that's okay, but, at least for
2 your all's review and discussion, we wanted it to be as clear as
3 possible how we think this could be operationalized or not, because
4 for example, with Alternative 3, we talked a lot about, if we did
5 this, what would it actually -- What would the program be like,
6 and how would it affect the vessels and things?

7
8 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** I think that's a good point. I would advocate
9 that we try to maintain the language in these actions, I mean,
10 these alternatives, as close to what the IPT has given us, so that
11 it goes back to the AP, if that's the consensus of the committee,
12 in its form that we're seeing here as well. Mr. Sanchez and then
13 Ms. Levy.

14
15 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Thank you. I have a question. I'm not clear here
16 if I could discern if this cellular/satellite option -- Are we
17 striving to get the six pings out of it, and then, of course, if
18 it's on cellular, and then it gets out of range, does the VMS
19 portion, the satellite portion, automatically kick in, and what
20 does that do to the cost structure then for those functionalities
21 being intermittent like that?

22
23 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Do you want to go first, Mara?

24
25 **MS. LEVY:** Yes, because I'm just going to jump in with my thought,
26 and then, if I'm wrong, someone can correct me. This action is
27 not mandating a hybrid system that is a satellite/cellular. It's
28 saying you can use a satellite or a cellular VMS, and, I guess, if
29 there's a hybrid system out there that works, so be it, but it's
30 not mandating a hybrid system.

31
32 Then, while I have the mic, similar to my other comment, I do not
33 think the language in red is really appropriate for the
34 alternative. It's not -- That's not what we're asking to be
35 implemented. We're talking about how it will work, right, and so
36 it's not part of what the action we're asking to be taken is.

37
38 If we want to have a table, or a box ,that highlights it, then
39 okay, but, if we are going to keep it here, the first sentence,
40 "If satellite VMS is installed, vessel position data would be
41 automatically transmitted to a NMFS server", that's true of both.

42
43 What's different with the satellite is it's real-time
44 transmission. They're both automatically transmitting, right, and
45 so the first sentence here, about satellite, is not articulating
46 what the difference is, which is real-time automatic transmission,

1 versus archived and then automatic transmission.

2
3 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Sanchez.

4
5 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I understand what you're saying, and I see the
6 semantic nature of this, but I would just want to understand
7 better, personally, me, the cellular part of it, and it could be
8 archiving, or what have you, but is it operating at the same six
9 pings, or what have you that we're striving for, as the gold
10 standard, versus what we know the satellite can do or not? I'm
11 not clear on that, and that would help me a little bit in my
12 thought process.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Strelcheck.

15
16 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Hopefully I can provide some clarification. So,
17 regardless of cellular or satellite, it's going to be the ten-
18 minute pings that have to be provided by that unit that the shrimp
19 fisherman selects for his vessel.

20
21 Cellular, once you get out of range, it will continue to log that
22 data and maintain it on the cellular unit, and then, when you come
23 back into range, it will transmit it through a cell tower. For
24 satellite, that's going to be sent every ten minutes, or every
25 time period that the VMS device can send it to a satellite and
26 then onto us.

27
28 There is, I think, one hybrid unit, and there might be more, that
29 can transition from cellular to satellite. I don't know the cost,
30 and whether that would be an approved unit or not, but the key, I
31 think, difference is the cellular. Obviously, once it goes out of
32 range, it still logs that data. It's just not transmitting it to
33 us while at-sea.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you. Dr. Freeman.

36
37 **DR. FREEMAN:** I probably should have spoken up earlier, with Mr.
38 Sanchez's question regarding the satellite/cellular hybrid that
39 was mentioned before and the cost. In that email that we received
40 from the company, it's described as a satellite or cellular hybrid
41 service, but my understanding, from the email, is that it's
42 transmitting the data using cellular, because I know you had a
43 question as far as the cost seemed rather low, but that it uses
44 satellite coverage in providing distress alerts. As far as for
45 our purposes, for the data collection, it's using the cellular
46 function. The satellite portion is simply sort of a safety feature

1 that it offers, in terms of being a hybrid function.

2

3 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Osborne.

4

5 **MR. OSBORNE:** Just for clarification, if we use Alternative 2, or
6 Alternative 3, there's no more memory cards being mailed in,
7 correct?

8

9 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Yes, that's correct.

10

11 **MR. OSBORNE:** So that's not even an option, if somebody doesn't
12 even want to do that cellular, or satellite, and they couldn't
13 revert back to --

14

15 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** That's a stopgap right now, because the 3G
16 service went out, and there was no way to get data from the boats
17 currently for the effort estimation, other than manually turning
18 in those cards, and so that will go away.

19

20 **MR. OSBORNE:** Gotcha.

21

22 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Any further questions, or conversation, about
23 Alternative 2? Does anyone want to pose a motion for adopting the
24 language in Alternative 2, with the IPT and what's included? Mr.
25 Strelcheck.

26

27 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I know everyone is shocked. **I will propose that**
28 **we adopt the language recommended by the IPT, with the exception**
29 **of the, I guess, last sentence, or two sentences, the last two**
30 **sentences, and so everything up until the red.**

31

32 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. We have a motion on the board to adopt
33 the language in Alternative 2, including the edits from the IPT,
34 with the exception of the last two sentences in red.

35

36 **MR. STRELCHECK:** You just delete those, and it would be to approve
37 the following language in Action 1, Alternative 2.

38

39 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Freeman.

40

41 **DR. FREEMAN:** Just for clarification, in case this passes, for the
42 IPT, the part stating that it would go to a NMFS server, would you
43 want us to integrate that into the remaining language, because
44 that's embedded in that red. It's a carryover from before, and
45 it's in black, but it's embedded in those two red sentences, and
46 so I just want to make sure we know, or have direction, on what to

1 do with that piece of it. I think we could word it into the first
2 sentence, but I just want to make sure we have a clear
3 understanding of what's requested.
4

5 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** You're saying similar to what we did in
6 Alternative 1, where we moved it -- We moved sentences?
7

8 **DR. FREEMAN:** I'm so sorry. Could you repeat that for me?
9

10 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Similar to what we did with Alternative 1, and
11 is that what you're saying?
12

13 **DR. FREEMAN:** So, here in red, if we start with that first sentence
14 in red, it says that would be automatically transmitted to a NMFS
15 server, and so I just want to make sure that the "to a NMFS server"
16 -- Since, in Alternative 3, we're designating that it's going to
17 a non-OLE server, I just want clarification if we should mirror
18 where it's going to.
19

20 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Froeschke.
21

22 **DR. FROESCHKE:** Maybe an easy fix is just to put that language at
23 the end of the first sentence, where it says at -- Where it says
24 "the SEFSC shrimp effort algorithm", and then you could put "to a
25 NMFS server", and just put it right there.
26

27 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** That would work. Mr. Sanchez.
28

29 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I'm thinking where it says -- We struck through
30 "archived" and we had discussed, at length, that, with the cell
31 transmission, there is no longer -- They don't have contact. It's
32 going to store the data, and then, as soon as it comes back into
33 range, it's going to dump it.
34

35 I would like to be more clear, with that somehow expressed in the
36 wording, where, if we're striking through "archived", just to let
37 us -- You know, make it clear that cellular data is going to have
38 that functionality, that, if it goes out of range, it's stored,
39 and it will dump it later, and it's good to go. That, to me,
40 further helps address the satellite VMS concerns and costs and all
41 that.
42

43 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay, and so we have modifications to your
44 original motion, Mr. Strelcheck, but we have not yet had a second
45 on your original motion to start with, and so are you good with
46 any of this being drafted, or do you prefer your original motion

1 to stay on the board?
2
3 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I'm fine with some wordsmithing. I think. Let's
4 see. That provides position data compatible with the Science
5 Center's shrimp effort algorithm to a NMFS server, and then, John,
6 you were suggesting that it maintains some language with regard to
7 "archival"?
8
9 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I don't have it for you, but, yes, I'm suggesting
10 that.
11
12 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** I think the intention would be to leave this
13 as intact as possible, for the AP to get ahold of it as well, and
14 so just keep that in mind, but Dr. Freeman and then Mara.
15
16 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay. I was just going to say that the "archived"
17 just really seems to be more of a scripser for the cellular
18 service, whereas satellite is real time. You know, I interpret it
19 as we're not necessarily removing it from the document, and just
20 some of the descriptors, in those last few sentences in red, would
21 be moved into the discussion of the alternative, denoting what
22 happens if an operator is using cellular versus satellite.
23
24 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Mara.
25
26 **MS. LEVY:** Well, so similar to what we did with the for-hire
27 document, the alternative should say that, if you were doing a
28 vessel monitoring system requirement, that, at a minimum, it
29 archives, right, and then automatically transmits, and so that's
30 the minimum. One that actually transmits all the time, like a
31 satellite, would meet that minimum.
32
33 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** While we're wordsmithing this, we're going to
34 need a second on with the language change and to move forward.
35 Dr. Banks.
36
37 **DR. BANKS:** I'll second for point of discussion.
38
39 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Freeman.
40
41 **DR. FREEMAN:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, I just want to check, based
42 off of Mara's comment, that we have captured what was discussed,
43 that reference to that it would be, at a minimum, archived position
44 data, and if the -- If that captures what she was suggesting, that
45 that would be okay with the original motion maker and the seconder.
46

1 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Strelcheck, are you good with that?

2

3 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I'm good with that language.

4

5 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Banks, are you good with that?

6

7 **DR. BANKS:** Yes.

8

9 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Strelcheck.

10

11 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Just to speak to the motion, we've talked about,
12 obviously, the IPT language that we were eliminating, that still
13 can be captured in some of the discussion. This expands the use
14 of vessel monitoring systems for not only cellular to satellite,
15 but it doesn't require satellite, right? It gives just more
16 options to the industry, as well as vendors that might be
17 submitting for approval of those units. At the end of the day, it
18 will come down to personal decisions by the industry members, but
19 this provides them broader flexibility relative to the previous
20 alternative that we had passed in council meetings past.

21

22 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Any other discussion on the motion on
23 the board to approve the following language in Action 1,
24 Alternative 2 to implement a vessel monitoring (VMS) requirement
25 for the Gulf of Mexico shrimp fishery that provides, at a minimum,
26 archived position data compatible with the Southeast Fisheries
27 Science Center's shrimp effort algorithm to a NMFS server. If
28 selected by the Science and Research Director, the owner or
29 operator of a vessel with a Gulf shrimp moratorium permit will be
30 required to install a type-approved unit according to 50 CFR.
31 Anyone opposed to this? Okay. The motion passes. Dr. Freeman,
32 we have no other business on our agenda, correct?

33

34 **DR. FREEMAN:** Fortunately not.

35

36 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Chairman, this concludes the Shrimp
37 Committee, and I hand it back to you with sixteen minutes to spare.

38

39 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on November 4, 2024.)

40

41

- - -