

1 GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

2  
3 MEETING OF THE SHRIMP ADVISORY PANEL

4  
5 December 16, 2024

6  
7 **SHRIMP AP MEMBERS**

8 Leann Bosarge.....MS  
9 Kristen Baumer.....LA  
10 Steve Bosarge.....MS  
11 Glenn Delaney.....  
12 Haley Gambill.....LA  
13 Alan Gibson.....  
14 Gary Graham.....TX  
15 Dennis Henderson.....FL  
16 Chris Londrie.....TX  
17 Laura Picariello.....TX  
18 Justin Versaggi.....FL  
19 Bob Zales.....FL

20  
21 **STAFF**

22 Matt Freeman.....Economic Analyst  
23 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director  
24 Jessica Matos....Administrative Document Editor & IT Coordinator  
25 Camilla Shireman.....Administrative & Communications Assistant  
26 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director

27  
28 **OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

29 Matt Dettloff.....NOAA  
30 Nick Farmer.....NOAA  
31 Carissa Gervasi.....NOAA  
32 Dave Gloeckner.....NOAA  
33 Frank Helies.....NOAA  
34 Rachel Hisler.....TX  
35 Tricia Kimball.....TX  
36 Mara Levy.....NOAA GC  
37 Greg Lovingfoss.....  
38 Chris Schieble.....GMFMC  
39 Andy Strelcheck.....NOAA  
40 Matt Walia.....NOAA OLE

41  
42 - - -  
43

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1  
2  
3 Table of Contents.....2  
4  
5 Table of Motions.....3  
6  
7 Introduction of Members.....4  
8  
9 Election of Chair and Vice Chair.....9  
10  
11 Adoption of Agenda.....10  
12  
13 Approval of Summary from March 19-20, 2024 Meeting.....11  
14  
15 Scope of Work.....12  
16  
17 Council Actions in Response to Motions from the March 2024 Shrimp AP  
18 Meeting.....12  
19  
20 Draft Shrimp Framework Action: Modification of the Vessel Position  
21 Data Collection Program for the Gulf of Mexico Shrimp Fishery and  
22 Presentation.....16  
23  
24 Updates on Shrimp Futures Program.....129  
25  
26 Public Comment.....133  
27  
28 Adjournment.....140  
29

TABLE OF MOTIONS

PAGE 74: Motion that the Shrimp AP recommends that, instead of a census of the fleet, the SEFSC develop a statistically-robust design for distributing units to a representative portion of the active vessels in the fleet that would be comparable to the last ten years. The motion carried on page 81.

PAGE 112: Motion to request the council to receive a brief slide presentation from the Shrimp AP chair regarding revised cost estimates for Draft Shrimp Framework Alternatives 2 and 3. The motion carried on page 115.

PAGE 115: Motion to request the council's consideration of the following revisions to Draft Shrimp Framework Alternative 3 and to adopt Alternative 3, as so modified, as its preferred alternative. Alternative 3 would read to implement a cellular ELB (cELB) requirement for the Gulf shrimp fishery that provides archived position data to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center that is compatible with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center shrimp effort algorithm. If selected by the SRD, the owner or operator of a vessel with a SPGM permit would be required to install a Southeast Fisheries Science Center approved cELB that archives vessel position when on a shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf and automatically transmits those data via cellular service to a non-OLE NMFS server. Southeast Fisheries Science Center approved cELBs would be type-approved for the Gulf shrimp fishery through a process external to 50 CFR 600.1501. The motion carried on page 124.

- - -

1 The Meeting of the Shrimp Advisory Panel of the Gulf of Mexico  
2 Fishery Management Council convened at the Gulf Council Office in  
3 Tampa, Florida on Monday, December 16, 2024, and was called to  
4 order by Mr. Matt Freeman.

#### 5 6 **INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS**

7  
8 **DR. MATT FREEMAN:** Welcome. I'm going to start with the meeting  
9 statement. Good morning. My name is Matt Freeman. I'm the  
10 council staff liaison to the Shrimp Advisory Panel, and I welcome  
11 you all to the Shrimp Advisory Panel meeting of the Gulf of Mexico  
12 Fishery Management Council. We appreciate your attendance at this  
13 meeting and input in this meeting.

14  
15 Representing the council is Chris Schieble. Council staff in  
16 attendance are Matt Freeman, Camilla Shireman, Jessica Matos,  
17 Carrie Simmons, and John Froeschke. Notice of this meeting was  
18 provided to the Federal Register, sent via email to subscribers of  
19 the council's press release email list, and was posted on the  
20 council's website.

21  
22 This meeting will cover the following topics: Adoption of the  
23 Agenda, Approval of the March 2024 Meeting Summary, Scope of Work,  
24 Council Actions in Response to Motions from the March 2024 Shrimp  
25 AP Meeting, Draft Shrimp Framework Action, Update on Shrimp Futures  
26 Program, Public Comment, and Other Business.

27  
28 This meeting is open to the public and is being streamed live and  
29 recorded. A full agenda, which outlines all the topics for  
30 discussion at today's meeting, may be found on the council's  
31 website. A summary of the meeting will be produced and made  
32 available to the public via the council's website.

33  
34 To signal you wish to speak during the meeting, if you're  
35 participating on the webinar, please use the raise-your-hand  
36 function, and staff will display your name on the notepad on the  
37 screen. Please remember to identify yourself before speaking and  
38 to also re-mute your line each time you finish speaking.

39  
40 For anyone who has called in on a cell phone, there is no-raise  
41 hand function, and so, in that case, you'll need to simply unmute  
42 and speak, and, likewise, if you are in the room, as an AP member,  
43 please turn on your mic. That way, not only folks in the room,  
44 but also that are participating virtually will be able to hear  
45 you, and then press it again when you're done. There's a red light  
46 that will come on when it's pressed on.

47  
48 The first thing that we'll start with on the agenda is the

1 introduction of members, and so we'll start with members that are  
2 in the room, and so if you can just tell us a little bit about  
3 yourself, in terms of your connection to the shrimp industry, and,  
4 also, if you don't mind, letting folks know if you're a returning  
5 Shrimp AP member or a new AP member, and so we'll start to my  
6 right. We'll start with Chris Schieble.

7  
8 **MR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE:** Good morning, Dr. Freeman. Thank you. I'm  
9 Chris Schieble, representing the Gulf Mexico Fishery Management  
10 Council. I am the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Louisiana  
11 Department of Wildlife and Fisheries. I've been on the Gulf  
12 Council since 2017, I think, as a proxy for our Assistant  
13 Secretary, who currently is Ryan Montague.

14  
15 **MS. HALEY GAMBILL:** Good morning, everyone. Haley Gambill,  
16 Louisiana Sea Grant. I'm a new AP member, and so thanks for  
17 allowing me to be here. I am in Houma, Louisiana, as a marine  
18 extension agent. My background is in commercial fisheries, and  
19 studying invertebrates, but now I have gotten the chance to be  
20 involved with fishermen in south Louisiana, work with them, learn  
21 from them, and I'm happy to be on this board today.

22  
23 **MR. BOB ZALES, II:** Bob Zales II, Executive Director of  
24 Southeastern Fisheries Association. Our membership includes  
25 shrimpers. My history is my family and I have been in the charter  
26 for-hire and commercial Fishing Business since 1965, and I recently  
27 retired from that, and sold my boat, and then was offered this  
28 job, and I took it. I have been involved in fishery management,  
29 this fishery management system, since the late 1980s.

30  
31 **MR. STEVE BOSARGE:** Steve Bosarge, and I'm a returning member. I  
32 have Bosarge Boats Incorporated, Pasco, Mississippi. We've got  
33 six steel freezer trawlers. We were incorporated in 1979, and  
34 I've been involved in fisheries management. I was up with the DMR  
35 for about ten years in Mississippi. I'm currently President of  
36 Southern Shrimp Alliance. I'm glad to be here, and I look forward  
37 to working with these new members.

38  
39 **MR. DENNIS HENDERSON:** I'm Dennis Henderson. I was on the Shrimp  
40 Advisory for many, many years, and I'm returning now. Fort Myers,  
41 Florida. I have a fleet of shrimp boats and a fish house. That's  
42 about it.

43  
44 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** Carrie Simmons, Executive  
45 Director of the Gulf Council. I've been working for the council  
46 for over seventeen years. In my previous life, I worked on coral,  
47 and then I worked on fish, and I've worked for the council for  
48 almost eighteen years now. Welcome, new members, and

1 congratulations, returning members. Thank you for being here, and  
2 I look forward to a productive meeting.

3  
4 **DR. JOHN FROESCHKE:** John Froeschke, the Deputy Director of the  
5 Gulf Council. I'm working on my sixteenth year at the council. I  
6 started as a fishery biologist, and now we work on, you know, reef  
7 fish, and shrimps, and all the other ones, and so I'm happy to be  
8 here. Thanks for coming.

9  
10 **MR. KRISTEN BAUMER:** Kristen Baumer, and I'm a new AP member. I'm  
11 one of the owners of Paul Piazza & Son, headquartered in New  
12 Orleans. We're a fourth generation family shrimp processing  
13 company that sources shrimp, really from Texas through Florida,  
14 and then takes that shrimp and processes it and takes it to market.

15  
16 I'm also heavily involved in some of the sustainability initiatives  
17 throughout the Gulf of Mexico, and I'm certainly happy to be here,  
18 and I look forward to a productive day.

19  
20 **MR. JUSTIN VERSAGGI:** Good morning, everybody. Justin Versaggi  
21 here, a fourth generation shrimp company here out of Tampa. We  
22 started in 1912. I'm a new member to the AP. I'm happy to meet  
23 some new folks, and see some familiar faces, and I'll pass it on  
24 to you, Gary.

25  
26 **MR. GARY GRAHAM:** Gary Graham. I'm a returning member. I retired  
27 from Texas Sea Grant, and I'm a boat owner, and I'm still involved  
28 in the fishery.

29  
30 **MR. LAURA PICARIELLO:** Hi, everybody. Laura Picariello, interim  
31 director for Texas Sea Grant. I am also a returning member. I've  
32 been on the AP for five or six years now, and I've been down in  
33 the Gulf, working with fisheries, for about the past eleven years,  
34 particularly with the shrimp fishery, on several projects across  
35 the Gulf, and I'm happy to be here. Thanks.

36  
37 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** I'm Leeann Bosarge. I'm currently your AP  
38 chair. I have worked at our family business, Bosarge Boats, almost  
39 thirty years now, actually. That's kind of scary, when you do the  
40 math. In every aspect of that business that you can imagine, from  
41 on the water, on the boats, to the turning wrenches, to heading  
42 shrimp, to negotiating contracts with international companies, and  
43 so from the ground up, every piece of it, which is what I love  
44 about it.

45  
46 Before I was part of the Shrimp AP, I was a Gulf Council member,  
47 and so this AP, as you all know, or maybe you might not know, some  
48 of the newer members, but our input feeds up to the Gulf Council,

1 and those voting members of the Gulf Council essentially send  
2 amendments to National Marine Fisheries that, if National Marine  
3 Fisheries approves, becomes regulations for our fish, become  
4 regulation for our fisheries. I served on that for nine years,  
5 before I termed out.

6  
7 I'm a board member for the Southern Shrimp Alliance. I'm part of  
8 the Young Fishermen Development Program, to help us bring the next  
9 generation of fishermen, and deckhands, into our fishery, that  
10 will hopefully become captains. I'm on a multitude of different  
11 boards and panels, but I won't bore you with all that.

12  
13 I'm happy to see so many people here in-person today. I think it  
14 speaks well for our industry that we have a meeting that's what,  
15 maybe six-and-a-half hours long, something like that, six hours  
16 long and people flew in for a meeting that won't last a whole day.  
17 Thank you. I know that's a big commitment, and I think it's very  
18 important that we're here face-to-face, when we can. I think it's  
19 a much more productive environment.

20  
21 For those of you that are online, thank you for calling in. I  
22 know it would have been a big jump for a lot of you to get all the  
23 way to this side of the Gulf for a short meeting like this, and so  
24 thank you for being on the phone. Matt, did you have anything  
25 else, before we go on to the --

26  
27 **DR. FREEMAN:** I need to introduce myself.

28  
29 **MS. BOSARGE:** We've got two online people. Okay. All right.

30  
31 **MR. GLENN DELANEY:** This is Glenn. Do you want me to go?

32  
33 **MS. CAMILLA SHIREMAN:** Yes. Go ahead, Glenn.

34  
35 **MR. DELANEY:** Okay. Glenn Delaney. I started out on the water,  
36 as a commercial fisherman, about fifty years ago. Some years  
37 later, I worked for Congress, on the hill, for a number of years,  
38 and I've been a consultant to the Southern Shrimp Alliance for the  
39 past twenty-two years, or since its founding. I serve on many  
40 different advisory committees, and panels, and boards, and I am a  
41 returning shrimp AP member. Thank you. I look forward to the  
42 meeting.

43  
44 **MS. SHIREMAN:** Chris Londrie.

45  
46 **MR. CHRIS LONDRIE:** My name is Chris Londrie. My family and I  
47 have been in the shrimp business since about 1960. We own a fleet  
48 of boats down in the Brownsville/Port Isabel area. My father is

1 Harley Londrie, who I believe was on this panel for a long, long  
2 time. I'm also the current president of the Texas Shrimp  
3 Association, and I'm a new member on this panel.

4  
5 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay, and so I think that's everyone we have on the  
6 line right now. Bob, do you have something, real quick?

7  
8 **MR. ZALES:** Yes, and I failed to say I'm a new member on the AP.

9  
10 **DR. FREEMAN:** Thank you. So, if we have anybody that's able to  
11 join later this morning, we'll have them introduce themselves at  
12 the appropriate time.

13  
14 Just to finish up this agenda, again, my name is Matt Freeman.  
15 I'm the council staff liaison to the Shrimp AP, and I've been with  
16 the council about eight-and-a-half years. My first job related to  
17 the shrimp industry was with LSU and Louisiana Sea Grant. I spent  
18 two years there, helping run programs, at the time related to  
19 primarily the trade adjustment assistance program, as well as other  
20 extension programs.

21  
22 I segued over to Mississippi State, where I did research work,  
23 again with shrimpers around the Gulf Coast. I was serving on one  
24 of the committees, advisory committees, for the council, and I  
25 really enjoyed the work they were doing, and the interaction with  
26 fishermen, and so, when a position came open, I segued over here.  
27 All right, and so the next agenda item -- Is there anything else,  
28 Leann?

29  
30 **MS. BOSARGE:** Well, and Matt -- So, for those of you that don't  
31 know Matt, he's been essentially running shrimp for the council,  
32 for many years now. He has roots in the shrimp fishery, and he is  
33 amazing to work with. You're going to love him, because he is  
34 just like a shrimper, except on the PhD side, right, and so he's  
35 a doctor, but he works harder than any man I've ever met, except  
36 for maybe my daddy, because I've got -- You know, daddy has always  
37 got to come first, but so you're a close second, and I just hope  
38 that you all get a chance to really meet him and use him for that  
39 knowledge that he has.

40  
41 He is an asset to all of us, and, if you ever need anything, he  
42 will always be there for you, and so just know that you can always  
43 come to him. He's great. We're lucky to have him.

44  
45 **DR. FREEMAN:** Thank you for this kind words, Leann, and so, yes,  
46 I have been with the council for eight years. I think I've actually  
47 been working with the Shrimp AP for about six-and-a-half or so,  
48 and something I've thoroughly enjoyed, and I'm looking forward to

1 this meeting.

2

3 I know I've mentioned to a few of you all, and just a quick heads-  
4 up that we always have an annual meeting, before the April council  
5 meeting, to discuss, along with other issues, the AP stance on the  
6 Texas closure for the coming summer, and so look for another doodle  
7 poll from me, probably in mid-January. It will likely be like a  
8 day-and-a-half meeting, and we'll do our best to schedule that  
9 around everyone's schedules.

10

11 The next item on the agenda is the Election of Chair and Vice  
12 Chair, and so we'll start by opening nominations for chair. Go  
13 ahead, Gary.

14

#### 15 **ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**

16

17 **MR. GRAHAM:** I nominate Leanne Bosarge as chair.

18

19 **MR. ZALES:** I'll second.

20

21 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay. We've got a nomination and a second. Ms.  
22 Bosarge, do you accept that nomination? Okay. Terrific. Are  
23 there any other nominations, including anyone online? All right.  
24 Then we will close nominations, and so, given you're the sole  
25 nominee, congratulations, Ms. Bosarge, on being elected chair of  
26 the Shrimp AP. Next, we will open nominations for vice chair.

27

28 **MS. PICARIELLO:** I would like to go ahead and nominate Steve  
29 Bosarge.

30

31 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay. Do we have a second?

32

33 **AP MEMBER:** I second.

34

35 **DR. FREEMAN:** Perfect. Steve, do you accept that nomination?

36

37 **MR. BOSARGE:** Yes, I do accept the nomination.

38

39 **DR. FREEMAN:** Thank you. All right. Any other nominations? All  
40 right. Seeing none, then we will close nominations, and  
41 congratulations, Steve, on being vice chair.

42

43 The next item we have is Adoption of the Agenda, and our newly-  
44 elected chair will run us through that. I did just receive a text  
45 from one of our AP members, Alan Gibson, that he thinks he's  
46 connected. If you don't mind, Camilla, can you -- Do you want to  
47 try a quick voice check and see if he's able to unmute? Alan,  
48 they're saying that you're in listen-only mode, and so we'll see

1 if we can get that resolved, so that you can speak going into the  
2 meeting.

3  
4 Okay, and so it sounds like, without the app, you'll be in listen-  
5 only mode, unfortunately, for this meeting. If there's something  
6 that you would like asked, feel free to send me a text, or an  
7 email, and I'll try to check that as I can, and so I will hand it  
8 over, at this point, to our chair.

9  
10 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Matt. I appreciate you taking us  
13 through all that. The next item is our Adoption of our Agenda,  
14 and, just to kind of briefly go through, we'll have a summary from  
15 our last meeting that we'll go over, to make sure that everyone is  
16 okay with that.

17  
18 Then we'll have a scope of work document, and so Dr. Freeman,  
19 before each agenda item, will go to that scope of work document,  
20 to kind of lay out what are we hoping to accomplish on this agenda  
21 item. He'll take us through that, and so the meat of this agenda  
22 is you come to Agenda Item IV, and we're going to -- Matt is going  
23 to give us a brief summary of the motions that we've made at this  
24 AP in the past, that have been presented to the council, and any  
25 action that the council may have taken on our motions.

26  
27 Then the meat and potatoes will be the next agenda item, Draft  
28 Shrimp Framework Action: Modification of the Vessel Position Data  
29 Collection Program for the Gulf of Mexico Shrimp Fishery. We'll  
30 have a presentation from Dr. Freeman. We'll also have a  
31 presentation from the Science Center that goes a little deeper  
32 into costs associated with the different options and the tradeoffs  
33 between either having this program be a survey or census.

34  
35 Then we'll get an update on our Shrimp Futures Program, from the  
36 Science Center as well, from Dr. Gervasi. Then we'll have Public  
37 Comment and Other Business, and so is there anything anyone, number  
38 one, wants to add to Other Business, because we do take  
39 recommendations for that, if anybody has something very specific  
40 they want to discuss, and we can put that under Other Business, or  
41 any changes to the timing of the agenda. At this point, if there's  
42 anything from any of the members on that, I'll entertain those  
43 ideas.

44  
45 We usually have three or four things we add to Other Business.  
46 Well, I have one item for Other Business, and it's a little bit  
47 deeper discussion on some of those costs, maybe some food for  
48 thought, so we can get some feedback on that, and so, if everyone

1 is okay with that, I would like to add a more detailed discussion  
2 on costs, under Other Business. Any opposition to that? Hearing  
3 none, we'll add that to Other Business.

4  
5 As we go through the presentation, if it looks like that's more  
6 relevant to place, which I think it will be, let's go ahead, and  
7 we'll have that conversation on the more detailed costs. It would  
8 probably be good to have that right after Agenda Item VII. That  
9 way, costs will be fresh on our minds, and so we'll put that right  
10 before the update on the Shrimp Futures Project.

11  
12 **DR. FREEMAN:** Camilla, instead of putting it under Other Business,  
13 if you can put it following Agenda Item VII.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Are there any other amendments or  
16 additions to the agenda? Seeing none, can I get a motion to adopt  
17 the agenda, as modified?

18  
19 **MR. ZALES:** So moved.

20  
21 **APPROVAL OF SUMMARY FROM MARCH 19-20, 2024 MEETING**

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So moved by Mr. Zales, and do I have a second?  
24 We have a second by Mr. Baumer. Any opposition to that motion?  
25 Seeing none, the motion carries. All right. That will bring us  
26 to our Agenda Item Number IV, the Approval of the Summary from the  
27 March 19<sup>th</sup> through 20<sup>th</sup>, 2024 Shrimp AP Meeting.

28  
29 In your briefing book, which I assume everybody was able to find  
30 the briefing book online, and did anybody have trouble with that?  
31 If you go to the council's website, and you go to Meetings, and  
32 then AP Meetings, you'll see the Shrimp AP meeting, and you click  
33 on that, and then, every agenda item that you see on this piece of  
34 paper, cause I'm old school, and I have a piece of paper up here,  
35 but you can actually click on that online, and it links you to the  
36 presentation, so you can click on it and open it up on your  
37 computer, if that's what you prefer.

38  
39 That was there in your briefing book. Did anybody have any  
40 feedback on that? If not, we're going to approve that summary  
41 from the March meeting. Did anybody have revisions? I'm not sure  
42 we can actually make a revision to the summary, but we could  
43 provide some feedback. Seeing none, okay, and I'll take a motion  
44 to -- I'll entertain a motion to adopt the summary from the March  
45 19<sup>th</sup> through 20<sup>th</sup>, 2024 Shrimp AP meeting, as presented.

46  
47 **MS. GAMBILL:** So moved.

1 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I have a motion from Ms. Gambill. A second?

2  
3 **MS. PICARIELLO:** I'll second.

4  
5 **SCOPE OF WORK**

6  
7 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Second from Ms. Picariello. Any discussion?  
8 Seeing none, any opposition to that motion? No opposition, and  
9 the motion carries. All right, and that will bring us to our Scope  
10 of Work, and, Dr. Freeman, would you like to go through that with  
11 each agenda item?

12  
13 **DR. FREEMAN:** I think that would be appropriate. Thank you.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, and so then that'll bring us to the  
16 Council Actions in Response to the Shrimp AP Motions from the March  
17 2024 Shrimp AP Meeting. Dr. Freeman?

18  
19 **COUNCIL ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO MOTIONS FROM THE MARCH 2024**  
20 **SHRIMP AP MEETING**

21  
22 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay, and so, for this item, for the scope of work,  
23 council staff will provide an overview of council actions in  
24 response to the Shrimp AP's motions at its March 2024 meeting.  
25 This information does not require any formal AP action, and so,  
26 Camilla, if you can -- Perfect.

27  
28 All right, so we can advance to the next slide, and there were  
29 four AP motions, and then a separate four motions from the council,  
30 that I'll be discussing, and so the first motion is up on the  
31 board. I'll let everybody have a moment to read it, but it was  
32 requesting that the Science Center recall the previous trip  
33 matching code/algorithm for determining species-specific shrimp  
34 effort. The status of that, there was no council motions made in  
35 relation to that particular AP motion, and so, Camilla, if we can  
36 advance forward.

37  
38 The second was to request that NMFS continue with the Texas federal  
39 closure in the coming year, in conjunction with the State of Texas  
40 closure in 2024. The council passed the same motion, and that  
41 later was transmitted to NMFS, in April of 2024.

42  
43 All right, and the third motion was to request the council amend  
44 Alternative 3 in Action 1 of the draft shrimp framework action as  
45 follows and to select Alternative 3, as so amended, as its  
46 preferred alternative.

47  
48 You'll see the strikethrough in that paragraph following the

1 motion. That was the amendment from the Shrimp AP, and then the  
2 status is the council passed the following motion, at its April  
3 meeting, to replace the words "a non-OLE server" with "the  
4 Southeast Fisheries Science Center or Office of Science and  
5 Technology". You'll see an asterisk there. There were further  
6 modifications to Alternative 3 since the April council meeting,  
7 and so, Camilla, we can move forward.

8  
9 Then the last AP motion was recommending that the council request  
10 NMFS adopt the following priorities for utilizing the Fiscal Year  
11 2024 \$850,000 appropriation for ELB development and  
12 implementation, and those three bullets are listed there. The  
13 council passed a similar motion, and that later was transmitted to  
14 NMFS, in April of 2024, following its meeting.

15  
16 All right, and we can advance forward. So, from the most recent  
17 council meeting, which was the first week of November, there was  
18 a motion to convene the Shrimp AP to review, discuss, and provide  
19 commentary to the council regarding the revisions to the draft  
20 shrimp framework action, in advance of the council's January 2025  
21 meeting, and that's what we're currently meeting today for.

22  
23 Then the next three motions deal with the language of the three  
24 alternatives in the draft framework action, which we'll be  
25 discussing in just a few moments, and so the first was to adopt  
26 the language in Action 1, Alternative 1, per the IPTs  
27 recommendation.

28  
29 I know there's an abbreviation there, and we've got some new  
30 members. "IPT" refers to interdisciplinary planning team. All of  
31 our management documents that the council is working on is  
32 comprised of a team of staff from the council office, from the  
33 Southeast Regional Office, and from the Science Center.

34  
35 On occasion, we may have one or two additional members that  
36 participate, and they work in drafting the document for the  
37 council, and then as well discussing any potential roadblocks, or  
38 things like that that, the council may need to consider, and so  
39 the IPT had sent forward some recommendations on the language to  
40 the council at its last meeting.

41  
42 We jumped forward, in the council discussion, to Alternative 3,  
43 and they approved the revised language in Action 1, Alternative 3,  
44 with recognition that funding is currently unavailable. We'll  
45 talk about that in more detail, what that means, this morning,  
46 following my presentation, once the Science Center has giving its  
47 presentation, and you'll see the language of these alternatives as  
48 well in more depth when we go into my presentation.

1  
2 So, Camilla, if we can move forward, and then we moved back to  
3 Alternative 2, and this was to approve the following language in  
4 Action 1, Alternative 2, and so, here, the council received an IPT  
5 recommendation, and the council made its own modification to the  
6 language of Alternative 2, and that's what's in front of you now.  
7 Okay, and so I think we are good. I'll see -- Before we move to  
8 the next item, are there any questions on any of those items? Yes,  
9 Ms. Bosarge.

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So I listened to that council meeting, but I  
12 didn't catch this during the council meeting, and I did catch it  
13 when I was reviewing this for this meeting, and so they added "at  
14 a minimum".

15  
16 There was IPT-recommended changes to Alternative 2, but this is  
17 actually a little different than what the IPT had recommended, and  
18 one of the big differences is that addition of that language "at  
19 the minimum", and so I should step back here, because I wanted to  
20 recognize, as we were doing those introductions, but we hadn't  
21 done our election of chair, and so I was trying to be quiet.

22  
23 I wanted to recognize the fact that we actually have some very  
24 heavy hitters, from both the SERO office and the Science Center,  
25 in the room today, which I very much appreciate, so that we can  
26 have informed discussions, and I think make a lot of good progress.  
27 We have Mr. Andy Strelcheck. Thank you for being here in-person,  
28 and we have Dr. John Walter, from the Science Center, and so both  
29 the upper echelons there, and so thanks for being here.

30  
31 That addition of "at a minimum", and I don't remember who made  
32 this motion at the council meeting, and I'm not going to put you  
33 on the spot and ask, but I would guess it was probably the Science  
34 Center or the agency.

35  
36 What was the "at a minimum", and so everything else says we're  
37 going to collect position data, which is for effort computation  
38 for the shrimp fleet, and what is the other data that the agency,  
39 or the Science Center, is thinking about collecting with the VMS,  
40 when you say "at a minimum"?

41  
42 **DR. FREEMAN:** So that discussion, if I recall, and I believe  
43 General Counsel was assisting with some of that language tweaking  
44 here. That was in the sense of trying to acknowledge that, in  
45 this case, because it would allow for satellite as well as cellular  
46 VMS, and the "at a minimum" was referring to the archiving that,  
47 depending on the device, some of it may be in real-time, whereas  
48 other devices may have to archive it. So, at a minimum, it would

1 archive it and then transmit that data when it was within range to  
2 do so.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you. All right. Well, that's good, and  
5 I hope we'll -- Hopefully we can put that in the document, and s  
6 I know you all haven't finished fleshing it out, because that was  
7 confusing to me, as an industry member. I thought it was speaking  
8 to the next part about position data, and that maybe there was a  
9 different type of data that we were thinking about collecting  
10 through the VMS, and so that's good to hear. All right. That was  
11 my only question.

12  
13 **DR. FREEMAN:** So we'll read this scope of work for the next agenda  
14 item, if there's no other questions. We've got Mr. Delaney online.  
15 He's got a question.

16  
17 **MR. DELANEY:** Actually, and I'm sorry to interrupt, but, before  
18 you move to the next agenda item, and I don't mean to put her on  
19 the spot, but I just noticed, and want to recognize, that we have  
20 online, covering the meeting Bailey Archey, who works for Senator  
21 Hyde-Smith on shrimp issues, and many, many other issues in  
22 Washington.

23  
24 I just want to recognize, and it's extraordinary to have  
25 congressional staff take the time from their incredibly busy  
26 schedule in D.C. to cover this meeting. It speaks volumes to the  
27 support that Senator Hyde-Smith has had for the shrimp industry  
28 for many years, and I just want to thank you for that, Bailey.  
29 Again, I apologize for putting you on the spot. You don't need to  
30 say anything, but I just wanted everybody to know that you and the  
31 Senator continue to support our industry so strongly. Thank you.

32  
33 **DR. FREEMAN:** So we will go ahead and recognize the Senator at  
34 this point. She's got her hand raised.

35  
36 **MS. SHIREMAN:** Bailey, you're welcome to speak.

37  
38 **MS. BAILEY ARCHEY:** Hi everyone. Thank you, Glenn, for the  
39 shoutout, and I'm happy just to listen today and hear more about  
40 what is going on and how the Senator can best try to support.  
41 Thanks.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Thank you very much for being online  
44 with us. That means a lot. We very rarely get anyone online of  
45 your stature, and the Senator's stature, and so thank you for  
46 taking an interest in our fishery in a time where we so desperately  
47 need it.

48

1 So, Dr. Freeman, with that, you want to do our scope of work for  
2 Agenda Item VII, the Draft Shrimp Framework Action: Modification  
3 of the Vessel Position Data Collection Program for the Gulf of  
4 Mexico Shrimp Fishery?

5  
6 **DRAFT SHRIMP FRAMEWORK ACTION: MODIFICATION OF THE VESSEL**  
7 **POSITION DATA COLLECTION PROGRAM FOR THE GULF OF MEXICO SHRIMP**  
8 **FISHERY AND PRESENTATION**  
9

10 **DR. FREEMAN:** Yes, ma'am. That will be great. So, for this item,  
11 the AP will be presented with an updated draft framework action to  
12 transition the Gulf shrimp fishery from the expired CELB to a new  
13 device collecting vessel position data for the purpose of  
14 maintaining effort estimation.

15  
16 Council staff will review updated draft alternatives, and then  
17 staff from the Southeast Fisheries Science Center will present  
18 information on current coverage of the Gulf shrimp fishery with  
19 cELB devices, along with information related to sample design under  
20 the alternatives in the draft framework action. The AP should ask  
21 questions as well as provide feedback and recommendations to the  
22 council on the alternatives and purpose and need statements. The  
23 council will review the AP's recommendations at its January 2025  
24 meeting and is expected to take final action in April 2025.

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, and so I think Dr. Freeman is going  
27 to delve right into his presentation that he has for us. I wanted  
28 to let the members know that sometimes we take questions during  
29 the presentation, and sometimes we hold the questions until the  
30 end.

31  
32 Given that we have so many new members, and so there's a lot of  
33 history here that we need to make sure we bring everybody up-to-  
34 speed on, and then the next presentation is going to be a fairly  
35 technical one, I would encourage everyone to -- Let's ask our  
36 questions during the presentation. Let's stop, and, if you have  
37 a question, please ask your question.

38  
39 I would rather you get the question answered than to go through  
40 twenty minutes of a presentation where you were confused, because  
41 you needed a question answered around the five-minute mark, that  
42 everything else was contingent upon, and so don't hesitate. Raise  
43 your hand. All questions are good questions. Throw it at us, and  
44 we'll answer them. Thank you.

45  
46 **DR. FREEMAN:** All right. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I'll note,  
47 if there are any questions that either I, or NMFS, are unable to  
48 answer right at the moment, that sometimes we'll look into it at

1 the break and then respond perhaps a little bit later, once we're  
2 able to get that information.

3  
4 An outline of my presentation, we'll look at the council timeline  
5 to-date, review the purpose and need statements, discuss changes  
6 to Alternatives 2 and 3 in the document, and then note differences  
7 between Alternatives 2 and 3, and then, lastly, discuss the  
8 tentative timeline for council action on this document. Then,  
9 following my presentation, then you'll receive a presentation from  
10 the Science Center related to this document.

11  
12 All right, and so, back in September of 2020, at the council  
13 meeting, there was a presentation received from the Science Center  
14 that 3G cellular coverage for the cELB devices would be  
15 discontinuing, effective January 1st of 2021, and they noted that  
16 new shrimp effort data collection methods would be warranted.

17  
18 At the November/December of 2020 council meeting, following a  
19 presentation from Dr. Ben Gallaway, there was a motion for a letter  
20 to be sent to the Science Center supporting development,  
21 implementation, and funding of a P-Sea WindPlot program, and, if  
22 you're not familiar with that, that's a navigation software that  
23 would acquire and transmit shrimp fishing effort.

24  
25 The council then conducted a competitive request for proposals, in  
26 2021, for \$350,000 to test P-Sea WindPlot, that modification.  
27 Final results from LGL, who was the council-funded contractor,  
28 following the RFP, were presented at the April 2023 council  
29 meeting, and the recommendation from LGL was to not further invest  
30 in P-Sea WindPlot as a method to record shrimp vessel positions  
31 for calculating effort.

32  
33 I'll note, and, as you can tell, we are going to be jumping around  
34 a little bit in the timeline, just so that it follows a certain  
35 bullet point, so that you can see, at this point, sort of what the  
36 end result was, and so, Camilla, if we can move forward.

37  
38 At the April 2021 council meeting, there was a motion directing  
39 staff to begin a framework action to set reporting requirements  
40 for the expiring 3G cELB program and to transition to a new  
41 platform for effort reporting of the Gulf of Mexico federal shrimp  
42 fishery. So, if you're paying attention, then, if the council  
43 does take final action at the April 2025 meeting, that will be the  
44 four-year mark from the original motion to begin work on this  
45 document.

46  
47 In October of 2021, at the council meeting, there was a motion for  
48 NMFS to test a sample of approved cellular VMS units on federally-

1 permitted commercial shrimp vessels. There was a first deployment  
2 in 2022, which tested Faria and NEMO, alongside cELB units. There  
3 was a second deployment in 2023, which then tested ZEN and a solar-  
4 powered NEMO alongside cELB units, and those results were presented  
5 at the April 2023 meeting.

6  
7 At the April 2023 council meeting, there was a motion to bring  
8 back the draft shrimp framework action after NMFS completed side-  
9 by-side testing of cELB units with a minimum of the following  
10 devices, a NEMO unit in this case that would be hardwired to the  
11 vessel, and, previously, as I mentioned, it was solar-powered, a  
12 ZEN VMS, and the Nautic Alert Insight X3.

13  
14 I'll just mention, real quickly, the NEMO device that was solar-  
15 powered was having issues, at times losing its power, and so  
16 industry, and the AP were, interested in, okay, if it's hardwired  
17 to the vessel, maybe the performance will be better, and so that  
18 was what they were interested with that particular device, and  
19 those results were presented at the October 2023 council meeting.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, and so I think we have a hand up, at  
22 least one hand up, online, and I would also -- If you don't mind,  
23 Dr. Freeman, I would like to -- I think you're great. He gave a  
24 great intro on -- Especially for some of our newer members, on  
25 kind of why we're here today, and the more recent steps that we've  
26 taken to get to this point.

27  
28 If you don't mind, I would like to back up a couple of decades and  
29 give a little different history, the full history, I would like to  
30 say, of the program that we have.

31  
32 So, first off, this ELB, and so we use a lot of acronyms, and so  
33 ELB, and that's our electronic logbook, right, and this is an  
34 actual piece of hardware that we have on the shrimp boats, on a  
35 sample of the shrimp -- The federally-permitted fleet carries  
36 these.

37  
38 What do they actually do? They collect scientific effort data.  
39 Now they collect the raw data for the scientific effort. As you  
40 know, when we shrimp, there's a certain speed range that we have  
41 to be in when we're towing, right, and we're not going super-fast.  
42 We're going pretty slow, but too slow and that won't work either,  
43 and so there's an ideal speed for towing.

44  
45 What this box does is it essentially monitors our speed, right?  
46 It does that by saying, okay, we're going to get a GPS position on  
47 you every ten minutes, and we're going to be able to calculate the  
48 distance that you traveled over time. If you have time and

1 distance, you can calculate speed.

2  
3 When they -- When the Science Center, who does those calculations,  
4 sees that our speed was in some particular range, and was it two?  
5 Well, no, and their range is 1.8 to -- They actually go a little  
6 high on it, to something up above.

7  
8 **AP MEMBER:** 1.6, I think, up to four knots.

9  
10 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, to four knots, which the industry's not so  
11 sure about that four knots, but, okay, but, anyway, we'll go with  
12 it. So if we're -- If we are moving, if that vessel is moving, in  
13 that speed range, they consider us to have nets in the water, and  
14 dragging our nets, right, and so they can tell where our fishing  
15 grounds are at, at that point, and how much -- How many days of  
16 trawling is occurring on those vessels. They use that information  
17 to extrapolate to the full fleet, right, and so that's the ultimate  
18 premise of this box.

19  
20 What I kind of wanted to go back for is that we actually started  
21 this program in the early 2000s with LGL. LGL built some boxes,  
22 as well as an algorithm, and so you can't just take the data off  
23 the box and have effort. You actually have to do some  
24 computations.

25  
26 They built a shrimp algorithm, which is just a computer code that  
27 you could put all that data into, and you could get effort,  
28 location, and quantity out of it, and so LGL managed that, which  
29 is a private company, and managed our electronic logbook program  
30 from those early 2000s up to around 2012, or 2013-ish, and, at  
31 that point, you know, there were some budget constraints, I guess,  
32 and it was deemed that, if that process, and those functions, were  
33 brought in-house at the Science Center, it would be more efficient,  
34 from a budgetary standpoint. They could do it cheaper, right,  
35 than hiring the contractor.

36  
37 What happened, at that point, is that the Science Center, the  
38 National Marine Fisheries Science Center, found a private company  
39 that could build new boxes, and so, the old LGL boxes, you actually  
40 had to physically -- The LGL had people that would go around to  
41 the boats, and they would get the data off your box. They would  
42 get that chip data off your box, and they would get it by hand.

43  
44 When the Science Center took over, they found a company that could  
45 build a box that would actually transmit the data, when you were  
46 within cell phone range from the boat, if you had a cell signal,  
47 and you were close enough to a cell tower, from the boat to NMFS.

48

1 That way, NMFS got the data in a more timely fashion, right, and  
2 it wasn't necessarily real-time, because, a lot of the times we're  
3 shrimping, we don't have cell phone signal. But, when we would  
4 come within range, it would dump the data to NMFS, and so NMFS had  
5 those boxes built, and they beefed up that random sample.

6  
7 They put about 500 of those boxes out onto the fleet, through their  
8 random sample, and the stuff started to transmit automatically.  
9 Well, that rocked and rolled for a good long while, up until 2021.  
10 Those boxes that -- We still have those boxes on the boat. They  
11 still function. The one thing they don't do is transmit  
12 automatically, and so they ran on 3G technology.

13  
14 Well, the cellphone companies all did away with 3G in 2021, and so  
15 that's kind of why we're here today. We're still collecting our  
16 data. We still have effort data. We're not deficient in that  
17 area. However, it could be better, right? It would be better if  
18 it transmitted automatically.

19  
20 What the Science Center is doing right now to get our data, and,  
21 luckily, there's a backup program that the Science Center built  
22 into those boxes, where it will transmit automatically, but it  
23 also stores it on a chip, almost like a thumb drive, right, that  
24 you can go pull out of that box and put in a new one. You can  
25 send your old thumb drive, or chip, to NMFS, and they can get your  
26 effort data off of it, and so that's where we're at today.

27  
28 When 3G expired, that's when we got into all the things that Matt  
29 just told you about. You can tell we've done a good bit of testing.  
30 We tried to use something that maybe industry already had on a lot  
31 of the boats, that P-Sea WindPlot, which is the plotter program  
32 that a lot of the offshore boats use, and we just couldn't make  
33 that work. We tried like hell, but we just couldn't make it work.  
34 That would have been nice for industry.

35  
36 Then we started trying some other boxes, and we do have some units  
37 that are doing fairly well. Nothing's perfect, and I think we  
38 still have some kinks to work out, and so that's where we're at.  
39 Mr. Delaney, I think you have your hand up, and then I have Mr.  
40 Bosarge.

41  
42 **MR. BOSARGE:** Just you did a pretty good job explaining, but you  
43 need to let them know what that effort data is used for.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Yes, and, Glenn, if you can -- He texted  
46 me and said his hands up. I don't know, and maybe he's having  
47 some problems, too.

1 **MR. DELANEY:** I had my hand up earlier, Leann. Thanks, and that  
2 was earlier, on Slide 3.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Go ahead, Glenn.

5  
6 **MR. DELANEY:** I just wanted to -- You know, it just caught my eye  
7 that, as Dr. Freeman correctly -- I think it was maybe the previous  
8 one, the one that talked about P-Sea WindPlot. I just wanted to  
9 point out that, and it caught my eye, that, in addition to the  
10 \$350,000 that the council provided, thankfully, to that P-Sea  
11 WindPlot effort, the SSA, the Southern Shrimp Alliance also  
12 provided a like amount to fund that issue.

13  
14 Just for the point that, in addition to the council, and, frankly,  
15 to Congress, that has funded so much of this, all the way back to  
16 those earliest days that you, Leann, spoke to, I just wanted to  
17 point out that the industry has also stepped up to the plate in  
18 helping to fund these efforts over the years. Thanks. Sorry for  
19 interrupting.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** No. No problem at all, and somebody brought  
22 up, you know, what is the data used for, and I mentioned what I  
23 call the elephant in the room, which is our effort data, right?  
24 It is used for that. It's used to monitor effort in the Stat Zones  
25 10 through 21, ten to thirty fathoms, for red snapper bycatch,  
26 okay, and it's used to do some calculations for sea turtle bycatch,  
27 right, and so a lot of our bycatch issues.

28  
29 It's also used for some things that are nice for us, that sometimes  
30 help us, which are these -- So think about windmills going in,  
31 wind energy going in, and think about the different zones that we  
32 draw as habitat areas of protection around coral, or other  
33 sensitive habitats, and, by having this type of data there, we're  
34 actually -- We're able to have some hard evidence of where we  
35 shrimp and have a real conversation about tightening up lines  
36 around some of these areas, to say, look, there's no coral there,  
37 and you can tell we're shrimping on the corner of that box that  
38 you just drew, and can we tighten this up a little bit, so you  
39 don't take our historical shrimp grounds away.

40  
41 The same thing with the conversations with wind energy. We've  
42 been able to go to BOEM and say, well, look, and you can tell this  
43 is a high-use area for the shrimp fishery. These are historic  
44 grounds, and can we please have a conversation about maybe not  
45 putting wind energy right there, and could you move it a little  
46 bit, and so it's used for a multitude of things other than just  
47 effort. Does that answer the question, Mr. Bosarge? All right.  
48 Dr. Freeman, I've interrupted you enough. Mr. Zales.

1  
2 **MR. ZALES:** I've got a question about the effort and the number of  
3 vessels that had those boxes. The Fisheries Service, up to -- As  
4 far as I know, they're still having, and I don't know if they've  
5 corrected it or not, but they haven't been able to identify the  
6 number of federal fishing permits that are out there, and I don't  
7 know if they've got a number now or not, but I know, not too long  
8 ago they didn't have a number, and I guess Andy could answer that  
9 question. If we know how many permits are issued to shrimp boats,  
10 how many of those shrimp boats are actively fishing?

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Strelcheck.

13  
14 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** Yes, and so kind of two parts to that, and  
15 so Bob is right that we've been having some challenges with our  
16 permits system, and so, on the front end, we're able to issue the  
17 permits very efficiently, and effectively, and so that's what you  
18 see. On the backend, the way that the data has been housed is  
19 essentially been garbled into a database that hasn't been properly  
20 built, and so we have been working to fix that.

21  
22 We are at a point where we think we're close, if not finalizing,  
23 the ability to replicate historical permits, all the way through  
24 the current permitting, and have addressed a lot of the database  
25 problems, with the intent of finalizing that early next spring.

26  
27 In terms of the active fishing, that would probably be a better  
28 question for the Science Center, but, obviously, we would be  
29 looking at reports of the logbook, you know, e-logbook data, as  
30 well as, obviously, any reported landings data, to look at how  
31 many permits are out there relative to how many are actually  
32 reporting shrimp landings.

33  
34 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I think we'll actually get that number in the  
35 presentation from the Science Center, a little bit later on, on  
36 the active vessels. I'm not sure as of what date, but we will get  
37 a little bit of info on that, Bob, I believe. Okay, and did I  
38 have any other hands, around this table? Sometimes you have to  
39 flag me more than once. Is everybody good? Okay. I've got one  
40 online.

41  
42 I see a hand from the public up, Ms. Tricia Kimball, and I'm  
43 excited to have you on, and so I'll say, Ms. Kimball, let me look  
44 on my agenda here, and let me find it, and so I'm going to let you  
45 go ahead and weigh-in this right now, real quick, but we also have  
46 a spot for public comment. It's Agenda Item IX, and I would very  
47 much encourage you to speak during that as well, because that will  
48 be the public comment that gets recognized in the meeting summary

1 for this meeting, and so it will go on to the council, your  
2 comments, and so go ahead and speak now, but I really encourage  
3 you to do it under that public comment, so the council can  
4 definitely hear what you had to say. If you can unmute, Ms.  
5 Kimball. All right, can you hear us? I mean, can you try and  
6 speak, Ms. Kimball?

7

8 **MS. TRICIA KIMBALL:** Can you hear me?

9

10 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, ma'am.

11

12 **MS. KIMBALL:** Okay, my concern is like the wind turbine farms, and  
13 they're trying to put them in our area of Texas. When you're  
14 talking about that data, it doesn't show all of the shrimping  
15 effort in historic shrimping grounds.

16

17 Those that were, or are not, being currently monitored are not  
18 going to be on that data, and so it's not showing a full  
19 representation of what's going on, and that's a bit of a concern,  
20 because they're trying to plant those things out in the Gulf of  
21 Mexico, in our areas, and that may not be exactly where you're  
22 shrimping, you know, where they've designated. You may be trying  
23 to shrimp in the areas where they want to plant those turbines,  
24 and they're not aware of that data.

25

26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you. Yes, ma'am, and don't forget that  
27 we're going to have public comment. It will be towards the end of  
28 the meeting, but I really would encourage you to speak again at  
29 that time, so we can get it on the official record, please, ma'am.  
30 Thank you, and thanks for listening in.

31

32 **DR. FREEMAN:** I'll just add, and, if anyone from NMFS wants to  
33 chime-in, as of September 20<sup>th</sup> of this year, the most recent data  
34 poll that we have, for the number of vessels with valid or  
35 renewable federal Gulf permits, is 1,257, and that's the number  
36 that we'll be using in the document.

37

38 Then I don't -- Like I said, I don't know if the Science Center  
39 has additional information. I know, from one chat that I was in,  
40 looking at vessels with trip ticket landings for 2023, they said  
41 that there were 807 vessels total, and 651 of those being solely  
42 with offshore landings.

43

44 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thanks, Matt. Ms. Picariello.

45

46 **MS. PICARIELLO:** I just wanted to clarify that, Matt, when you say  
47 valid or renewable, and so some of those permits may be expired,  
48 but in that one-year window, in that total number, right?

1  
2 **DR. FREEMAN:** Correct.  
3  
4 **MS. PICARIELLO:** Okay. Thank you.  
5  
6 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you for your patience, Dr. Freeman. I  
7 think that's all our questions, if you want to continue on.  
8  
9 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay, and so the next item are the purpose and need  
10 statements, and so again, particularly for our new AP members, all  
11 of our documents will have a purpose statement, as well as a need  
12 statement, to explain sort of the impetus for that document.  
13  
14 The purpose of the framework action is to transition from the  
15 expired 3G cellular electronic logbook program to a system that  
16 would maintain the council's and NMFS' scientific ability to  
17 estimate and monitor fishing effort in the Gulf shrimp fishery,  
18 while minimizing the economic burden on the industry to the maximum  
19 extent practicable.  
20  
21 The need is to base conservation and management measures on the  
22 best scientific information available and to minimize bycatch, to  
23 the extent practicable, as required by the Magnuson-Stevens  
24 Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and minimize interactions  
25 with protected species, as required by the ESA.  
26  
27 Action 1, and I'll add too that there's only one action in this  
28 particular document, titled "Modify the Method Used to Collect  
29 Vessel Position Data for the Gulf of Mexico Shrimp Fishery". There  
30 is a note as well with this action that the types of data, as well  
31 as the amount and timing of data collection, would not vary between  
32 alternatives.  
33  
34 Consistent with current requirements, the permitted vessels  
35 selected to participate must also provide NMFS with the following:  
36 the size and number of shrimp trawls deployed for each set, and  
37 the type of bycatch reduction device and trawl excluder device  
38 used in the nets. As set forth in Amendment 13, and 50 CFR 622.51,  
39 compliance with these requirements, and the requirement to submit  
40 vessel position data is required for permit renewal.  
41  
42 So, Alternative 1, in this case, this is what was presented to the  
43 council, at its November meeting, in terms of the IPT  
44 recommendations for the language change, and so you'll see there  
45 was some text that had strikethrough, and then there was simply a  
46 verb tense change, from "will collect" to "would collect", and so  
47 I'll give everybody just a moment, and then, as we advance through,  
48 I'll show a cleaned-up version and then the rationale from the IPT

1 for those proposed changes that had gone to the council.

2  
3 This is the language as it stands following the November council  
4 meeting, and, Camilla, if we can move forward to one more, and so  
5 the rationale here, from the IPT, was not that the text was not  
6 important, or germane, to the document, but simply that could be  
7 moved to the discussion, as well as potentially to the economic  
8 analyses in the document, and that it didn't need to be in the  
9 alternative itself. Camilla, hold on one second. Can you back up  
10 a slide?

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Here again, just to take a step back, to  
13 understand how the council functions, for some of our newer  
14 members, and so you have a fishery management plan, right, in this  
15 case for shrimp, and, when you want to make changes to how you  
16 manage the shrimp fishery, you have an amendment to that Shrimp  
17 Fishery Management Plan.

18  
19 This is a framework document that will amend the fishery management  
20 plan for shrimp. For each action item in a fishery management  
21 plan, the council staff, along with the IPT, and so the Science  
22 Center and the agency, they give us a reasonable range of  
23 alternatives to choose from, right, and so Matt just took you --  
24 Alternative 1 is always status quo, right, and so keep doing it  
25 the way you're doing it, right, and so that's what Matt just took  
26 you through.

27  
28 We have three alternatives in the one action item that we have in  
29 this document. He's going to take you through Alternative 2 and  
30 3. The reason he's showing you the red-line version is because,  
31 at the last council meeting, the council made changes to the  
32 language in all three of those alternatives, and so he's trying to  
33 take us through the changes that -- The most recent changes that  
34 the council made, and so just to kind of back up and give everybody  
35 an overview of where we're going with this. Mr. Zales.

36  
37 **MR. ZALES:** What is the difference in the terminology meaning, or  
38 whatever, between "will" and "would"? What was that change made  
39 for? I don't understand. It's like "shall" and "should". What  
40 is the difference in the definition, or terminology?

41  
42 **DR. FREEMAN:** Mr. Zales, I wish I could respond right offhand.  
43 That was one of those language changes that I'm going to take a  
44 guess might come from General Counsel, and so I think it was just  
45 a legal aspect, that it was a recommendation, and so -- But I do  
46 not recall, right off the top of my head, what the rationale for  
47 that particular verbiage change was.

1 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** We have a brave member. Yes, go ahead. I think  
2 we have an answer to the question coming to the podium. Frank,  
3 will you introduce yourself, if you don't mind?  
4

5 **MR. FRANK HELIES:** Of course. Good morning. Frank Helies, NOAA  
6 Fisheries, Branch Chief for the Gulf of Mexico Operations. The  
7 question on "will", versus "would", we don't like to use "will" in  
8 amendment documents until the final rule stage, because it's pre-  
9 decisional, and so it's pretty simple and not that big of a deal.  
10

11 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, sir.  
12

13 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay, and so Alternative 2 -- This was a version in  
14 front of the council prior to its meeting, and so this was to  
15 implement a cellular vessel monitoring system, or cVMS,  
16 requirement for the Gulf of Mexico shrimp fishery that provides  
17 archived position data compatible with the Science Center shrimp  
18 effort algorithm.  
19

20 If selected by the Science and Research Director, the owner or  
21 operator of a shrimp vessel with a valid or renewable Gulf shrimp  
22 moratorium permit (SPGM) would be required to install a type-  
23 approved VMS unit (following 50 CFR 600.1501) that archives vessel  
24 position when on a shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf and  
25 automatically transmit set data, via cellular service, to NMFS.  
26

27 If we move forward, the council motion, at its November meeting,  
28 is in front of you right now, and that was to implement a vessel  
29 monitoring system (VMS) requirement, which I'll note here, and  
30 I'll explain more in just a moment, but, if you'll notice, they  
31 took out the word "cellular", and so part of that rationale was to  
32 allow for shrimpers to select either cellular or satellite VMS,  
33 and so a VMS requirement for the Gulf of Mexico shrimp fishery  
34 that provides, at a minimum, archived position data compatible  
35 with the Science Center's shrimp effort algorithm to a NMFS server.  
36

37 If selected by the Science and Research Director, the owner or  
38 operator of a vessel with a Gulf shrimp moratorium permit (SPGM)  
39 would be required to install a type-approved VMS unit (following  
40 50 CFR 600.1501), and let me mention the rationale for some of  
41 this.  
42

43 Some of the rationale from the IPT, because they did accept some  
44 of the IPT changes, but there was further council discussion, and  
45 they made further modifications, and this was due to vessels with  
46 a SPGM permit, as well as other permits that already require  
47 specifically a satellite VMS, that it would be burdensome to  
48 require those vessels to have two VMS devices onboard, as well as

1 pay for two transmission fees, and so, for those vessels, in  
2 essence, they're operating in a fishery with a permit where they're  
3 already having to have a satellite VMS. If Alternative 2 were  
4 selected, then they would also have to install a cellular VMS and  
5 pay transmission fees.

6  
7 The rationale there was simply to let them decide what makes the  
8 most sense, from a business aspect. You know, it may wind up being  
9 cheaper, and that they want to also have a cellular VMS device,  
10 and that's fine, but they didn't want to limit them, and then,  
11 lastly, there was some text that was removed as descriptors of  
12 permits.

13  
14 Specifically, I'll note the "valid or renewable", and they were -  
15 - The rationale there was it was a matter of any owner or operator  
16 of a vessel with a SPGM being selected, and, Camilla, can we go  
17 back one slide, so everyone can see what that is looking like?  
18 Okay. Ms. Bosarge, I think you had a question.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, and so, if I recall correctly, when we  
21 started this amendment, many years ago, we actually spelled out  
22 both satellite and cellular VMS, satellite or cellular VMS, in  
23 this alternative, and I swear I remember we had a motion, at the  
24 council meeting, and we had a lot of discussion, and we struck  
25 "satellite" from this option and changed it to only a cellular  
26 VMS, due to the cost concerns of having a satellite VMS ping six  
27 times an hour, okay, and so we have satellite VMS on snapper boats,  
28 and other boats in the Gulf, but they ping once an hour, and not  
29 six times an hour.

30  
31 You pay for the pings, right, on a satellite, and so we're going  
32 to get some information on that later. It just struck me that  
33 we've come full circle now. The council took that out, and now  
34 the council is putting it back in, after we had a lot of discussion,  
35 and so I hope we'll get some good cost data on what it would  
36 actually take for someone that has a satellite VMS, for some other  
37 fishery, on their shrimp boat and take that VMS and actually make  
38 it meet the shrimp fishery VMS requirement.

39  
40 You're going to have to increase the ping rate to six times an  
41 hour, and so there's a cost to that, and we're going to talk about  
42 that and see if this is actually a realistic idea that somebody  
43 would use that or not.

44  
45 The other thing that strikes me here, and I was the one, if I  
46 remember correctly, that added it to this alternative, when I was  
47 on the council, and I was very specific about this being a device  
48 that needs to be on and functioning when on a shrimping trip in

1 the Gulf of Mexico, and so now the changes that the council has  
2 made to this is it doesn't matter where you are, or what you're  
3 doing, and you need to be tracked at all times.

4  
5 If you go to the South Atlantic, it doesn't matter. You're not  
6 even in the Gulf of Mexico federal jurisdiction anymore, but you  
7 better have it on and pinging. The government needs to see where  
8 you are at all times, regardless. We're trying to calculate Gulf  
9 shrimp effort, but we need to have this box on, and pinging, or  
10 we're in violation, when we're in a different body of water, in a  
11 different ocean, and so they may be minor changes in the IPT's  
12 mind, but, for a fisherman, it's not.

13  
14 That's a big change, and so hopefully we'll have some more  
15 discussion about that when we get to the actual framework document.  
16 Does anybody else have any tidbits of information, or feedback, on  
17 this one? We'll have another bite at this apple when we get to  
18 the actual document itself, too. Glenn, go ahead.

19  
20 **MR. DELANEY:** Great. Thanks. I would just like to make a point  
21 along the lines of some that you've made, Leann, is, you know,  
22 particularly for the new members, and I just want to point out  
23 that the Shrimp AP did not have the opportunity to review the IPT  
24 changes to the alternatives before they were presented to the  
25 council and on which the council took action in November.

26  
27 That was, in large part, the impetus for this Shrimp AP meeting,  
28 to give us, the AP, the opportunity to reconsider these issues,  
29 and the new text in the alternatives, and provide our advice to  
30 the council prior to their next meeting in January, and so I just  
31 wanted to point out that it's these changes that we hadn't had a  
32 chance to review and provide comment on, and that's why we're here  
33 today. Thank you.

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thanks, Mr. Delaney, and so this is the VMS  
36 alternative, and I think the one thing that's not written in here,  
37 that Dr. Freeman will take us through, as he goes through the  
38 document, and he's trying to summarize for us here, and so this  
39 unit is actually a program that's overseen and managed by the  
40 Office of Law Enforcement.

41  
42 The Office of Law Enforcement type-approves VMS, and your tracking  
43 of your vessel actually shows up on a map for both federal law  
44 enforcement and certain state law enforcement officers nationwide,  
45 due to the joint enforcement agreements that we have, and so  
46 there's a lot of people that are watching the movements of your  
47 vessel.

1 This one goes -- At this time, that all goes to the Office of Law  
2 Enforcement, and that's the Alternative 2, with a VMS, and Dr.  
3 Freeman is amazing, because he has to multitask. You don't even  
4 realize what all he's doing. He has to write the meeting summary,  
5 and so not only is he running this presentation, and trying to  
6 field questions, and see who's out there, but he's also trying to  
7 take his notes for his meeting summary of what we ask questions  
8 about and what we say, and so bear with him.

9  
10 **DR. FREEMAN:** All right. Camilla, if we can move forward. I will  
11 add one other quick piece of information. It will probably come  
12 up later today as well. Again, as far as the number of vessels,  
13 as of September 20 of 2024, with valid or renewable SPGM permits,  
14 and I mentioned it was 1,257. Of those, there are an estimated  
15 104 vessels that are required to comply with VMS requirements in  
16 other fisheries, and those currently are required to have a  
17 satellite VMS.

18  
19 **MR. ZALES:** Are those permitted for reef fish, or charter, or some  
20 other permit that's out there, those hundred and whatever?

21  
22 **DR. FREEMAN:** Sure, and so I've actually got the breakdown of that.  
23 Ninety-one of those have South Atlantic rock shrimp limited-access  
24 permits, eleven have commercial Gulf reef fish permits, and five  
25 have various Atlantic HMS permits, highly migratory species.

26  
27 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I believe, if I'm not mistaken, that VMS for  
28 the rock shrimp fishery -- That was an enforcement tool.  
29 Essentially, there's some habitat areas over there, coral and  
30 things like that, and it was a lot of concern that your shrimpers  
31 might, especially rock shrimp, get in those areas, when they drew  
32 these new lines, and so it's an enforcement tool for rock shrimp,  
33 to make sure you don't get in those habitat areas, so that law  
34 enforcement can see you, when you get over that line, and you're  
35 going to get in trouble.

36  
37 I will also mention that, in the South Atlantic, the way that that  
38 was written up, that is for -- You have to have that device on the  
39 boat, and operational, when you're rock shrimping in the South  
40 Atlantic. They said in the South Atlantic. If you come to the  
41 Gulf, that's no longer a requirement for it to be pinging, because  
42 you're not in the South Atlantic anymore, and we're going about  
43 this -- We have been going about it that same way in the Gulf,  
44 saying, when you're on a shrimping trip in the Gulf, you would  
45 have to have that VMS on and pinging, but the council just changed  
46 that, and so I just want to point that out.

47  
48 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay, and so in front of you are the recommendations

1 that went to the council, at its November meeting, from the IPT.  
2 You'll see there were some portions with strikethrough, and then  
3 some portions that are in green, which would be new text.  
4 Highlighting a few of those, and, similar to before, I'll have a  
5 slide that goes through the rationale for them, and it was doing  
6 a word change from "electronic logbook" to "VMS".

7  
8 Also, in terms of where the data is being transmitted, rather than  
9 saying to the Science Center, or the Office of Science and  
10 Technology, it's simply staying that would be to a non-OLE, which  
11 is Office of Law Enforcement, NMFS server, and stating that --  
12 Sort of clarifying that this would be type-approved through a  
13 process external to 50 CFR 600.1501, which is federal regulations  
14 dealing with VMS devices, and so, Camilla, if we can move forward  
15 a slide, and so this is the cleaned-up language.

16  
17 Those IPT recommendations were accepted by the council in November,  
18 and I'll add one other thing. Again, particularly for our newer  
19 members, one of the issues that we've heard, from the start, and  
20 Ms. Bussard just touched on this a minute ago, is, often, with  
21 VMS, it's for enforcement purposes, as has been discussed multiple  
22 times by the AP.

23  
24 This is for the purpose of being able to calculate effort, and so  
25 it's for scientific purposes, rather than for enforcement. As a  
26 result, the AP, and industry, we've heard multiple times, would  
27 prefer that this data not go to OLE, and so Alternative 3, over  
28 this process, has been more of an industry-driven alternative, and  
29 I'll phrase it that way, and so that was why that suggestion was  
30 simply to say that, yes, it is going to NMFS, but not to OLE.

31  
32 Again, I'll have some of the rationale on the next slide, but I  
33 just wanted to, again, sort of provide a little more background.  
34 This was just in the event that it wound up needing to go to some  
35 group other than the Science Center, or Office of Science and  
36 Technology, and they didn't want necessarily limit themselves, and  
37 so they thought it would be better to simply to say who it would  
38 not be going to within NMFS.

39  
40 The only other addition I'll add, just real quick, again for  
41 background, particularly for our new members, is we have heard,  
42 from the Science Center, several times, that, even under  
43 Alternative 2, if the data goes to the Science Center, or whoever  
44 else, OLE has access to it. The same goes for Alternative 3. Even  
45 if it's a non-OLE NMFS server, OLE will still be able to access  
46 that data. It's simply sort of the first stop repository, but  
47 anyone can access that.

48

1 **MR. ZALES:** Where it talks about a process external to the current  
2 CFR, would that process require new CFR language?

3  
4 **DR. FREEMAN:** That's a good question. That would be really -- I  
5 would direct that to NMFS. I believe it would wind up being a new  
6 CFR, but I'm not 100 percent sure. I'm getting some nods from the  
7 back of the room, and so it appears so, yes.

8  
9 Okay, and so the rationale here, retaining the cellular-only  
10 option, and the non-OLE NMFS server, as I mentioned, is so this  
11 alternative really originated from the industry and the AP's input,  
12 and so, unlike Alternative 2, the IPT did not recommend allowing  
13 satellite and cellular.

14  
15 Referring to cellular ELB as cellular VMS, we heard, from IPT  
16 members, that, at the end of the day, the way these devices are  
17 going to be structured, that is what they would be referred to, is  
18 vessel monitoring systems.

19  
20 Similar to Alternative 2, removing some text related to the  
21 descriptors of the permits, because it's simply a matter of any  
22 owner or operator of a vessel with an SPGM permit being selected,  
23 and then, as I mentioned, that bullet point right there, in terms  
24 of the rationale for the non-OLE NMFS server being the recipient  
25 of the data. Then, lastly, again, saying that the process for  
26 type-approval would be external to 50 CFR, and we had a hand from  
27 Mara, and so, Ms. Bosarge, do you mind if she chimes in?

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mara, if you don't mind, just for the new  
30 members around the table, would you introduce yourself, and then  
31 go ahead and tell us whatever you wanted to clue us in on.

32  
33 **MS. MARA LEVY:** Hi. Can you hear me?

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, ma'am.

36  
37 **MS. LEVY:** Hi, I'm Mara Levy. I'm with the NOAA Office of General  
38 Counsel, and I'm primarily focused on the Gulf issues, and attend  
39 those meetings, and it was more of a question related, or a comment  
40 related, to Alternative 2, and a question for Matt, because I can't  
41 remember all the discussion at the last council meeting, but, in  
42 relation to some of your points, Leann, in the discussion of  
43 Alternative 2 in the document, it does state that it would require  
44 a VMS, which, at a minimum, archives vessel position when on a  
45 fishing trip in the Gulf.

46  
47 It's not in the alternative language, like it is for Alternative  
48 3, and so I can't remember if that's an oversight, or we

1 specifically removed it, but the discussion does address what you  
2 were raising, Leann, in terms of your concern about when it needed  
3 to be transmitting. Thanks.

4  
5 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, and I noticed that when I read the document  
6 too, that the two were in conflict with each other, but I assumed  
7 that the alternative was the one that would be correct, because  
8 that's all that's going to get codified. It's not going to codify  
9 that discussion part, and so, essentially, the codified regulation  
10 is going to say you have to have it on regardless, wherever you  
11 are, unless the council goes back in and adds that language back  
12 to Alternative 2 that says, you know, it only has to be on when on  
13 a shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf of Mexico. I've got a couple of  
14 hands up around the table. I have Dr. Froeschke first, and, John,  
15 if you don't mind, introduce yourself, please, sir.

16  
17 **DR. FROESCHKE:** John Froeschke, Deputy Director of the Gulf  
18 Council. I don't know if I have all of the recollection of this,  
19 but some of the challenges that I had, when we discussed, this is  
20 we don't have tech specs, and, in general, the VMS, in other  
21 fisheries that we use them in the Gulf, you cannot turn them off  
22 unless you have a power-down exemption, and so the idea that it  
23 would only be on when you're on a fishing trip doesn't seem  
24 compatible with how these VMS units were --

25  
26 Like how they have ever been operationalized, to my knowledge, and  
27 I know we had some discussion about that, and it isn't necessarily  
28 the way they would have to work in this case, but, if the idea was  
29 to accommodate a VMS that was already on a boat from some other  
30 fishery, and that's why they have a satellite-based VMS, I'm not  
31 aware of any that you can turn them off or turn them on at-will.  
32 You know, for example, in the reef fish, if you want to shut it  
33 down, you've got to request a power-down exemption and let them  
34 know when, why, how long, and all that.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I've got a couple of hands. I'm going to go to  
37 Mr. Bosarge.

38  
39 **MR. BOSARGE:** The ones we have for the rock shrimp fishery, yes,  
40 we power them down, because when we power them down, you're not  
41 paying every month for it to ping, when it's unnecessary. We don't  
42 need it in the Gulf of Mexico, but, when we round the tip of Key  
43 West, we have to make sure it's up and pinging.

44  
45 **DR. FROESCHKE:** So, just as a follow-up, so you can turn it off,  
46 and turn it on, just like anything else, and it's not hardwired  
47 into the boat and on all the time?

48

1 **MS. BOSARGE:** It's a piece of electronics. It's powered-up, and  
2 it's powered-down.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** John, I think the confusion stems from the fact  
5 that VMS, for rock shrimp, for reef fish, it is an enforcement  
6 tool, and hence the reason it's got to be up and on at all times,  
7 because law enforcement needs to see where you're at and what  
8 you're doing.

9  
10 What we're trying to use this VMS for is actually scientific data  
11 collection. The Science Center needs to know how much shrimp  
12 trawling is occurring, and where it's occurring, right, the nets  
13 in the water, how many hours are your nets in the water, and where  
14 is that occurring. If you're going to get fuel, that has nothing  
15 to do with effort, right? You're not shrimping. If you're  
16 engaging in something -- If you're in the South Atlantic, that's  
17 got nothing to do with shrimping in the Gulf of Mexico.

18  
19 That's a scientific program, and that makes sense on a scientific  
20 program, but, when we're trying to take a law enforcement program  
21 and use it to collect data, then things get real confusing, and  
22 we're having to monitor people more than what we need to in order  
23 to get the scientific data. We're getting way more than what we  
24 need to.

25  
26 Anyway, and so I think, Matt, if you want to introduce yourself,  
27 and I think you were going to hopefully give us a little insight,  
28 too.

29  
30 **MR. MATT WALIA:** Sure. Thank you. I'm Matt Walia, Compliance  
31 Liaison with the Office of Law Enforcement. I just want to raise  
32 a couple points that may help with the discussion, with  
33 clarification, and so, in Alternative 2, where it keeps referencing  
34 as the type-approval process with the regs, kind of what John was  
35 just talking about, that solely speaks to the tech specs of how a  
36 VMS unit is set up, the communication, the integrity of it, what  
37 a vendor does to apply and get approval.

38  
39 All this other change of how often it reports, what happens if you  
40 want to power-down, if you have interruption of service, all that  
41 is decided under a specific fishery management plan.

42  
43 The rock shrimp, that's separate regs, where a lot of VMS units  
44 are hardwired in, and so you can turn it on and off, but you can't  
45 mess with it, right, and HMS also has gear-dependent specific  
46 areas, where they don't always need it on twenty-four-seven, and  
47 so all that is kind of separate regs, decided through the  
48 management process, that you would have to do, but the type-

1 approval process is not involved in that, and so it's kind of two  
2 distinct things, and I just wanted to note that, if that helps.  
3 Thanks.

4  
5 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, that's very helpful, and, you know, I'm  
6 glad you brought up the HMS, because that was another thing that  
7 I thought about. So, whenever you all took Gulf of Mexico, and  
8 not you all, but the council took Gulf of Mexico out of that VMS  
9 requirement, and so there are some of these Gulf shrimp permits on  
10 HMS vessels, and that's why you wanted to allow the satellite.

11  
12 Well, you just -- By doing this, we're going to make them have  
13 that VMS on, and pinging, at all times now, because we said it  
14 doesn't matter. If you hold a shrimp permit, it's got to be on,  
15 and functional, at all times, whereas, before, they only had to  
16 have it on, and going, when they had certain gears on the boat,  
17 when they were actually engaging in a certain type of fishery, and  
18 so that will have an impact on them as well, I think.

19  
20 **MR. WALIA:** Well, it all depends down to the permit requirements,  
21 and so that's separate from like, again, the type-approval process  
22 that's referenced in there, and so all that would have to be  
23 decided afterwards. You know, every fishery has different  
24 requirements on how often to report, whether it's on twenty-four-  
25 seven, just when you're out fishing, just when you're in an area,  
26 and so, depending on your decision, you could cater the Gulf shrimp  
27 one to meet your needs.

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, but, the way they have it written now, if  
30 you hold that permit on that vessel, it's got to be on, and pinging,  
31 at all times, regardless of in the Gulf or not, and so, if they're  
32 HMS fishing in the Atlantic, and it doesn't matter. If they keep  
33 that permit on that boat, they're going to have to have the VMS  
34 on, and pinging, at all times.

35  
36 **MR. WALIA:** Are you referencing the HMS ones?

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** The HMS vessels, the way we currently have  
39 Alternative 2 written. That's the way I understand it.

40  
41 **MR. WALIA:** Yes, and HMS is confusing, but it's as the gear -- Of  
42 what's on there, and it's tied to their Atlantic tuna permit, and  
43 so that's what dictates when -- If they take the floats off, or  
44 the mainline is disengaged, they can turn the VMS off and go fish  
45 for something else.

46  
47 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Not if they have a shrimp permit on that boat,  
48 after this is passed. If they have a shrimp permit on that boat,

1 the way that we wrote this, it won't matter anymore. That device  
2 will have to be on, and pinging, because they hold a shrimp permit.  
3 Gloeckner, I see you shaking your head. What am I misinterpreting  
4 then about that Alternative 2?

5  
6 **MR. WALIA:** I mean, I'll let them speak so, and so the Alternative  
7 2 just speaks to the tech specs, and so you have to use a  
8 government-approved GPS locator device, and it must meet these  
9 requirements. Nothing gets -- Nothing has been decided yet of the  
10 reporting frequency, or it has to be on twenty-four-seven. They  
11 don't go hand-in-hand, and so, if you want to use a government-  
12 approved device, you would have to use a type-approved one through  
13 a vendor. The next decision would then what requirements do we  
14 want to make, and that hasn't been decided yet of, you know,  
15 twenty-four-seven in the Gulf.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dr. Freeman.

18  
19 **DR. FREEMAN:** I'll just add a few quick points. To back up just  
20 a moment, to one of Mara' questions, as far as Alternatives 2 and  
21 3, I was looking back at my notes. From what I can tell, I think,  
22 again, that was where the IPT was trying to not be overly involved  
23 in making changes to Alternative 3, the language, and I think that  
24 was why Alternative 3 -- The language itself still referred to  
25 when on a fishing trip in the Gulf, whereas, in Alternative 2, it  
26 got moved to the discussion.

27  
28 I will just add though that, as I think we've heard from some folks  
29 in the room, there are other items that are not in the language of  
30 the alternatives, such as the ping rate. It's not described in  
31 the alternative. It's described in the discussion. It's one of  
32 those things where, as appropriate, some things do get moved to  
33 the discussion, and they are still germane, but they don't need to  
34 be in the language of the alternative, describing the device, how  
35 people are selected and which individuals with permits may be  
36 selected. Andy, were you making your way to the podium?

37  
38 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and apologies. When I came up earlier, I  
39 didn't introduce myself, and so, for those that don't know me,  
40 Andy Strelcheck, Regional Administrator, NOAA Fisheries. I just  
41 wanted to kind of clarify a couple of things, because I think this  
42 is a good discussion, and there's good points being raised.

43  
44 One, building off of what Matt just suggested, we don't always  
45 capture everything in the details of the alternatives in the  
46 amendment. Some of that falls into the discussion, and some of it  
47 ultimately will get integrated into a proposed rule that the will  
48 council review and deem as appropriate to submit to the Secretary

1 of Commerce, right, and so keep that in mind, that it's the whole  
2 composition of the alternatives, in conjunction with the  
3 discussion in the amendment, that we build a rulemaking around.

4  
5 With that said, some of the points are well taken, right, and so,  
6 if this AP wants to emphasize, obviously, to the council, clarity  
7 with regard to when the VMS would preferably want to be on, right,  
8 or off, then that's, obviously, within your purview to provide  
9 those recommendations to the council.

10  
11 I would certainly encourage you to do that, or make sure that that  
12 clarity is there for your comfort level if, obviously, that action  
13 moves forward with that particular alternative as preferred, and  
14 so just suggestions, as you kind of move throughout the day, that  
15 making those recommendations are beneficial to the council  
16 process, and understanding the why, right, and your concerns with  
17 regard to economic impacts, costs, whatever they might be, are  
18 really helpful then for the council then to adapt, or modify, or  
19 change any of these alternatives, going forward. Thanks.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So, Andy, while you're up there, so there was  
22 some discussion about the ping rate, and so we have a scientific  
23 shrimp algorithm, and we've always used a six-ping-per-hour rate  
24 to get a fairly accurate speed for the boat, so that we can  
25 calculate a fairly accurate effort. Is there some contemplation  
26 that we're going to change the ping rate?

27  
28 I haven't seen anything in the document that suggests that, but I  
29 was listening to law enforcement, and they said that hadn't been  
30 defined yet, but we are intending to go with the six-ping-per-hour  
31 rate, as we always have, correct?

32  
33 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I haven't heard anything differently. That's the  
34 plan, yes.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Just making sure I was on the right page. Did  
37 we have other hands? I'm going to let Mr. Baumer go, and then Mr.  
38 Zales.

39  
40 **MR. BAUMER:** What document sets forth the pings every ten seconds?

41  
42 **DR. FREEMAN:** Camilla, can you pull open the document for us? If  
43 you'll go to -- It's right before Table 2.1.1. If you can scroll  
44 up just slightly, and so this is some of what we were referring  
45 to. The sentence right before that table notes that, in comparing  
46 Alternatives 2 and 3, the types of data, hour, minute, seconds,  
47 or, sorry, degrees, minute, seconds, amount, timing of data  
48 collection, minimum number of position fixes, would not vary, and

1 then it clarifies that vessel position would be recorded every ten  
2 minutes, which is what is currently the case for the cellular  
3 electronic logbooks.

4  
5 Then, further, it states that the minimum number of position fixes  
6 the unit can process would be 14,400, and that was based off of  
7 how long shrimp vessels may be offshore, that they may need to  
8 archive data, to then be able to transmit within range, and so  
9 this is some of what the discussion was about, that, you know,  
10 while this is not in the language of the alternatives, it's still  
11 stated within the document.

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dr. Simmons.

14  
15 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Madam Chair. But, Matt,  
16 to be clear, I mean, that would be defined in the tech specs for  
17 this particular fishery, and so, even though that's the intent,  
18 and that's the understanding, that would be codified in that  
19 process, after this document is final, correct?

20  
21 **DR. FREEMAN:** Correct. That's been -- Every discussion from the  
22 IPT that I recall, that's how it's been stated, yes. Camilla,  
23 seeing no other questions, can we go back to the presentation? I  
24 believe Ms. Bosarge has a question.

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Zales, go ahead.

27  
28 **MR. ZALES:** Because the rock shrimp thing -- That's the first I've  
29 heard about a permit being able to be turned on and turned off,  
30 depending on where you work, and so, if you're wanting to only  
31 report if you're in the Gulf shrimping, then, whatever language  
32 they used on the South Atlantic side, for their rock shrimp  
33 requirement, if you could mirror that for the Gulf requirement,  
34 and then you could probably -- Because all the permits -- Like  
35 John said, all the permits that I'm familiar with in the Gulf  
36 required you to comply with that permit requirement, regardless of  
37 where you fished. You could be in the Bering Sea, and you still  
38 had to comply with Gulf requirements, and so I would look at South  
39 Atlantic language, to see how that works to incorporate that.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, and so that's what I did, when I was on  
42 the council. I looked at the South Atlantic rock shrimp language,  
43 and I made a motion to add that language to Alternative 2 and 3,  
44 to make it mirror that, and that's how the language was written,  
45 where it said on a shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf of Mexico.

46  
47 I'm not on the council now, and the council, at their last meeting,  
48 took that out, and I get, in their minds, it probably streamlined

1 things, but, in my mind, it made it a much broader program than  
2 what it was. It streamlined, I guess, who needs to have it on,  
3 and when, but it opened Pandora's box, as far as the data that's  
4 being collected now. It's much more than just on a shrimping trip.  
5 I have Dr. Freeman.

6  
7 **DR. FREEMAN:** Camilla, can you go back to the document? Can you  
8 go up two pages? It'll be the bottom of page 10. To clarify, it  
9 was not taken out the document. It was taken out the language of  
10 the alternative. It states, in the beginning of that paragraph,  
11 Alternative 2 would transition the data collection by requiring  
12 the owner or operator of a vessel with a SPGM permit, if selected  
13 by the SRD, to install an approved VMS, which, at a minimum,  
14 archives vessel position when on a fishing trip, and "fishing trip"  
15 is also a defined term, in the Gulf and transmits that data to  
16 NMFS, and so it still states it within the document. It was not  
17 removed. It was just moved to the discussion.

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I think Matt is ready to go back to his  
20 presentation slides. Mr. Zales.

21  
22 **MR. ZALES:** The only issue I see with it, for shrimp vessels that  
23 would have a reef fish permit, or whatever other kind of permit  
24 that would require that VMS can't be turned off, is those few  
25 vessels would be stuck with having to have them on, but the  
26 majority would not, if that language was in there, as far as I  
27 read.

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So I'm glad that we have the Science Center in  
30 the room today, and so if we can go back up a slide, where we can  
31 actually see Alternative 3. There we go. Okay. So, around the  
32 council table, even when I was on the council, there seemed to be  
33 confusion about what is the difference between Alternative 2 and  
34 Alternative 3.

35  
36 Over and over, I tried to explain that, in my mind, from the  
37 fishery side, right, that Alternative 2 is a VMS that goes to law  
38 enforcement. It has to be on, and operational, all the time, if  
39 the boat is moving over water, right, and now hopefully just in  
40 the Gulf, and I'm not sure. I'm a little confused by the last  
41 conversation.

42  
43 Alternative 3 was essentially an alternative that took our  
44 electronic logbook program, that we've had for over twenty years  
45 now, right, and continued it as it was, as a scientific program,  
46 where we took our data, and it went to the Science Center.

47  
48 We were very careful, in Alternative 3 to use that ELB language.

1 That's what we've always had, is an electronic logbook. That's  
2 what our program has been referred to for decades now. We did not  
3 use VMS, because VMS has a set of codified regulations that are  
4 very strict that go along with it, and it's a law enforcement  
5 program.

6  
7 That helped to differentiate between these two alternatives, and  
8 the main difference between the two, and so we had a status quo,  
9 where we could keep mailing chips in, and we had an Alternative 2  
10 that put a VMS requirement on the Gulf of Mexico shrimp fleet, and  
11 we had an Alternative 3 that continued our historical electronic  
12 logbook program through the Science Center.

13  
14 The first sentence, in both Alternative 2 and Alternative 3, now  
15 reads to implement a VMS requirement, whether cellular or not, but  
16 implement a VMS requirement for the Gulf shrimp fishery, because  
17 of the change from ELB to VMS that the council made.

18  
19 To me, this muddies the water, and it tells me that my shrimp fleet  
20 has a VMS requirement, and VMS has specific codified language that  
21 goes with it, and so why do we say VMS and then go muddy the water  
22 even further and say, but we won't use the VMS regulations that  
23 are already codified, and we're going to use some other  
24 regulations.

25  
26 Why not just leave ELB there? If you're going to say it's a VMS,  
27 but we're not going to use VMS regulations for it, that seems a  
28 little contradictory, in my mind, and I worry about somebody  
29 reading this, five years from now, and trying to interpret, you  
30 know, what we meant. Well, we put a VMS requirement on the shrimp  
31 fleet, and so what was the rationale there? What was the problem  
32 with ELB? Yes, sir, Dr. Gloeckner.

33  
34 **DR. DAVE GLOECKNER:** The biggest problem I think we have with using  
35 ELB is the fact that it's not a logbook. The rest of the fishermen  
36 in the Gulf, that actually have a logbook requirement that's on  
37 paper, they know what a logbook is. It is catch, it is effort, it  
38 is what port you sailed from, what port you landed at, who you  
39 delivered your fish to. That's a logbook.

40  
41 This is a location recording device, and a location recording  
42 device falls under the VMS requirement, or regulations, and, you  
43 know, basically, a VMS unit records where you're fishing, at a  
44 given interval, and transmits it to NMFS.

45  
46 What we're talking about, when we say VMS, in this instance, is a  
47 unit. Everybody understands what a VMS unit is. That's why we're  
48 using this term, and not ELB, because it's not an electronic

1 logbook. It never was.  
2  
3 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So we have a codified definition for VMS  
4 somewhere, correct? Do we have a codified definition for an  
5 electronic logbook?  
6  
7 **DR. GLOECKNER:** It is being drafted.  
8  
9 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So it's going to be drafted after the fact.  
10  
11 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Not after the fact. You've got electronic logbooks  
12 in process, as an amendment, in both councils, and the electronic  
13 logbook the Northeast has is already in place, and there's a  
14 definition there, and so we've got those definitions established.  
15 It's just that this was a misnomer that had been carried through,  
16 and it creates us all kinds of problems.  
17  
18 I can't tell you how many data requests I get for catches from the  
19 shrimp electronic logbook, and so it really confuses the public  
20 that are used to asking for fisheries data from a logbook, and  
21 they know what's usually in a logbook.  
22  
23 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** What's usually on a logbook, and that was going  
24 to be my question, and so, as you go into each logbook program,  
25 you define the questions that will be asked, correct, the Science  
26 Center?  
27  
28 **DR. GLOECKNER:** We do.  
29  
30 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** We do. Okay.  
31  
32 **DR. GLOECKNER:** On a form, yes. On a form available from the  
33 SRD, is how it's currently written.  
34  
35 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** On the what?  
36  
37 **DR. GLOECKNER:** A form available from the SRD.  
38  
39 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, and so you can define what the logbook  
40 collects.  
41  
42 **DR. GLOECKNER:** We can.  
43  
44 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, and our logbook collects effort data,  
45 because, to put landings --  
46  
47 **DR. GLOECKNER:** It collects location data, not effort data.  
48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Because, to put landings data into our logbook,  
2 offshore, for a boat that may harvest 40,000 pounds at a time,  
3 would be a substantial undertaking. Therefore, our logbooks do  
4 not, and probably will never, collect effort data, or, I mean,  
5 collect landings data, on that type of level. That's why we have  
6 trip tickets. When we start offloading 40,000 pounds at a time,  
7 we need to put that across a scale, to get an estimate on how many  
8 pounds it is, and that's how our landings data come.

9  
10 It's just not reasonable, for our type of fishery, for thirty-day  
11 trip, and the quantity of product that we handle, and so that's  
12 what I needed to know. We can define what a logbook collects.

13  
14 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I will caution you, when you start talking about  
15 those pounds, the fisheries in the Bering Sea have the same logbook  
16 -- Essentially the same logbook requirements as the other  
17 fisheries, and they're handling 100 metric tons at a trawl.

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** With three people onboard?

20  
21 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Not with three people onboard. I'll give you that.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Right. That's right. Go ahead.

24  
25 **AP MEMBER:** You mentioned that there's codified requirements for  
26 VMS that would not apply to this alternative. Can you explain  
27 that, and, if it doesn't apply, and it's I agree with you that it  
28 would be confusing, if it doesn't apply to and at some point later  
29 on be applied, and why wouldn't we change the VMS language to an  
30 LRD language, a location recording device?

31  
32 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Andy, do you want to speak to it?

33  
34 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I'll provide maybe a little bit of history here,  
35 and, Leann, I can't remember when you rolled off the council. In  
36 2021, maybe, or 2022, and so, as you recall, we had the for-hire  
37 logbook program that was coming online.

38  
39 There was also a number of other programs around the country that  
40 were starting to use these cellular vessel monitoring system  
41 devices, right, and so we, as an agency, codified regulations for  
42 our VMS program that not only includes the satellite devices, but  
43 also cellular devices, right, and so, in terms of nomenclature,  
44 and you and I went back and forth for many council meetings  
45 discussing this, right, what we've been pilot testing now, in  
46 recent years, are essentially cellular vessel monitoring system  
47 devices, as defined by our regulations.

48

1 These are very similar, if not the same devices, that were being  
2 used in our for-hire logbook program. They're just cellular-  
3 based, rather than satellite-based, and so that rule was  
4 essentially expanded to include cellular VMS devices.

5  
6 They are location devices that are collecting data, and then, in  
7 terms of the kind of broader requirements, as Dave Gloeckner was  
8 suggesting, right, I mean, there's certainly different  
9 requirements that can come along with that, in terms of reporting,  
10 right, different forms and, as you all know, the IFQ program in  
11 the Gulf has more rigorous reporting requirements than some of the  
12 for-hire logbook reporting. Those are all then specified specific  
13 to the fishery, with regard to the reporting requirements that go  
14 along with that. In this instance, we're not suggesting that the  
15 shrimp industry report beyond just the cellular VMS location data.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thanks. We appreciate that, and so hopefully  
18 we'll have a little more discussion later on Alternative 3, and  
19 feedback from the Shrimp AP on how we think the language should  
20 read in Alternative 3, whether we agree with the changes that the  
21 council made or maybe we have a better way to say it, and so we'll  
22 have some more discussion on that here a little bit later on.

23  
24 **DR. FREEMAN:** Camilla, can we advance forward? One more. Okay.  
25 Perfect. So these were some of the differences that --

26  
27 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I'm sorry. We have a hand up from Glenn Delaney.  
28 Mr. Delaney, I apologize.

29  
30 **MR. DELANEY:** Actually, given what you just said, maybe this is  
31 appropriate for later in the meeting, but I raised my hand back in  
32 the context of your discussion on the effect of the changes  
33 Alternative 2 had with respect to vessels with VMS satellite units  
34 onboard that operate in other -- Because of their operation in  
35 other fisheries, such as rock shrimp, and the fact that the way  
36 Alternative 2 was modified at the last council meeting, based on  
37 the IPT's recommendations.

38  
39 I guess what I'm getting at is do you want to -- Did you want to  
40 consider a motion to address that problem in Alternative 2, and  
41 this is in, you know, that archives vessel position when on a  
42 shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf language that was removed, and we  
43 can address that later in the meeting, if that's more appropriate,  
44 but I'm happy to offer a motion to that effect.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Mr. Delaney. I was just consulting  
47 with Dr. Freeman, and I think, for, today, because almost the whole  
48 day is going to be on this topic, and Dr. Freeman and I were

1 thinking, if we get through his presentation, and then the Science  
2 Center presentation, and then we're going to come back to the  
3 actual framework document, and that will probably be a cleaner  
4 time to have those motions to change the alternatives, if that's  
5 okay with you.

6  
7 **MR. DELANEY:** Absolutely, and I will, just to that point, have a  
8 few other motions to make with respect to Alternative 3, but this,  
9 I guess, was more with respect to Alternative 2, and I don't know  
10 if the AP wants to consider a motion to modify that, but I'll bring  
11 this all up later on, when that time comes. Thank you.

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, sir.

14  
15 **DR. FREEMAN:** All right, and so this is a table contained within  
16 the document that highlights some of the differences between  
17 Alternatives 2 and 3, given the latest language of Alternatives 2  
18 and 3 from the November council meeting, and so Alternative 2 would  
19 allow for both cellular and satellite VMS. Alternative 3 would be  
20 cellular only.

21  
22 The data recipient, under Alternative 2, would be NMFS. Given  
23 that it's following the 50 CFR, NOAA OLE would currently be the  
24 data recipient. Under Alternative 3, it would be sent to a non-  
25 OLE NMFS server, again with that asterisk that OLE would still be  
26 able to access that data though.

27  
28 There is device reimbursement, through the Pacific States Marine  
29 Fisheries Commission and NOAA OLE. Under Alternative 2, since it  
30 would be following 50 CFR, individuals would be eligible for that  
31 reimbursement.

32  
33 I'll note that any program that allows cellular VMS as an option  
34 is capped, in terms of the reimbursement, at \$950. Now, again,  
35 that's for the initial VMS, and so, again, if there were folks who  
36 had already gotten reimbursement, with a permit for another  
37 fishery, my understanding is they would not be able to apply for  
38 a second pot of money. So, in this instance, if Alternative 2 --  
39 You know, if they already had satellite, and now they chose to get  
40 cellular as well, they would not be able to sort of double-dip.

41  
42 Alternative 3, since it would be a process external to the 50 CFR,  
43 individuals would not be eligible for that device reimbursement,  
44 and then, in discussion with NMFS, you know, the question of if  
45 there's additional NMFS costs from not utilizing the current 50  
46 CFR -- In Alternative 2, there would not be additional costs.  
47 Alternative 3, since a new process would have to be established,  
48 there would be additional costs to the agency, and I know -- I'll

1 add to, and I know it comes up in the next presentation, at one  
2 point, under some of the cost information, and I will add too that  
3 there is an Early Adopter Program.

4  
5 Some folks have already been participating in that, which is  
6 providing devices to folks with a SPGM and two years of  
7 transmission, and those devices are -- There are three cellular  
8 VMS units currently under that Early Adopter Program, and so they  
9 can select from that and have two years of transmission covered.  
10 Camilla, if we can move forward to the next slide. Okay.

11  
12 Then the last item to mention is tentative timeline for the  
13 council, and so staff is planning to bring the draft framework  
14 action back to the council as its January 2025 meeting. It's at  
15 the end of January. We are working to prepare Chapter 3, and we're  
16 working as well at trying to get Chapter 4 completed.

17  
18 Particularly for folks who may be new to the council process,  
19 Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 go into our frameworks. Chapter 3  
20 describes the environment, and there are different subsections,  
21 and so there will be a description of the biological environment,  
22 for instance, and so related to, in this case, the shrimp  
23 environment. It will touch on things like bycatch, or protected  
24 species, things like that, and it sort of provides a descriptor.

25  
26 There will be a description of the economic environment. There  
27 will be a description of the social environment, and then Chapter  
28 4 delves into analyses related to each of those subsections of  
29 Chapter 3, and so that's where we look at biological effects from  
30 actions, economic effects, social effects, et cetera, and so, so  
31 long as Chapter 4 is prepared in time for the January council  
32 meeting, the council can then consider selecting a preferred  
33 alternative, based on those analyses, and then, again,  
34 tentatively, final action is anticipated at the April 2025 council  
35 meeting.

36  
37 One other thing that -- While it's not highlighted here, the AP  
38 summary, and any motions from today, will also be presented to the  
39 Shrimp Committee, as well as to the Full Council, in January, and  
40 the AP chair will be on hand to assist with that summary and then  
41 expand on any items that the committee would like clarification on  
42 and answer questions, and then that was the last slide I had, other  
43 than questions, and I will stop there.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Can you go back two slides? I had a question,  
46 and is Miss Kelly available on the webinar?

47  
48 **DR. FREEMAN:** Camilla, I think to the table, and is that --

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes. That one. Thank you. Kelly, can you --  
3 We're going to unmute you on our end. Can you try and speak, tee  
4 if we can hear you.  
5  
6 **MS. KELLY SPAULDING:** Hi. Can you hear me?  
7  
8 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, we can hear you. Technology at its finest.  
9 So thanks for being on. I actually called you, and, shoot, it was  
10 probably three years ago, and I called you, and you were so  
11 helpful. It was when we first started this, and you were able to  
12 answer every question I had, and I was just amazed at the wealth  
13 of knowledge that you held. You know, you didn't have to consult  
14 with anybody. You had it at your fingertips, and so I was  
15 wondering.  
16  
17 When we talked back then, I was asking a little bit about funding  
18 for the VMS reimbursement program, and I think what you had said  
19 was usually that's funded at about \$250,000 a year, and I was  
20 wondering if that -- Is that still about the funding level,  
21 annually, for that for that VMS reimbursement program?  
22  
23 **MS. SPAULDING:** So it's about \$250,000 to \$300,000, for what we  
24 call our normal course of business, and so that's if there's no  
25 new implementations, and it's just the regular sort of turnover of  
26 permits and such, and so, if there's going to be a new  
27 implementation, then we will need a little bit of time, but we  
28 would plan for that, and so we would budget differently.  
29  
30 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Right. Okay, and so the \$250,000 to \$300,000,  
31 that's to reimburse -- That's like a nationwide fund, and so  
32 anybody that gets a VMS, their initial VMS, in any fishery,  
33 nationwide, that's what we use to reimburse them, right?  
34  
35 **MS. SPAULDING:** Right.  
36  
37 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, and so, if shrimp were to come online,  
38 and say shrimp was a census, as the Science Center it seems would  
39 prefer, that's, you know, 1,200 or 1,300 permits. It's about  
40 seven-hundred-and-something-thousand dollars, I think, that we'll  
41 need just to reimburse the shrimp fleet for VMS, and so where do  
42 you go to get that money? So, right now that's unfunded. We don't  
43 have that money, and do you have to go to Congress, or it has to  
44 come out of the NMFS budget somewhere else, and how do we make  
45 sure we actually have the money, because usually the document reads  
46 that we'll be reimbursed if funds are available, and so just walk  
47 me through how that works.  
48

1 **MS. SPAULDING:** Okay, and so that is true. It is always if funds  
2 are available, and so we would -- I have -- Every year, we project  
3 out the next couple of years, on what kind of implementations could  
4 be put in place, and where that conversation stands, and so we're  
5 always keeping an eye on when we're going to need to increase the  
6 reimbursement contract and what that timeline might look like, and  
7 then we would put that in my spend plan for the year that this  
8 implementation will actually go into effect.

9  
10 Once we get to that point, that will go into my spend plan, and  
11 then, if OLE needs to start searching for more money, then we will  
12 generally go down to the region who is working on the regulation,  
13 and maybe up to NMFS, and we find it.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. So we -- So you don't have to go  
16 get it from Congress. We take it out of some other piece of the  
17 budget for NMFS.

18  
19 **MS. SPAULDING:** That's how it's been so far, yes.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** What's that calendar year for you all's budget?  
22 It runs from, what, October to September or --

23  
24 **MS. SPAULDING:** Yes. The fiscal year is October 1. It starts  
25 October 1.

26  
27 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Okay. Then so one other question.  
28 When we talked, a few years ago, because that was very helpful, so  
29 I can understand where we've got to go to get these funds. When  
30 we talked, a couple of years ago, I think we had like maybe 4,500  
31 boats total, nationwide, in the VMS program for law enforcement,  
32 and most of them ping -- Most of them were paying in at once per  
33 hour. Is your -- Is it more than that now, the number of boats?  
34 About how many do you have in there? Do you know?

35  
36 **MS. SPAULDING:** I can look that up, really quick, but I would --  
37 I would say we're at about maybe 5,000, or maybe a little bit more.  
38 I can get that exact number here in a minute.

39  
40 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. That's -- So it hadn't increased  
41 too much. All right, and so it's about 4,500 to 5,000. So, when  
42 we talked last time, because of the six-ping-per-hour rate for the  
43 shrimp fleet, and so say you've got 4,500 vessels pinging once per  
44 hour, that's 108,000 pings per day that OLE has to manage through  
45 their API and their database. If we add shrimp, and we do a  
46 census, it's going to be 295,000 pings per day that OLE needs to  
47 handle.

48

1 When we talked, a few years ago, we were discussing how OLE would  
2 probably have to make some changes to be able to handle that, that  
3 level of data coming through, I think maybe with your API, or  
4 something like that, and so where do you all stand? Have you all  
5 made those upgrades? Could you handle tripling the data coming  
6 in?

7  
8 **MS. SPAULDING:** Yes, and so we moved our whole system up into the  
9 cloud, and so we have a lot of space to hold the data now, and so  
10 space won't be a problem. The one thing that we might have to  
11 tweak a little bit is, in order to make sure that the system is  
12 running quick enough for the users of the system, is we may pull  
13 out historic data and store it in a separate table, or a separate  
14 database, that can be reachable, and we can pull it back in, as  
15 needed, but, you know, we might only have five years of data easily  
16 accessible, or sitting in the database that's behind the system.

17  
18 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Well, I'm glad you mentioned that,  
19 because it makes me think of one other question that -- It's  
20 something you and I talked about, that I had concerns about, about  
21 the storage of the data, and so ours is -- Ours is scientific data,  
22 right, and so we've got to store it forever. We need that  
23 historical record.

24  
25 **MS. SPAULDING:** Yes.

26  
27 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So, at that point in time, OLE definitely was  
28 storing all your data indefinitely, like forever, but you were  
29 telling me that you have to store data based on the National  
30 Archives and Records Act, or something, NARA, and that NARA was  
31 going through some revisions back then, and so did any of that  
32 change? Do you still have to keep the data forever?

33  
34 **MS. SPAULDING:** Yes, we still have to keep the data forever, and  
35 we actually just, maybe a year-and-a-half ago, revised almost all  
36 of the law enforcement retention records, and so it's been  
37 reiterated, or restated, that the VMS data is kept forever.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** That separate data, that separate database that  
40 you probably had to pull our historical data off of there, you  
41 know, anything older than five years, you already have this  
42 separate database to put our data in, that can handle our level of  
43 reporting?

44  
45 **MS. SPAULDING:** I don't think it's built yet, but we've been  
46 talking with our contractor, and the OCIO, about you guys for a  
47 couple of years, and so everybody is prepared to get that done  
48 quickly, when needed.

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Thank you. I appreciate that.  
3 That's good to hear, that you've been working towards that. I'm  
4 not going to put you on the spot right now, but, at some point,  
5 maybe just shoot me an email and just kind of let me know how long  
6 that you all think it would take to build out that database, and  
7 what that cost would look like to get that done, just so I can  
8 wrap my mind around, you know, making sure that would be secured  
9 and when and what that cost is, please, ma'am.

10  
11 **MS. SPAULDING:** So I think it's going to be -- You know, I don't  
12 know, and it's going to be another table, maybe, where it's just  
13 sitting there, and then we can pull it in as needed, but when it,  
14 and vTrack is the system we use, is running, it will just have  
15 that five, whatever -- How many years we pick, and let's say five,  
16 just so that the system runs faster for the user, but the data  
17 will just -- The further, the older, historic data will just be  
18 moved over to another table. It's still easily accessible from  
19 the system, but --

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Thank you. That's all the questions  
22 I have for you right now. I'm so glad you're on. I knew you would  
23 be able to answer them all. Thank you.

24  
25 **MS. SPAULDING:** Yes, and thank you.

26  
27 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** We're going to take a short break. This is a  
28 good spot to take a break. Do you want a ten-minute -- A ten-  
29 minute break, and so we'll come back in about ten minutes, guys.  
30 Get you some coffee, because it's thrilling stuff.

31  
32 (Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

33  
34 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. If everybody can make your way back  
35 to the table, we're going to get started. All right. We are going  
36 to pick back up with our agenda. We are still under Agenda Item  
37 VII, and so we've had our presentation from Dr. Freeman, which was  
38 Tab 7(b), and now we are going to have our presentation from the  
39 Science Center, which is Tab 7(c). It's our presentation on survey  
40 design and estimated costs for position recording devices in the  
41 Gulf of Mexico shrimp fleet, and I think that's going to be a tag  
42 team from Mr. Dettloff and Dr. Gloeckner.

43  
44 **MR. KYLE DETTLOFF:** Good morning, everyone, and so I'm Kyle  
45 Dettloff. I'm with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center, a  
46 statistician, and I've been working on the shrimp effort estimation  
47 for the past few years. I'm going to give a presentation today,  
48 along with Dave, on a presentation that we gave to the Gulf Council

1 last month on position recording devices and placement within the  
2 Gulf shrimp fleet under a new sample design.

3  
4 Some history of the original vessel selection under the LGL  
5 program, it began based on landings in 2003 and 2004 for shrimp  
6 vessels permitted to fish in Gulf of Mexico federal waters as of  
7 December 31, 2004, and so, ultimately, 577 vessels submitted data  
8 through the ELB, or cELB, program at some point between 2005 and  
9 2013. I guess that would just read "ELB". That's pre-cellular  
10 days.

11  
12 Vessels were assigned to one of nine geographic zones across the  
13 Gulf Coast, based on the port with the majority of landings in the  
14 most recent year of fishing activity. Five of those nine zones,  
15 with significant numbers of both ice and freezer boats, were split  
16 into two separate strata, and so that's a total of fourteen strata,  
17 the five times two for the ice and freezer, plus the additional  
18 four.

19  
20 The number of samples within each stratum was based on the  
21 proportion of total offshore landings, and so you have a weight  
22 going on both for which port received a greater selection, and  
23 then within the vessels within that port were individually weighted  
24 based on the average of their 2003 and 2004 landings, with twice  
25 as much weight given to the 2004 landings.

26  
27 Any vessels that chose not to participate were replaced with an  
28 alternate randomly-selected vessel, and so there is some selection  
29 bias going on there in the ability to decline, and, if a problem  
30 arose with installation on a randomly-selected vessel at the dock,  
31 the researchers would seek out volunteer vessels willing to have  
32 a unit to complete their number of installations for the day.

33  
34 Then, in 2014, the Southeast Center took over with a new selection,  
35 a new cellular electronic data collection program, and selected a  
36 sample of 500 SPGM vessels in 2014. I believe the only difference  
37 there was the ice and freezer strata were gone by then. It was  
38 strictly geographic weighted by landings, and then an additional  
39 100 vessels were selected in 2018, and that brought the sample to  
40 approximately 40 percent of the permitted fleet. For all our  
41 analyses, estimation, everything we're doing, we're still  
42 operating off of that sample, that static sample that was selected  
43 in 2014.

44  
45 The current state of vessel coverage, as of the numbers, or as of  
46 October 2024, when this presentation was originally put together  
47 ahead of the council meeting, the Gulf-wide coverage is  
48 approximately 32 percent, or 397 vessels, with ELB units, out of

1 1,257 SPGM vessels with valid and renewable permits.

2  
3 In 2023, in terms of active vessels, based on trip ticket reported  
4 landings, we received effort data from 27 percent, or 176 out of  
5 651, active offshore vessels, based on offshore landings, and so  
6 651 reported offshore landings through a trip ticket, and we  
7 received active ELB fishing data from 176 of those vessels, and so  
8 27 percent coverage. That is down substantially from the  
9 approximately 60 percent of the active offshore fleet that we were  
10 covering pre-2020 loss of 3G.

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Can you go back one slide for me? So, in my  
13 mind, and I always peg our coverage of the shrimp fleet, like the  
14 sample that we have for the shrimp fleet with the boxes on it, the  
15 ELB boxes, since, you know, about twenty years, and I always had  
16 it pegged at about a third of the fleet, right, and then sometimes,  
17 as things fell off, maybe closer to a quarter, but that 40 percent,  
18 and you say approximately 40 percent of the permitted fleet. How  
19 did we arrive at that?

20  
21 I ask because the original selection was 500 boats, right, in 2014,  
22 and we had 1,515 permits in 2014, and so that's 33 percent of the  
23 fleet that we were sampling. That's about a third, you know, which  
24 is about what my memory says we've usually targeted, and so where  
25 did we bump up to -- Then, in 2018, we picked another 100 vessels,  
26 because some of those vessels that we originally picked were no  
27 longer shrimping.

28  
29 They had gotten rid of their permits. The permit fell out, and  
30 the boat fell out of the fleet, and so we needed to beef our survey  
31 back up, to try and get it back up to that one third, and so where  
32 are we getting to this 40 percent of the fleet idea?

33  
34 **MR. DETTLOFF:** It's possible that's an aggregate number from  
35 transmitted data at any given time throughout the program, and so,  
36 if you were to look, year by year, on an annual basis, it may come  
37 out something closer to 33 percent, but that 40 percent is just  
38 saying, throughout the entire duration of the program, 40 percent  
39 of those vessels that were permitted at some time transmitted ELB  
40 data.

41  
42 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Gotcha, but our sample size is usually -- We  
43 usually have -- We're sampling about a third of the fleet in any  
44 given year.

45  
46 **MR. DETTLOFF:** Something closer to that.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay.

1  
2 **MR. DETTLOFF:** But a much greater proportion of the active fleet  
3 in any given year, at least in modern -- At least, 2014 to present,  
4 that number is closer to about 60 percent.

5  
6 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Because, in any given year, generally speaking,  
7 at least a quarter of the fleet is inactive. A quarter of the  
8 permits generally are inactive. Now, right now, in the more recent  
9 times, half the fleet -- From what I can see on your slide, about  
10 half the fleet is inactive, because we've got twelve-hundred-and-  
11 something permits, and you say we only have six-hundred-and-  
12 something active boats, and so we got 50 percent of the fleet tied  
13 to the dock, not shrimping, and it's been that way for a couple of  
14 years now. It gets a little worse each year, I believe, but okay,  
15 and so about a third of the fleet we're sampling. That's what I  
16 want to make sure, that my memory was correct on that. Thank you.

17  
18 **MR. DETTLOFF:** So a recap of the assumptions. As I list before  
19 every effort estimation number, it's that first assumption is that  
20 the devices are capturing all fishing activity for a vessel, and  
21 so if -- Like we're talking about, if they're on a fishing trip in  
22 the Gulf, we're assuming that the devices are on, at least for  
23 this effort estimation program. It's not concerned with anything  
24 that's happening outside of the Gulf or when vessels are not  
25 fishing. That's all filtered out anyway.

26  
27 We're assuming that there's no systematic bias in the  
28 classification of effort from ELB devices, and so that speed  
29 footprint that we are calculating from, and it's actually closer  
30 about 1.9 to 3.6 knots, and then there's some additional logic  
31 that goes on after that to ensure that that is happening for a  
32 long enough of a period of time, at least an hour of activity, to  
33 be considered a tow.

34  
35 These Assumptions 3 through 5, these are what are introduced as a  
36 result of having to scale a subsample of vessels with units up to  
37 the entire fleet, and so the assumptions we need to make for that  
38 are that CPUE of vessels with ELBs onboard is representative of  
39 the total fleet. We are having to assume that the spatial  
40 distribution of ELB vessels is representative of the total fleet  
41 within the time-space strata at which the effort is scaled up.

42  
43 Another critical assumption is that the reporting of landings in  
44 terms of completeness or reporting at all or accuracy is similar  
45 between those with ELB and non-ELB units, and so Assumptions 3  
46 through 5 are there strictly due to a subsample, and, under a  
47 census, those could be eliminated.

1 This figure is meant to assess how well we are fulfilling that  
2 Assumption 1 that we're capturing all ELB effort data, and, at  
3 least in the recent chip collection years, the metrics indicate  
4 we're not doing as well as we've been doing with that in the past.

5  
6 If we look at this partial year reported effort, versus partial  
7 year landings, with partial year defined as only landings in one  
8 six-month period of the year or the other, and we look at that for  
9 landings, and we look at that for effort, we see that landings --  
10 That number has been pretty stable over time, 2014 through 2022,  
11 hovering around 10 or 15 percent of vessels will report landings  
12 in only one half of the year or another, but, with the chip return,  
13 and the potential to receive only a partial year of chip data,  
14 that number has shot up in 2021, suggesting that there are cases  
15 where we're not receiving complete data for a year, for a given  
16 vessel, relative to the landings that they're reporting, and that  
17 is something that is going to affect the estimation and potentially  
18 bias estimates downward.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So, Kyle, that's something that you anticipate,  
21 and that's because of the chips, because we mail those in twice a  
22 year.

23  
24 **MR. DETTLOFF:** Yes, that's right.

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** We didn't have that problem so much when we  
27 transmit automatically, and so, regardless of the type of device  
28 we put on the boat, as long as we can get that transmission  
29 mechanism back in place where it transmits automatically, you think  
30 that will begin to remedy itself?

31  
32 **MR. DETTLOFF:** Yes, exactly. Yes, and it's just the fact that the  
33 chip mailing, the multi-chip mailing, creates an additional  
34 mechanism of potential missingness that isn't there with the  
35 automatic transmission.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** You are going back the next year, and so  
38 somebody has two shots to mail it in each year, but, if they're  
39 late, and they mail it in the following year, the data is still on  
40 there from the prior year. You all are going back and pulling  
41 that off, and filling in those gaps, where you had a half a year,  
42 right, because you just get it late. We're filling it in, right?

43  
44 **MR. DETTLOFF:** Yes, and we'll be updating it. So some assessment  
45 of the other assumptions I listed out there, in terms of the  
46 related to the actual scaling up to the fleet by landings, and we  
47 looked at the spatial and temporal representation of landings for  
48 devices with and without ELB units, to compare how well we are

1 capturing the picture of the fleet as a whole, in terms of time,  
2 space, species.

3  
4 What we found was that the percentage of landings by area, and  
5 quadrimester being season, and species have generally remained  
6 constant through time, through the 2014 through 2022 period. The  
7 ELB proportional coverage, by the time-space strata, has remained  
8 relatively steady through time. The representation across the  
9 year of vessels with and without ELB devices shows a similar  
10 pattern, in terms of landings.

11  
12 What we did find, that could potentially be problematic, is that  
13 Area 3, and I have a figure of this, a map of this, in the next  
14 figure, but that is Stat Zones 9 through 14, is generally somewhat  
15 underrepresented by ELBs, in relation to Areas 4 and 5, and it  
16 probably correlated to the next bullet point there, that, in  
17 general, white shrimp is generally underrepresented, in relation  
18 to brown shrimp, and so that's probably a function of the people  
19 going further offshore are better represented in the ELBs, or those  
20 fishing in Areas 4 and 5.

21  
22 Pink shrimp has generally been well represented in Areas 1 through  
23 3, where that fishery occurs, and so the scaling process, as it  
24 exists, it can account for potentially unequal representation  
25 among the strata, but the thing that we're tied to, with the  
26 resolution of the landings data, is that, within the time-space  
27 strata, we are stuck to assuming equal representation, which may  
28 or may not be true.

29  
30 These are the five aggregate areas used for scaling of the box  
31 effort to the fleet, 1 through 5, and this was based on a cluster  
32 analysis of where vessels typically conduct their trips, and that's  
33 not to say that there's never any overlap on a single trip between  
34 these areas, but, if we were to pick any five areas to get the  
35 greatest amount of separation for defining a trip, based on  
36 landings, these would be the five.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Kyle, I think we have a question. Mr. Bosarge.

39  
40 **MR. BOSARGE:** So Kyle, can we go back one slide? One more. So,  
41 when you talk about that Area 3, nine through fourteen is generally  
42 somewhat unrepresented by ELBs, and, you know, that's the area we  
43 don't fish. There's -- From that Port St. Joe, to just about  
44 between Pensacola and Mobile, that's just very -- Over the years,  
45 there have been so many artificial reefs, unreported artificial  
46 reefs, put out that you can't wet a net there. You're going to  
47 draw back a nub, and so, when you say it's underrepresented, it's  
48 not fished. You know, could that be some of what you're seeing?

1  
2 **MR. DETTLOFF:** Well, this is actually in terms of landings that  
3 have been reported in those areas, and so we're looking at the  
4 proportion of landings reported by non-ELB vessels in that area  
5 and by ELB vessels in that area, and so that's where we see a  
6 little divergence, compared to the other areas, and so there may  
7 be less fishing going on in there, but the landings at least  
8 indicate -- That's probably mainly in Areas 13 and 14, I would  
9 guess that it's all happening, but I'm guessing the 9 through 12  
10 is probably lower effort.

11  
12 **MR. BOSARGE:** Yes, and very little effort, just nearshore, very  
13 nearshore, effort, and that's limited, but, anyhow, just keep that  
14 in the back of your mind, that that could be part of what you're  
15 seeing, when you're thinking it's underrepresented, when it's  
16 actually not fished. Nobody's going to be reporting landings in  
17 those areas.

18  
19 Do you follow what I'm saying? Their landings are going to be  
20 more over towards that mouth of the river, and if you go back to  
21 -- I don't remember the numbers, the actual, it would be 12, 13,  
22 and 14, I think, and 15, you know, which encompasses that Area 3  
23 to 14, all the way up to 14. Those landings will be more in that  
24 one end of that Area 3, if they're where they're reported.

25  
26 **MR. DETTLOFF:** Okay. Could we go to the figure on the next slide?  
27 Yes, and so it'd be coming off southern Louisiana there, I think,  
28 is the main, in terms of effort, and, in terms of effort in Area  
29 3, I think it's really off of the southern Louisiana there, is  
30 what we're looking at, and so that's generally the spot that is  
31 underrepresented by the ELBs.

32  
33 **DR. GLOECKNER:** It's trips reported in trip ticket, versus ELBs,  
34 right, and that's where establishing that it's underrepresented,  
35 and so we're just having a subset. I mean, essentially what we're  
36 looking at is trip ticket data, is trips reported from these areas,  
37 and we're comparing that to what the ELBs are reporting, and that's  
38 where the underrepresentation is happening, is you're getting more  
39 trips in trip ticket than you're seeing from the ELBs, and so it  
40 doesn't matter how many landings you're seeing. It's still just  
41 a proportion, and so it's still saying that you're seeing less  
42 represented in the ELB data than you're getting from trip ticket  
43 data.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, I think what Steve is getting at -- So  
46 you're talking about how your random sample may be  
47 underrepresenting things, and I think what -- I guess our concern  
48 is, if you're about to draw a new random sample out of our fishery,

1 and you think that whole stat zone, or that whole Zone 3, which  
2 encompasses Stat Zones 9 through 14, if you're -- If you don't put  
3 a little more detail into what you want for representation, you're  
4 going to go try and put more ELBs in that area, where you have  
5 effort and landings in Stat Zone 3, I mean in Zone 3, when, really,  
6 the whole eastern part of that particular area is really not fit.

7  
8 You're not going to have landings coming into those ports hot and  
9 heavy, because you don't have a bunch of shrimp grounds offshore  
10 of that area, and so we don't want you to try and make something  
11 a reality that's not a reality, if we go to resample, is what we're  
12 saying.

13  
14 **MR. BOSARGE:** If you're looking at landings on a whole, and you're  
15 trying to divide those landings across the complete 3, Section 3,  
16 it's not going to happen. There are no landings. There are no -  
17 - There's no effort, very little effort, and very little landings  
18 that take place in most of that Zone 3, and so it's all -- The  
19 Zone 3, around that mouth of the river, all the landings for that  
20 whole Zone 3 are coming out of that one little area. Do you follow  
21 what I'm saying? So, in your mind, you see it being as  
22 unrepresented. In my mind, I see it is no -- The reality is  
23 there's no fishing in that area, and so you have to allocate all  
24 those landings to that one area.

25  
26 **MR. DETTLOFF:** I hear your point, but that's not what we're trying  
27 to do. We're not trying to allocate across all the three. It's  
28 just that the landings -- What I'm getting at is the landings we  
29 are getting in Zone 3, based on the effort, are likely coming just  
30 from that section, and so we're seeing that that Louisiana section  
31 is generally underrepresented, in terms of landings.

32  
33 **MR. BOSARGE:** I think neither one of us are quite understanding  
34 the other one, but you -- I'm just making the point -- A lot of  
35 times, your ELB logbooks will show effort down there around that  
36 mouth of the river.

37  
38 It may not -- The landings may not show up as coming from that  
39 area, because that boat might have come out of Texas, and he  
40 doesn't have that many choices where to report his landings, and  
41 so, if he caught shrimp there, but he caught the bulk of his shrimp  
42 in the middle of Louisiana, that may be where he reported his  
43 landings being. Do you see what I'm saying? They don't give you  
44 the option of saying, well, I caught this much percentage from  
45 here, and this much percent, and so it skews your -- It just a  
46 little bit.

47  
48 **MR. DETTLOFF:** Yes, and that's exactly the reason we're using this

1 aggregation in the first place, is because the cell-by-cell level  
2 is much too fine scale to get at that, and so that's why we're  
3 here with these areas.

4  
5 Okay, and so another assumption of -- We're looking into the CPUE  
6 assumption, as best we can evaluate it, between ELB and non-ELB.  
7 One way we can do that is look at the average numbers of nets per  
8 vessel reported in the annual landings and gear survey conducted  
9 out of Galveston.

10  
11 This is based on the average nets per vessel among the federally-  
12 permitted fleet and looking at that number for vessels with an ELB  
13 and without an ELB through time. We're seeing that the ELB vessels  
14 have a consistently higher average number of nets. Looking at two  
15 versus four-net configurations, it's about 3.75 nets for the  
16 average vessel with an ELB, and 3.25 for non-ELB, and so, as we  
17 know, that's going to suggest that you're going to get a higher  
18 CPUE with a higher number of nets.

19  
20 We've done some analyses on that, to put a number to how CPUE  
21 scales between two and four nets, and, generally, we've seen that  
22 your CPUE, for an average tow, is about 40 percent higher for a  
23 four-net vessel than for a two-net vessel. That's not an exact  
24 times-two scaling, as simple math would indicate, but it's closer  
25 to that 1.4 number, and so we're getting -- This all makes sense,  
26 based on the way the original sample was selected, to be based on  
27 landings, and that would drive the selection toward vessels with  
28 higher CPUE and a greater number of nets.

29  
30 Looking into the reporting assumption, equally likely to be  
31 reporting, ELB versus non-ELB, and so this is an analysis of the  
32 vessels that have reported landings through time, and the blue  
33 line is out of the SPGM fleet, and so that is counting up for  
34 looking at 2023, all the way on the left, and just under 800  
35 reported offshore trip ticket landings.

36  
37 Then we're cumulatively adding vessels to that that have reported  
38 landings at any time, all the way back to 2014, and so there's the  
39 plateau, over to the right, and then this is in relation to the  
40 dashed red line at the top, which is the current number of valid  
41 and renewable permits.

42  
43 If we were to make a selection today, we would be selecting from  
44 the pool that totals up to the dashed red line at the top, but the  
45 problem with that is we would have to use the landings data as a  
46 sampling frame to inform that selection for the entire fleet, and  
47 we don't have data for the entire SPGM fleet to even inform that  
48 selection.

1  
2 We only have it for about 86 percent of the fleet, if we were to  
3 go back all the way to 2014, which may be even a little far to go  
4 back, talking about a current sample to select, and so that's an  
5 issue there, in terms of a stratification for a new sampling  
6 design.

7  
8 Then, also, indicated here is that, among the 171 vessels, and so  
9 the gap between the blue and the red line, the 171 that have not  
10 reported landings at any time since 2014, 92 percent of those have  
11 never held an ELB, and so, for whatever reason that might be,  
12 whether it's latent permits, whether it's the vessels are more  
13 likely to report landings if they have an ELB, that number there  
14 is a little problematic for the scaling to the fleet, whatever it  
15 may be due to. You would hope to see equal nonreporting, ELB  
16 versus non-ELB, but, in this case, the ELB people seem to do a  
17 much better job of reporting landings.

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So, Kyle, I had trouble wrapping my head around  
20 this slide. We're saying that there's this 171 vessels that have  
21 not reported landings, and 151 of those have never held an ELB.  
22 Well, that makes perfect sense to me, because we're trying to get  
23 shrimp effort from boats that are shrimping, right, and not boats  
24 that are consistently tied to the dock, and so, when we originally  
25 developed this, and picked our sample, right, who we're going to  
26 survey, we limited it to active boats, right?

27  
28 We said we don't want to survey boats that aren't fishing. We're  
29 trying to figure how much net-in-the-water time we have, and so we  
30 want to put these boats -- These devices on boats that are  
31 shrimping, and so we actually went and said, all right, the only  
32 people that we're going to use for the pool to sample are people  
33 that had landings in the last two years.

34  
35 At least they've been active recently, because we want it on active  
36 vessels, right? That's what we did in 2003, or 2004, whatever it  
37 was, and it looks like we did a good job.

38  
39 We kept these devices off of boats that weren't fishing, and that  
40 continued to not fish, because you've got 158 boats that never  
41 held an ELB and have never reported landings, and so we did good.  
42 That's a good thing.

43  
44 Are you saying that, if you go back and redo this sample, that the  
45 Science Center now wants to try and put just as many boxes on boats  
46 that are tied to the dock as boats that are active? I don't  
47 understand. If we're trying to get shrimp effort, why are we going  
48 to survey boats that don't shrimp? Why would we target boats that

1 don't shrimp?

2

3 I understand that for things like recreational fisheries, where  
4 you're trying to do this huge extrapolation, and it's important to  
5 know how many people don't fish, but you know who has landings and  
6 doesn't have landings. We need to know how much effort is there,  
7 and so what's our rationale? What has changed in our line of  
8 thought there?

9

10 **MR. DETTLOFF:** Yes, and absolutely that is what we want to target,  
11 are the people actually shrimping, but, in terms of constructing  
12 that frame, we want to construct it as people who potentially have  
13 the ability to shrimp at some point, and so, just because these  
14 people happen not to have fished in those couple of years, you're  
15 kind of skewing it to the heavier hitters, that may be reporting  
16 landings every single year, where we want our sample to be more  
17 representative of anybody who could potentially shrimp in the  
18 future, or at any given time.

19

20 This issue, I think, is also playing into the fact that we're  
21 seeing the higher kind of bias to the higher CPUE people, by  
22 selecting the people that were active at that point in time,  
23 weighted on their landings, and so that's what we would hope to  
24 avoid.

25

26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, to me, because you say that, prior to the  
27 nontransmission, we were essentially sampling 60 percent of all  
28 active boats. We got more than half the people out there shrimping  
29 that we're getting their data, their effort data.

30

31 It's hard for me to believe you could be in any way skewed. You  
32 can't say that 60 percent of the active fleet, that that's all  
33 your highliners. There's a small percentage of the fleet that's  
34 your highliners, and, if you're getting 60 percent of the active  
35 boats, it's hard for me to believe that we would somehow be biased  
36 to the upside when your coverage is that great. I just worry that  
37 we're nitpicking here over things that we actually are doing a  
38 pretty good job, and, if we start screwing around with that, we  
39 may have worse data and not better. Mr. Bosarge.

40

41 **MR. BOSARGE:** Just I agree with what you're saying, in that there's  
42 those boats that have never had landings. You definitely wouldn't  
43 want to put a ELB on those, and, for instance, because these are  
44 moratorium permits now, when a boat leaves the fishery, and is  
45 permanently gone, whether it caught fire or sunk, whatever, that  
46 permit doesn't disappear.

47

48 Some do, but a lot of them -- I'll give you a for instance. I had

1 a gentleman that had one that I had helped him out all the years,  
2 and the boat was lost, and he gave me the permit. Well, it's  
3 parked on a boat now that will never go shrimping, because I have  
4 the permit, and so you wouldn't want to put an ELB on that. Do  
5 you see what I'm saying?

6  
7 What Leann is telling you makes sense. You're trying to get effort  
8 from the fleet, and so you definitely wouldn't want to put an ELB  
9 on a boat that will not fish, will never fish, and cannot fish,  
10 and then back up just a little bit to the nets once again, to where  
11 you did the average of the nets.

12  
13 Once again, if you look at vessels in general, and vessels that  
14 pull four nets, versus vessels that pull two nets, most of the  
15 time you're going to see that two-net vessel is fishing mostly  
16 inshore, state waters, and the four-rig vessel is going to be  
17 fishing offshore, which is in federal waters, and so that's where  
18 we're trying to get the effort from, correct, is federal waters.

19  
20 That's what we're managing, and so that's -- It's kind of -- I  
21 mean, you broke it down, and that's good to see, but just know, in  
22 the back of your mind, that, most of the time, when you see that  
23 average of the lesser nets, those are going to be some of your  
24 state-registered vessels that have federal permits on them. They  
25 have landings, but they're federally-permitted vessels, also.

26  
27 **MR. DETTLOFF:** Yes, absolutely, and this is just -- To be clear,  
28 this is just the offshore vessel component here, and we do see  
29 that it's greatly, you know, skewed to four. Fleet-wide these  
30 days, it's pretty much mostly four, but those that are using two  
31 nets tend to be in that nearshore, the zero to ten-fathom area.

32  
33 **MR. BOSARGE:** I'm sorry, but, when you talked about it, you almost  
34 talked about it as if the four-rig boats were the higher producing  
35 boats, and that we were skewed towards the highliners. Not  
36 necessarily, and you're just skewed toward the vessels that are  
37 actually working in federal waters, versus that federal permit on  
38 a state-registered boat just pulling two nets inshore, but he has  
39 some landings in federal waters. Do you see what I'm saying?

40  
41 So, in your mind, you're saying, well, we're skewed towards the  
42 highliners, but, no, and you're skewed towards -- You're getting  
43 where you need to be, in the federal waters of the Gulf of Mexico  
44 pulling four rigs. I'm sorry, Gary. Go ahead.

45  
46 **MR. GRAHAM:** I want to make sure I understand. You're saying that  
47 you've got a number of boats who are fishing two nets that are  
48 fishing offshore. I want you to make sure that -- Define offshore

1 again.

2

3 **MR. DETTLOFF:** The COLREG line out, and so basically everything  
4 except bays and estuaries, and it's not a big proportion, but there  
5 are some that tend to be in the zero to ten nearshore, and so that  
6 gets back to the whole somewhat spatially confounded, where we may  
7 be underrepresenting certain areas. It may be due to a net thing,  
8 and it may be due to a spatial thing, but there's something where  
9 --

10

11 **MR. GRAHAM:** I use term inshore, nearshore and offshore, and I've  
12 been doing that for years. Inshore is inside the COLREG.  
13 Nearshore, that's the white shrimp fishery, out to ten fathoms or  
14 so, and then you got offshore.

15

16 In Texas, if you're fishing, you're limited to two nets, if you  
17 fish right near the beach. White shrimping becomes more complex.  
18 The other boats can pull four nets, if they're out in a certain  
19 distance. I could not right now find you a boat that's fishing  
20 two nets on brown shrimp. I just don't think I could right now.  
21 I've been on a lot of boats.

22

23 In Texas, I don't think I could find you a double-rig boat that's  
24 fishing brown shrimp offshore. I just don't think I could. Laura,  
25 you've been on a lot of boats, checking TEDs, and I just don't  
26 think that, and so I'm a little confused about that.

27

28 **MR. DETTLOFF:** When I'm talking about offshore here, I'm talking  
29 about your nearshore and offshore. I'm talking about everything  
30 except for inshore, and so what I'm getting at is, when they do  
31 have two nets, in the nearshore and offshore, they tend to be in  
32 the nearshore.

33

34 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Laura and then Mr. Zales.

35

36 **MS. PICARIELLO:** But, just following to that point too, it's that  
37 you're getting one snapshot of them reporting that, at one point  
38 in time, when they're filling out that paperwork, and we have  
39 several boats that switch back and forth between two-net and four-  
40 net throughout the year, and so you are overestimating, if you're  
41 accounting for all those boats using four nets all the time, and  
42 that's not necessarily the case. We have boats that are switching.

43

44 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Zales.

45

46 **MR. ZALES:** I'm trying to understand. If you're sampling a certain  
47 number of boats, right, and you've got a third, 50 percent,  
48 whatever it is. At the end of the day, do you not take whatever

1 data you get off the boats that you've sampled and extrapolate  
2 that to the whole fleet, assuming that, whatever this small sample  
3 is doing, everybody is doing the same thing?  
4

5 **MR. DETTLOFF:** Yes, and that's the logic behind the scaling, is  
6 that we're -- We can at least do that at the time-space areas that  
7 are reported on the trip ticket, but there's other things, like  
8 depth, that aren't reported on the trip ticket, that are at a fine  
9 scale, that we have to assume that the vessels within that -- That  
10 the ELB sample we're getting within that time-space block is  
11 representative by depth, or by time of day, or by all the other  
12 more fine-scale effort metrics that are not reported on a trip  
13 ticket, and so that's where the assumption of representativeness  
14 comes in.  
15

16 We do the best we can with the resolution of the landings data  
17 that we have to scale to the fleet, but those fine-scale metrics  
18 aren't recorded in the landings at the level we need to do that  
19 for all the various factors.  
20

21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Miss Gambill.  
22

23 **MS. GAMBILL:** I kind of just want to ask a clarifying question.  
24 So, because you wanted to be representative of the fleet as a  
25 whole, is that the reason you were unhappy with the 90 percent of  
26 vessels that had never had an ELB, because you wanted to you wanted  
27 to consume that some of the boats were not fishing at all, and so  
28 you wanted to still have an ELB on those vessels.  
29

30 **MR. DETTLOFF:** That would be nice to know. It would be an  
31 additional means of knowing who definitely is not fishing at all,  
32 because, as of now, there's no way to know that that this vessel  
33 for sure is never going to fish again on our end. If we had that  
34 kind of information, it would be something to actually get at the  
35 number of latent permits, but now it's impossible to tangle apart  
36 who's actually latent, who just may not have reported, for whatever  
37 reason, who may have reported an incorrect vessel ID, that we can't  
38 match to a landing, things like that.  
39

40 **MS. GAMBILL:** Okay. I think I get that, from a statistical  
41 standpoint, but, from an industry standpoint, of course, that's  
42 not what they want to see, and what they understand is coming from  
43 this data.  
44

45 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** From an industry standpoint, you're saying,  
46 well, you have to report landings at a census level, and you never  
47 reported landings, and, therefore, we could consider your permit  
48 a latent permit, and inactive, but we really want to make sure

1 that's really the case, and so we want you to pay for a device,  
2 every single month, to put on your boat, when you're tied to the  
3 dock, and prove to us, by paying a monthly fee, that you really  
4 never did go shrimping, because we don't believe that you're  
5 telling us the truth in your nonreporting of landings, that that  
6 was actually you not shrimping.

7  
8 That's where this gets a little fuzzy for the industry. Like it's  
9 us saying a sample is not good enough, and we need a census,  
10 because we think that there's some nonreporting, and so all you  
11 boats, half the fleet that's tied up and not shrimping, you need  
12 to pay for this box every month, so we can really see that you  
13 really aren't shrimping.

14  
15 I get that, from a scientific, statistical, top of the line, no  
16 uncertainty perspective, but it's not realistic. It's not a  
17 realistic rationale for an industry to go pay for a box, and a  
18 monthly service charge, right? We can have some uncertainty there,  
19 and it's okay.

20  
21 As far as this goes, it sounds like what the AP is saying is, by  
22 and large, your offshore fleet is pulling four rigs, pulling four  
23 nets. You have data here on maybe how many are pulling two rigs,  
24 and so you have calculations there that you can make an assumption  
25 on what the difference in the CPUE is, because you obviously have  
26 some data.

27  
28 You gave us a number of about 40 percent. You may have some  
29 uncertainty around that number, but you have an estimate, and you  
30 have all the numbers there that, if you had to account for this  
31 difference with a calculator, rather than making the entire shrimp  
32 fleet put a VMS on their boat, so that you have a census-level  
33 data, and pay for that every month, it would be a lot cheaper to  
34 do that with a calculator, at the Science Center, than to make  
35 every boat carry a ELB, or VMS, to get at that small percentage  
36 that might be carrying, or pulling, two rigs and their CPUE, versus  
37 a four-rig boat, because I think that's where we're going in this  
38 presentation, and so I think it's easier to point out those things,  
39 and maybe how the industry feels about those scientific  
40 uncertainties, and what it would mean to us for you to get rid of  
41 it, but let's keep going. We'll go through the rest of them. Mr.  
42 Bosarge.

43  
44 **MR. BOSARGE:** Yes, and, just for the new members, Kyle has been  
45 working on this stuff for two, three years now, and I've got to  
46 say that he probably knows more about it, in my opinion, than most  
47 folks in this room. He's good at what he does, and so, when it  
48 may look like we're getting down on Kyle, no, no, and we're just

1 -- This is what we have to do, but he's good at what he does.

2  
3 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, I completely agree. He's the only man  
4 that I've ever picked apart everything he did, when he wrote that  
5 shrimp algorithm, and, when I got done, I said this is some damn  
6 good work. I couldn't find a hole in it anywhere. I just -- I  
7 loved it. He did great, and that's what we love about Kyle,  
8 because he does -- He gets into the weeds, and he tries to make  
9 sure his stuff is right, and so he does a great job, and so I must  
10 say that I'm going to let Mr. Baumer go next, and then you all  
11 help me out.

12  
13 When you get ready to go, if you have a question, which I don't  
14 seem to have a name tag anymore, but stand your name tag up for  
15 me, if you don't mind, and that will make it easier for me to  
16 remember who -- Without having to make a penciled-in list, and so,  
17 Mr. Baumer, go ahead.

18  
19 **MR. BAUMER:** I'm listening, and I'm just trying -- I don't think  
20 this is what we're here to talk about today, but 651 active  
21 vessels, and how that decline in the industry works in relation to  
22 the moratorium that's in effect right now, and that's kind of the  
23 concern I have. We have less fishermen, but we're not giving any  
24 new licenses to get people that want to fish more, and we're  
25 keeping old licenses that aren't -- People that aren't fishing,  
26 and it's making us slowly, as an industry, land less product, and  
27 become increasingly irrelevant in the market.

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** What we kind of feel like sometimes, Kristen,  
30 is that, you know, as you see more and more fishermen fall out,  
31 and fall out, it's almost like death by a thousand cuts. Like  
32 we're being regulated out of business. I mean, right now, half of  
33 us can't make a living, but we're talking about putting another  
34 monthly cost onto those people that are tied to the dock, and so  
35 we'll -- I think we'll get to that deeper conversation later.

36  
37 Just know that, I mean, it is part of this discussion. It is, and  
38 maybe not in the exact sense you were talking about, but, yes,  
39 that's all very relative. Did somebody else have their hand up?  
40 Did I get everybody? Okay. All right. Dr. Dettloff.

41  
42 **MR. DETTLOFF:** Okay. Thank you. By the way, we are doing the 1.4  
43 net correction thing, and so that's built in, to at least address  
44 that difference of CPUE, but there's still, you know, other factors  
45 out there that contribute to different CPUEs, as we know that  
46 they're a little more difficult to account for.

47  
48 To sum up what we just went over there, the recent increase in

1 partial year effort, relative to partial year landings, indicates  
2 we're likely not receiving complete chip data, and so this is a  
3 problem that's going to bias the recent year effort estimates  
4 further downward than they may already naturally be going.

5  
6 At the recent red snapper data workshop, last week, we actually  
7 explored some approaches to correct for that, that we're working  
8 on. In terms of spatial coverage, it's remained relatively  
9 constant through time, across strata, but some of the strata are  
10 not proportionally represented, and so this representativeness  
11 could be addressed with a new sample, but the problem with that is  
12 it's only valid at the time of selection, and the picture of the  
13 fleet may change into the future.

14  
15 Whenever we select a static sample, it's based on our information  
16 at the time, and it's difficult to address how that would remain  
17 valid to a changing fleet into the future without a complete census  
18 selection.

19  
20 Again, if we were to draw a sample now, it would only be based on  
21 the 86 percent of vessels with valid permits that have reported  
22 landings in the past ten years, and that's at a maximum, if we  
23 were to go all the way back to ten, but, as Leann and others have  
24 mentioned, the ultimate goal would be to get at only targeting the  
25 proportion of the fleet that could potentially fish again at any  
26 point.

27  
28 We're not trying to put boxes on people who are outside of the  
29 sampling frame, with no potential to fish, if we have a way of  
30 knowing that in advance. We're just talking about any vessels  
31 that can potentially be active again in the future, and so the  
32 evidence indicates that the Assumptions 4 and 5 -- There's some  
33 evidence that those aren't being met with the current selection,  
34 which, on an aggregate, would potentially bias effort estimates  
35 downward, and a new sample could alleviate the issue of unequal  
36 CPUE, but not the fact that, if there is any mechanism going on of  
37 vessels with an ELB being more likely to report landings than a  
38 non-ELB vessel, that would remain problematic into the future.  
39 That's something a sample can't address.

40  
41 In terms of the statistical aspects of a census, it would be the  
42 most scientifically-defensible collection approach. All vessels  
43 are selected. We would be provided with much more rapid estimates  
44 of effort, when we would be separated from the current reliance on  
45 trip ticket landings to scale effort, which come in on a delay.

46  
47 We would have complete spatial coverage. We would be able to drop  
48 the three assumptions that are associated with scaling up to the

1 fleet under the current estimation program, and, as I mentioned,  
2 we would eliminate dependence on trip ticket landings as a  
3 component of the effort estimation. The data we would receive  
4 would be the data we receive, and no scaling would have to take  
5 place.

6  
7 That would help us determine the number of latent permits, get a  
8 more accurate count of those actually fishing, and this was the  
9 primary recommendation of a CIE, Center of Independent Expert,  
10 review of the effort estimation methodology that we presented,  
11 maybe back in 2021 or 2022.

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Kyle, can you back up two slides? So,  
14 essentially, what the Science Center is saying is, moving forward,  
15 we need to have a census. That's what you're saying? Are you  
16 saying that is the only approach?

17  
18 **MR. DETTLOFF:** I think --

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Moving forward for ELBs, or VMS, that it must  
21 be a census, in order to be usable data.

22  
23 **MR. DETTLOFF:** I think, to get unbiased effort, estimates of effort  
24 that are spatially representative, and tell the complete story,  
25 that's what is going to be necessary, because we're -- We need one  
26 piece of the puzzle, at least, to be complete, to get an idea of  
27 what's going on, and, if that's not landings, and landings are --  
28 As much as we would like them to be complete, we know there's --  
29 Not everything is making it there, and so just getting one complete  
30 piece of the picture is necessary to estimate what's actually going  
31 on, in terms of fleet activity spatially, and from an economic  
32 standpoint and things like that.

33  
34 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** But is it accurate to say that there are biases  
35 in plenty of the other data streams that the Science Center uses  
36 for scientific purposes, that there are very few of our data  
37 streams that have zero bias whatsoever.

38  
39 That's a perfect-world scenario, and, yes, we strive to attain  
40 that, but it has to be in some frame of reasonableness to the  
41 fishery, right, a reasonable burden on the fishery, and so I think  
42 some of the things that are biases, that you brought up, and we  
43 talked about them. One bias, with this partial year reporting,  
44 when you have automatic transmission, that bias is going to go  
45 away. You don't need a census for that.

46  
47 We talked about this idea that are the inactive -- Are the permits  
48 that don't have any landings with them really inactive? I think

1 that's an assumption that we can make. I don't think we need a  
2 census of boats carrying an ELB, that 50 percent is tied to the  
3 dock, to feel confident in our ability to say those boats are  
4 really inactive.

5  
6 This idea of the CPUE difference, we talked about that a lot. That  
7 seems to be a very small problem. This is not widespread in the  
8 fleet, and you are, in fact, really targeting the offshore fleet,  
9 and that's why you see that difference. I don't see where that's  
10 a problem.

11  
12 This assumption about the equal CPUE, that's a little frustrating  
13 to me, and so, if we're sampling, before 2020, 60 percent of the  
14 active fleet, and we are uncomfortable saying that the catch rate  
15 for those 60 percent of the boats out there shrimping is probably  
16 similar to the catch rate for the other 40 percent, but we can  
17 make an assumption like -- So that's within a fleet, and that's  
18 commercial vessel to commercial vessel.

19  
20 We can take a CPUE off a boat that's not even a commercial fishing  
21 boat, and it's a research vessel, a SEAMAP vessel, and make an  
22 assumption, for certain bycatch extrapolation computations, that  
23 the SEAMAP CPUE for fish bycatch is comparable to the CPUE for the  
24 commercial fleet that pulls a fish excluder in the net, and the  
25 SEAMAP doesn't, and, if we can make that kind of assumption, and  
26 be okay with that type of bias, it's hard for me to think that  
27 we're going to not be able to make this assumption and tell the  
28 whole fleet that, no, that's too much of an assumption for us to  
29 make, and you all have to carry a device for us to get rid of that.

30  
31 That one is a little frustrating. That one gets in my craw a  
32 little bit. I think we're kind of nitpicking this, and I'm not  
33 sure, in my opinion, that we really have enough rationale here  
34 that says you have to have a census of the fleet.

35  
36 It's like me saying -- I mean, there's options, and, yes, that is  
37 always the most scientifically-defensible, but it's just a  
38 question of uncertainty. How big is your uncertainty, and what  
39 comfort level are you going to have? We have uncertainties with  
40 effort in other fisheries, and take any recreational fishery you  
41 want to name, that is exponentially greater than the uncertainty  
42 that you have in this shrimp fleet, but I don't see census-level  
43 reporting being mandated anywhere there.

44  
45 I'm just saying that we do a lot in this fishery. You have one  
46 hell of a coverage for a sample, a sample that's covering a third  
47 of the fleet, in general, and half or more of the active boats,  
48 prior to 2020. That's amazing coverage, scientifically, for any

1 sample, in my opinion, and so I feel like we're -- I don't know.

2

3 I just want to take a step back and say I think we're doing a  
4 pretty good job. I know that we would love to have a census, if  
5 you're a scientist, but I'm not sure that we can sit here and say  
6 that it has to be, because we have to eliminate these biases. I  
7 don't think that it's really skewing our data, and creating that  
8 much uncertainty, that it outweighs the cost, and burden, that  
9 that's going to put on the fishery. I have Dr. Freeman, and then  
10 Mr. Zales.

11

12 **DR. FREEMAN:** Mr. Zales, if you want to go first, feel free.

13

14 **MR. ZALES:** Are trip tickets required from Brownsville through Key  
15 West, in the Gulf of Mexico, for every state?

16

17 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, sir. Census-level trip ticket reporting  
18 for all landings.

19

20 **MR. ZALES:** So every shrimper that lands a shrimp, somewhere in  
21 the Gulf of Mexico, you know landed a shrimp, and you know how  
22 many shrimp they landed, and so you know how many of those  
23 permitted vessels are fishing for the -- Let's say for the period  
24 of one year, right, and you know how many did that. That would be  
25 considered a census, correct?

26

27 So, when you're dealing with the ELBs or whatever you're going to  
28 use to sample a percentage of the fleet for the effort, when it  
29 comes to the extrapolation for the entire fleet, like we do with  
30 most every fishery that I'm familiar with in the Gulf, you create  
31 confidence levels, PSEs and whatnot, for the biases that are there,  
32 to figure out how close you are to being close to 100 percent.

33

34 So, when it comes to a census, and I don't know, because they've  
35 tried it in different things and don't even get me started on the  
36 rec thing that you mentioned. It's almost impossible to sample,  
37 even if you require a census, and you're not going to get 100  
38 percent. I'm sorry, but it's not going to happen. I don't care  
39 what fishery you're in. People are just not going to do it.

40

41 I don't know where that is absolutely necessary. With the  
42 technology that we have today, and all this new AI stuff that I  
43 don't know anything about, there's got to be a way to take what  
44 information you have in the subsample, that you have to extrapolate  
45 to the total, to get a reasonable conclusion as to what's being  
46 done.

47

48 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** That is what we've done in the past, and I'm

1 glad you brought up trip tickets, because it again puts in  
2 perspective what our shrimp fleet is doing today. When we started  
3 this amendment, and the Science Center wants to collect effort  
4 data, right, and that's the deal, and the council actually asked,  
5 well, how do you collect effort data for the shrimp fleet in the  
6 South Atlantic? It's off trip tickets.

7  
8 We put our effort also in the Gulf on those trip tickets, and so  
9 we submit it, and we said, well, that ought to be in the reasonable  
10 range of alternatives, and not because we want to go back to that,  
11 but to lay out, for the general public, just how far ahead of the  
12 curve this fleet already is on what it reports. We go above and  
13 beyond.

14  
15 To put it in perspective, up until February of this year, there  
16 was no other fleet in the Gulf of Mexico that gave their effort  
17 data electronically automatically to NMFS. We were the only one.  
18 NMFS just created an electronic logbook program for the finfish  
19 fisheries. They were doing pencil-and paper-after the fact.

20  
21 We are ahead of the game, and we have been for quite some time,  
22 and we're okay staying ahead of the game and giving you the data  
23 electronically, but it's very frustrating, when we come into a  
24 meeting and it's portrayed as if we're not doing enough, that the  
25 only way that you can get good data from us is to have a census of  
26 every fisherman out there and have those fishermen pay monthly for  
27 it.

28  
29 We're already ahead of the other shrimp fisheries in the United  
30 States, and we have excellent data. We've got to fix the  
31 transmission, but this idea of census can -- I think that's  
32 debatable. I know I talk a lot. I'm sorry. All right. Let's  
33 keep moving. Next slide. Dr. Gloeckner.

34  
35 **DR. GLOECKNER:** The trip tickets in the South Atlantic, they're  
36 not sufficient for what we need, and so it's great that we're doing  
37 this here. The other issue is we have tied an electronic reporting  
38 program to a paper reporting program, in the trip tickets, which  
39 is why you don't have data that you can use for over a year.

40  
41 The census would actually get us around that, and so we could  
42 actually use the data in almost real-time and give you those kinds  
43 of information at your AP meetings of where is the effort, where  
44 is that happening, where has there been a shift. You have to keep  
45 in mind that it's not just for us, but it also allows near real-  
46 time reporting for you all as well, and so tying us to a trip  
47 ticket program, that's still on paper, really is not doing justice  
48 to what you can do with an electronic reporting program like this,

1 unless you go to electronic trip tickets. Thanks.  
2  
3 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, in Mississippi, our trip tickets are  
4 electronic. Dr. Freeman, go ahead.  
5  
6 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay, and so two things. One, Dave, I think you  
7 actually answered the question I was about to ask, and so, just to  
8 confirm, so, based off what was being presented, you're saying  
9 that a census-level approach, without dependence on trip tickets,  
10 would mean we wouldn't have that two-year lag on effort estimates?  
11  
12 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Not for effort, no.  
13  
14 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay.  
15  
16 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Now you've got it almost real-time.  
17  
18 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay. Okay. The second thing, just for the sake of  
19 AP members, so everybody is aware, I will just chime-in, real  
20 quick. As far as the census versus sampling approach, that, at  
21 the end of the day, will be a Science Center decision, and so I  
22 think, at best, the AP may want to make a motion to the council,  
23 you know, with a recommendation, and the council can then convey  
24 that to the Science Center, but keeping that in mind.  
25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. I think we have a hand up online  
27 from Chris Londrie.  
28  
29 **MR. LONDRIE:** I would just like a better explanation as to why the  
30 trip tickets are not adequate and what exactly -- I guess, again,  
31 and I apologize for my ignorance, but just what data are you  
32 looking for, and exactly why do you need it? Why is the data that  
33 you currently have, or could obtain through a trip ticket, not  
34 sufficient?  
35  
36 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dr. Gloeckner.  
37  
38 **DR. GLOECKNER:** So spatial resolution in the trip tickets is  
39 inadequate, compared to what we're using right now from your  
40 electronic logbooks, right? Fine-scale trawl data, coming from  
41 the electronic logbooks --  
42  
43 **AP MEMBER:** Can you talk into the mic a little bit? I can't hear.  
44  
45 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Yes, and we've got fine-scale trawling information  
46 coming from the electronic logbooks, versus a large geographic  
47 area, and these numbers of days coming from the trip ticket, and  
48 so it's not even comparable to what we get from the electronic

1 logbook, but that's the same reason that I find the information we  
2 get from the trip tickets on the Atlantic not that useful, because  
3 we've got basically rough estimates of days fished, and what gear,  
4 and where they were fishing, which are big one-degree-by-one-  
5 degree boxes, and it's not sufficient for what we're trying to --  
6 For how we're trying to manage spatial information. Hopefully  
7 that answers the question.

8

9 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Zales.

10

11 **MR. ZALES:** A couple of questions. Number one, when you say it's  
12 not adequate for what you're trying to manage, what is it that  
13 you're trying to manage?

14

15 **MR. DETTLOFF:** Well, one example would be the red snapper  
16 restricted area between fathoms ten and thirty, and so there's no  
17 indication of depth reported anywhere on a trip ticket. The only  
18 way we get at that is through the fine-scale ELB data, and so Stat  
19 Zones 10 through 21, between the ten-through-thirty-fathom zone,  
20 and other potential things, as we'll get to our protected species  
21 interactions, and the pink shrimp fishery, and things like that,  
22 that we'll have some slides coming up on.

23

24 **MR. ZALES:** So you're telling me that over the past -- Because red  
25 snapper has been managed now, what, since the late 1980s, and I  
26 know the TED and turtle thing started coming into play there,  
27 because when I used to go after shrimpers, to make them full TEDs  
28 for bycatch reduction on red snapper, and have since learned a  
29 whole lot about shrimpers, that really wasn't their problem, and  
30 I used to have shrimpers try to kill me, but in the process --

31

32 In that period of time that we're in now, the information that has  
33 been gathered, and distributed, and evaluated on red snapper  
34 discards, and on other marine mammal interactions and whatnot,  
35 hasn't been enough to manage red snapper and to determine what  
36 marine mammals, or turtles, or sawfish, or whatever is out there  
37 have been adversely affected by shrimping?

38

39 **MR. DETTLOFF:** That's a big question that I don't know that I can  
40 get at here, but what we're talking about is, more than anything,  
41 is a representative picture of what's actually happening, right?  
42 With the sample we have here, we feel pretty good about our  
43 precision, in terms of error, given the assumptions are met, but  
44 what we're trying to get around is a sample that's biased in space,  
45 or time, that's not showing a complete picture of the fleet.

46

47 For an estimate of something like a total, we can do pretty good  
48 estimating that with a subsample, assuming there's no bias going

1 on, which some things are indicating that that may not be the case,  
2 but, anyway, what that doesn't apply to is the actual spatial  
3 picture of the fleet, and the people you're not capturing in the  
4 sample there are just totally unaccounted for, in terms of a  
5 picture of looking at a map.

6  
7 Coming up with a total is one thing, and you get good precision,  
8 but, with the subsample, you're still leaving out a large  
9 proportion of what's actually going on spatially, potentially, for  
10 these other interactions.

11  
12 **MR. ZALES:** Okay, and my next question, I guess, on a trip ticket,  
13 without seeing one, I'm assuming the trip ticket -- Number one, it  
14 accounts for what's landed. Does it account for how much time was  
15 spent catching that shrimp, and where that shrimp was caught, and  
16 what the depth of water -- Or, if you don't have the depth of  
17 water, clearly, by the area that it was shrimped, you can  
18 determine, because you're not shrimping up in the water column,  
19 right? You're shrimping on the bottom. All this information, is  
20 that information not already included in the trip ticket program?

21  
22 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, it is, and I'm going to try and bring this  
23 into -- To rein it in, because we got two hours left on this  
24 meeting, and we've got to get to some more stuff. It is. A lot  
25 of that information, yes, is on there, and do they use it to manage  
26 other shrimp fisheries? Yes, they do.

27  
28 We have always gone a step above and beyond that, and we've carried  
29 these ELB boxes, so they can have finer resolution to run the  
30 annual analysis for red snapper. It's an annual analysis. We run  
31 it once a year, and so this idea that we get a census, and we would  
32 be able to run these things all the time, and we run it once a  
33 year, and, actually, we usually get it ten to twelve months after  
34 that year has ended.

35  
36 Trip tickets come in three months after the year ends, and they  
37 would run their analysis and give it to us about six months later,  
38 and so, the industry, we don't -- It doesn't matter a hill of beans  
39 to us, really, if you give it to us right after the fact or ten or  
40 twelve months later. It's not worth that to have a census for us.

41  
42 I'm going to let -- I can see Dr. Walter. I think he's chomping  
43 at the bit to set us straight. I'm going to let him set us  
44 straight, and then, because the council is not going to control  
45 this, if the AP wants to make a motion saying, hey, we don't --  
46 You know, we're not sure about your idea on a census, and that can  
47 happen, to at least put our views out there, but just know that  
48 the council can't control this, but it's still good for the Science

1 Center to hear it, before they mandate it, and so go ahead, Dr.  
2 Walter.

3  
4 **DR. JOHN WALTER:** Thanks, and we certainly want to get the advice,  
5 and guidance, of the AP here on this, and as you advise your  
6 council, and there's a couple of things that I probably need to  
7 point out, because it seems like we're talking about potentially  
8 stepping backwards, which I think is not an option for us, in the  
9 sense that --

10  
11 The binding things, that allow for the existence of the shrimp  
12 fishery, in the face of endangered species, and the Endangered  
13 Species Act, are called biological opinions, and so, if you aren't  
14 familiar with them, you're going to get pretty more familiar with  
15 them with the smalltooth sawfish and giant manta rays, but the  
16 current biological opinion for sea turtles has, as its Reasonable  
17 and Prudent Measure Number 1, and that's the thing that must  
18 happen, is that effort must be equal to or greater than -- The  
19 monitoring must be equal to or greater than the current levels  
20 right now, which means that we can't step backwards and use  
21 something like trip tickets.

22  
23 We've got to use something that's modern, like an electronic  
24 logbook reporting, like we have, but right now we see it doesn't  
25 report. Something like a VMS, that then passively reports, and  
26 means that the fishermen don't have to do anything, and it just  
27 reports a location, and it's completely seamless, and that might  
28 be the easiest way.

29  
30 One of the things we're concerned about, in terms of why we're  
31 putting forth saying a census, is that we need representative  
32 effort throughout the area. It's probably going to become more  
33 and more important that we get that, as we try to keep the shrimp  
34 fishery operating through these other two biological opinions that  
35 are going to be coming out there.

36  
37 Knowing where that fishing is occurring, or being able to avoid  
38 bycatch, is going to be really the key thing to be able to fish  
39 around smalltooth sawfish or giant mantas. That's going to be, I  
40 think, a really important thing, moving forward.

41  
42 Are we concerned about a census? Why? Is it because of the cost  
43 of the industry? Probably, yes, and I think that's what the  
44 council said and tasked us with trying to develop a management  
45 plan that would have the least cost to the industry.

46  
47 Option two, because of the reimbursements, would have the least  
48 cost to the industry, and we'll go through the costs, and I think

1 we need the full measure of cost to industry and cost to agency,  
2 but, because of that reimbursement, that's going to have less cost  
3 to the industry, whether it's phased into everybody gets that,  
4 some sort of phase-in to eventually have everybody get them, and  
5 that could certainly be one of the conversations, but, previously,  
6 vessels who chose not to have an ELB on their boat, and refused,  
7 could opt out.

8  
9 That's a big problem, and I don't think anyone who has got one  
10 thinks that's fair, that someone else could say that I don't want  
11 one, and I'm just not going to put one on my boat, and then not be  
12 counted. We don't know where that effort is occurring, because  
13 that vessel opted out.

14  
15 I think it's going to become more important that we know where  
16 that effort is in the future, for a number of other things that we  
17 talked about, in terms of knowing where to put wind and where not  
18 to put wind, and so I think we're fearing this census on cost, but  
19 let's get the cost-benefit analysis to be able to inform that.

20  
21 Then, in terms of the key things that why we need this effort,  
22 there's also an effort cap for red snapper, and, if we go above  
23 that, then the shrimp fishery gets cut down. We're not near that,  
24 but that's something that's in the legislation for red snapper,  
25 and so there's a lot of things that rely on getting this effort,  
26 in terms of why it's so critical in this fishery, and why it's  
27 gotten to this history, and I don't think we can go back with trip  
28 tickets, because it won't give us the spatial type of resolution  
29 we need. Thanks.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I've got one from Dr. Freeman right here. Your  
32 question, and then we need to move forward, or we're not going to  
33 get to the meat and potatoes of this.

34  
35 **DR. FREEMAN:** So just one quick thing that I haven't yet heard  
36 mentioned, or, if it was, and it might have been when I was in a  
37 quick side conversation, is that -- Also keeping in mind that, if  
38 a census approach is not taken, and a sample is drawn instead,  
39 it's quite possible that the Science Center will be redrawing that  
40 sample over time.

41  
42 You know, it was mentioned earlier, during Kyle's presentation,  
43 that the last time any units were put on vessels was back in 2018,  
44 I believe, and so, given that, you know, the industry is changing  
45 over time, you know, that redraw of a sample could be every two  
46 years, or something like that, and that would also be burdensome  
47 to the industry, and so that's another component, just to take  
48 into consideration.

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, Glenn Delaney. Let me get to Glenn.  
3 He's had his hand up online. Go ahead, Glenn.  
4

5 **MR. DELANEY:** Yes. If, Madam Chair, you are receptive to it, I  
6 would be glad to offer a motion regarding the census subsample  
7 issue. I did send, to council staff, a draft motion. It's Motion  
8 Number 3 that I sent this morning, if you could put that on the  
9 screen,  
10

11 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, and so we have a motion on the board.  
12 Glenn, I'm going to read it, and we'll see if we got a second, and  
13 then we'll ask for some rationale and discussion from you, okay?  
14

15 **MR. DELANEY:** Thank you.  
16

17 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** The motion is the Shrimp AP recommends that,  
18 instead of a census of the fleet, the Southeast Fisheries Science  
19 Center develop a statistically-robust design for distributing  
20 units to a representative portion of the active vessels in the  
21 fleet that would be comparable to the last ten years. That's the  
22 motion. Do we have a second? We have a second from Mr. Zales.  
23 Mr. Delaney, did you want to talk about it a little bit, or --  
24

25 **MR. DELANEY:** Yes, and probably a lot more than you would like,  
26 but, you know, I'll provide a lengthy rationale, with the new  
27 members in mind, and some of it will sort of rehash some of the  
28 discussion you've had, but my first reason for offering this motion  
29 is for the Shrimp AP to have the opportunity to consider what has  
30 been the position it has taken previously on this matter.  
31

32 This motion is consistent with a motion adopted unanimously by the  
33 Shrimp AP at its March 2024 meeting. I believe Dr. Freeman  
34 referred to that motion in his presentation earlier. That March  
35 2024 motion was more broadly addressed to the AP's recommendation  
36 for how we felt the congressional appropriations for electronic  
37 logbooks should be utilized. One of the purposes specified in  
38 that motion is the basis for this motion, almost verbatim.  
39

40 Further, I want to point out that cELBs have been deployed on a  
41 significant sample of fleet for many years. This approach has  
42 been both statistically robust and effective for a wide range of  
43 scientific monitoring and data collection purposes, including  
44 fulfilling our Endangered Species Act requirements in the 2021  
45 biological opinion that John Walter just referred to.  
46

47 We use it for shrimp stock assessments. We use it for minimizing  
48 juvenile red snapper bycatch. We use it for deconflicting offshore

1 aquaculture with the shrimp industry, deconflicting offshore wind  
2 energy with the shrimp industry, and I've used that extensively,  
3 for both of those two purposes, in working with BOEM and NOAA.

4  
5 Deconflicting the National Marine Sanctuary boundaries with the  
6 shrimp fishery and deconflicting coral HAPC boundaries with the  
7 shrimp fishery, and those are just some of the purposes that we  
8 use this data for, scientific purposes.

9  
10 As the AP has observed previously, none of these scientific  
11 purposes are for enforcement purposes. None of these scientific  
12 purposes require VMS units be installed on every vessel for real-  
13 time monitoring or enforcement, and any incremental increase in  
14 precision of the vessel location data generated by a census of the  
15 fleet does not justify the added costs to the industry or the  
16 agency.

17  
18 Further, while the agency's presentations point out some of the  
19 limitations being experienced by the current cELB program, or ELB  
20 program, things that reflect, in significant part, the  
21 consequences of the termination of the cellular service in 2021,  
22 including the need, current need, to manually collect what are  
23 outdated data chips, and, while we develop something to replace  
24 that old technology and program, we're all very much aware of those  
25 limitations of the current situation, and that has been the point  
26 of this entire exercise.

27  
28 That does not mean we cannot develop a new statistically-robust  
29 design to address those spatial and temporal issues the agency has  
30 identified in its presentation, that we cannot put to use the new  
31 generation of units, and chips, and develop a new design for  
32 distributing units to a representative subsample of the fleet that  
33 would be comparable to the last ten years, and it does not mean,  
34 to me, that our only option is to go to a full census of the fleet,  
35 in order to have an effective program to serve that wide range of  
36 purposes I referenced.

37  
38 Maybe a subsample will not be perfect, but I think it will be far  
39 more than enough, just like so much of science is today.  
40 Realistically, in my experience, a census is rarely, rarely  
41 feasible in fisheries science.

42  
43 I would like to go a little further into some information later in  
44 the agency's presentation that we haven't gotten to yet, but I  
45 note, notwithstanding the agency's presentation, with respect to  
46 smalltooth sawfish and giant manta rays, it remains unclear, at  
47 least to me, how a requirement for the entire shrimp fleet to carry  
48 a VMS unit to generate real-time position data would be

1 particularly useful in addressing the challenges associated with  
2 the bycatch of those two species.

3  
4 Such a requirement has not been needed to provide adequate  
5 monitoring and data collection for shrimp fishery interactions  
6 with other endangered and threatened species addressed by the  
7 current shrimp biological opinion, including those five species of  
8 ESA, the Endangered Species Act, listed sea turtles, among others.

9  
10 Perhaps a highly-targeted strategy for avoiding interactions in  
11 those very specific areas, where smalltooth sawfish and giant manta  
12 rays are most commonly encountered, are warranted, but, again,  
13 real-time electronic monitoring of a vessel's position does not  
14 seem particularly useful for that purpose.

15  
16 I note that nonregulatory strategies, such as the captain's  
17 communication plan, are under development, with the help of LGL,  
18 and Nathan Putman, I think, is in the meeting, and others, and  
19 that could be effective in enabling the fleet to avoid  
20 interactions, such as they have been in other U.S. fisheries, and  
21 certainly nothing, in my review of the agency's draft recovery  
22 plan for the giant manta ray, suggests, to me, the need for real-  
23 time electronic monitoring of the locations of every vessel in the  
24 shrimp fleet.

25  
26 As I noted, with respect to another motion I plan to have, the  
27 requirements with respect to Alternative 2, any regulation that  
28 would transform what is a scientific monitoring and data collection  
29 program into a real-time monitoring enforcement tool for the entire  
30 fleet would seem to be ripe for challenge, following the recent  
31 Supreme Court ruling on Chevron deference.

32  
33 Finally, I just point out that the U.S. shrimp industry is  
34 currently in the midst of an existential crisis of unprecedented  
35 proportions. Any unnecessary additional costs imposed on this  
36 fleet will simply put more small family-owned businesses out of  
37 business and render our nation that much more dependent on cheap,  
38 often illegal, and unhealthy farm shrimp imports. I ask the agency  
39 to please consider if it really believes that Alternative 2, and  
40 a census, would justify those painful additional losses for those  
41 families and their communities. That's it. Thank you.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Glenn, I think you covered it all. Excellent  
44 rationale. Mr. Zales, if you want to add a little something, and  
45 then we'll see if there's any other discussion, and we'll take a  
46 vote, because we got to keep moving.

47  
48 **MR. ZALES:** Yes, and mine is going to be real simple. I mean, you

1 hear all this talk about cost-benefit analysis, and Glenn touched  
2 on it. The shrimp industry is going to hell in a handbasket. It's  
3 not just the shrimp industry. You look at the commercial fishing  
4 industry, period, and the whole industry is going downhill, and  
5 has been for a while.

6  
7 Everything I read, every day, several things every day, no matter  
8 where it is in this country, commercial fisheries are struggling.  
9 They're going downhill. They're being hit by regulatory impacts,  
10 which is destroying the business. They're being hit by market  
11 impacts, imports, and everything else, and every little bit of  
12 additional cost that you add to a small family operation further  
13 drives that family out of business.

14  
15 When you drive that small family out, you drive the small family  
16 processor, the restaurant owners, and the consumers eventually are  
17 the big losers, because then they're forced to eat poisoned food,  
18 harvested by small children, illegally, and it's just -- The whole  
19 thing is a travesty, but you need to keep, everybody in this room,  
20 and everybody that I talk to, needs to keep in mind how this  
21 industry is struggling, and it's not just the shrimp. It's all of  
22 them in the commercial business.

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Any other -- I will let you have  
25 the last word, Andy. Come on up here. We have Chris online.  
26 Andy, Chris has hand his up for a while. Will you let him talk  
27 first, please? Okay. Chris, you are going in front of the head  
28 of the Southeast Regional Office. You go right ahead, sir. You  
29 have trumped him.

30  
31 **MR. LONDRIE:** Yes, and I'm backtracking a little bit, and, again,  
32 I'm a new member, and so I apologize for my ignorance here. I'm  
33 assuming that what I'm about to say is correct, but please correct  
34 me. That's the reason I'm asking the question.

35  
36 So, basically, the trip tickets, and the other monitoring that's  
37 going on, is not sufficient and you basically want -- They  
38 basically want more precise monitoring, simply in order to protect  
39 other species in the Gulf. Is that -- In a nutshell, is that  
40 statement correct?

41  
42 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I got a head nod of yes from the Science Center,  
43 when you said more precise information, and a maybe on the second  
44 part of it, to protect other species, and so I got a thumbs-up,  
45 and so it sounds like, yes, you're spot-on.

46  
47 **MR. LONDRIE:** Okay, and so a quick follow-up. Does NOAA, or anyone  
48 else, have data on -- We're worried about a thousand vessels, if

1 we want to call it a thousand, and we know it's less than that,  
2 because I know so many fishermen that did not go fish this year,  
3 and we're worried about roughly a thousand vessels fishing the  
4 Gulf of Mexico, and do we have any corresponding data to the  
5 recreational fishermen that -- I mean, it's probably a hundred to  
6 one, or probably 300 or 500 to one, and do we -- Do you all have  
7 any of that data on the recreational fishermen?

8  
9 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** They do. Their sample coverage is nowhere near  
10 ours, and so I'll tell you, and I think it's -- Is it about a  
11 percent, or less than a percent, on your effort survey of all the  
12 trips that you survey, and I think ours -- What did we say?  
13 Generally, a third of the entire fleet is surveyed, their whole -  
14 - Their effort, yes, and we're census-level on landings, and so,  
15 yes, we're light years ahead, but they have some data on them, and  
16 so we'll -- But I'm with you. I'm with you, Chris. That's why  
17 sometimes it seems like it's -- I don't know.

18  
19 **MR. LONDRIE:** I mean, does that not just sound absolutely  
20 ridiculous? I don't mean to be insulting, but that -- I'm sorry,  
21 and that's just stupid. The recreational -- If you're worried  
22 about red snapper, you're barking up the wrong tree.

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Chris. I love having shrimp  
25 meetings, because we have no filter, most of the time, and that's  
26 what I -- We keep it interesting. Thank you, Chris, and thank you  
27 for being patient. I'm sorry. It's hard for me to keep up with  
28 the hands online, as we're going through this, and just, you know,  
29 keep on me about it, if I miss you. Mr. Strelcheck. Please, sir,  
30 go ahead.

31  
32 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Just to kind of address Chris's comments, you  
33 know, the Fisheries Service has to address numerous mandates,  
34 right, under the Magnuson-Stevens Act, under the Marine Mammal  
35 Protection Act, under the Endangered Species Act, and we, as John  
36 has indicated, authorize the shrimp fishery based on take of  
37 endangered species, and so there is, obviously, important data,  
38 and information, that we need to collect, in order to be able to  
39 do that.

40  
41 You know, you've kind of noted it, in terms of your motion, and I  
42 guess I wanted Glenn, and maybe the AP, to just clarify a few  
43 things, and so the biological opinion says that, you know, the  
44 effort data should be kind of comparable, or better, than the last  
45 ten years. That's based on 2021, right, and so, when we were  
46 talking about the last ten years, essentially, that was when we  
47 issued the biological opinion and not the time period between 2021  
48 and now, where we know that the data is actually kind of eroded

1 over time, because of the 3G units no longer being operational,  
2 and so I just wanted to get clarity from the AP, in terms of  
3 intent.

4  
5 Then I guess a couple other points would be, you know, and not  
6 arguing census versus sampling, and one of the challenges we've  
7 faced with a representative sample is you need to resample that  
8 group, right, because people will come into the industry, and  
9 they'll leave the industry, or they're largely leaving the  
10 industry, and so that sample group may not be representative over  
11 time, right?

12  
13 So, with the Science Center developing a statistically-robust  
14 design, if they pursue that, I think that would have to be a  
15 component of this, is how do you then add vessels to that design,  
16 or take vessels out of that design, to ensure it remains  
17 representative over a period of time.

18  
19 The last comment, just to -- I know we're running late on time  
20 already, but I know Kyle and Dave I think had more to their  
21 presentation, and so I just wanted to note that, because there's  
22 more information with regard to, obviously, the discussion  
23 pertaining to the census versus sample.

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. So, Glenn, I guess I'll let you weigh-  
26 in on what you were thinking, as far as this goes, but, as far as  
27 this idea of redrawing, and how do you stay relevant over time, I  
28 would point to some of the bullets that you saw from the Science  
29 Center, where we pulled that last sample back in 2014, I believe,  
30 and one of the conclusions that they had was that the ELB coverage  
31 has remained relatively constant through time, and across strata.

32  
33 They went on to say a similar thing on another slide and I'll have  
34 to find it. Here we go. The percentage of landings by area,  
35 quadrimester, and species have generally remained constant through  
36 time.

37  
38 There's a lot of constantness in our fishery. Although we have  
39 fall off-in the fishery, the sample that you pulled back then, the  
40 sample frame that you used to figure out what boats to target, you  
41 did a good job, and, because you already get a quarter to a third  
42 of the fleet, you can have some changes, and fluctuations, in  
43 permits and vessels, and you still got a pretty good sample.

44  
45 Your ELB proportional coverage by strata has remained relatively  
46 constant, and steady through time, and so you pulled something ten  
47 years ago, and you told us, today, it actually is still a pretty  
48 good sample, as far as it being representative. We're getting

1 pretty good data out of it, and so this idea that you got to re-  
2 pull it every two years -- I would say that your presentation you  
3 gave us says otherwise.

4  
5 Maybe you look at it once a decade, and see if you think it's still  
6 relative. If it's not, pull it again, but it sounds like it's  
7 something the Science Center doesn't really want to do anyway. It  
8 costs you money, and so, if you feel good about it, leave it alone.  
9 If it's not broke, don't fix it. As far as the other part of that,  
10 Glenn, do you want to speak to what Andy was asking us?

11  
12 **MR. DELANEY:** Well, I think you covered the statistically-robust  
13 design issue, and I won't belabor it, but, to the issue of  
14 comparable to the last ten years, you know, I'm sure it's obvious  
15 to you that I was referring specifically to the biological  
16 opinion's Reasonable and Prudent Measure Number 1, and that's what  
17 that is intended to reference.

18  
19 You know, if you're concerned that the fact that things have  
20 changed in the last two years, since that document was generated  
21 in 2021, I think, you know, I certainly invite someone to tweak  
22 these words, but I think you certainly understand what it is that  
23 we are recommending, that we be consistent with what we've done in  
24 recent years

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** To me, what we've done is sample a third of the  
27 fleet, generally speaking, and so I guess what we're saying is  
28 stick with that. Don't start going 40, 50, 100 percent. That  
29 third of the fleet has gotten you some pretty good data for the  
30 last ten years. We feel that's sufficient. You feel it's giving  
31 you decent data. Everything could always be better, but we would  
32 like you to continue on with that, and we'll get our transmission  
33 problem fixed, and hopefully we'll have some good data for you  
34 that's timely again. All right. Any further discussion on this,  
35 before we vote it up or down? Go ahead, Dr. Walter.

36  
37 **DR. WALTER:** My only point is that we're voting on motions without  
38 having finished the presentation that has a lot of the cost-  
39 benefits in it, and so it seems, to me, to be a little premature  
40 to make these decisions, without having seen all the information,  
41 and so my request would be to allow the presentations to be  
42 finished and then come back to the motion. Again, that's just a  
43 simple request. Thank you.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** No problem, and I'll note that we allow  
46 observers that are not part of the panel to speak during the  
47 meeting. We're very good about that, to let you weigh-in and give  
48 your opinion.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

**MR. ZALES:** I call the question.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, Mr. Zales. Oh, he calls the question. All right, and so we're going to have a vote. The motion on the board, we've read it into the record, and we have a second. There's no further discussion on the motion. **Is there any opposition to the motion? Any opposition online?** Online, you can either unmute yourself, and say you're opposed, or raise your hand or something. Do you see anything online, Camilla? No? Okay. **No opposition, and the motion carries.** We're going to continue with Kyle's presentation. As you see fit, run to the back. Your lunch is on the back counter, right, Matt?

**DR. FREEMAN:** On the table.

**CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** On the table, and so on the table to the right, and there's water and stuff to drink. Just grab your stuff. We're coming back. It's a working lunch, right? This is in real shrimper spirit. We don't stop and eat, do we? We just keep on going, and so grab your lunch and come back to the table when you want to. It's up to you. It's there and ready. Dr. Dettloff, if you want to keep on going.

**MR. DETLOFF:** Okay. So, just to address a few of the things I heard, statistically, I just want to point out that the reason for the -- When we talk about a representative sample, we're getting at -- What we're concerned with is accuracy over precision, and so I've heard the word "precision" a lot.

We've never had a problem with precision. We're doing very good there, in terms of coverage. It's -- "Accuracy" is the better term for that, to ensure that we're seeing a picture of what's actually going on fleet-wide, to clarify.

The reason -- As Leann has pointed out, some of the spatial representation has stayed constant over time. Some has not, necessarily, but there's absolutely no guarantee that that holds into the future, with a changing fleet, and so that would be the need to potentially redraw a sample, to remain representative through time, because anything we're going to do is going to be based on the data, and the distribution, that we have at any given time of how vessels are distributed among stat zones and depth strata, things like that.

Even accounting for those kind of things, there's potentially changing spatial behavior, in terms of depth, time of year, time of day, as the fishery changes, and that's the reason for needing

1 this fine-scale effort data and not being able to rely on trip  
2 tickets, or a potential subsample, and so we're talking about  
3 accuracy.

4  
5 I think we are on to the next slide here, and so some potential  
6 benefits to industry under a census. When we're talking about the  
7 value of data per box, that is maximized under a census, for the  
8 reasons we mentioned, in terms of the more timely data, the  
9 dropping of the three assumptions for scaling to the fleet, and so  
10 those people with boxes are actually getting more value out of  
11 their box when everybody has one, as opposed to I guess being the  
12 unlucky one, as it might be seen.

13  
14 What this ensures is better representation of effort across depth  
15 zones. What I alluded to earlier, with the net thing, is we are  
16 potentially underestimating the two-net effort, which is  
17 correlated with the nearshore area, which means, under the current  
18 selection, we're potentially even overestimating effort in the red  
19 snapper restricted zone, given that we are under-sampling the  
20 nearshore.

21  
22 We have no way of knowing that, without a complete picture of the  
23 fleet at a fine-scale depth strata. That's just one example of  
24 how census estimates may actually benefit the industry in a way,  
25 if that is the case, to be more representative across depth zones,  
26 rather than more skewed to what we're calling the offshore ten-  
27 fathom-out area.

28  
29 In terms of protected species, if closures were deemed necessary  
30 to reduce interactions, complete spatial coverage of effort would  
31 allow for decisions that minimize negative impacts to the fishery  
32 and improve recovery outcomes for those species, and so we'll show  
33 maps, in some upcoming slides, of interactions with smalltooth  
34 sawfish on the West Florida Shelf, as well as mantas off Louisiana.

35  
36 As was brought up in the public comment earlier, under the current  
37 selection scheme, only those vessels with boxes factor into  
38 placement decisions, such as offshore wind turbines, and so any  
39 vessels that are not included in that selection have no impact, in  
40 terms of placement for things like that. They're not taken into  
41 consideration.

42  
43 As I mentioned, earlier, complete effort data could be used to  
44 better estimate the underreported landings that aren't showing up  
45 in trip tickets. If we have at least one complete piece of the  
46 puzzle, we could pair that with other data sources to arrive at a  
47 more accurate total economic value of the fishery than what is  
48 strictly reported in landings.

1  
2 These are just some summaries put together of sawfish and manta  
3 bycatch, to show the overlap with shrimping effort. The majority  
4 of sawfish interaction is taking place in Stat zone 2, the pink  
5 shrimp fishery, and manta interaction is taking place in Stat Zone  
6 13, off Louisiana, broken down by -- Here, the nearshore is defined  
7 as the zero to ten-fathom offshore, as the ten-fathoms out, and  
8 then that presented in terms of a map, with the observed  
9 interactions from observer data of sawfish in triangles, and  
10 mantas, in the diamonds, are in Stat Zone 13 off Louisiana, and so  
11 both corresponding to areas where we're picking up shrimp activity.

12  
13 Then zoomed into the sawfish interactions, Stat Zone 2 around the  
14 Tortugas, and so these are observations, I believe when they were  
15 first recorded, beginning in 2008, through 2022, of sawfish, and  
16 then the next slide is manta interactions from when mantas were  
17 first reported in the observer data, beginning in 2019, and so  
18 this is 2019 through 2022. That I think we will move into the  
19 cost considerations component presented by Dave.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Before we move on, was there any  
22 questions from AP on that? Okay, we've got a question from Mr.  
23 Bosarge, and then Mr. Zales.

24  
25 **MR. BOSARGE:** Kyle, so it's hard -- That map is blown up so big  
26 that it -- To me it gives an illusion of a lot of takes. So, when  
27 we talk about smalltooth sawfish, that was 2008 to 2022, for a  
28 total number of how many takes? I think I saw it in your --  
29 Anyhow, and --

30  
31 **MR. DETTLOFF:** I'm not sure I have data on that. I think the  
32 purpose of these maps is just to show the overlap, and so I'm not  
33 putting an absolute number on anything here.

34  
35 **MR. BOSARGE:** We had that conversation at one of the prior  
36 meetings, and so a follow-up question. They were having -- There  
37 was an event taking place, in I think March of 2024, where they  
38 were having strandings, I guess you would call it, of the sawfish.  
39 Where's that at? In other words, unexplained strandings. What  
40 happened? Where is it at? Where are we at now?

41  
42 **MR. DETTLOFF:** I honestly have not been focused on that. I wish  
43 I had a better answer on that, but I'm sure some other people in  
44 our group could answer that better.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Definitely, and just introduce yourself, if you  
47 don't mind.

48

1 **DR. NICK FARMER:** Dr. Nick Farmer. I'm the Chief of the Endangered  
2 Species Conservation Branch for NOAA Fisheries Southeast Region,  
3 and so we're still working through that, with Florida Fish and  
4 Wildlife primarily, with a variety of partners, the University of  
5 South Alabama and Florida Gulf Coast University being some of them.

6  
7 We had over fifty documented sawfish mortalities, all of them  
8 extremely large individuals. We're talking seven-plus-feet, and  
9 most of them nine-plus-feet, primarily in the Florida Keys, but  
10 some as far north as, for example, Bay Pines, just right here in  
11 the Tampa Bay area, and so really --

12  
13 **MR. BOSARGE:** Are necropsies done?

14  
15 **DR. FARMER:** Yes, and so necropsies on over fifty, and then we had  
16 over 150 unique reports of individuals. Every individual that was  
17 responded to as a unique report died. The one individual that we  
18 rehabilitated, with twenty-four-seven veterinary care, with over  
19 twelve veterinarians involved, also died, and so it's probably a  
20 fair assumption that the vast majority of those unique reports,  
21 and possibly all of them, died, and so it was a pretty upsetting  
22 event for that population.

23  
24 The population we believe is quite small. These were all large  
25 juveniles, two reproductively viable individuals, that passed  
26 away, and then, on top of that, there has been some information  
27 released.

28  
29 Florida is the lead on the toxicology side of things, and so I  
30 would defer to them. There was a National Geographic article that  
31 was released, maybe about a month-and-a-half ago, with some quotes  
32 from University of South Alabama that was identifying some  
33 dinoflagellates, and toxins associated with those dinoflagellates,  
34 as the proximate cause of death.

35  
36 This is a situation where, according to that article at least,  
37 and, like I said, there hasn't been a peer-reviewed published  
38 scientific document on it yet, but it appears that this was a  
39 warming-related algae shedding, creating toxins along the bottom  
40 of the seafloor at locations that sawfish were moving through that  
41 created that problem.

42  
43 Given the Florida Keys have been heating up through time, we are  
44 concerned that another event might happen, and so we do have a  
45 response planned, but, yes, this has taken its toll on the  
46 population, for sure.

47  
48 **MR. BOSARGE:** Well, I appreciate that, because it's been on my

1 mind, because we got just a little glimpse of what happened, and  
2 then that was it. We never heard anything more, and so thank you  
3 for the info.

4

5 **DR. FARMER:** You're welcome.

6

7 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Zales.

8

9 **MR. ZALES:** So none of those deaths had anything to do with shrimp  
10 trawls or being -- That was all environmental impact?

11

12 **DR. FARMER:** Yes, and so that specific event we believe is an  
13 environmental event. That's not to negate that there are also  
14 documented mortalities within the shrimp industry, and that is,  
15 other than that mortality event, the largest known cause of sawfish  
16 mortality within the Florida ecosystem.

17

18 **MR. ZALES:** Okay. If you could go back a couple of -- To do the  
19 whole Gulf picture, with the colored stuff on it, and could you go  
20 back to that slide? There you go. So the issue with sawfish, and  
21 also with manta rays, is predominantly in the area of the Keys and  
22 off the river, pretty much.

23

24 **DR. FARMER:** So sawfish are a southwest Florida primarily issue,  
25 and that is where the population is centered. Giant manta ray are  
26 primarily off of Louisiana, although there are some Atlantic  
27 interactions with the shrimp fleet as well.

28

29 **MR. ZALES:** So my question to you all is what is the benefit of  
30 having the census for the entire Gulf, when you've got two areas  
31 identified where the issues are? Do you see what I'm asking here?  
32 It's that you're looking at trying to create a census for every  
33 shrimp vessel fishing the entire Gulf of Mexico, but the problem  
34 with the ESA is in the Keys and off the river.

35

36 So, to me, if you're trying to identify that, and trying to work  
37 on that issue, then you work on trying to figure out how to identify  
38 the impact of trawls, maybe, on sawfish in the Keys, and then manta  
39 rays there, and you don't worry about the rest of the Gulf, because  
40 apparently they're not in the rest of the Gulf.

41

42 **MR. DETTLOFF:** Yes, and so this is just one component of it, and  
43 so, when we're talking about doing a census for some areas, and  
44 not for others, we're kind of starting out already biasing things  
45 that may be undesirable in time and space, and so we're already  
46 skewing the selection a bit there, to the people that would or  
47 would not be required to be covered under a census, and so, from  
48 a statistical standpoint, that's the reasoning behind that, and if

1 Dave has more to say about --

2

3 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I think the other issue is, you know, you've got  
4 these areas of interaction, and you don't have the information for  
5 the entire fleet. If you've got the information for the entire  
6 fleet, you can narrow any areas that they may consider for closure  
7 to a smaller block.

8

9 If you don't have it for the whole fleet, now you know that you've  
10 got an underestimate of the effort in that area, and you can't  
11 tell everybody is fishing, and so you may have to have a much  
12 larger block that you would close, if you're doing a seasonal-type  
13 closure, and so it allows the impacts to the fleet to be minimal.  
14 You can minimize those impacts, and it also goes for offshore wind  
15 as well, and we've said that.

16

17 You know, if you don't have everybody's effort, there may be  
18 certain areas where it looks like you can stick a turbine, and  
19 impact where somebody trawls, and eliminate that opportunity, and  
20 so there are benefits to this.

21

22 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. We're going to have to wrap it up  
23 right there and move on to the cost portion of this presentation.  
24 All right, and so this is going to be the Dr. Gloeckner show now.

25

26 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I probably didn't introduce myself earlier. I'm  
27 Dr. David Gloeckner. I am the director of the Fisheries Statistics  
28 Division at the center. Okay, and so industry costs. I want to  
29 thank Alan Lowther, the director of our Survey Design and Data  
30 Management group, or branch. He put together most of these figures  
31 for me. Thank you, Alan.

32

33 Okay, and so we'll start out with the industry costs, and so we  
34 were looking at three units in the Early Adopter Program, and so,  
35 as far as the cost for the units, Zen VMS ran \$1,095, with a  
36 cellular service plan of \$99 a year. The Nemo VMS was \$574, with  
37 cellular service at \$175 a year, and Boat Command VMS was \$199,  
38 with cellular service at \$179 a year.

39

40 As we worked through some of these cost assumptions, or some of  
41 these costs, we made some assumptions. We used the middle value  
42 for the unit and the cellular service, and so we used \$574 for the  
43 device and \$175 for the cellular service. We had an average  
44 installation cost estimated at about \$300, and so total costs to  
45 the industry will be lower for any Early Adopter units that are  
46 type-approved under Alternative 2. Discussion with vendors  
47 indicate they all intend to submit for a fishery-specific type-  
48 approval.

1  
2 This also assumes all vessels will eventually be selected, either  
3 in an initial sample or subsequent re-samplings, if we go that  
4 route. We calculated costs on all permitted vessels, and so this  
5 mimics a census approach over time.

6  
7 The total costs are based on current active permits, within a  
8 reasonable amount of error, given our current permit situation.  
9 Costs will be less if owners select lower-cost options.  
10 Alternative 2 would -- The VMS system would offer device cost  
11 reimbursement, through the NIMS VMS program, and so something to  
12 consider. Cellular VMS devices are reimbursed up to \$950 a unit.  
13 Satellite are reimbursed up to \$3,100 per unit. If cellular and  
14 satellite are both allowed, reimbursement would only be available  
15 up to the \$950 per unit.

16  
17 This one is kind of busy. As I said, we went through what we used  
18 for the devices at \$574 and took that times 1,257 permits. For  
19 Alternative 2, the device total cost is \$721,518, annual cell  
20 service comes out to \$219,975, and the installation is \$377,100,  
21 for a total first-year cost of \$1,318,593, although that doesn't  
22 include the Early Adopters, and so, removing some of those costs,  
23 it comes out to \$500,175.

24  
25 For Alternative 3, we can see that it's not much different for the  
26 devices. That's still the same cost, at \$721,518. The annual  
27 cell service cost is the same, at \$219,975, and, of course,  
28 installation is the same as well, and s that total first year cost  
29 is the same, at \$1,318,593, but we don't have the vessel  
30 reimbursement, as we did in Alternative 2, and so that runs up the  
31 net costs, in the first year, to over a million bucks.

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dave, just to be clear, and I know the answer,  
34 but, for everybody else that maybe hadn't studied this over and  
35 over and over, like I have, and so, right now, your Alternative 2  
36 -- So the council changed Alternative 2 to include cellular or  
37 satellite VMS, and the Science Center is hoping that people that  
38 already have a satellite VMS, for some other fishery, will use it  
39 for shrimp.

40  
41 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I don't think that's the case.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** You don't want the people that already have a  
44 satellite VMS to use it for shrimp?

45  
46 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I don't think I have that -- No, that was never  
47 the reason to allow that. The reason for that was to allow  
48 flexibility of the vessel owner. If they want to buy another unit,

1 sure. If they don't want to buy another unit, and they think just  
2 using the satellite is fine for their business, it's just  
3 flexibility. That's all that was.

4  
5 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes. Okay. I think we're saying the same  
6 thing. You're just saying it different. The guy has already got  
7 a satellite VMS on the boat, and so he can use it to meet his  
8 requirements for the shrimp permit.

9  
10 **DR. GLOECKNER:** He can, yes.

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Once he makes it ping at six times an hour,  
13 because, right now, he's only pinging at one, and so we had  
14 requested, or I had requested, and the council had asked, well, so  
15 these costs, are they reflective of the service fees, the monthly  
16 service charge, you would have to pay for a satellite VMS to ping  
17 six times an hour, and, right now, this table is not, correct?  
18 This is only cellular transmission, and so, at some point, you  
19 will revise this table, and you will have a range of costs for the  
20 annual service. It will have a high end for pure satellite, and  
21 it will have a low end for pure cellular, right?

22  
23 **DR. GLOECKNER:** We can do that. I think we have that information  
24 available. We just hadn't been able to incorporate it in this  
25 table, and so it's in a later slide.

26  
27 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, but, at some point though, it's got to go  
28 in this table, in order for the public to be able to actually see  
29 that that's the minimum cost, and what is the maximum cost to a  
30 fisherman for this particular unit? If you use a satellite, that  
31 pings six times an hour, it's not going to be a hundred bucks a  
32 year.

33  
34 **DR. GLOECKNER:** No, and I think that information is available, so  
35 people can look at the cost for the satellite and make that  
36 determination for themselves.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So why wouldn't you incorporate it into the  
39 table that everybody flips to to get the summary real quick?

40  
41 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Well, I think this is the cheapest option.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So you're only going to show the fishermen the  
44 cheapest option?

45  
46 **DR. GLOECKNER:** This is the cheapest option, and then the satellite  
47 costs are on another slide, and they can look at that cost.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I would hope that, eventually, you show the  
2 true range of costs for the fishermen, so that they truly  
3 understand whether that's viable for them to use that satellite  
4 VMS they already own, which is the whole reason that we put  
5 satellite in that alternative, or not. They should not have to  
6 dig to find that cost. They ought to be able to see that at a  
7 glance. Is it real important, Bob? I'm just checking.

8  
9 **MR. ZALES:** Because this doesn't show -- Because, in the real  
10 world, with VMS that have been involved in reef fisheries and  
11 whatnot, when they initially came out with VMS, those VMS, or  
12 whatever, they changed, and they get into a more modern unit, and  
13 so those are eliminated. The new VMS, the fisherman has to buy  
14 100 percent, and he's not reimbursed for it. If something goes  
15 wrong with repairs, or whatever, the fisherman pays that cost.

16  
17 None of that is involved in this, and those are costs that a real-  
18 world activity, that eventually can come up, that a fisherman needs  
19 to understand that, if he goes with one of these units, it ain't  
20 going to be there for the whole life that he's in the fishery. It  
21 could change, and he could -- It costs him more money down the  
22 line.

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Bob, because I actually did request  
25 that that is a cost to the industry as well, and that that needs  
26 to be incorporated as a cost to the industry. You don't buy one  
27 car and drive it for the rest of your life. You're going to have  
28 to replace it, and the same goes for us. You're going to buy us  
29 our first car, possibly, but we got to buy all the ones after that,  
30 and we've got to maintain that car every year, too. When the one  
31 piece of it gets messed up, we've got to replace it, we've got to  
32 find parts, and we've got to take care of it.

33  
34 None of those costs to industry are included in here, and those  
35 are real costs. That's an unrealistic expectation, to think you  
36 will never have to do maintenance or buy another VMS, and so we've  
37 got to account for that somewhere. We've got to come up with an  
38 estimate somehow.

39  
40 The other cost, that's not in these alternatives, is the downtime  
41 under Alternative 2, and so, under Alternative 2, if it's an OLE  
42 device, you're not supposed to move that boat over water unless  
43 that device is -- That VMS is working, and so don't go get fuel,  
44 and don't go to the shipyard, and don't do any -- You can't go  
45 shrimping. If that device is not working, you risk getting a fine  
46 from OLE, and they can see you pinging on a map. I mean, they  
47 know when you quit pinging.

48

1 Under Alternative 3, however, the Science Center program, in the  
2 past, the way that historically that program has been run, it's a  
3 sample, and it's for scientific data, and so it's a survey.

4  
5 Sometimes the antennas go out, or something goes wrong with that  
6 device, and we work with NMFS to let them know that we're trying  
7 to remedy the problem. They try and help us remedy the problem.  
8 It does not prevent us from going shrimping. We can still go make  
9 a living. We don't have unpaid downtime. That has been the  
10 historic precedent with the Science Center.

11  
12 That downtime, and loss of revenue, is not in Alternative 3, but  
13 it is in Alternative 2, and, at some point, we have to be upfront  
14 with the fishermen, and transparent, as to what the real costs  
15 are, and put them in these tables, even if they're hard to  
16 estimate. We've got to find a way, and get them in there, for  
17 this to be accurate, please, sir. All right. Andy, I see you up  
18 there.

19  
20 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and a couple of points. So I appreciate the  
21 comments. In fairness to the Science Center, this is first-year  
22 costs, right, and you're talking about a lot of additional costs,  
23 right, and this is presenting first-year costs. Maybe there's  
24 some downtime that has to be factored into both of that, and point  
25 well taken, but the reality is first-year costs.

26  
27 I guess the second comment is this is an average-priced unit,  
28 right, and so your point about we need to factor in the cost of  
29 using satellite -- You know, as we're trying to emphasize, there's  
30 choices to be made here, right, and we're not dictating what, you  
31 know, you are going to pick, in terms of your device, and we're  
32 giving people options, right, and, if you want to choose the more  
33 expensive option, that's not us telling you to choose the more  
34 expensive option. That's you going to the car dealership and  
35 deciding you're going to buy a Cadillac, or a Tesla, versus the  
36 Chevy or Ford, right?

37  
38 If we go the path that you're suggesting, in terms of the satellite  
39 VMS, I guess I would also note that, well, then we have an average  
40 estimate, based on cellular devices, but we should have a lower  
41 estimate, based on the cheapest cellular devices.

42  
43 We should have a higher estimate, based on the more expensive  
44 cellular devices, and so you can see that there's a whole array of  
45 options that can be considered here, in terms of costs, but the  
46 reality is that the one that's most comparable would be the one  
47 that actually has you choosing, based on an average cost to the  
48 industry itself, and, if you choose to be more expensive, then,

1 obviously that's on you, but we need to do a good job in rolling  
2 this out and showing the fishing industry the options that are  
3 available, just like LGL has done with this pilot program, because  
4 not everyone picked the cheapest unit, right? Not everyone picked  
5 the most expensive unit. It was an array of different units that  
6 were being utilized by the industry.

7  
8 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, so I appreciate that, Andy, but I feel  
9 like what we've done here is we've only chosen the lowest-cost  
10 units, and then we took an average of the lowest-cost units, and  
11 so we're only looking at cellular units. The most expensive one  
12 is right at \$1,000.

13  
14 We excluded all satellite units from these figures. The satellite  
15 units are on the order of \$2,500 to \$3,000 each. We have excluded  
16 everything over the \$1,000 mark. The transmission costs, and we'll  
17 get to transmission costs, but the Science Center has one estimate  
18 of transmission costs of \$100 a month. We're using transmission  
19 costs of \$100 a year as a midline, I mean, as a -- Excuse me. It's  
20 a hundred-and-something a year, \$130, I think you have, a year, as  
21 our estimate of costs.

22  
23 We're so far off of being in the middle of the total range of  
24 options that the fishermen have to choose from. We took all the  
25 lowest-cost options, which are cellular, and then took a mid-range  
26 on that. Instead of taking all satellite and cellular options,  
27 and, you know, if you want to take a mid-range of that, and show  
28 it to the fishermen, then okay, but I think what would be better  
29 is to show them the most expensive and the cheapest.

30  
31 You've got to have a range. Show me the upper bound and the lower  
32 bound. If you want to to show a mid-range, that's fine, but we  
33 have totally excluded ten out of thirteen units, roundabout, on  
34 the approved list. I think there's ten units approved for the  
35 rock shrimp fishery that are all satellite.

36  
37 We have an additional three units that are cellular that we're  
38 talking about looking at for shrimp in the Gulf. That's thirteen  
39 units. We only took the three cellular units and put them into  
40 this table. We excluded the other ten, which are the most  
41 expensive units, sometimes more than three-times the cost, and so  
42 it just -- It doesn't, to me, paint an accurate picture.

43  
44 Say the fishermen do what you say, and a lot of them pick that  
45 Zen. Well, it's free, right, and it's the most expensive unit.  
46 If you're going to give me something for free, well, give me the  
47 most expensive one. I don't want the little diamond. I want the  
48 big diamond, if you're going to give it to me, right?

1  
2 Okay, and, well, say they do that for this VMS program, for the  
3 reimbursement. Man, I get it for free. Well, give me that \$3,000  
4 satellite unit, but you never put the cost in this document of  
5 what it will cost them to make that satellite unit ping six times  
6 a month, and, when they realize that it's \$170 a month to keep  
7 that sucker operating, they're going to go, oh shit, I have screwed  
8 up, and why didn't NMFS tell me that in that document? I think  
9 that's what we're up against. We've got to make that clear, what  
10 the true range of costs is here. Andy.

11  
12 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Not to get in a back-and-forth debate, and I think  
13 we're talking two different things. One is the actual cost of the  
14 unit to the fishermen, right, both the purchase price and the  
15 transmission costs.

16  
17 The other is an estimate of the overall cost to the industry as a  
18 whole, and so what you're asking for is kind of an upper estimate,  
19 but then you have to make some decisions, and assumptions, about  
20 how many vessels are going to choose a satellite VMS over the  
21 cellular VMS, right, and how many are going to actually go with  
22 that, and how would we determine that? What would be the basis  
23 for that? We could certainly generate some numbers, but it doesn't  
24 necessarily mean that that's going to be reality, and you get back  
25 to Alternative 2, and the way it's worded.

26  
27 It says archival position data, at a minimum, right, and so they  
28 have the choice, once again, to choose a cheaper unit, that is  
29 going to cost you less. If they so choose that they want to spend  
30 more money on that, that's on them, in terms of the cost of the  
31 industry.

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. If you want to proceed, Dr.  
34 Gloeckner.

35  
36 **DR. GLOECKNER:** So that was the end of the first-year cost  
37 estimates, and so additional notes on our industry costs. Here we  
38 go. Satellite device costs, and so this is including a cost  
39 estimate, transmission cost estimate, for transmitting six times  
40 an hour, or, sorry, pinging six times an hour, and so this is  
41 actually, I think, what you were looking for.

42  
43 So MetOcean has a satellite device for \$1,850, and then a hundred  
44 bucks a month for the transmission costs. SkyMate provided an  
45 estimate of between \$1,000 and \$1,500 for the unit, and thirty to  
46 eighty bucks monthly for transmission, and you're going to see a  
47 lot of variation, depending on what kind of plan the vendors have.

48

1 We had insufficient responses to calculate the costs based on  
2 missed fishing opportunities. I mean, obviously, the vendors don't  
3 want to give us an estimate of how often their units fail, and so  
4 we had a hard time getting that out of them. We had one that said,  
5 you know, the unit was down for less than 1 percent of the time,  
6 and so that's all we've got so far to go on.

7  
8 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Did you reach out to any other of the  
9 vendors, like Woods Hole, that a lot of the --

10  
11 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Yes, we did.

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, and did you -- You didn't get a response?

14  
15 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Yes, we did, and we didn't get a response.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Well, so I reached out to them. Camilla,  
18 can you pull up my email, with that little attachment on it? So  
19 you did an informal survey, and I read it, and I said, well, I've  
20 only got a quote from two people, and those quotes don't make much  
21 sense to me, and so I called the CLS that we have a VMS through,  
22 and I said, look, you know, or I didn't call them, but another  
23 lady did it for me anyway.

24  
25 Anyway, and so I said our VMS pings, right now, once an hour, and  
26 we pay \$65 a month for it to ping once an hour. I said we're  
27 thinking about moving it to a fishery where it needs to ping six  
28 times an hour. Scroll up some please. Keep going. I said, well,  
29 do you know what it would cost to make -- To have our VMS ping six  
30 times an hour? They said, yes, and it would be \$170 a month.

31  
32 So, all right, and, I said, man, that's way different than what I  
33 see on this slide for the Science Center, and so let me look at  
34 SkyMate. Go back up a little bit. All right, and now make it a  
35 little smaller, so we can see that screen just a little more. All  
36 right. A little more. Now scroll up, so I can see the bottom of  
37 the page a little bit.

38  
39 I made some notes at the bottom. Right there. That's the SkyMate,  
40 and that's their published rates online, and so you can see, if  
41 you want hourly reporting, and so one ping per month, the lowest-  
42 cost plan is the silver. That's twenty-two bucks a month for  
43 silver, for one ping, and they told you it might be thirty bucks  
44 for six pings?

45  
46 So, if you look at two pings an hour, with the SkyMate, that's  
47 every thirty minutes, and they say the lowest cost plan is gold.  
48 That's thirty-nine bucks. Well, I round off to even numbers, and

1 that's forty bucks for two pings an hour, and so I'm not sure what  
2 they told you verbally, but what their published rates are online  
3 don't line up with what they said verbally.

4  
5 If I do my math right, it's about \$17 for every additional ping  
6 above one per hour that you need, and so this is my informal  
7 survey, and so, if we ping one time an hour, for twenty-two bucks  
8 on SkyMate, we need five more pings to get to six pings an hour,  
9 and so seventeen times five, plus the original twenty-two, is \$107  
10 a month, without the message feature. If you add the messaging  
11 feature, I don't know what it bumps it up to.

12  
13 That was the lowest-cost plan I could find. The upper echelon  
14 I've got so far is the VMS, the Woods Hole that we carry, at a  
15 hundred-and-seventy bucks per month. These are like orders of  
16 magnitude different than what's in that cost table that you've got  
17 over there, because we're only calculating on what, fifteen to  
18 twenty bucks a month, that the fishermen would pay for this  
19 service.

20  
21 That's a far cry from \$170, and that's what I mean when I'm saying  
22 that we're not telling the fishermen the true costs that could be  
23 involved. My conspiracy theory brain, as a fisherman, what I  
24 worried about, when you all put satellite in that option, is what  
25 happens if there's not a cellular VMS? You just backed this  
26 fishery into a hole, where we've got to get a satellite VMS. We  
27 have no choice, and we've got to pay these astronomical monthly  
28 fees. That's my concern, and that's a real concern for a fishery.

29  
30 That could happen, and we've got no negotiating power, really.  
31 There's no reason for you all to come to the table and try and  
32 compromise with us, because there's still options out there. Oh,  
33 well, and it's going to cost you more, and that's the industry's  
34 problem, and so I just want to put it out there, that I managed to  
35 find these in about two days, and so I think we've got to do a  
36 better job of incorporating these real numbers into the cost data  
37 for the fishermen, and the industry, as we move forward, and not  
38 at the last minute, when we go final on this document.

39  
40 If you really think that some guy that's got a VMS on a boat that  
41 pings once an hour is willing to go from paying sixty bucks a month  
42 to paying \$170, so he doesn't have to buy an additional unit, he  
43 would pay for that additional unit in a year. He would be a fool  
44 not to go buy a different unit, and put it on there, a cellular  
45 one, and so I guess I'm getting at this whole rationale about we  
46 put "satellite" in that option so that those people with a VMS  
47 could use it.

1 Based on my informal survey, that doesn't seem like a reasonable  
2 assumption to make, and it could back my industry into a corner,  
3 where, if something happens to cellular, we have to go satellite,  
4 and so just food for thought, and I'm going to give you the industry  
5 perspective on that, and I hope that we can get these costs that  
6 the council asked for, the satellite costs for transmission, to  
7 get that in front of them, so that they know. All right, and  
8 that's all I got on that one, Dave. Go ahead.

9

10 **DR. GLOECKNER:** All right.

11

12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you. We have Mr. Londrie.

13

14 **MR. LONDRIE:** Yes, and why would NOAA not pay? I mean, you guys  
15 are wanting these. We, obviously, or I sure as heck don't want  
16 them, and why would you guys not pay the costs to maintain them,  
17 to have the ping sent to them, and, I mean, this should just be  
18 fully funded by you guys, since you're requiring it, or wanting to  
19 require it.

20

21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Dave.

22

23 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I don't know if I've got the answer to that. I  
24 mean, I think part of the cost sharing agreement, that we had in  
25 the last amendment, was for the industry to cover the transmission  
26 costs, and the agency is covering the cost of the unit, the initial  
27 cost of the unit, through our reimbursement program.

28

29 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** If you have funds available, right, which we  
30 don't right now.

31

32 **DR. GLOECKNER:** We don't know that we won't. I mean, we do have  
33 funds that are going into the Early Adopter Program, and so, you  
34 know, maybe those that see this coming would want to go ahead and  
35 get a unit through that program. You know, I think, as Kelly said,  
36 we usually seem to find the money.

37

38 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** That's accurate. You usually do seem to find  
39 the money. I will say, on that, this idea that you can't calculate  
40 a cost for our downtime, and that it's less than 1 percent  
41 downtime, I would say that there's been enough downtime, with  
42 cellular VMS, and that the council actually has an amendment on  
43 the books, that they were working on, until the lawsuit threw it  
44 out, for the charter-for-hire fleet, that you all put a VMS  
45 requirement on, and they said, hey, we're missing fishing  
46 opportunities, because these boxes aren't working, and we're  
47 having to cancel trips, and this has lost revenue, and you've got  
48 to give us an exemption of some sort. We have tried to get

1 exemptions like that for commercial fisheries in the past, and it  
2 is always a no. Hands down, we will not give an exemption to go  
3 fishing when the box isn't working to the commercial fisheries.

4  
5 We have given -- We picked a preferred that would give that  
6 exemption to recreational fisheries, the for-hire charter boat  
7 fisheries, and so there is obviously a reason for downtime. It  
8 was real. The council did an amendment to try and work on it.  
9 It's there. We've got to figure out how to quantify it.

10  
11 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I think, you know, as Matt Walia said, you know,  
12 there are some things that VMS implements, that VMS enforces.  
13 There are some things that we need to set down in the tech specs,  
14 and it sounds like that's probably part of that, and I think that's  
15 why it's going to be hard to estimate those costs.

16  
17 You know, if we are setting aside a certain number of times where  
18 you can get an exemption and still fish, or if you have an alternate  
19 reporting capability, and so we haven't talked about any of that,  
20 and maybe that's something that this AP recommends to the council,  
21 is that they do consider something like that.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** What do you mean alternate reporting? You want  
24 to record GPS every ten minutes, and turn it into you?

25  
26 **DR. GLOECKNER:** We haven't thought about it, have we?

27  
28 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, I've thought plenty about it. I've been  
29 trying to find devices that will do that for three years now, and  
30 so I'm saying it's a real cost, and you've got to put a dollar  
31 figure on it.

32  
33 We can't just say, oh, there's all these costs to the fishermen,  
34 but we can't quantify them, but we can quantify every cost that  
35 ever could possibly exist for the government, and quantify those,  
36 but it's too hard to quantify the cost to the fishery, and so we'll  
37 just leave that out. I don't think that --

38  
39 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I think it's so variable that it is extremely  
40 difficult.

41  
42 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, then give us a range, if it's variable.  
43 Something. All right. Next slide.

44  
45 **DR. GLOECKNER:** All right, and so, in the Southeast Center costs,  
46 there's two main categories, census versus subsampling, and so,  
47 for a VMS system, Alternative 2, that's versus a duplicative VMS  
48 system at the center, Alternative 3, and so, for census versus

1 subsampling, a census approach will have lower costs, as it does  
2 not need a survey statistician to oversee the survey design and  
3 sampling.

4  
5 Building a VMS-like system at the center, we've got increased costs  
6 to operate and maintain the system. A lot of those are associated  
7 with the information technology folks. Increased costs to operate  
8 a help desk, contracting, the type-approval process, data sharing,  
9 data interface, and secure transmission costs.

10  
11 The cost slides have the following caveats, and so it's based on  
12 FTEs. If we were -- If we had to go down the road of hiring IT  
13 contractors, we're talking about two to 2.5-times the cost of an  
14 FTE, and a portion of the costs are required to maintain a system,  
15 once developed.

16  
17 All right, and so, for the VMS-like monitoring, additional costs  
18 for Alternative 3, and so DOC, NOAA, and NMFS strategic plans  
19 emphasize enterprise-level data systems and eliminating  
20 duplicative data systems, or stovepipes, additional costs, and  
21 considerations, that were elaborated by the VMS program. VMS legal  
22 staff authorizes requests for data access and dissemination to VMS  
23 data.

24  
25 VMS utilizes forms for all requests that are reviewed by GC. Like,  
26 for example, state law enforcement, under JEA, could obtain access,  
27 but a state manager would require review for applicability under  
28 MSA, and so a VMS-like system would incur additional costs to the  
29 center for legal review at approximately another thirty-thousand  
30 bucks a year.

31  
32 The SEFSC will need to increase their Federal Information Security  
33 Modernization Act, what we call FISMA, and the Privacy Impact  
34 Assessment Levels, PIA. Those are government mandates that are  
35 based on the type of data collection and stored in a data system,  
36 and one-time costs may take up to a year to implement, and so  
37 around two-hundred thousand bucks.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** On that one, the FISMA and PIA -- So you all  
40 have been storing, receiving and storing, our effort data for two  
41 decades now. So tell me what changes? Have we not been  
42 safeguarding it the way we're supposed to all these years, or is  
43 there something in -- What's different, that we have to spend this  
44 \$200,000 now to receive and store?

45  
46 **DR. GLOECKNER:** It's a different level.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Why? It's the same data, and why is it a

1 different level? Is it -- I mean, I don't -- That's what I'm  
2 trying to wrap my head around, and are you doing that for the  
3 commercial logbook program for finfish, too? I assume you've got  
4 to do this FISMA and PIA for them?

5  
6 **DR. GLOECKNER:** We probably do have to, once we start receiving  
7 the data through an API, yes.

8  
9 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So it's what you have to do to your API, to  
10 secure your API?

11  
12 **DR. GLOECKNER:** That's my -- I think that's -- I think that's part  
13 of what has to happen, yes, and so it's the data coming through an  
14 API and resting -- I mean, all of this is going to be in the cloud,  
15 and so we will have to implement additional security levels.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay.

18  
19 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Especially once the permit data gets fixed.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Right. Okay. So, essentially that \$200,000  
22 may not be \$200,000 for the shrimp fleet, because you're going to  
23 have to do some of this anyway, to start receiving electronic  
24 logbook data from all your finfish fisheries that you're setting  
25 this up for, and so that actually may be a zero, you know, best-  
26 case scenario.

27  
28 Worst-case scenario, you split the difference, and you charge 50  
29 percent of it to us and 50 percent of it to the other, you know,  
30 commercial logbook program, but it sounds like it's something  
31 you're going to have to do regardless of if you do this for shrimp  
32 or not. You're going to have to go through this.

33  
34 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Well, it's not charging anything to you. It's  
35 cost to the government.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** It is.

38  
39 **DR. GLOECKNER:** It's whoever first needs it.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, but you're saying it's a cost to the  
42 government, only because we want an ELB program that goes through  
43 the Science Center. That's the only time it becomes a cost. What  
44 I'm saying is --

45  
46 **DR. GLOECKNER:** -- already covers it for their program.

47  
48 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** What I'm saying is though that this may be a

1 cost to the government if you never did anything with shrimp, VMS  
2 or ELB. You're going to have to go through this, and do this, to  
3 have an electronic logbook program for finfish, and so don't -- We  
4 shouldn't maybe say that this is a cost only for the shrimp ELB  
5 program.

6  
7 This may be a cost that we're going to have to have regardless of  
8 what you do with shrimp, and that's why I'm saying that maybe  
9 it's not a zero, but you could at least share the cost across all  
10 your logbook programs, if that's something you have to do for any  
11 logbook program. Andy.

12  
13 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I just would caution -- I think there's some  
14 assumptions, and statements, being made here with people that are  
15 not experts in information technology, right, and so we don't have  
16 the right people at the table to answer these questions. What I  
17 understand is we have this FISMA compliance for data that's  
18 collected through our reef fish VMS system, through our IFQ system  
19 at the Southeast Regional Office, but, for the Science Center to  
20 essentially build this collection of information that's going to  
21 come directly to them, they would also have to have that FISMA  
22 compliance standard met for security purposes, right?

23  
24 Now, we can clarify this, and get into greater detail, but I just  
25 caution us speculating on the record here without a little more  
26 information from IT.

27  
28 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, and so we got a CYA on what we've been  
29 doing with that data previously. Thank you, Andy, but I still  
30 think the part that is maybe a valid question is, is this something  
31 that will have to be stood up through the Science Center,  
32 regardless of what you do with shrimp, because you are standing up  
33 another commercial electronic logbook program through the Science  
34 Center, and so you're probably going to have to do this to receive  
35 that data, and so this probably shouldn't be a \$200,000 cost under  
36 Alternative 3. This is going to happen regardless of what you do  
37 with this amendment. That's what we need to find out. Okay, and  
38 so that's my only question there. Thank you. Dr. Gloeckner. Mr.  
39 Zales. I'm sorry. You had a question?

40  
41 **MR. ZALES:** Kind of to Andy's point, and what I'm trying to figure  
42 out is why have we got to reinvent this wheel, right, and we've  
43 already got IFQ programs, and you've got reef fish permit programs  
44 in the Gulf, and we used to have a for-hire survey program in the  
45 Gulf.

46  
47 I'm certain, within the Fisheries Service, throughout the country,  
48 there are other programs similar to what is being looked at being

1 created here. Why is it that the agency, the different departments  
2 that are involved here, don't communicate together to say, oh, you  
3 got this program here, and maybe we can adopt some of that to this,  
4 and save all that time, money, and effort to do these things,  
5 because this program may exist somewhere else that you just have  
6 to mirror. Why do you have to create a brand new one to do  
7 something like this? That's what I've never understood about the  
8 agency. It's like there's different departments here, but nobody  
9 ever talks together.

10  
11 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Well, I think that's what we're doing. We already  
12 have a program that collects the location data from a vessel and  
13 transmits it to NMFS. It's in the VMS program. That's why we  
14 went down this path.

15  
16 This is just showing what we would have to cover if we create a  
17 duplicative program separate from VMS, and so this is really the  
18 agency using what other programs have already been developed to  
19 implement when we have a need in one of the regions, and so that  
20 just is kind of supporting what we're saying here.

21  
22 **AP MEMBER:** It's a program for law enforcement, versus a program  
23 for scientific.

24  
25 **DR. GLOECKNER:** It's a data collection. It's data collection that  
26 can be used for science.

27  
28 **AP MEMBER:** Yes, and it's going to be hard to keep the law  
29 enforcement side out of it.

30  
31 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Even in the previous program, they had the data  
32 immediately.

33  
34 **AP MEMBER:** Yeah, I understand, but it's not real-time data on a  
35 screen, you know, and I understand. You said, when you talked  
36 about the JEAs, because I was involved in some of that in the state  
37 agency, where you have a specified person, and that's the only  
38 person there that they can see that information, but it's only  
39 certain people within that organization that can actually come in  
40 there and look at that information, because it's proprietary  
41 information, and it can't go anywhere, and so, yes, I'm following  
42 you, but it's still a law enforcement tool that we're trying to  
43 adapt to fisheries management. It's two different animals.

44  
45 **DR. GLOECKNER:** I guess that is one way to look at it. I look at  
46 it as a data collection, whether it's collected by the center or  
47 collected by the Office of Law Enforcement. VMS data in other  
48 fisheries is used for science as well.

1  
2 All right, and we've gotten to that slide, right? All right.  
3 Additionally, if we have a center alternative, then we have to  
4 create a graphical user interface, so law enforcement, the Coast  
5 Guard, and state JEA can access the data. It allows for access  
6 with or without a warrant, or other process, from vessel monitoring  
7 systems for any officer who is authorized to enforce the  
8 regulations.

9  
10 That's a considerable cost to the center, and it requires security  
11 measures, data transmission and summary reports, and graphic  
12 depictions, and so \$300,000 to start up, and an additional \$100,000  
13 a year for maintenance, and we would also have to hire help desk  
14 staff, and so these folks would assist with unit activation.

15  
16 If the unit is registered, and showing in our system, associated  
17 with the permit and vessel, to make sure that all happens. They  
18 would work with the vendors on any software upgrades over time,  
19 implementing security standards, work with fishermen to  
20 troubleshoot failing units, assist with data requests, and that's  
21 an estimated cost of around \$250,000 a year, with potential  
22 increasing costs in years that require a software upgrade to those  
23 units.

24  
25 Then we would also have to cover device approval, and so type-  
26 approvals are by fishery, for those fishery requirements. Type-  
27 approval only can happen after the requirement is final. The  
28 vendor must request the type-approval for each fishery. Cost is  
29 incurred per unit from a vendor, and so \$30,000 to \$60,000 per  
30 unit, based on the VMS program.

31  
32 VMS utilizes a contractor for all type-approvals, and so, if we  
33 went with Alternative 3, we would have to develop our own process  
34 to create our own contract that duplicates an existing contract,  
35 paying twice for the same work, and so this may not meet the  
36 standards for federal contracting.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** How much does it cost to get a contract on the  
39 books with a vendor these days for the government, for something  
40 like this?

41  
42 **DR. GLOECKNER:** For something like this, I think we estimated  
43 \$300,000.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I thought you said that the \$300,000 was because  
46 you were going to have to do type-approval, create the specs, do  
47 the type-approval process, and then \$30,000 to \$60,000 for the  
48 testing, and so the \$300,000 covers the specs, the type-approval

1 process, and the contract, right?

2

3 **DR. GLOECKNER:** That covers the contract to do the type-approval  
4 process.

5

6 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So it doesn't cover the cost to write the tech  
7 specs and create the approval process. It costs \$300,000 to have  
8 somebody sign a contract to do business with the government.

9

10 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** For type-approval, yes. Yes.

11

12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. That's what -- And so the contract you  
13 have -- Well, this is probably a Kelly Spaulding question, if she's  
14 on the line. Kelly, the contract that's on the books right now,  
15 with that contractor out of Denmark, because that's who does the  
16 type-approval for the units in the law enforcement program -- When  
17 I read the document, it says it's a contract with NMFS. Well,  
18 that covers a lot of ground. The Science Center is NMFS, and OLE  
19 is NMFS. You're all part of NMFS.

20

21 So, Kelly, do you know -- Is that a misstatement in the document?  
22 Is the contract actually only for NOAA OLE, only a specific  
23 division of NMFS, and no other divisions of NMFS have the ability  
24 to engage that contractor, and they have to go get their own  
25 contract with that vendor? If you're talking, Kelly, I think you  
26 might be muted on your end.

27

28 **MS. SHIREMAN:** It's unmuted, but it's not coming through.

29

30 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Well, those contracts, it's all public  
31 information, because it's a government contract, and so maybe we  
32 just need to get a copy of the contract, because this may be an  
33 unrealistic cost that's just that -- You have a contract, and NMFS  
34 has a contract with this vendor, and it's just a question of whose  
35 budget the \$30,000 to \$60,000 per unit for the testing comes out  
36 of, but you may not need an actual new contract.

37

38 If they are contracted with NMFS, they're contracted with NMFS,  
39 and it's just the Science Center would have to pay the \$30,000 to  
40 \$60,000 per unit to test it, and so I think that's something we  
41 need to look into, and so somebody show me the contract. Okay,  
42 and that's all I had on that one. Dave. Go ahead.

43

44 **DR. GLOECKNER:** We're on the next one. Some more costs, and so,  
45 for a VMS-like system at the center, you know, our analysis and  
46 maintenance costs for Alternative 2 is \$272,500 for startup. For  
47 the maintenance, \$241,000.

48

1 For Alternative 3, which is the VMS-like system at the center,  
2 it's \$487,500 for the startup, versus \$341,700 for ongoing  
3 maintenance, and so the additional cost to the center, outside of  
4 analysis and maintenance, is for Alternative 3, over a million  
5 bucks, and, for the maintenance, it's going to be \$440,000 to  
6 \$500,000 a year, and so, in total for the center, we're looking at  
7 \$272,500 for the Alternative 2 startup. For the Alternative 2  
8 maintenance, it's \$241,000, versus Alternative 3, for the startup,  
9 is \$1,567,000, and the maintenance, for Alternative 3 is \$781,700  
10 to \$841,700.

11  
12 Adding then those costs that we estimated for the industry, we see  
13 that the total program cost for Alternative 2, just to start up,  
14 is \$772,675. Ongoing maintenance, after that, is \$460,975.  
15 Alternative 3 is, for the startup, is almost more than twice that.  
16 It's \$2,672,097, just for the startup, and, for the maintenance,  
17 under Alternative 3, we're looking at over a million dollars a  
18 year.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, sir, Mr. Henderson.

21  
22 **MR. HENDERSON:** One question I've got now is we're going through  
23 all this cost and everything, and I understand that, at the end,  
24 we're going to be paying this, but I don't understand -- You know,  
25 we've got the logbooks now, and all that there, and what is all  
26 this going to -- What's it going to do for the fishery, except for  
27 cost, and it's a lot of money, and what all do you all plan on  
28 monitoring out of this?

29  
30 I mean, maybe I'm just too old now, and I just forgot what you all  
31 have said, but could you explain it a little bit to me? You know,  
32 what are we going to get out of it, and, another thing, is the  
33 government isn't paying for nothing. It's our money. There's no  
34 such thing as government money. Without us, it wouldn't be  
35 government money, but I could see, right now, that, down the line,  
36 we're going to be paying whatever is up there on that board, and  
37 I'll tell you what, but the fishery can't afford that, not the way  
38 I see it. I mean, it seems like, every time you turn around, the  
39 cost always goes on us.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So, ultimately, it's used to determine where we  
42 shrimp and how much we --

43  
44 **MR. HENDERSON:** I can't hear you.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Ultimately, it's used to determine where we  
47 shrimp, and how much shrimping we do in those areas, and so effort.  
48 Then they use that effort data for a lot of different things, but,

1 at its most basic, that's what it is.

2

3 **MR. HENDERSON:** Well, you know, I want to be able to track all  
4 these guys, and can we put a monitor on where they're at all the  
5 time? They want to know where the fishermen are all the time, and  
6 they're not really telling us the whole story of what they're going  
7 to monitor for, that I could see, you know, and maybe I'm just an  
8 old man, and I don't understand anymore, but it don't seem like  
9 they're going to track much for the amount of money we're going to  
10 end up being paid -- That we're going to pay at the end.

11

12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I think you one thing you touched on, that we  
13 haven't talked about a lot, and you're spot-on, is that it's  
14 taxpayer money, and so, in NMFS' defense, they're trying to  
15 minimize the costs, and do this in the most efficient way, so that  
16 they wisely use taxpayer funds. I'll give them that.

17

18 However, I think what's missing from this table right here is we're  
19 only talking about costs to the Science Center, and we're  
20 pretending that the functions that the Science Center doesn't take  
21 over in Alternative 2, the VMS alternative, and we take those  
22 functions, and we put them on the VMS department at OLE over there,  
23 and there's still a cost.

24

25 They still have to type-approve the units, and test them, at  
26 \$30,000 to \$60,000 a unit. That's a taxpayer money cost, whether  
27 it goes through the Science Center or through OLE. They have to  
28 be tested, and type-approved, and so there's some of these costs  
29 that we're assuming, because we let OLE do it, it's free, that  
30 there is no cost there, and, therefore, we don't need to consider  
31 that a cost, and a use of taxpayer funds, so that we could compare  
32 apples to apples.

33

34 What is the total government cost on Alternative 2? We don't have  
35 any cost for type-approvals in there, because we're only counting  
36 Science Center costs, and we're saying, well, we're going to put  
37 it on OLE, and they're going to type approve them at \$30,000 to  
38 \$60,000 a unit, but that's no longer a cost to the taxpayer,  
39 because we only care about what the Science Center costs are,  
40 whereas, under Alternative 3, the Science Center would have to  
41 test and type approve units, and so we're going to call it a cost  
42 there of taxpayer funds, but we don't account for the taxpayer  
43 fund cost on Alternative 2, because it's outside the Science  
44 Center.

45

46 We have to look at the total cost in taxpayer funds, regardless of  
47 whether it's an OLE cost or a Science Center cost. You add up all  
48 those costs for Alternative 2, and you compare that to Alternative

1 3. Then you've actually carried out all the same functions, and  
2 we'll see what the dollars look like. Yes, Mr. Baumer.

3  
4 **MR. BAUMER:** A quick question, and have we seen, and I may have  
5 missed this, but have we seen any cost on what it costs the country  
6 under 3G before 2021? What was the annual cost, compared to what  
7 the proposals are today?

8  
9 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** We've seen bits and pieces of cost. We know  
10 what it costs the industry. We know what NMFS originally paid for  
11 the boxes. There is some dollar value, when they used to engage  
12 a contractor. They told us they could do it cheaper, but I don't  
13 know. Maybe Dr. Walter can answer quickly, and we've got to keep  
14 going.

15  
16 **DR. WALTER:** Yes, and I would be happy to. We got about a million  
17 dollars to implement that program, for several years. That million  
18 dollars no longer exists in our budget. We don't get that  
19 dedicated funding, and so, right now, the only dedicated funding  
20 we have, and the reason that we're using say an additional cost to  
21 the Science Center, is because we operate on the budget that we're  
22 allocated. We can't just ask OLE for their money, and, right now,  
23 we don't have that extra money to do what is being asked for under  
24 Alternative 3.

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I think he wants to know what was the annual  
27 cost of the old program?

28  
29 **DR. WALTER:** \$1,000,000 annually, about \$1,000,000.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** That's what you paid the contractor before you  
32 took it under the Science Center?

33  
34 **DR. WALTER:** Partly contractor payment, partly to purchase units,  
35 partly maintenance units. We did the whole package for that.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** For the contractor, right?

38  
39 **DR. WALTER:** Well, we did some of the work, and the contractor did  
40 some of the work, and so, under that \$1,000,000, the full 3G  
41 program was running.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** But then you brought it in-house, because you  
44 thought you could do it cheaper than the contractor was doing it,  
45 and so what is the Science Center's cost to run that program?

46  
47 **DR. WALTER:** Currently or at the time when it was actually fully  
48 operational?

1  
2 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** When it was fully operational, what was the  
3 cost?  
4  
5 **DR. WALTER:** I don't know entirely, because we rarely ever did it  
6 solely on our own. It was usually always a contract to the  
7 contractor for a lot of the work, and so I'm not sure of that  
8 allocation between the two, but, as you know, the cost of doing  
9 anything goes up, and so, right now, we're talking about a program  
10 that was designed fifteen years ago, and a million dollars to do  
11 a similar program like that, and it's going to cost even more than  
12 that, and so, I mean, I think that's why you're seeing the cost  
13 right here come out the way they are.  
14  
15 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Versaggi and then Mr. Henderson.  
16  
17 **MR. VERSAGGI:** Just a quick follow up on that, John. Some of you  
18 all might remember, and what was the cost to the boat, to the  
19 vessel?  
20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Under the old program?  
22  
23 **MR. VERSAGGI:** Yes.  
24  
25 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So, under the old program, NMFS sole-sourced  
26 the boxes and had them built to fit our needs, and so they went to  
27 a contractor, and they built the ELB boxes, the cellular ELB boxes,  
28 and they purchased all of them. They still have -- I don't know  
29 what've you got, about 500,000 in inventory, of the extra boxes,  
30 and they put them on our boats.  
31  
32 We paid for the annual cell service. I think that was -- It was  
33 about twenty bucks a month, I think, twenty-something-bucks a  
34 month, for cell service, and then NMFS actually had the spare  
35 parts, and so, when our antennas go out on those, we call NMFS.  
36 They've got antennas in storage, in inventory, and they mail us a  
37 new antenna. Okay. Mr. Henderson.  
38  
39 **MR. HENDERSON:** Gary might be able to answer this too, but what  
40 we're talking about here is something we already have. I mean,  
41 we've got tracking devices. We've been tracking the boats. It's  
42 been even helping us a little bit in some of the things, and so  
43 why are we getting something all together new? We already have  
44 it. The way I see it, or all my boats did anyways. They tracked  
45 them, and they could tell where they were all the time, and now  
46 we're going to do something that's going to cost more money. Why?  
47  
48 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So we're running low on time. Camilla, I sent

1 you an email. If you will pull up that attachment in that email,  
2 I'm going to pull up something that I hope the Science Center will  
3 look at and try and incorporate in the future and show us some  
4 more detail on these costs. When I finish with this, we're going  
5 to move on to the actual alternatives in the document, because we  
6 need to get to that, before we run out of time. Some of you all  
7 have flights, and you don't want to work over, and we'll try and  
8 get some motions on the board.

9  
10 So we've been talking about the shrimp electronic logbook, and I  
11 keep mentioning this brand new logbook program that's being stood  
12 up through the Science Center, and not OLE, but through the Science  
13 Center. It is for some finfish species, and not all finfish, but  
14 it's for the Gulf and South Atlantic, for snapper grouper, dolphin,  
15 wahoo, and coastal migratory pelagics. All right.

16  
17 There's some costs that were published on what it would cost the  
18 Science Center to stand up that logbook program. Some of those  
19 activities that the Science Center has to go through for that  
20 logbook program are the same activities they have to go through  
21 for our logbook program.

22  
23 For example, they had to create a data interface for OLE's  
24 monitoring and compliance. They've got to get law enforcement  
25 access to the data, right? For the shrimp electronic logbook, we  
26 were told, just now, that it would cost \$300,000 just to put in  
27 that interface. However, for the commercial finfish electronic  
28 logbook, the Science Center can do it for \$5,000.

29  
30 My guess is the difference is that, for shrimp, you're trying to  
31 build the absolute top-of-the-line GUI interface, where they can  
32 see us pinging on a map of the Gulf of Mexico at all time, and see  
33 exactly where our boat is at, versus the interface for the  
34 commercial finfish fishery, which is nowhere near that nice. It's  
35 an interface. They have access, but it's not going to ping real-  
36 time on a map for them, more than likely.

37  
38 Then, for us, it's \$100,000 a year for the electronic logbook for  
39 shrimp to maintain that GUI database. There was a zero cost for  
40 the other logbook program.

41  
42 Now, this other logbook program is a little different than ours.  
43 They collect more data than us, and they do it through software,  
44 and not hardware, okay, and it's for 7,000 permits, and they have  
45 to submit data that's not only effort data, but they have to submit  
46 landings data, discard data, economic data, and so it's a much  
47 bigger program, that has a lot more bells and whistles, and so my  
48 question is why exactly would a bigger program, with more bells

1 and whistles, be a fraction of the cost of ours?

2

3 You're collecting more data, from more people, and you're giving  
4 OLE the access to that data, but it costs \$300,000 to let OLE see  
5 our data, and it costs \$5,000 to let OLE see their data. It was  
6 hard for me to wrap my mind around what was so different.

7

8 **DR. GLOECKNER:** It's because it already exists.

9

10 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** What already exists?

11

12 **DR. GLOECKNER:** OLE already has access to those logbook data. We  
13 would just have to change the way they do that, and so it's a small  
14 change, compared to what we're talking about here.

15

16 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, I would argue that OLE has always had  
17 access to our logbook data. It's always been accessible to them,  
18 but what we're proposing here is, if I was going to the liquor  
19 store to buy a bottle of vodka, we're saying that the only vodka  
20 we can buy is Grey Goose, at \$300,000, versus Taaka, at \$5,000.

21

22 What I'm saying is there seem to be a range of options to give  
23 access to OLE, but, unfortunately, we are seeing the upper echelon  
24 of the range only, and not the other options that may be out there.

25

26 If OLE has been able to access shrimp effort data for the past  
27 twenty years, without a GUI interface, I don't see why we say the  
28 only way for them to access it is to build a \$300,000 GUI interface.  
29 This is where I'm having trouble with the costs, and we have some  
30 underestimates on the cost on industry side, where we just can't  
31 put a number on it, even though we know it's a cost, but then we  
32 have what I think might be some overestimates on the government  
33 side of the cost to the government.

34

35 So, if you move on down, the customer service phone line -- You  
36 said that you had to set up a customer service phone line for the  
37 7,000 electronic logbook holders for the finfish electronic  
38 logbook program. There will be about 1,300 for the Gulf program.  
39 It's going to cost \$5,000 to set up the customer service line, and  
40 \$20,000 a year thereafter to maintain it, for the 7,000 permit  
41 holders. For the 1,300 shrimp permit holders, it's going to cost  
42 \$250,000?

43

44 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Yes, and so these are costs that we got from  
45 estimates from Office of Law Enforcement, how much do they actually  
46 pay for theirs, right?

47

48 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, these are supposed to be Science Center

1 estimates, for the Science Center demand.  
2  
3 **DR. GLOECKNER:** You have to have something to base those off of.  
4  
5 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** But you already had these costs documented in  
6 your electronic logbook program, that you already have finalized  
7 through the South Atlantic and Gulf Councils, that's in rulemaking.  
8  
9 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Right, but they're very different.  
10  
11 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** No, and it's a call line. It's a call line for  
12 people with electronic logbooks that have a problem.  
13  
14 **DR. GLOECKNER:** It's a customer service call line.  
15  
16 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay.  
17  
18 **DR. GLOECKNER:** Most of -- We have it set up. It's already manned.  
19  
20 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** You have it set up, and it's already manned?  
21  
22 **DR. GLOECKNER:** For the logbook, for the actual commercial logbook  
23 program, and so a lot of these costs are so low because we already  
24 have existing systems, and it's just a matter of modifying them.  
25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So why did you say it would cost \$250,000 to  
27 install one for shrimp, if you already have one?  
28  
29 **DR. GLOECKNER:** It's a -- So we're talking about a very different,  
30 with different staff, right, but they're a very different program,  
31 and so we've been doing the same process in the commercial logbook  
32 program for years. This is something new. We would actually have  
33 to set up the requirements, set up the actual phone line, and how  
34 we how we have staff deal with the shrimp industry.  
35  
36 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So 've been manning --  
37  
38 **DR. GLOECKNER:** It's going to require a very different staff.  
39  
40 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, I guess my argument there would be, Dave,  
41 you've never had an electronic logbook program for the commercial  
42 finfish fishery. It was a piece of paper, and so you may have  
43 manned calls for a piece of paper, but you've never had to man a  
44 phone line for an electronically-transmitted logbook for finfish.  
45  
46 You have been manning a phone line in the form of a couple ladies  
47 over in Galveston, that we call when we have a problem with the  
48 commercial electronic logbook, for twenty years now. Well, ten

1 years within the Science Center, and the other ten with LGL.  
2  
3 That's a new program for finfish. You have never done that before  
4 for them on electronic. We have been, for at least ten years in  
5 the Gulf. I think there's some wiggle room in these costs, and  
6 I'm throwing it out here, so you all can go back home and research  
7 it and come back to us with some options that are not all Gray  
8 Goose options. There's more than one way to skin the cat, and  
9 there's some interface options for OLE that are not \$300,000 a  
10 year to access our data. Dr. Walter, go ahead.

11  
12 **DR. WALTER:** So, Chair, thank you. We could certainly debate these  
13 costs, and probably try to get them down. I mean, ideally, we  
14 will try to do that. I'm not sure it's going to be that productive  
15 use of our time right now, when we have fifteen minutes left,  
16 because this is going to go before the council, and I think this  
17 council -- The council is going to need advice from the advisory  
18 panel.

19  
20 I think what we're still missing here is cost to the industry,  
21 and, here, the cost to the industry, of how they get their initial  
22 unit, Alternative 2 could nearly be zero cost to the industry for  
23 the first unit.

24  
25 How would that get done? A phased approach, accessing using the  
26 combination of the Early Adopter funds and then two or three years  
27 of reimbursements, to about \$250,000, or something like that, to  
28 eventually phase-in everybody, if indeed it goes to the Science  
29 Center saying that a census is the right approach. If our analyses  
30 say that we can do something like 40 percent, we could still phase  
31 it in, but there's no getting around that the only way the fishery  
32 is going to get their initial unit covered cost covered is under  
33 Alternative 2.

34  
35 Otherwise, it would only be the Early Adopter funds, until they  
36 run out, for Alternative 3. We're debating these costs, but that's  
37 not the fundamental thing. It's how much we can reduce the cost,  
38 and the burden, to fishermen.

39  
40 We've heard the same things you guys have heard. Hopefully, we'll  
41 get to our Shrimp Futures presentation, because we are trying to  
42 do things to support the fishery. Option 2 is the best way to  
43 support them, in terms of getting the effort recording devices,  
44 location recording devices. If want to change the name, let's do  
45 it, and thank you for offering the time for me to respond here.

46  
47 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you.

48

1 **DR. WALTER:** I am trying to move us along.  
2

3 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. If you'll go to the next slide,  
4 and, Mr. Ballmer, you ask your question.  
5

6 **MR. BAUMER:** Yes, a quick question. Over the course of the last  
7 ten or fifteen years, as I understand it, the shrimp industry has  
8 funded lots of tariffs that have brought in anywhere -- Even in  
9 the last ten years or so, to the tune of maybe -- Don't quote me  
10 on this, but approximately \$50 million a year to the federal  
11 government.  
12

13 It would seem, to me, that none of these costs should really be  
14 borne by the fishermen alone, when, as an industry, we've brought  
15 so much money into the federal government that there would have to  
16 be a way to get some legislation to fund some of these costs, based  
17 on monies we've already brought into the government.  
18

19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Camilla, my slide, if you don't mind, has one  
20 other, and it goes into the -- Well, it goes to -- A lot of it  
21 goes to NMFS, but it goes to their operating fund, and it gets  
22 used for everything under the sun, even though it's coming off the  
23 backs of this fishery right here that is suffering. That's what  
24 those tariffs are for, is to support us, to put us on a level  
25 playing field, to allow us to continue in business, and not be  
26 shut down, but those funds can't be geared towards us, once they  
27 get to their ultimate destination, and so that's the bottom line,  
28 okay, right there.  
29

30 The reason I wanted to put this up here, and harp on it, is because  
31 it is important to the council discussion. I listened to the  
32 council discussion, at the last council meeting, and the whole  
33 discussion about Alternative 2, versus Alternative 3, is, well, we  
34 don't have the money for Alternative 3, and we should just remove  
35 it from the document, because those costs that were put up there,  
36 to start and maintain Alternative 3, the electronic logbook program  
37 that we've had for twenty years, were so astronomical that the  
38 council didn't even want to consider that.  
39

40 That's why I think this is a relevant discussion, and that's why  
41 I ask you to please go back and look at what it costs you, that's  
42 been documented, as to what it cost the Science Center to stand up  
43 that other logbook program and find some lower-cost options for  
44 the same functions for ours, because they must be out there  
45 somewhere.  
46

47 I can only -- I have no other explanation for it. They have to be  
48 lower cost. We don't need Gray Goose. Go get me some Taaka. I'll

1 take it. All right, and so let's go to the framework action, and  
2 let's try and get some motions on the board. Who has got a flight  
3 to catch? Has anybody on the AP got a flight to catch? All right.  
4 Good.

5  
6 **MR. DELANEY:** Madam Chair, this is Glenn. I've had my hand --

7  
8 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Delaney. Yes, sir.

9  
10 **MR. DELANEY:** In the interest of time, I want to try to move these  
11 motions along, if that's possible. Is that okay with you?

12  
13 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, sir.

14  
15 **MR. DELANEY:** Okay. Great. Camilla, or whomever, if you could  
16 call up Motion Number 1 that I sent this morning, please. If I  
17 could get a second, I'll go ahead and give my brief rationale, or  
18 I guess I need to read it.

19  
20 **To request the council to receive a brief slide presentation from**  
21 **the Shrimp AP chair regarding the revised cost estimates for Draft**  
22 **Shrimp Framework Alternatives 2 and 3.**

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, and so we have a motion on the board from  
25 Mr. Delaney, and we had a second from Mr. Zales. You have some  
26 rationale?

27  
28 **MR. DELANEY:** Well, just very briefly, this motion simply responds  
29 to the motion adopted by the council at its November meeting, which  
30 stated to convene the Shrimp Advisory Panel to review, discuss,  
31 and provide commentary to the council regarding the revisions to  
32 the draft shrimp framework action.

33  
34 I want to be sure that the council has the opportunity to fully  
35 consider our chair's analysis, given that the slide presentations  
36 to the council by advisory panel chairs may not be the most common  
37 thing they're used to, and so I just want to make sure the council  
38 will accommodate this request, so they get a full understanding of  
39 it. Thank you.

40  
41 Then, Madam Chair, I have a second motion, relevant to this whole  
42 section of the meeting, that I would like to offer as soon as this  
43 motion is dispensed with. Thank you.

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, and so we have a motion on the board.  
46 We'll take this one first, Mr. Delaney, and so I'm reading that,  
47 and, essentially, what you're referring to is some of the  
48 information that I just presented in those couple of slides, and

1 so a brief slide presentation from the chair showing the revised  
2 cost estimates, i.e., the estimates for the other logbook program  
3 for Draft Shrimp Framework Alternatives 2 and 3. Do we have  
4 discussion on this motion? Dr. Simmons, is that -- If it's very  
5 brief, do you have time, do you think, in January, to have that on  
6 the agenda?

7  
8 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** Thank you, Madam Chair. I mean, I  
9 was thinking that this would be part of the report, and Matt would  
10 cover some of it, and then you could chime-in on whatever is  
11 missing, but I think -- I mean, I think the request is to the  
12 Science Center, and staff, to consider this information and try to  
13 integrate it into the document, right, and not just you give a  
14 presentation to the council. You would like it considered, and  
15 trying to be in the document, correct?

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I would, Carrie, but, every time I've asked, in  
18 this meeting, for that to be incorporated into the table, I've  
19 heard, well, we can't really get an estimate on that, and it's  
20 hard to quantify, and it will be somewhere in the text somewhere.

21  
22 I think, if there are costs out there that are much different for  
23 a logbook program, that are much different from these, the council  
24 only has January and April. If they don't see this data in January,  
25 then they won't see it until they take final action. It's -- You  
26 know, it's just a couple of slides. It's similar to what Dr. Nance  
27 does from the SSC, when he gives his presentations on the meeting  
28 summary, and he has a couple of slides.

29  
30 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** I mean, I think if the AP wishes this  
31 to happen, we can think about the best way to handle it at the  
32 council meeting. We have Mr. Schieble here, and we can talk about  
33 it after the meeting, but I don't think it's something we would  
34 normally do, and so I think we need to think carefully about it.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Andy, you had a comment?

37  
38 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and, obviously, the decision is up to the AP  
39 and how you want to proceed. I guess the suggestion I would have  
40 is, if you do vote this up -- What is often challenging is when  
41 we're seeing slides, and information, presented during the  
42 meeting, right at the eleventh hour, right, and so we've shared  
43 presentations, and we've given you, obviously, an opportunity to  
44 review our information.

45  
46 I would ask that that would be reciprocated, and we would be given  
47 an opportunity to review and provide input and feedback back to  
48 you on that presentation, in advance of the council meeting, if

1 that's how you choose to proceed.

2  
3 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, I can, and I won't be a smart aleck and  
4 tell you that we got this presentation Thursday at noon, for this  
5 meeting, and so I'll try and get it to you further in advance than  
6 one day before the meeting, so you have time to review it, because  
7 that's all the AP got to review this one we just got. Mr. Schieble

8  
9 **MR. SCHIEBLE:** Just a bit of housekeeping, I guess, from the  
10 council perspective, and so, at the last meeting, you know, we got  
11 the IPT recommended language back, with a lot of significant red  
12 ink in there, and the council, around the table, saw those changes.  
13 Now those changes have come back in front of you all to provide  
14 comment, with potential motions here at this meeting, to maybe  
15 modify some of that language.

16  
17 I think, if we can get out of here today with some suggestions for  
18 the council, it be extremely helpful for the people around that  
19 table to know what you all want in that document. I know we're  
20 crunched for time here a little bit. Obviously, we're going to  
21 run over, but, before we get out of here, I think that would be  
22 highly critical.

23  
24 Also, in those potential motions, I would suggest anything includes  
25 the words "preferred alternative", if that's your intention as an  
26 AP, for the council to have some guidance. We have new members  
27 around that council, that were not there when this all started  
28 many years ago, and so I think it would be helpful for them to see  
29 that guidance from the AP itself, before it comes back in January.

30  
31 If we're going to stick with a council timeline of April to go  
32 final, we're going to have probably public hearing letters going  
33 out after the January meeting, and so, to me, this is pretty much  
34 the last bite of the apple for you guys. I don't see this coming  
35 back in the March Shrimp AP meeting, correct, and so I think we've  
36 got to get a lot of things done here.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** I'm hoping that Mr. Delaney is going to get to  
39 that.

40  
41 **MR. DELANEY:** He read my mind, and my next motion speaks very  
42 directly to what you just said about providing the council some  
43 input on that, and so, if we could dispense with this motion, then  
44 I'll move on to the next.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Any further discussion on this  
47 motion in front of us? **Seeing none, is there any opposition to**  
48 **the motion?** I hear none in the room. Is there any opposition

1 online? I got a head shake no. **No opposition, and the motion**  
2 **carries.** Mr. Delaney, you have another motion?

3  
4 **MR. DELANEY:** I do.

5  
6 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Go ahead.

7  
8 **MR. DELANEY:** Camilla, if you could put up my Motion Number 2 that  
9 I sent you this morning.

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, and I'll read it into the record.

12  
13 **MR. DELANEY:** Let me just make a point. Unfortunately, the strike  
14 -- The edits are no longer apparent, when Camilla copied what I  
15 sent, and you see my -- Is there any way to transfer those actual  
16 edits, so it's clear to the AP what the changes are? I apologize  
17 if that's not the case. Perfect.

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. Glenn, when I read it, I'm going to skip  
20 the words that are redlined and struck through, and so okay. **The**  
21 **motion is to request the council's consideration of the following**  
22 **revisions to Draft Shrimp Framework Alternative 3 and to adopt**  
23 **Alternative 3, as so modified, as its preferred alternative.**  
24 **Alternative 3 would read to implement a cellular ELB (cELB)**  
25 **requirement for the Gulf shrimp fishery that provides archived**  
26 **position data to the Southeast Fisheries Science Center that is**  
27 **compatible with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center shrimp**  
28 **effort algorithm. If selected by the SRD, the owner or operator**  
29 **of a vessel with a SPGM permit would be required to install a**  
30 **Southeast Fisheries Science Center approved cELB that archives**  
31 **vessel position when on a shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf and**  
32 **automatically transmits those data via cellular service to a non-**  
33 **OLE NMFS server. Southeast Fisheries Science Center approved cELBs**  
34 **would be type-approved for the Gulf shrimp fishery through a**  
35 **process external to 50 CFR 600.1501.**

36  
37 That is the motion. Do we have a second for the motion? It's  
38 seconded by Mr. Bosarge. Mr. Delaney, you want to give some  
39 background and rationale?

40  
41 **MR. DELANEY:** Yes, and I apologize again, but I'm going to be a  
42 little more in-depth, for the benefit of the new members of the  
43 AP. My first reason for offering this motion is for the Shrimp AP  
44 to have the opportunity to consider what have been effectively the  
45 position it has taken on Alternative 2, versus Alternative 3, to-  
46 date, over the last several years.

47  
48 The proposed edits to the text of Alternative 3 essentially bring

1 it back to where we were prior to the IPT making changes to it,  
2 changes that were adopted by the council at its November meeting,  
3 as has been so well explained by our chair today.

4  
5 My motion also reflects what I understand to have been the intent,  
6 if not the express position, of the Shrimp AP for the council to  
7 adopt Alternative 3 as its preferred alternative.

8  
9 In addition to that, I note that the analysis presented by our  
10 Shrimp AP chair of the cost estimates of the shrimp electronic  
11 logbook program, Alternative 3, based on the agency's cost estimate  
12 of that South Atlantic and Gulf Councils joint commercial  
13 electronic logbook reporting program, indicate that the costs for  
14 the shrimp electronic logbook program presented by the agency to  
15 the council at its November meeting were substantially  
16 overestimated and may have led to the council's decisions at that  
17 meeting.

18  
19 The results of this further analysis by our chair confirmed that  
20 the costs associated with Alternative 3 are substantially below  
21 the agency's cost estimates for Alternative 3, and so Alternative  
22 3 should be selected as the council's preferred alternative.

23  
24 Our chair's analysis of that joint commercial electronic logbook  
25 reporting program indicates that there are options available to  
26 the Science Center which would allow it to operationalize  
27 Alternative 3 at a significantly lower cost, but it has apparently  
28 chosen not to analyze or present that information to the council,  
29 or to the Shrimp AP.

30  
31 As even Congress has confirmed in its appropriations legislation  
32 to provide funding for the development, deployment, and cellular  
33 service for cELBs in recent years, the purpose of this ELB program  
34 is, and always has been, for scientific monitoring and data  
35 collection.

36  
37 It has been highly effective in achieving that purpose, for a wide  
38 range of scientific issues that I mentioned in another motion  
39 previously. It has been the long-held position of the Shrimp AP  
40 that Framework Alternative 2 would however transform this program  
41 into a real-time monitoring and enforcement tool.

42  
43 As I noted with a previous motion, for this reason, regulations  
44 that would implement Alternative 2 appear, to me, to be vulnerable  
45 to challenge and judicial review, following the recent Supreme  
46 Court ruling on Chevron deference, and, since I brought up  
47 Congress, and I'm not sure if the newer members of the AP are aware  
48 that, working in particular with Senator Hyde-Smith and her staff

1 that were on the call earlier, and others, other Senate and House  
2 offices, the Southern Shrimp Alliance has been able so far to  
3 secure \$1.7 million to cover costs that would essentially be  
4 associated with Alternative 3 implementation, and there is another  
5 850,000 in both the House and Senate FY25 appropriation bills,  
6 making that funding very likely sometime next year.

7  
8 I'll leave it there, as I expect, Leann, maybe you want to speak  
9 further to the implications of your analysis, but I ask the AP to  
10 please favorably consider this motion. Thank you very much.

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Further discussion on the motion? I've talked  
13 a lot today, and so, yes, sir, Mr. Henderson.

14  
15 **MR. HENDERSON:** Something that's been working for twenty years  
16 now, or at least ten, some people are saying, and now we're going  
17 to go to something completely different and spend a whole bunch of  
18 money and just get what we're getting today, and I just don't  
19 understand it.

20  
21 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So, to me, one of the most important pieces in  
22 the in the language being written this way, for this alternative,  
23 is that it says "ELB". We have always had an electronic logbook  
24 program. This gives the council options. If this goes back to  
25 VMS, then you've got status quo, which is not acceptable, and two  
26 alternatives that say implement a VMS requirement for the Gulf  
27 shrimp fleet.

28  
29 We can't have both alternatives read that. Then we have no longer  
30 have a reasonable range of alternatives, and it's confusing as  
31 heck to tell the council that, well, it's a VMS, but we're not  
32 going to treat it like a VMS. We're going to -- I know there's  
33 CFRs for VMSs, but we'll do this under different -- No, and it's  
34 a logbook. We're collecting scientific effort data, the raw data  
35 that we use to compute effort.

36  
37 The ELB program is known as a scientific program. It's an  
38 electronic logbook, regardless of whether it captures just effort  
39 or effort and landings and discards. It's a science program.  
40 That's what we have, and that's what we want to maintain.

41  
42 The other thing I think it makes clear to the council is that, if  
43 you go this route, we're not involving law enforcement on the  
44 management and upkeep. Yes, law enforcement has always had access  
45 to our data, and they can go get it. When they got a bad actor,  
46 and they want to go look for some, you know, what he's been doing  
47 wrong, they can go get our data.

1 This is a science program. It says that it provides position data  
2 to the Science Center. That's who we're providing this data to,  
3 the Science Center. It says that the Science Center is going to  
4 approve the units that we use. The Science Center is going to  
5 type-approve them. This makes that clear that that's where this  
6 will be housed and managed, is in the Science Center.

7  
8 I think that's important for the council. Otherwise, the two  
9 alternatives look almost exactly the same. It's like, well, what's  
10 really the difference, but they're actually very, very different,  
11 from an industry perspective and what it means to the industry.  
12 This, I think, makes that clear.

13  
14 However, I've got Andy in the room, and I'm going to let a few  
15 people talk, and then, Andy, you tell me what you just can't live  
16 with in this thing, because, ultimately, you're on the council,  
17 and you can see the headwinds that would be a problem, you know,  
18 of writing something this way, because you're going to stand things  
19 up, and so do you see any big, big problems that are  
20 insurmountable?

21  
22 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Well, I see a lot of challenges, but I'm not going  
23 to wordsmith your motion. It's your motion. I think the biggest  
24 thing, and you've talked a lot about costs today, and, you know,  
25 I think we're willing to, obviously, go back and look under the  
26 hood, and take a look at those costs, and make some refinements,  
27 but the council ultimately will be facing a decision, with regard  
28 to the cost of these two alternatives, right, and which one is  
29 going to cost the agency, the fishermen, the program more money or  
30 less money, right, and maybe those numbers will change greatly  
31 today, relative to what you were presenting, and maybe they won't.

32  
33 I don't know, right, but, at the end of the day, I think that's a  
34 large part of the decision that's going to be faced, that, you  
35 know, the council is going to be faced with, ultimately, in  
36 January, and you'll be there, obviously, to share your perspective,  
37 as AP chair, and the discussions that happened around this table.

38  
39 You know, as we've talked about, and this is just -- You know,  
40 when Leann was on the council, and I think a lot of this comes  
41 down to semantics with regard to terminology, right, and calling  
42 it a cELB, versus a cellular VMS, they're the same thing, right?

43  
44 Who, obviously, is responsible for approval, the, obviously,  
45 systems that have to be stood up, or not stood up, and all of that,  
46 obviously, balances out the administrative costs to the agency,  
47 and then also the potential for reimbursement, or lack of  
48 reimbursement.

1  
2 You know, what Glenn said about the funding from Congress is  
3 important, right, and that has certainly been helping the industry  
4 to transition. There's no long-term guarantee that that money  
5 will come to the agency to help support this program.

6  
7 I would love to say that it's locked in, and we're going to get  
8 ten years' worth of funding from Congress for this program, but it  
9 could go away tomorrow, based on the next Congress, right, and so  
10 all of those are factors in terms of the decision-making process  
11 and why we have to, obviously, look at this holistically, when we  
12 make decisions, and so I will just leave it at that, and your  
13 motion is, obviously, up to the AP to decide how to proceed with.

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Andy, thank you for saying you would look under  
16 the hood at the costs. I appreciate that. That's why I like  
17 working with you, because you're going to go look at it. Thank  
18 you. Feedback from Dr. Freeman, and then did somebody around this  
19 side of the table have their hand up? Okay.

20  
21 **DR. FREEMAN:** A question for the Science Center. With the language  
22 change, if we go to cELB for Alternative 3, the devices for the  
23 Early Adopter Program are VMS devices. Does that mean they will  
24 not be able to be used with Alternative 3?

25  
26 **DR. WALTER:** The bottom line is you need a piece of hardware that  
27 works, whatever the heck you call it. It's what it's used for,  
28 and whether it does the job, and so I don't think it would make  
29 one bit of difference. As Andy said, they're interchangeable.  
30 This is just semantics. It needs to be a unit that records the  
31 location, and then archives it, and cellular transmits when it's  
32 in cell range. Whatever we call it, if it gets the job done, and  
33 meets the needs, then it does the job. Thanks.

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you. I appreciate that. Mr. Zales.

36  
37 **MR. ZALES:** Isn't this just kind of an improved device over what  
38 you all have had for the past twenty years, and it's still operated  
39 by cell, but this is just a new car, versus an old car?

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, so that it will transmit automatically  
42 again. The old ones are still working. They just don't transmit  
43 automatically. They have issues, like any box, but they're still  
44 collecting data, but we need something to replace them that will  
45 transmit automatically, and we've always had cELBs. All right.  
46 Okay. Mr. Delaney, have you got any final last words, or anybody  
47 else around the table, before we vote this one up or down?

48

1 **MR. DELANEY:** I think you did such a thorough job today, Madam  
2 Chair, and I don't have anything to add, at this point. I  
3 appreciate it.  
4

5 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you. We've talked a lot about the  
6 language changes. We're also going to be making this the Shrimp  
7 AP's preferred alternative, saying to the council, and to the  
8 agency, this is the route we hope you go. If we vote this in a  
9 positive manner, that's what we're going to say, that we would  
10 prefer to have a Science-Center-managed ELB program, rather than  
11 an OLE-managed VMS program.  
12

13 I think one thing that has not been touched on in this meeting  
14 before, during this meeting, is the fact that this is a man's  
15 life's work. What you're taking, the data you're taking from this  
16 man, or woman, but generally it's men, that's what he worked his  
17 whole lifetime to compile, right here between his ears.  
18

19 He knows when to go, and where to go, to have the competitive  
20 advantage to be one hell of a shrimper. That's what you're mining  
21 from him. To take it willy-nilly, and farm it out to all federal  
22 law enforcement, and most of the state law enforcement, on a  
23 blanket access, so that they can see it for enforcement purposes,  
24 that's not the point of this data.  
25

26 This data is for science, and, the less people that see it, the  
27 better. I can't imagine any other company giving away their  
28 trademark formula for something willy-nilly and just blanket  
29 putting it out there. No, and this is our life's work. This is  
30 an invasion of our privacy, and we're saying, all right, we'll go  
31 along with you, under certain conditions.  
32

33 You're going to use this for science, to help the betterment of  
34 other species and our industry. We don't want you to weaponize  
35 this against us. That's not what this is supposed to be, and I  
36 think us choosing the cELB alternative, if that's what we do,  
37 that's the message that we're sending. We're saying, look, we  
38 love law enforcement, and they -- Management couldn't exist without  
39 them, because they have to enforce the rules, but this particular  
40 set of data is for science, and we don't want our science to be  
41 weaponized against us by blanket open access to people nationwide.  
42

43 All right, and that's all I got to say on that one. Anybody else?  
44 No? Okay, and so let's do a show of hands on this one, because  
45 it's an important one.  
46

47 **AP MEMBER:** (The comment is not audible on the recording.)  
48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** The last line says "preferred".  
2  
3 **MR. LONDRIE:** I have one thing.  
4  
5 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Is that Chris?  
6  
7 **MR. LONDRIE:** Yes.  
8  
9 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Go ahead, Chris.  
10  
11 **MR. LONDRIE:** Glenn mentioned the Chevron deference. Is it --  
12 Based on that case, isn't this entire thing like in violation of  
13 that? I mean, at least them requiring us to spend a dollar on any  
14 of this, and how is that not a clear violation of what the Supreme  
15 Court just ruled on in that Chevron deference case?  
16  
17 **MR. DELANEY:** Well, I don't know if you're asking me, or if that's  
18 a rhetorical question, but that's why I raised it in both of those  
19 motions, is that I think that it's ripe for that, but we'll have  
20 to see what the attorneys say when that day comes.  
21  
22 **MR. LONDRIE:** But can we just -- Well, until any attorney says  
23 everything, why don't we just tell them to go pound sand, quite  
24 frankly?  
25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Zales.  
27  
28 **MR. ZALES:** Glenn, correct me if I'm wrong, but that whole Chevron  
29 thing was based on the paying for observers for those guys up in  
30 the Northeast, and it's my understanding that the court has sent  
31 that back to the lower court to be redone and that there hadn't  
32 been a clear decision yet on whether or not they're going to have  
33 to pay for observers or not have to pay for observers. Am I  
34 correct or not?  
35  
36 **MR. DELANEY:** You're correct, but the facts of any given case are  
37 very specific, and so, you know, regardless of how that specific  
38 case is ultimately, you know, resolved, that doesn't mean that the  
39 facts of this situation would not be subject to review. They're  
40 not necessarily the same facts, but very similar, of course.  
41  
42 Conceptually, we're talking about a similar interpretation by the  
43 agency of statute, and, as long as a challenge is filed within  
44 thirty days of any final rule being issued to implement this  
45 measure, it would be potentially subject to a case filed, and a  
46 judicial review, and so we'll see, and with the context of the  
47 Chevron decision by SCOTUS.  
48

1 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So we're going to do a vote by show of hands,  
2 and so, for those of you on the webinar, when I ask for a vote of  
3 all in favor, and all opposed, whichever way you're going to vote,  
4 when we get to that point, you raise your hand online, and Camilla  
5 -- Okay. Who is on the phone that can't? Chris. Alan. Okay.  
6 Does Alan have somebody's phone number that he can text his vote  
7 to? Alan, if you're still on the line, you can text your vote in  
8 favor or opposed to Mr. Kristen Baumer. You've got a question,  
9 Mr. Henderson? Go ahead.

10  
11 **MR. HENDERSON:** I just want to know -- This motion, and why don't  
12 we just leave it the way it is? I mean, that's what I can't  
13 understand, is why -- I mean, what we've got is doing what it's  
14 supposed to do, and now we want now we want to change something  
15 that's going to cost us a lot of money, and it might not even work.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So you want to answer, Steve? Go ahead.

18  
19 **MR. BOSARGE:** So we can't leave it like it is, because it has quit  
20 working, and we're mandated to -- So the cellular part, the 3G  
21 part, of our electronic logbooks no longer functions, and so it  
22 doesn't transmit cellularly, and so we are mandated to come up  
23 with a system that will be better, or equivalent, to what we've  
24 done in the last ten years, and so, for the last ten years, we've  
25 been transmitting cellularly, and we're not doing it now, and so  
26 this is where we are, and we're trying to --

27  
28 **MR. HENDERSON:** You've said enough.

29  
30 **MR. BOSARGE:** Well, for the last two or three years, we've been  
31 we've been at odds, back and forth with you guys over this, and  
32 this is this is what we originally said we wanted, was to try to  
33 keep the program we got going, and I guess maybe what -- So if I  
34 could put you in my shoes just for a minute.

35  
36 A sister agency, being the U.S. Coast Guard, passed a law that  
37 says now that any vessel built has to be built under class and  
38 have a load line. Basically, they said you're not going to build  
39 any new shrimp boats, and, to my knowledge, there has been no  
40 shrimp boats built under that set of guidelines.

41  
42 The only way we can do it now it has to be under seventy-nine foot,  
43 and it has to be built as close to class as you can, under the  
44 same standards, and it doesn't have to have a load line. There's  
45 been no new boats built, and so we're trapped in these old boats,  
46 and I don't have to tell you, and, anybody that's in the industry,  
47 it's a full-time job keeping them up and keeping them going.

1 The other thing to that is I've been doing this all my life, and  
2 shrimp prices today are the same, or less, than they were when I  
3 was twenty years old. Now, you imagine, and just look at this  
4 business. Imagine if you had to run this business on the amount  
5 of money that was appropriated for this business in 1976. You  
6 better figure out how to streamline it, and that's where our  
7 industry can't -- We can't take anything more.

8  
9 So I'm not saying in the future -- In the future, if things turn  
10 around, and this industry gets to where it's lucrative, we may  
11 come in here and volunteer and say, hey, yes, we want to do this,  
12 and we want to give you all the information you need, but, right  
13 now, we just need to -- We're just holding on. We're treading  
14 water, and so understand it from our perspective, just a little  
15 bit. Thank you.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Okay, and so we're going take a  
18 vote, and it's old-fashioned. You just raise your hand, okay, and  
19 I'll count the hands.

20  
21 **MR. DELANEY:** Leann, I've got my hand up, if you could just --

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay. All right. Go ahead, Glenn.

24  
25 **MR. DELANEY:** I just want to emphasize, to the folks on the AP,  
26 that we absolutely need this data. The shrimp industry needs this  
27 data for scientific purposes. We don't need it for enforcement  
28 purposes, which is the direction maybe the agency wants us to go,  
29 but, as I had referenced in a previous statement, we absolutely  
30 need this data to enable our fishery to be authorized to operate  
31 under the Endangered Species Act.

32  
33 We absolutely need this data for shrimp stock assessments. We  
34 absolutely need this data to comply with the juvenile red snapper  
35 bycatch effort cap. We absolutely need this data to deconflict  
36 offshore aquaculture and offshore wind energy development. We  
37 absolutely need this data to deal with National Marine Sanctuaries  
38 boundaries.

39  
40 We just, most recently, have been using it with respect to the  
41 Florida Keys Sanctuary, and to great effect, hopefully, and we  
42 absolutely needed to deconflict with coral habitat areas of  
43 particular concern, and we've used it extensively for that purpose,  
44 to our benefit.

45  
46 We need this data for scientific purposes. What we don't need is  
47 for this data to go to OLE and have a real-time vessel monitoring  
48 system for enforcement purposes. None of those things, the

1 scientific purposes that I just articulated, are enforcement  
2 purposes. They're purely scientific and management. Thank you.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, and so, all of those in favor,  
5 signify by raising your hand. Okay, and, Alan, you didn't hear  
6 the motion read into the -- Okay, and so the motion is -- It's a  
7 motion to change the language in Alternative 3 and to make it the  
8 preferred alternative of the advisory panel, and so it says to  
9 request the council's consideration of the following revisions to  
10 the Draft Shrimp Framework Alternative 3 and to adopt Alternative  
11 3, as so modified, as its preferred.

12  
13 So, with our changes, Alternative 3 would read to implement a  
14 cellular ELB requirement for the Gulf shrimp fishery that provides  
15 archived position data to the Science Center that is compatible  
16 with the Science Center's shrimp effort algorithm. If selected by  
17 the SRD, the owner or operator of a vessel with a SPGM would be  
18 required to install a Science Center approved cELB that archives  
19 vessel position when on a shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf and  
20 automatically transmits those data, via cellular service, to a  
21 non-OLE NMFS server. Science Center approved cELBs would be type-  
22 approved for the Gulf shrimp fishery through a process external to  
23 50 CFR 600.1501. All right. **All those in favor, raise your hand.**  
24 All right. I've got eight in the room and then --

25  
26 **MR. DELANEY:** Glenn is yes.

27  
28 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Sorry. Nine in the room. Okay, and Glenn is  
29 a yes. That's ten. Are there any other votes online? So, Chris,  
30 are you a yes, in favor, or a no, opposed?

31  
32 **MR. LONDRIE:** I mean, I hate to say it, but I kind of don't  
33 understand what the -- I mean, based on the cost, it looked like  
34 Alternative 3 was the most costly, and so I'm kind of not -- I'm  
35 not clear as to why we're all voting for the most costly one.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, and so you're an opposed, right?

38  
39 **MR. LONDRIE:** Yes.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Got it. All right, and then we'll get a text,  
42 maybe. All right, and so we've got ten yes and two no, right,  
43 plus Glenn online. Nine in the room, plus Glenn online, was ten  
44 for yes, and then two online no. **All right, and so motion carries.**

45  
46 Thank you. All right. We're doing good work at the end of the  
47 day. We're staying strong. All right. Were there any other  
48 motions that people had? Mr. Delaney, did you have a motion for

1 Alternative 2, or no, to change that language?

2  
3 **MR. DELANEY:** Well, I would be glad to put it out there for  
4 discussion. If so, then, Camilla, I sent a motion, later on in  
5 the morning, to modify Alternative 2, if you could find that and  
6 call it up, and, again -- Well, let's get it up first. Thank you.

7  
8 Is that clear that that's Alternative 2 as it existed, as it exists  
9 in the framework, following the November meeting, with the addition  
10 of that underlying text at the end, which actually was text in the  
11 Alternative 2 prior to the November meeting, and this was very  
12 specifically to address your earlier discussion, way back earlier  
13 this morning, you know, discussing how other fisheries may be  
14 operating in the Gulf with other equipment, and we wanted to make  
15 sure that this would apply only to a vessel, a shrimp vessel, when  
16 it's fishing in the Gulf of Mexico, and s that was the purpose of  
17 this. I put it out there for discussion, and that's really all I  
18 have to say about it.

19  
20 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, and so we have a motion. Are you asking  
21 a question or seconding, Mr. Zales? All right. Go ahead and ask  
22 a question.

23  
24 **MR. ZALES:** Isn't this counter to what we just passed, because  
25 this is calling to implement a VMS, and we just passed using a  
26 cellular ELB.

27  
28 **MR. DELANEY:** I put it out for discussion. I don't know if you  
29 want to mess with Alternative 2 or not, but go ahead.

30  
31 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So this won't make Alternative 2 our preferred.  
32 This does not tell the council that this is what we want you to  
33 do. We told them we want Alternative 3, the cELB program, and I  
34 don't know. I'm on the fence about whether we do this or not.

35  
36 What I've seen thus far, from the Science Center and the agency,  
37 is they really want to put a VMS requirement on us, and so if I,  
38 as an industry member, sit here in this meeting, and I have any  
39 ability to try and make that less onerous, if I think that's what  
40 is going to happen, whether I like it or not, then I add this  
41 language to this alternative, so that --

42  
43 Because, as you know, there's a whole bunch of boats in the Gulf  
44 of Mexico that are dually-permitted. They have South Atlantic  
45 permits, too. They shrimp in the Atlantic, and they shrimp in the  
46 Gulf.

47  
48 If you don't put "while on a shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf" in

1 here, they get monitored always. It doesn't matter where they're  
2 at, or what they're doing. If they're in the South Atlantic, this  
3 box is supposed to collect Gulf effort data, and they can't turn  
4 it off. Law enforcement is still monitoring them twenty-four-  
5 seven-three-sixty-five, and it no longer even serves the purpose  
6 that it was intended for.

7  
8 I don't know. I don't know if you muddy the waters, or if you  
9 just hope that NMFS heard us, and they understand that that seems  
10 to be an undue burden, and they change their language on their own  
11 without us passing a motion. I'm not sure. Mr. Baumer.

12  
13 **MR. BAUMER:** I personally think -- I feel it would be better to  
14 not rule on this motion, to stick with one motion, and then, when  
15 you speak to the council, you can always discuss that, if  
16 necessary.

17  
18 **MR. ZALES:** I agree with that. I think this will confuse,  
19 especially some of the newer council members that are out there,  
20 that haven't been involved in any of this for any period of time,  
21 because this is kind of like you're giving them a choice, right?  
22 You can pick this one, or, even though it's not preferred, you can  
23 pick that one, and so I would say that you just kind of leave this  
24 one alone and stick with the preferred.

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Chris, have you got any feedback, since you're  
27 on the council, and you have to go to those meetings.

28  
29 **MR. SCHIEBLE:** Well, I mean, I can explain, as we go through, this,  
30 you know, you guys would be making edits to Alternative 2.  
31 However, you selected Alternative 3 as your recommended preferred,  
32 and you made modifications to that language.

33  
34 All this is, it's really reverting back to the language that was  
35 prior to the IPT reviewing it. By adding that sentence to the  
36 backend of it, that's really the difference, and so that can be  
37 explained, but I feel it's almost unnecessary for you guys to do  
38 this, if you're recommending the other Alternative 3 as the  
39 preferred.

40  
41 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** It will be in the meeting summary as well, you  
42 know, that it was our wishes that this be only while on a shrimp  
43 fishing trip in the Gulf. You think that was loud and clear enough  
44 in the meeting and that that would probably come through in the  
45 summary report, Dr. Freeman? Okay. All right. Mr. Baumer.

46  
47 **MR. BAUMER:** I was going to say it actually sends a stronger  
48 message to the council that we considered a second motion, and

1 declined to vote on it, because we feel that strongly about the  
2 first one.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right, and so we had a lot of discussion,  
5 Dr. Freeman, about, you know, that VMS only being on when on a  
6 shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf. We also had a lot of discussion  
7 about satellite, versus cellular, and the fact that satellite was  
8 not in there. It was removed from that alternative, when there  
9 was a shrimp industry council member on the council, and then now  
10 there is no shrimp industry member on the council, and satellite  
11 went back in, and so there were several things in that Alternative  
12 2 that we took issue with, but we would rather just have that in  
13 the summary report, rather than make a motion on it. I think I  
14 agree. I think it's -- I'm looking around. Mr. Delaney, we don't  
15 have a second. Are you okay with withdrawing this motion?

16  
17 **MR. DELANEY:** Absolutely. As I said, you know, I was putting it  
18 out for discussion. I wasn't sure I was going to offer it, except  
19 you asked me if I had another motion, and so I figured it's better,  
20 and now we have a good solid record as to why the AP does not want  
21 to go forward with this. I had the same thoughts as many of you  
22 just expressed, and so I'm very pleased to withdraw my motion and  
23 make sure that it's recorded in the record of the meeting. Thank  
24 you so much.

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, sir. All right. Dr. Walter, you  
27 hung in here this whole time. You've got just a handful of slides  
28 on your Shrimp Futures presentation.

29  
30 **DR. WALTER:** (Dr. Walter's comment is not audible on the  
31 recording.)

32  
33 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Oh, you're not? You're not presenting? You're  
34 here, but you're not presenting? Oh my God. Before we leave the  
35 framework document, did anybody have anything else? Will we see  
36 this again? We always have a Shrimp AP meeting in March, every  
37 year, because we have to vote on the Texas closure, and so I assume  
38 we will see this one more time in March, before the council takes  
39 final action in April, if that's what they -- It will be on our  
40 Shrimp AP agenda?

41  
42 **DR. FREEMAN:** (Dr. Freeman's comment is not audible on the  
43 recording.)

44  
45 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** No?

46  
47 **DR. FREEMAN:** So, based on the tentative timeline I went through,  
48 if they select a preferred in January, we would be doing a mailout

1 to permit holders between the January and April meeting, and so  
2 any additional comments would be submitted through that process.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** So the Science Center will never get back to us  
5 on the differences in the cost and the extra cost to industry?  
6 We'll never get presented on that, about the findings and how that  
7 all turned out? Dr. Walter, go ahead.

8  
9 **DR. WALTER:** We have, as an agency, said we'll take a deep dive  
10 into that. I think the time to get that would be for the January  
11 council meeting, if we do get that. I'll note that it would be  
12 good to get the cost estimates that you provided just to us now,  
13 because, really, I only glanced at it on the screen, and so we can  
14 probably bring something.

15  
16 There will need to be finalized cost estimates in Chapter 3, I  
17 think, for the IPT, and so that's when we're going to have to take  
18 a deep dive into that and look into it, which will give us that  
19 time to be able to get those in and to take a hard look at it. I  
20 don't know how much more we can squeeze out of it. Thank you for  
21 your time, and looking at those, and providing some alternate cost  
22 estimates, but there is -- We do have to do that due diligence for  
23 the amendment, and that will go before the council.

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, and so, if you present that to the council  
26 in January, then we could have that on our Shrimp AP meeting agenda  
27 for March, so that we could see that presentation, too.

28  
29 **DR. WALTER:** As you wish. I mean, the decision will probably have  
30 been made, at that point, in terms of what the preferred is.

31  
32 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Well, I would -- Personally, I would like some  
33 explanation as to the differences in those costs, you know, and  
34 so, if that is going to be fleshed out, and you're going to give  
35 a presentation, a detailed presentation, somewhere, I would like  
36 to see it here too, and so that would be good. Okay, and so  
37 hopefully we'll at least get that.

38  
39 I still am not real sure why we don't see the amendment again, if  
40 we have a meeting right before the council takes final action, but  
41 I guess we assume whatever the council does in January is really  
42 final action and they're not going to change anything or anything  
43 like that, and I don't know. Okay. Well, I'll get with staff, as  
44 we get closer to that meeting. All right, and so no -- Nothing  
45 else on the framework document? No? All right.

46  
47 Last presentation. Hang in there. Hold on to your seats, and so  
48 we have Dr. Gervasi on the line, or in the room? In the room.

1 Hello. Hello. Before you dive into that, I'm going to let Dr.  
2 Freeman go through the scope of work.

3  
4 **UPDATE ON THE SHRIMP FUTURES PROGRAM**  
5

6 **DR. FREEMAN:** So, for this item, the AP will be presented with an  
7 update on NMFS' plan for workshops for the Gulf shrimp industry.  
8 These workshops are intended to assist NMFS in addressing current  
9 challenges faced by the Gulf shrimp industry, as well as in  
10 developing plans for various future scenarios. The AP should  
11 consider the information presented, ask questions, and provide  
12 feedback to NMFS on the planned workshops.

13  
14 **DR. CARISSA GERVASI:** Okay. Thank you, everyone. I know there's  
15 been a lot of really heavy discussion, all day today, and so  
16 hopefully this presentation is exciting. The entire goal here is  
17 to help the shrimp industry in any ways we can, and so we're really  
18 excited to give you an update. I know John presented sort of an  
19 overview of this project, back in March, when it was just really  
20 an initial idea, and so we have some exciting updates to share.

21  
22 We heard your feedback, at that last meeting, that, you know,  
23 thinking about the future of the industry is important, but there  
24 are dire needs, and issues, that the industry is facing now, and  
25 so our objectives are split into two components, and the first is  
26 really focused on how can we support the shrimp industry in the  
27 present?

28  
29 This consists of, first, we're characterizing the current state  
30 and major challenges that exist throughout the entire Southeast  
31 region, and so the Gulf and South Atlantic. We're working to build  
32 connections with key partners, and agencies, and specifically  
33 agencies that might be able to assist the industry. For example,  
34 we've had some conversations with USDA, about their crop insurance  
35 program. You know, perhaps we can do something similar with the  
36 shrimp insurance program, those kinds of -- Workshopping those  
37 ideas.

38  
39 We're also working to identify some immediate actions and  
40 opportunities, like funding opportunities, that industry members  
41 might be able to take advantage of. We're trying to identify any  
42 success stories that exist in the industry. Are people managing  
43 to survive, despite all of these challenges, and kind of what are  
44 the ways that they're doing that, so we can highlight those  
45 stories.

46  
47 Then the second part of this project is thinking into the future.  
48 How can we support the industry long-term, and so that is going to

1 involve a series of workshops, where we're hoping to bring together  
2 industry members from throughout the supply chain, sort of  
3 everybody who is involved in the industry, and work to first  
4 develop a future vision for the industry and then identify  
5 strategies that will support a resilient industry into the future  
6 and some action items that are robust to that uncertainty.

7  
8 Our very first step here has been to consult the experts, and so  
9 we're really doing our homework. We've had, so far, twenty-two  
10 interviews with Sea Grant experts, state representatives, council  
11 AP members, and we've spoken to a couple of you in this room  
12 already, and so thank you again.

13  
14 Then scientists and researchers, and then, sort of next on our  
15 list, are going to be industry groups, association  
16 representatives, really just trying to get a lay of the land,  
17 understand the industry, who all the major players are, and the  
18 interactions among different groups, characterize all of the  
19 issues, and how they differ regionally, and really start compiling  
20 some of those ideas for strategies and solutions that might work  
21 for people.

22  
23 Then our next step, which we're gearing up to start in January, is  
24 to really get to know the people, and so we'll be traveling in-  
25 person around the Gulf and South Atlantic. to meet with harvesters,  
26 processors, dealers, fish markets, restaurants, everyone  
27 throughout the supply chain, to really get to know the people in  
28 the industry, and specifically the underrepresented groups, that  
29 might not show up to meetings like this, or be able to be involved  
30 in workshops, hear about concerns, potential strategies and  
31 barriers firsthand, and then generate some interest in  
32 participating in the workshop component of this project.

33  
34 I just wanted to quickly highlight a few current products. We  
35 have a big comms effort that is part of this project, and we've so  
36 far put out a Shrimp Futures project page, that we'll be keeping  
37 updated as we progress along this project.

38  
39 Then in the center here is a web story that we recently put out  
40 about the sustainability of wild-caught shrimp, and this story was  
41 picked up by the Southern Shrimp Alliance, *The National Fisherman*,  
42 *Perishable News*, and the Orange Beach, Alabama community website,  
43 and so it's gotten some great interest from the community, which  
44 we're excited about, and then on the left is a national story that  
45 was put out about direct marketing, that highlights Miss Gina's  
46 Shrimp, out of North Carolina. They've been very successful with  
47 their direct marketing efforts, and so highlighting some of those  
48 success stories, where we can, in these web stories is one of our

1 strategies.

2

3 Another big component of this study is an economic analysis, and  
4 the goal here is to compile an economic snapshot report of the  
5 economic condition in 2023 compared to the long-term trends, and  
6 the focus, in this first report we're putting out, is the Gulf of  
7 Mexico shrimp harvest sector. We hope to do the same thing for  
8 the South Atlantic later on.

9

10 We have a lot of great economic data that shows basically the  
11 status quo is likely to lead to continued long-term consolidation  
12 of the industry, and this figure, on the right, is an example of  
13 what we'll include here. This is the Gulf industry, in the context  
14 of the U.S. shrimp market, and so the imports are blue, and the  
15 domestic shrimp landings are in yellow, so we can see those trends.

16

17 Just another figure that kind of shows the long-term trends here.  
18 This is the shrimp price index, domestic in yellow, and imports in  
19 blue, and, as you all know, 2023 was a very bad year, but, even if  
20 these long-term trends continue, and you can click to the next  
21 slide, and, if we kind of imagine those long-term trends continuing  
22 into the future, it doesn't paint a good story of the future of  
23 this industry.

24

25 We're going to put together this report. It will be a really  
26 user-friendly document, geared towards stakeholders, that we hope  
27 will really provide the context needed to say, you know, this  
28 industry is in trouble, economically, and we need to do something  
29 about it and kind of the impetus for why we need this Shrimp  
30 Futures project.

31

32 Then our workshops, which are going to be held in winter of 2026,  
33 and so we're gearing up to hold those workshops next winter. We're  
34 going to be doing about ten scenario planning workshops, in  
35 strategic areas throughout the Gulf and South Atlantic, hoping to  
36 get as many people throughout the industry involved as possible.

37

38 During these workshops, participants will work together, through  
39 a series of activities, to identify visions for the future of the  
40 industry and some actions that can be taken by individuals,  
41 organizations, and governments to realize those future visions,  
42 and we are working with members of Sea Grant to plan these  
43 workshops, and facilitate them, and participants will be  
44 reimbursed for travel expenses. We have that in our budget, and  
45 so hopefully we can get a lot of participation and work together  
46 to come up with some out-of-the box solutions for this industry.

47

48 I'll just end there, with a quick slide here that just has an

1 overview of our process and timeline, and, again, we're culminating  
2 with the scenario planning workshops next winter, during the -  
3 offseason for most of the industry, and kind of wrapping up with  
4 a final resilience action plan report that we hope to publish in  
5 spring 2026, and with that, I'll take any questions. Thank you so  
6 much.

7  
8 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you. Did we have any questions or --  
9 Yes, Mr. Zales.

10  
11 **MR. ZALES:** I'm sure you've heard of some of the enforcement cases,  
12 and mislabeling and whatnot, for the Mary Mahoney's thing in  
13 Mississippi, and then the seafood processor that all got busted  
14 with prison sentences and the whole bit, and, also, where the DNA  
15 stuff, where forty-four restaurants in south Mississippi were  
16 sampled, and only eight had domestic shrimp.

17  
18 Is it possible, on the website that you're creating, to showcase  
19 that kind of information to the public, so that they can see that,  
20 when they're out looking at retail shops, grocery stores,  
21 restaurants, or whatever, to purchase shrimp, or any kind of  
22 seafood, to ask questions about where it comes from, to be sure  
23 it's domestic versus imports?

24  
25 **DR. GERVASI:** That's a great idea, and I don't know if, John, you  
26 have anything else to add, but I think that's like a strategy.  
27 We've definitely heard that a lot, the mislabeling and the consumer  
28 lack of knowledge about where shrimp are coming from. When they  
29 go to a restaurant, they're not necessarily sure what they're  
30 eating, and so that's a good idea. We'll see what we can put on  
31 the website, in terms of any links to reports, or published  
32 studies, if any exist. We could definitely try to do that.

33  
34 **MR. ZALES:** Yes, because, on that website -- I mean, because this  
35 kind of stuff comes out in news reports, that not everybody gets.  
36 I mean, I get a bunch of this stuff, and I forward it on to pretty  
37 much everybody in my list world that I have, but to have it in the  
38 Fisheries Service website, and whatnot, would kind of bring, I  
39 think, extra attention to the issue, and inform whoever is looking  
40 at that webpage, that, gee, maybe we need to check into this, and  
41 so, you know, it may help.

42  
43 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Mr. Schieble.

44  
45 **MR. SCHIEBLE:** Real quick, to that point, and so Kristen, and maybe  
46 Alan, can even speak to this, but our shrimp task force, in  
47 Louisiana, has contracted a testing group that goes out and  
48 genetically tests randomly-selected shrimp in restaurants and

1 reports on the testing. They publish those reports fairly  
2 regularly, with our shrimp task force, and also they end up in  
3 news releases, and so look for those, and you'll probably see some  
4 results that may be reposted.

5  
6 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** All right. Anybody else? Well, thank you for  
7 hanging in there all day to present to us. We appreciate that.

8  
9 **DR. GERVASI:** Thank you.

10  
11 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** The last thing we have is the public comment.  
12 Camilla, do you see -- Is there anybody online, from the public,  
13 that -- So, if you are online from the public, and you want to  
14 give comment, you use the raise-your-hand feature, and we'll call  
15 on you. There you go. You can see, on the screen right now, it  
16 gives you a diagram, an illustration, of where that raise-your-  
17 hand feature is. If you're using the GoToWebinar platform on your  
18 computer, or smartphone, that's how you would do it.

19  
20 I'll pause for just a minute and see if anybody raises their hand.  
21 Just, as we're waiting -- All right, and so, for public testimony,  
22 generally, during council meetings, it's a three-minute public  
23 testimony timeframe. That can be extended, at the discretion of  
24 the chair, but I ask you to try and keep that in mind as you are  
25 giving testimony. Be cognizant there's people behind you that  
26 want to speak, too. As I call your name, introduce yourself, and  
27 kind of give us a little -- Who you're affiliated with, if anyone,  
28 a little background, and then your public testimony. So we have,  
29 first, Mr. Greg Lovingfoss, and I think we're having some technical  
30 difficulties. We'll come back around to you, Greg. We have Tricia  
31 Kimball.

32  
33 **MR. GREG LOVINGFOSS:** Can you hear me now?

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, Greg. We can hear you. Go ahead.

36  
37 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

38  
39 **MR. LOVINGFOSS:** Okay. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I  
40 apologize if there's any echo here. I want to add, real quickly,  
41 a couple of items that need to be considered, I think. The Zen  
42 VMS has been reduced to \$545, and, if you add the installation to  
43 it, it's about \$300, and so you're at \$845.

44  
45 Now, separate from that, I want to mention, and this is something  
46 that I've discussed with the Science Center, and it's regarding  
47 your Alternative 2 and Alternative 3. I have suggested that the  
48 AP, and the council, consider using the GSat track program. That

1 is the program that is currently used by all the fishermen in the  
2 Early Adopter Program that have the Zen VMS. It's the same system  
3 that's used by LGL, and it is one of the most sophisticated GIS  
4 and management systems worldwide.

5  
6 It's used heavily in fisheries, in a lot of foreign fisheries, and  
7 so what I'm just going to throw out is a couple of specs about it  
8 here, and I will follow-up. In consideration of time, I will  
9 follow-up with a written follow-up for this.

10  
11 If you compare this to the figures that you currently have, the  
12 cost of this program, the GSat program has a setup, an original  
13 startup charge, not counting what has to be done security-wise on  
14 your end, but let me first state that this program will run on  
15 aws.gov.cloud. Those are government servers maintained by AWS  
16 that already have all the security, et cetera. I'm sorry that I  
17 can't tell you any more about that, but, if you can look into  
18 aws.gov.cloud, you may find a lot of savings there.

19  
20 Okay, and your startup cost is going to be about a quarter of what  
21 you have for Alternative 2. Your maintenance cost will run about  
22 a third of what's stated for Alternative 2, and a quarter of what's  
23 stated for Alternative 3. For instance, creation of a graphical  
24 user interface, the GUI, \$300,000, and it already exists. It's  
25 already there. The fishermen are using it now. The \$100,000  
26 maintenance for the GUI would be much, much less. As I said, it's  
27 already there.

28  
29 Hiring help desk staff, you have estimated at \$250,000. I would  
30 suggest it would probably be \$75,000, or less. Type-approval could  
31 still be done on the coattails of National Fisheries Service, if  
32 that's possible. I can't speak to that. However, I have rewritten  
33 those specifications so that they're more applicable to the shrimp  
34 industry and sent a copy to the Science Center, so they have them  
35 as a guide.

36  
37 Leann, I know you've spent a lot of time on that. I would be happy  
38 to share that with you, if you'd like to see it.

39  
40 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thanks. I would like that, Mr. Greg, and,  
41 just for everybody, you forgot to mention your affiliation, but I  
42 think you're with the Zen VMS group, correct?

43  
44 **MR. LOVINGFOSS:** Yes.

45  
46 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, and we're at the four-minute mark, and so  
47 if you can bring it to a close for me.

48

1 **MR. LOVINGFOSS:** Let me clarify that I'm not talking about this on  
2 behalf of Zen VMS. The GSat program is agnostic. It will take  
3 anyone's device that is approved by the council, or the Shrimp AP,  
4 and so I'm not representing Zen VMS with this. I'm trying to offer  
5 a solution, from my thirty years of experience with VMS programs.  
6

7 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you. I appreciate that. Would you be  
8 able to maybe just email us, or council staff, some of that info,  
9 so that we can look it up on our own? I appreciate that. Thank  
10 you, Mr. Greg.  
11

12 **MR. LOVINGFOSS:** I certainly will.  
13

14 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Okay, and so, next on the list, we have Tricia  
15 Kimball.  
16

17 **MS. KIMBALL:** Can you hear me?  
18

19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Yes, ma'am. Go ahead.  
20

21 **MS. KIMBALL:** I'm speaking for the shrimpers, their families, and  
22 the shrimping community at-large. We're not just numbers and data.  
23 I'm representing Port Arthur Area Shrimpers Association. I'm the  
24 vice president. Right now, we have 167 paid members and several  
25 hundred that cannot afford the \$50 dues.  
26

27 I draw a direct correlation between illegal and underpriced  
28 shrimping and illegal aliens coming into the U.S. Both are  
29 shrimping unchecked across our borders. The governmental agencies  
30 in charge, in both instances, have chosen to do nothing about it  
31 for decades, particularly over these last few years.  
32

33 Shrimpers of the U.S. population have been begging for assistance,  
34 and for our laws to be properly applied, and all of our cries fall  
35 upon deaf ears. Two governmental agencies, in the case of shrimp,  
36 were tasked, years ago, to make sure that only shrimp that came in  
37 from certified countries, according to Section 609, were to come  
38 into our borders.  
39

40 What has happened, over the past three decades, is that this agency  
41 turned a blind eye to its duties, until we were in the position to  
42 which we have found ourselves, with our country being overrun with  
43 1.8 billion pounds of shrimp dumped onto our domestic market in a  
44 single year, driving the price of shrimp for U.S. shrimpers to the  
45 lowest point in our industry's history. These foreign wild-caught  
46 shrimpers ought to be using the same equipment that was foisted  
47 upon our industry in 1989.  
48

1 TEDs and BRDs were essentially huge holes in our nets through which  
2 marine organisms, including shrimp, escape. This amount of shrimp  
3 has been, for years, the difference between a shrimper able to  
4 continue shrimping into the next year or foreclosure on the  
5 shrimper's homes and boats, often ending their jobs, and those of  
6 their deckhands as well.

7  
8 I'm a retired teacher, who taught science for thirty-three years.  
9 I have a degree in biology, and I understand academia. I was still  
10 in college when I met my future husband. I was taking a slew of  
11 biology courses, and when my boyfriend, now husband, offered to  
12 bring me on his boat, as a biologist, I jumped at the opportunity.

13  
14 I saw it as a practical application of the courses that I was  
15 taking. What I did not see is that this was his livelihood, his  
16 way of supporting a family in the future. I have to admit that,  
17 at the time in my life, I never thought -- I had never even thought  
18 as to how that shrimp got on my plate.

19  
20 I grew up as one of nine siblings, in a family that struggled  
21 during my preteen years, and, until we moved from Missouri to the  
22 Texas Gulf Coast, I had never eaten shrimp. I did not know how  
23 hard those shrimpers worked, until I deck-handed part-time for my  
24 eventual husband during my college years. There are very long  
25 hours, high risk, and dangerous situations that must be overcome,  
26 for very often little reward.

27  
28 Boats must be maintained, and I must admit there have been many  
29 times that I felt that the boat was his wife, and I was merely the  
30 mistress, based on the time and attention that he lavished on his  
31 boat, The Seahorse.

32  
33 I think, too often in academia, it is forgotten that there are  
34 people behind those statistics and data that they are mining,  
35 people who are desperately just trying to hold on one more season,  
36 one more year, until things turn around. We would have hoped that  
37 as academics started to see the rapid decline of shrimping in their  
38 statistics, they would have tried to help, and sustain the  
39 industry, instead of just documenting its decline. The decline  
40 has been going on over thirty years, and agencies are just now  
41 trying to do things to help.

42  
43 The only problem is that that help will take many years to come,  
44 far too long to save most of the shrimpers and their families.  
45 We're not just numbers and statistics, but real-life people who  
46 have been suffering for years without assistance.

47  
48 Every year we have to turn in data, in order to be able to get a

1 federal license. These folks in charge have watched, for over  
2 thirty years, as the number of boats has dwindled to next to  
3 nothing, and yet help was not to come.

4  
5 Our local Sea Grant agent, Nikki Fitzgerald, witnessed what was  
6 going on, and she's been trying to help the U.S. shrimpers, but  
7 that's all, and now we have the Shrimp Futures Project. If the  
8 governmental agencies wait much longer, there will be no future  
9 for the U.S. shrimpers.

10  
11 When the electronic logbooks came out, it was noticed, in 2014,  
12 that they needed to recruit, or force, 100 more shrimp boats to  
13 use the e-logbooks, because so many of the shrimp boats that had  
14 them went out of business and were no longer shrimping. Why was  
15 nothing done at that point? Fast-forward twenty more years, and  
16 there are far fewer shrimp boats in the water than twenty years  
17 before. This electronic tracking is no longer needed, as there's  
18 no way that the few boats left can possibly impact the vast numbers  
19 of shrimp in the water.

20  
21 As far as the fishing effort goes, the shrimpers can hardly afford  
22 to fuel down their vessels, with fuel that's considerably  
23 overpriced, to fish for shrimp that are disastrously underpriced,  
24 thanks to imported farm-raised shrimp and imported wild-caught  
25 shrimp that has flooded our markets unchecked and vastly untested  
26 for illegal chemicals and impurities over these many years.

27  
28 We watch helplessly as our fellow shrimpers lose their boats, their  
29 homes, and their livelihoods knowing full well that that can be us  
30 in the near future. I had to come out of retirement, and return  
31 to teaching, to help our family weather the storm, also. Help  
32 that comes five or ten years down the road will be far too late  
33 for our industry. We're drowning now, and there's no one willing  
34 to throw us that badly needed life ring.

35  
36 We don't need monetary assistance. We need the ability to sell  
37 our shrimp at a fair price, as in the past. My husband is a third-  
38 generation shrimper, in a family of three brothers who shrimp, and  
39 it looks as though this will be the last generation of shrimpers,  
40 given the outlook for the once proud shrimping industry.

41  
42 Shrimpers are beginning to band together, so that their voices  
43 might be heard more loudly, asking for desperately needed  
44 assistance to curb the never-ending stream of imported shrimp.  
45 The shrimp coming into the U.S. is tested for illegal substances,  
46 and impurities, less than 1 percent of the time, whereas the  
47 domestic shrimp are tested at a much higher rate, because of onsite  
48 inspectors.

1  
2 If you want to know the facts affecting our industry, just ask the  
3 shrimpers. We'll gladly tell you what the issues are, and what we  
4 feel could be solutions to these problems, and what action should  
5 be taken to keep those imported foods safe.

6  
7 It has become a huge food safety issue as well as an economic one  
8 of late. Our foods in the U.S. are safe, and countries that import  
9 them feel comfortable to import them, but what's coming to our  
10 borders is often unsafe and a danger to our citizens.

11  
12 When looking at the agenda, it is disheartening to see that most  
13 of the time and effort of this meeting is to track U.S. shrimpers,  
14 as though we're criminals, instead of working to come up with  
15 solutions that can save the shrimping industry itself.

16  
17 When you're monitoring the shrimping effort, keep in mind that  
18 often those hardworking people fuel down their boats with tens of  
19 thousands of dollars of fuel, only to arrive at the docks to sell  
20 their catch, often for less than it costs to pay for the shrimping  
21 trip. Boat owners are consistently in the red, at the end of a  
22 week-long or month-long trip, after paying for fuel, deckhands and  
23 supplies and upkeep of their vessels. All we're asking for is a  
24 fair playing field, no more and no less.

25  
26 Boats are running from this fishery. The level of shrimping is  
27 nowhere what it used to be. Why is everyone trying to cause the  
28 further collapse of the shrimp industry? It seems that the new  
29 governmental agency DOGE, the Department of Government Efficiency,  
30 should be asked for assistance to help with this efficiency, or  
31 with this fishery, and with those numbers they were coming up  
32 earlier with. Thank you very much. I appreciate the possibility  
33 to talk.

34  
35 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** You got me choked up, and so I'm having trouble  
36 talking back to you. Thank you for listening in.

37  
38 **MR. BOSARGE:** Yes, ma'am. Thank you, Ms. Tricia. Next up would  
39 be Ms. Rachel Hisler. Are you on?

40  
41 **MS. RACHEL HISLER:** Hello. Rachel Heisler. I'm in Double Bayou,  
42 Texas. I am a third-generation fishing family, currently in the  
43 red snapper fishery, but, in the past, our families have been  
44 involved in shrimping and the blue crabbing. Thank you, Ms.  
45 Kimball, for sharing your personal, very personal, side of this,  
46 because I know that it's hard to talk about financial hardships,  
47 and so thank you for sharing that with everyone.

48

1 As a new AP member on the Reef Fish AP myself, and this is my first  
2 time serving, I want to thank everyone for their participation in  
3 this AP today, and I did hear some people talking about maybe they  
4 were belaboring some topics, but I just want to say, as a new  
5 entrant, it is helpful to us, and we need this information.

6  
7 We need these backstories, and we need this experience, to continue  
8 moving forward, and so thank you for that. I know that, if you've  
9 been at this for a long time, it can seem redundant, but you have  
10 to share this information with us newcomers, and so thank you for  
11 that.

12  
13 Secondly, I would like to say that, even though some people did  
14 comment that some of this motions and things, that the language  
15 doesn't matter, and that it's just semantics, and I would argue  
16 that we have learned, in the past twenty years, that the language  
17 does in fact matter, and so thank you for the clear language in  
18 the motion for cELBs to be the preferred method for this fishery.

19  
20 Then, lastly, I would like to comment that, as a liberty-minded  
21 individual, I appreciated the comment about being The right of the  
22 people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects  
23 against unreasonable searches and seizures, and shall not be  
24 violated, and no warrant shall issue, but upon probable cause,  
25 supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the  
26 place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.

27  
28 If you know your Constitution, then you would recognize that that  
29 is the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment, and this information that is being gathered  
30 by the scientists is highly confidential. It is valuable  
31 information, and it is deeply personal information, that we do  
32 deserve to be secure in, and so, while we do need to gather  
33 information for our fisheries, to conserve them and keep them going  
34 for future generations, we still do have to be conscious that it  
35 is private information, and we do not want to live in a police  
36 state, and so those are my comments for today, and thank you.

37  
38 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Thank you, Ms. Rachel, and thank you to you,  
39 Tricia. I think you all said it better than probably I could have,  
40 and I think that the sentiment that Tricia laid out for us is it  
41 essentially -- Yes, I come in here, and I ask a lot of tough  
42 questions, and I poke holes in things, but that's because this  
43 industry is fighting for our life every day.

44  
45 That's where we're at, and that's what it feels like, every day  
46 when we get up and we come to these meetings, that we're fighting  
47 for our lives, and so I'm sorry if I ask a lot of tough questions,  
48 but it's what I feel I have to do to fight for our industry.

1  
2 I do want to say thank you though to Dr. Gloeckner, Dr. Walter,  
3 and Mr. Strelcheck. I know how busy you three men are, and all  
4 three of you came in here, and sat in here at this meeting, and  
5 looked us in the eyes, and answered our questions, as best you  
6 could, and that's all we can ask for, and we appreciate that.  
7 Thank you for giving us your time. I know we're at odds on this  
8 one, but we're still going to work together in the end. We're  
9 going to find some sort of solution, I hope.

10  
11 All right, and so any other comments, before we, or questions,  
12 before we leave today? Dr. Freeman, did I miss anything? You  
13 want the last word? I don't know if I can give you the last word,  
14 Dr. Walter.

15  
16 **DR. WALTER:** (Dr. Walter's comment is not audible on the  
17 recording.)

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN BOSARGE:** Most definitely. I deal with your staff quite  
20 often. You have an amazing staff, all of them. They're very  
21 knowledgeable, hardworking people. All right. If there's nothing  
22 else, thank you guys, and gals, for staying over. I'll see you  
23 again in March. Meeting adjourned.

24  
25 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on December 16, 2024.)

26  
27 - - -  
28