

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL

SHRIMP MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Renaissance New Orleans Pere Marquette New Orleans, Louisiana

January 27, 2025

**VOTING MEMBERS**

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

**NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

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

**STAFF**

- 32 Max Birdsong.....Social Scientist
- 33 Assane Diagne.....Economist
- 34 Matt Freeman.....Economist
- 35 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
- 36 Beth Hager.....Administrative Officer
- 37 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
- 38 Sarah Gardiner.....Fishery Biologist
- 39 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 40 Jessica Matos.....Administrative Document Editor & IT Coordinator
- 41 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
- 42 Ryan Rindone.....Lead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
- 43 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 44 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director

**OTHER PARTICIPANTS**

- 47 Leann Bosarge.....MS
- 48 Rick Burris.....MS

1 Frank Helies.....NOAA  
2 Tom Roller.....SAFMC  
3 John Walter.....SEFSC

4  
5  
6

- - -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1  
2  
3 Table of Motions..... 4  
4  
5 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of August 2024 Minutes..... 5  
6  
7 Action Guide and Next Steps..... 5  
8  
9 Draft Shrimp Framework Action: Modification of the Vessel Position  
10 Data Collection Program for the Gulf of Mexico Shrimp Fishery.. 6  
11  
12 Adjournment..... 39

- - -

## TABLE OF MOTIONS

1  
2  
3 [PAGE 32](#): Motion to adopt the Shrimp AP recommended language for  
4 Alternative 3. Alternative 3 would be revised as follows:  
5 Alternative 3: Implement a cellular ELB (cELB) requirement for the  
6 Gulf shrimp fishery that provides archived position data to the  
7 SEFSC that is compatible with the SEFSC's shrimp effort algorithm.  
8 If selected by the SRD, the owner or operator of a vessel with a  
9 SPGM would be required to install a SEFSC-approved cELB that  
10 archives vessel position when on a shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf  
11 and automatically transmits those data via cellular service to a  
12 non-OLE NMFS server. SEFSC-approved cELBs would be type-approved  
13 for the Gulf shrimp fishery through a process external to 50 C.F.R.  
14 600.1501. [The motion carried on page 34.](#)

15  
16 [PAGE 36](#): Motion to modify Alternative 2 as follows: Alternative  
17 2: Implement a vessel monitoring system (VMS) requirement for the  
18 Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) shrimp fishery that provides, at a minimum,  
19 archived position data when on a fishing trip in the Gulf that is  
20 compatible with the Southeast Fisheries Science Center's (SEFSC)  
21 shrimp effort algorithm to a NMFS server. If selected by the  
22 Science and Research Director (SRD), the owner or operator of a  
23 vessel with a Gulf shrimp moratorium (SPGM) permit would be  
24 required to install a type-approved VMS unit (50 C.F.R. 600.1501).  
25 [The motion carried on page 37.](#)

26  
27 [PAGE 37](#): Motion to make Alternative 3 the preferred alternative.  
28 [The motion carried on page 38.](#)

29  
30 - - -  
31

1 The Shrimp Management Committee of the Gulf of Mexico Fishery  
2 Management Council convened at The Renaissance New Orleans Pere  
3 Marquette in New Orleans, Louisiana on Monday morning, January 27,  
4 2025, and was called to order by Chairman Chris Schieble.

5  
6 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**  
7 **APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 2024 MINUTES**  
8 **ACTION GUIDE AND NEXT STEPS**  
9

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

16  
17 The first item on the agenda is Adoption of the Agenda, Tab D,  
18 Number 1. Does anyone have any other business they would like to  
19 add to the agenda? Mr. Sanchez.

20  
21 **MR. JOHN SANCHEZ:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, and, at some point  
22 during the discussion today, we do have the benefit of having the  
23 Shrimp AP chair with us, and so I would like to see if it's okay  
24 if she approaches the podium, or takes a chair and a microphone,  
25 and goes through some of the cost estimates presented by the AP  
26 during the meeting, so she can be here to answer questions and  
27 elaborate on that. Thank you.

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** I think that's a valid request. We don't need  
30 to modify the agenda, or we have Other Business for that, right,  
31 and we can just do that during the summary report, correct?  
32

33 **DR. MATT FREEMAN:** Yes, and so that's captured in the AP summary,  
34 and so the AP chair would be able to reference that. Are you good  
35 with that, Mr. Sanchez?  
36

37 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Yes, as long as, you know, we take advantage of her  
38 being here, having traveled here, that, if there's any questions  
39 or anything, she could chime-in, or elaborate, because I know she  
40 had some slides, and I found them interesting. I would love for  
41 her to run through them and kind of walk us through that. That  
42 would be helpful for me. Thank you.

43  
44 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Sure, and I think we could pull up the link  
45 from the bottom of the AP report, that has those slides, when we  
46 call her up, correct?

1  
2 **DR. FREEMAN:** Correct, and admin already has that ready to pull up  
3 when she approaches the podium.  
4

5 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay, and so, without any modification of the  
6 agenda, is there any opposition to the agenda as written? Seeing  
7 none, the agenda is adopted. The next item on the agenda is  
8 approval of the November 2024 meeting minutes, Tab D, Number 2.  
9 Are there any additions, deletions, or edits to the minutes?  
10

11 I have one edit. On page 34 of the minutes, line 40, we need to  
12 swap the word "production" with the word "reduction", and so I'll  
13 read it. Starting with line 38, and it's under Dr. Walter's  
14 section.  
15

16 He spoke that: I'll note the article certainly tries to play up  
17 the sustainability of the fishery and the many sacrifices that the  
18 industry has gone through for bycatch "production", and that should  
19 be changed to "reduction", and I asked Dr. Walter if he's okay  
20 with that edit, and he concurred, correct?  
21

22 **DR. JOHN WALTER:** Correct.  
23

24 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Any other edits or changes to the minutes from  
25 the November 2024 Shrimp Management meeting? Seeing none, is there  
26 any opposition to the minutes with that edit added? No opposition,  
27 and the minutes are approved as written, with the edit added on  
28 page 34. Next on the agenda is the action guide and next steps,  
29 Tab D, Number 3, and Dr. Freeman will lead us through that.  
30

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

35 **DR. FREEMAN:** Great. So, for this item, the committee will be  
36 presented with an updated draft framework action to transition the  
37 Gulf shrimp fishery from the expired cELB to a new device  
38 collecting vessel position data for the purpose of maintaining  
39 effort estimation.  
40

41 Council staff and the Shrimp AP chair will review AP  
42 recommendations from its December 2024 meeting. Staff from the  
43 Southeast Fishery Science Center will present information on  
44 industry and agency cost information under Alternatives 2 and 3 in  
45 the draft framework action. Council staff will then review the  
46 draft alternatives. The committee should ask questions and

1 consider selecting a preferred alternative, so that staff can  
2 prepare a final action document for the April 2025 Council meeting.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Freeman. I  
5 think the critical component in that statement is that we should  
6 try to move, as a council, to selecting the preferred, so we can  
7 stay within the timetable for the April council meeting, and so  
8 hopefully that will be the outcome of our meeting. Next up is the  
9 summary from the AP meeting, correct? You're going to present  
10 this summary from the AP meeting, correct?

11  
12 **DR. FREEMAN:** Yes, sir. I'll lead through the three motions that  
13 the AP made at its December meeting, and then I'll invite the AP  
14 chair up to the podium, so that she can elaborate on additional  
15 items from the meeting as well, as review some of the cost  
16 information that she provided at that meeting and answering  
17 questions. Bernie, if you could scroll down to page four of the  
18 AP summary.

19  
20 For this particular AP meeting that we held in December, the bulk  
21 of the meeting was focused on the document, and the AP produced  
22 three motions related to it. The first one was that the Shrimp AP  
23 recommends that, instead of a census of the fleet, the Southeast  
24 Fisheries Science Center develop a statistically-robust design for  
25 distributing units to a representative portion of the active  
26 vessels in the fleet that would be comparable to the last ten  
27 years.

28  
29 For anyone who was at the April meeting of last year, if this  
30 sounds familiar, and I dug through my notes, and the AP actually  
31 passed almost a verbatim motion at that meeting. The only  
32 modification that I noted was in that last line that's on the  
33 screen with the addition of the word "active" describing the  
34 vessels.

35  
36 The council received that motion at its April 2024 meeting, passed  
37 that motion, and council staff prepared a letter that was  
38 transmitted to Dr. Porch at the end of April, and, if anyone would  
39 like to see that letter, our admin has it available, and we can  
40 certainly pull that up for everyone to view, as well as email and  
41 circulate, as a reminder to council members. At your preference,  
42 just let me know how to proceed.

43  
44 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Dr. Freeman. Can we have Bernie at  
45 least send it to all around the table, the letter, a copy of the  
46 letter that was emailed, so they can review it before we get the

1 Full Council?  
2

3 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay. Great. The next motion, Bernie, is on the  
4 top of page 6, and that was a motion to request the council to  
5 receive a brief slide presentation from the Shrimp AP chair  
6 regarding revised cost estimates for the Draft Shrimp Framework  
7 Alternatives 2 and 3, and Ms. Bosarge was reelected as the AP chair  
8 at that meeting.

9  
10 She introduced materials, during that meeting, on cost estimates  
11 to the agency, and so, once I finish reviewing the third  
12 alternative, I'll invite Ms. Bosarge to review those materials  
13 with the committee.

14  
15 The last motion that AP passed was to request the council's  
16 consideration of the following revisions to Draft Shrimp Framework  
17 Alternative 3 and to adopt Alternative 3, as soon modified, as its  
18 preferred alternative.

19  
20 You'll note the insertion of new words, with blue text, and then  
21 some words have strikethrough. Some of the key things, again,  
22 requesting that, instead being referred to as VMS devices, that  
23 they are referred to as cellular electronic logbooks, which is how  
24 the units that are on the vessels currently are defined, and then,  
25 in that first sentence, requesting that the archived position data  
26 is provided to the Science Center, noting that, rather than these  
27 devices being approved by NMFS, that they're approved specifically  
28 by the Southeast Fisheries Science Center. Then, lastly, in that  
29 last sentence, just highlighting that they would be type-approved  
30 for the Gulf shrimp fishery.

31  
32 My humble suggestion would be perhaps to wait to take any sort of  
33 action on that motion until we review the document, and then we  
34 can have admin bring that motion back up, when we have the  
35 alternatives in front of the committee. Again, it's your pleasure.

36  
37 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Yes, and I agree with that. I think, looking  
38 at the document, if we're going to modify any language, that would  
39 be the appropriate time to do so. If anyone is opposed to that,  
40 let me know now. If we can wait until we get to the document  
41 later, I think that would be fine.

42  
43 **DR. FREEMAN:** Okay, and so, at this point, Ms. Bosarge, if you  
44 would like to come up. Again, Ms. Bosarge was reelected as the  
45 Shrimp AP chair, and, Ms. Bosarge, I'll let you let admin staff  
46 know if you want to have the summary up or if you would like to go

1 ahead and have that cost information up, and so I'll let you direct  
2 them. Thank you.

3  
4 **MS. LEANN BOSARGE:** Thanks, Dr. Freeman. Yes, if admin staff could  
5 go ahead and pull those two very brief slides up that were  
6 presented at the Shrimp AP, and, while they're pulling those up,  
7 I would just like to thank the council for convening the Shrimp  
8 AP. You all passed a motion, at your last council meeting, to  
9 have the AP meet prior to this meeting, if at all possible. Thank  
10 you to council staff for throwing that together in a very timely  
11 fashion. That's a quick turnaround in between meetings.

12  
13 We were able to meet. Our entire meeting, just about, was focused  
14 on this document, and really a lot of discussion on the cost,  
15 because, as you remember in your last council meeting, that was  
16 the first time that the costs to the agency for each alternative  
17 were really kind of put forth to you all. At this AP meeting,  
18 that's the first time the Shrimp AP had viewed any of that cost  
19 information as well, and so we spent a lot of time on that.

20  
21 These two slides, to kind of put this into context, and so, first  
22 off, I created these two slides, and I brought them to the AP  
23 meeting, and I wanted to go through them, and I thought it would  
24 be better to have something in writing, concrete, that we could  
25 look at, in a tabular format, to kind of compare the costs that  
26 are presented for continuing our historic electronic logbook  
27 program through the Science Center versus the costs for very  
28 similar functions that the Science Center has to undergo for its  
29 other electronic logbook program.

30  
31 The Science Center has our shrimp electronic logbook program that  
32 they've managed for, I guess, almost two decades now, and then  
33 they have a commercial finfish electronic logbook program, which  
34 you all are probably familiar with, because you actually just took  
35 final action on a document to implement that ELB program last year.  
36 It was a joint amendment between you all and the South Atlantic  
37 Council.

38  
39 The two columns in the middle there, you can see there's a shrimp  
40 electronic logbook program cost estimate column. That's the second  
41 column. The third column is for the commercial finfish electronic  
42 logbook program, and that program covers the snapper fishery,  
43 grouper fishery, dolphin wahoo, and CMP, in both the South Atlantic  
44 and the Gulf of Mexico.

45  
46 Now, although these are both electronic logbook programs, and they

1 are both managed and stood up and implemented by the Science  
2 Center, there are some differences between the two, okay, and  
3 that's probably good to point out at the beginning.

4  
5 The finfish program is more software oriented, okay, and so what  
6 they did, when the Science Center stood up that program, is they  
7 had a logbook program for these finfish fisheries for many years,  
8 but it was a paper logbook, right, that they were mailing in carbon  
9 copy forms.

10  
11 They transitioned that to an electronic logbook program for those  
12 fisheries, right, and that electronic logbook program relies  
13 primarily on software to carry out that goal, right? The shrimp  
14 electronic logbook program has been just that, electronic, for  
15 many, many, many years, for almost two decades, right?

16  
17 The estimates for the shrimp program, we rely on hardware more so  
18 than software, right? Obviously, there's some software built into  
19 the hardware, but we actually have a physical unit on the boat, as  
20 opposed to a cellphone with an app, and so there are some  
21 differences there.

22  
23 The other main difference is the shrimp logbook program, if you  
24 were to scale it up to the entire fleet, would cover about 1,257  
25 boats. Right now, it covers about 500, whereas the commercial  
26 logbook program is a much larger operation. It covers, from what  
27 I could tell, about 7,000 boats, somewhere in there, and, where  
28 our logbook collects only effort data, theirs collects effort, it  
29 collects landings, and it collects economic data, things like that,  
30 and so it's a much bigger program.

31  
32 Now, so, having said that, there are a lot of functions to stand  
33 up those two programs, or to continue those two programs. that  
34 overlap. You're going to have to have a help desk, right, for  
35 fishermen to call in when they're having issues with their hardware  
36 or their software. You're going to have to write technical  
37 specifications, and you're going to have to have a vendor approval  
38 process for vendors to get type-approved to provide that software  
39 as an option for sale, right, and so that's what I'm comparing and  
40 contrasting here.

41  
42 I actually went to the electronic, commercial electronic, logbook  
43 document, and, at the end of that document, the Science Center  
44 gave estimates for those functions, functions that overlap with  
45 the functions they'll have to stand up for our logbook program,  
46 and I noticed that the costs were considerably different.

1  
2 They were considerably lower for the commercial finfish electronic  
3 logbook program, as compared to what has been presented to us thus  
4 far. Now, that's not to say that the cost that the Science Center  
5 has presented for shrimp are inaccurate, but more so that there  
6 may be options out there that are more financially viable, right?

7  
8 It's sort of like if you go to the liquor store and you're going  
9 to buy a bottle of vodka, right? You can buy the Grey Goose  
10 bottle, or you can get the bottle of Taaka, and so I think maybe  
11 what we've been looking at thus far for the shrimp electronic  
12 logbook program is the Grey Goose cost, right, and so what I'm  
13 presenting here is just to help hopefully understand that there  
14 may be some Taaka options out there. I mean, hell, I would even  
15 take a Tito's option at this point, right? That could be used for  
16 shrimp to do this at, you know, a much lower cost point.

17  
18 So, just real quickly, we'll go through a couple of these line  
19 items. The first one is this OLE, and so your law enforcement  
20 data interface for monitoring and compliance. The Science Center  
21 estimated that, for the shrimp electronic logbook program, at  
22 \$300,000. They were able to get law enforcement access to the  
23 other electronic logbook program, the finfish one, for about  
24 \$5,000.

25  
26 Now, there may be some reasons there, but I think one reason is -  
27 - That it costs so much for shrimp is because what was being  
28 proposed was this GUI, this Graphical User Interface, which is  
29 essentially what law enforcement has now with their VMS program,  
30 and the Science Center was talking about setting up a whole  
31 separate one of those under the Science Center, but, in fact,  
32 that's not necessarily what you have to have, right?

33  
34 Law enforcement accesses scientific data on a case-by-case basis  
35 generally, right? It's not blanket, where they're going and trying  
36 to look at everybody's trip tickets for every boat in the Gulf  
37 every month. They have a specific case, more than likely, that  
38 they're trying to make on somebody, and they say, hey, I need to  
39 see where that guy was at, and what he was doing at this particular  
40 time, and that's the data that gets pulled, as opposed to a GUI,  
41 where we would ping, on a map for law enforcement, all 1,257  
42 vessels, 365 days a year.

43  
44 That's not -- That's blanket access, and it's probably a little  
45 more than what law enforcement actually needs on a day-to-day  
46 basis, and so it could be done cheaper, and then you can see that

1 next line item.

2

3 That's just the continuing maintenance to keep up that GUI  
4 interface is \$100,000 a year, versus, for the commercial finfish,  
5 where there's some sort of other access for OLE that was granted,  
6 and there is no continuing costs associated with that.

7

8 The customer service phone line, and so it was estimated, and  
9 presented to the council, that, for shrimp, to set up a phone line  
10 through the Science Center, where fishermen could call in when  
11 they had a problem, it would be \$250,000 a year. However, there  
12 was a customer service line that's been established for the finfish  
13 electronic logbook that had a startup cost estimated at \$5,000 a  
14 year, and about \$20,000 a year thereafter to service the calls  
15 that come in, and so there may be a cheaper alternative for that  
16 item as well.

17

18 The cost to maintain the system, once operational, that one was  
19 pretty hard for me to get a pulse on what the Science Center really  
20 thought it was going to take to maintain the API, and so the  
21 virtual server and things like that, and somewhere between \$250,000  
22 and \$625,000 a year. They're able to do this, through the other  
23 logbook program, at \$15,000 a year.

24

25 Now, I will say that program I think is running through ACCSP, and  
26 then to the Science Center, and so that may be where some of that  
27 cost savings comes in. However, I must note that both the council  
28 and the AP have asked the Science Center if we could have our data  
29 routed through ACCSP, or Gulf States, or any of these other  
30 entities that handle data for a living. That option has not been  
31 presented, and it seems like it may be more affordable to go that  
32 route.

33

34 Then vendor approval and testing, and so the presentation the  
35 Science Center gave at your last meeting showed a cost of \$30,000  
36 to \$60,000 per unit for this testing and type-approval, and it  
37 said that that's what it costs OLE. I haven't seen a cost for  
38 what it would be for the Science Center, other than the \$5,000  
39 that they estimated it would cost to type-approve devices for their  
40 other commercial logbook program, but, again, that is software and  
41 not hardware, and so that may be the difference in the cost.

42

43 Then the development of technical specifications and the vendor  
44 approval process, and so, for the other electronic logbook program,  
45 they estimated that -- The Science Center estimated that would  
46 cost \$25,000 to write the technical specifications, plus another

1 \$10,000 to put them on the website. For the shrimp electronic  
2 logbook program, it's estimated at \$300,000, and so that's quite  
3 a difference.

4  
5 All I can attribute that to, at this point, given the information  
6 I have, is this idea that the Science Center will have to execute  
7 a contract with a vendor to carry that out, right, and so, if you  
8 do that math, if you think the specs and website are about \$35,000,  
9 that leaves you \$265,000 to execute a contract. In other words,  
10 to sign a contract with a vendor, and not do the testing, but just  
11 sign the contract, and that may be what it costs the government to  
12 sign a contract these days, and I don't know.

13  
14 However, the questions that we've asked, in the Shrimp AP, the  
15 responses that we've gotten is that the vendor that does this  
16 testing has a contract with NMFS, and so NMFS covers OLE. It also  
17 covers the Science Center and the agency. It's the umbrella over  
18 all of them, and so I'm not so sure that you have to go and execute  
19 a new contract.

20  
21 It's more just whose line item budget is it going to come out of,  
22 right? You can go engage that contractor, but it's not going to  
23 come out of OLE's budget. It's going to have to come out of the  
24 Science Center's, and I'm not sure -- This \$265,000, I don't know,  
25 and that needs to be looked into.

26  
27 If you can go to the second slide, which is the last slide, this  
28 is just a summary slide that kind of brings you down to the bottom  
29 line, and so, for the startup costs for the shrimp electronic  
30 logbook program, the Science Center estimated, to continue our  
31 electronic logbook program, it would be \$1.5 million in startup,  
32 whereas the commercial finfish electronic logbook program was less  
33 than half-a-million, and so it's three-times the cost.

34  
35 Then the continuing costs, what they call maintenance, the Science  
36 Center estimated somewhere between \$784,000 and \$841,000 for the  
37 shrimp electronic logbook program, versus the commercial finfish  
38 program, which was estimated at about \$45,000.

39  
40 The finfish program, their electronic logbook is a much bigger  
41 program, right? It's 7,000 vessels collecting not just effort  
42 data, but various other forms of data, but, for some reason, it's  
43 a much more cost-efficient program.

44  
45 The cost that it took to stand that up and run it are a fraction  
46 of what it's going to cost for the 1,257 shrimp boats for only

1 effort data, and that's where I was having trouble wrapping my  
2 mind around it. I thought that this might be a good starting point  
3 to at least have some discussion as to are there other options out  
4 there, and how can you do it so cheaply, and should we pursue  
5 those, as opposed to simply saying, well, this is it, and we can't  
6 go with Alternative 3, because it just costs too much to the  
7 government.

8

9 That's what was presented there. The one thing that the AP did  
10 not have the luxury of reviewing, at their meeting, was the Chapter  
11 4 information, which is the economic information that is in your  
12 framework document, because that wasn't part of the document yet,  
13 and the only thing I would point out there, and I did have a chance  
14 to look at it.

15

16 I think, first off, Dr. Freeman did an amazing job with the  
17 industry costs in that section. He really was able to nail that,  
18 and put that in black-and-white, with numbers behind it, so you  
19 could see what each alternative would cost to the industry. The  
20 more governmental piece of that chapter, which is your governmental  
21 costs for each alternative, I think we've got some momentum there,  
22 but I think we have a ways to go.

23

24 Right now, when I look at that, it assumes there's only cost to  
25 the Science Center. Alternative 2 is an alternative that runs  
26 through a different government entity in NMFS, the OLE, and I don't  
27 think they work for free either, and so I think, at some point, we  
28 have to show the true costs of both alternatives, regardless of  
29 which government agency under NMFS is going to manage it. There's  
30 still a cost, and so we need to include that in the document, so  
31 we can truly compare the two alternatives costs, and so that's  
32 what I have.

33

34 The AP, other than these costs, they had some other reservations  
35 as well, privacy reservations, with Alternative 2, and being placed  
36 under law enforcement, and just having, you know, nationwide law  
37 enforcement access to the information that is how they make their  
38 living. They know when to go and where to go, and having that  
39 broadcast to people, when there's really no need for those people  
40 to see it, for a scientific program, that scares industry.

41

42 They also have a fear that that data, instead of it being  
43 scientific data for scientific purposes, to help safeguard the  
44 ecosystem, will now be weaponized against them, because it's  
45 twenty-four-seven access by law enforcement nationwide, and so  
46 there is some worry about that, you can imagine, and that's not a

1 reflection on law enforcement.

2

3 That's just general human nature, right? If I put an ankle  
4 bracelet on you, and tracked you at all points in time, you might  
5 be a little worried that somebody might be using it against you,  
6 in some form or fashion too, and so thanks for giving me the time.  
7 I appreciate it.

8

9 I'm sure there's some explanations between the two, but I hope we  
10 can get to a Taaka, or a Tito's, number at some point for that ELB  
11 program. Thanks, guys.

12

13 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Leann. Dr. Freeman.

14

15 **DR. FREEMAN:** Sure and so this might be a question for NMFS. Even  
16 when she was on the council, one of the things I love about Leann  
17 is how prepared she is, and she looks through all this information.

18

19 So, in the comparison that Leann is providing to us with the  
20 commercial finfish electronic logbook program, you know, the crux  
21 of the shrimp data collection program is, obviously, the ability  
22 to collect vessel position data, and so I'm not as familiar with  
23 the commercial finfish program, and so my question is does that  
24 program collect that information, or can you elaborate, I guess,  
25 on what information it does collect? Thank you.

26

27 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Walter.

28

29 **DR. WALTER:** All right. Thank you. I'm not on the committee, but  
30 I appreciate the recognition. This is John Walter of the Southeast  
31 Fisheries Science Center, and, as my boss has always said, that if  
32 he could hire Leann, he surely would, because she comes prepared.

33

34 However, if you're like me, your head might be spinning at these  
35 numbers, and wondering why, and what the purpose is relative to  
36 the decision point before the council, and, indeed, this is aside,  
37 and tangential, to the decision point before the council in a lot  
38 of ways, and it's comparing really apples with pineapples right  
39 here.

40

41 A lot of these comparisons between the ELB are the difference  
42 between a cellphone app that you actively put in your trips, and  
43 this is the eTRIPS app, which is going to be the coastal logbook.  
44 You actually, at the end of each trip, and you remember you only  
45 do it for one trip, and so the number of records is about 150,000  
46 a year that are actively entered by the fishermen on their

1 cellphone.

2

3 They all -- Most of them already have a cell phone, and so that's  
4 not an additional cost. eTRIPS is free. I downloaded it on my  
5 phone on Friday, and I entered in a test trip.

6

7 In contrast, what we're doing with the position, or location,  
8 recording devices on the shrimp boats is that's an actual physical  
9 unit. This is the old 3G unit. It no longer transmits, but these  
10 are the ones that were on the vessels that were put out. These,  
11 unfortunately, cannot be cost-effectively reprogrammed to transmit  
12 under any existing cellphone. These are what we need to replace  
13 to be able to simply keep this program whole, in terms of providing  
14 the data that we're going to do.

15

16 The next units are something like this, which is one of the VMS  
17 units from one of the vendors that was in the Early Adopter  
18 Program. This is the one that I actually had on my boat, because  
19 I wanted to see how do these things work, and what are these  
20 providing, and is it good, or bad, and I could actually track where  
21 my boat was, when it was in cellphone range, and so, when it gets  
22 stolen in Miami, which has about a 50 percent chance of happening,  
23 I could find out where it was.

24

25 Anyway, the vendor was able to tell me my boat didn't get stolen,  
26 but my vendor was able to tell me where I was, where the boat was,  
27 which is actually kind of useful, and it wasn't too big of a  
28 problem to put on a boat.

29

30 These are the things that we need to replace this with. We just  
31 need something that will transmit that data when it's in cellphone  
32 range. When it's out of cellphone range, it's not transmitting,  
33 and it's not a twenty-four-seven ankle bracelet, in the sense that  
34 right now your cellphone is probably tracking where you are, for  
35 some reason.

36

37 OLE has access to this data, and it has access to this data, and  
38 it has access to this data. OLE can get their hands on whatever  
39 they need to make the case they're making, but they've said,  
40 multiple times, their goal for enforcing the fishery management  
41 plan is simply to ensure that whatever is in that plan is enforced.  
42 Right now, that plan doesn't state that they're going to be using  
43 this data or this data or this data for other purposes.

44

45 If OLE finds a reason to do that in the future, well, that's OLE's  
46 business, but, right now, the decision point for the council is

1 what is most cost-effective for the fishery and what is most cost-  
2 effective to the taxpayer.

3  
4 In this case, when we saw those two costs between the coastal  
5 logbook and the shrimp location recording devices -- For shrimp,  
6 those were new additional costs to the taxpayer, the reason being  
7 is that the liquor cabinet is already stocked, because the VMS  
8 units -- That administration has already been paid for by the  
9 taxpayer. That's minimal additional cost.

10  
11 To stand up a new liquor cabinet, specifically for the shrimp  
12 fishery, that would be new additional cost, whether it's exactly  
13 what we specified, whether it's more or less, and that would  
14 eventually be determined, but it's all additional cost to the  
15 taxpayer, and then, as we'll go into in the presentation, and I'll  
16 talk about the other costs too, but that's kind of the bottom line,  
17 in terms of the comparison here, and I think what is the decision  
18 point between Alternative 2 and Alternative 3 for the council.

19  
20 I don't want to belabor this more, because I think there's a lot  
21 of details here that are probably more detailed than we even need  
22 to go to on the council floor, but I'm happy to take any questions.  
23 Thanks.

24  
25 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Dr. Walter. I don't know  
26 how you got all that stuff for TSA. I can't even get a fan through  
27 there, but any questions? Mr. Chair.

28  
29 **MR. J.D. DUGAS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Dr. Walter, a question.  
30 Does the Science Center have the funds to start this program, the  
31 \$1.5 million?

32  
33 **DR. WALTER:** No, we do not. We've received two batches of \$850,000,  
34 for two years, which has helped us to support the Early Adopter  
35 Program, but we do not currently have the funds for the full  
36 startup, nor do we know, or can predict, that we would have long-  
37 term sustaining funds to support it. Thanks.

38  
39 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Strelcheck.

40  
41 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** First, I wanted to just say thanks to Leann.  
42 She keeps us on our toes, and she, obviously, keeps us thinking  
43 about ways to improve amendments and actions and alternatives,  
44 and, obviously, is a huge proponent of the industry.

45  
46 I guess I wanted to just add a few things here. You know, I

1 appreciated the fact that she was looking in-depth at the costs.  
2 I think it's creating a lot of confusion now in the process, and  
3 I don't think it's going to be all that helpful for us to give a  
4 one-to-one rebuttal in terms of, you know, the costs. She might  
5 be right on some things, you know, and we might be right on other  
6 things.

7  
8 Ultimately, at the end of the day, the costs are estimated. They  
9 might be higher or lower than what we're actually estimating, but  
10 I think the important thing is to look at the comparison of the  
11 alternatives as we talk through this amendment.

12  
13 I do want to emphasize, right, there's no need for the government  
14 to come in and try to over-inflate costs for this program, and so,  
15 you know, that's, I think, the concern I have, is like there's  
16 some intention, you know, on behalf of the government, that we're  
17 trying to inflate the costs for Alternative 3 just to justify the  
18 preferred alternative, and so the center, the Regional Office, the  
19 Office of Law Enforcement, that runs the VMS program, have put a  
20 lot of thought, input, and information, obviously, into estimating  
21 those costs.

22  
23 Ultimately, at the end of the day, there are some unknowns, and  
24 some differences, but I think that's the key here, is kind of  
25 looking at this holistically, and how does this affect not only  
26 the government's cost, and the cost to the taxpayer, but also the  
27 cost to the industry as we look through and compare these two  
28 alternatives. Thanks.

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Andy. Any other comments  
31 regarding the AP summary and the AP chair's table of costs? Okay.  
32 Seeing none, we'll move on to the next section, the next agenda  
33 item, which is Dr. Walter's presentation, correct?

34  
35 **DR. FREEMAN:** Yes, sir. Bernie, that was -- There were several  
36 items under Agenda Item IV, and so I already covered that. Thank  
37 you.

38  
39 **DR. WALTER:** All right. Should I start, Chair? Thank you. All  
40 right. I'm John Walter of the Southeast Fisheries Science Center.  
41 Good morning, everyone. I'll be presenting on costs for position  
42 recording devices in the Gulf of Mexico shrimp fleet and a  
43 comparison of alternatives. This is a shortened and condensed  
44 version of the presentation we gave to the Special Shrimp AP in  
45 December.

46

1 One of the purposes for this is because we were trying to minimize  
2 costs both to the industry as well as to the taxpayer. That is  
3 the goal here, and to avoid redundancy. We have an obligation,  
4 under National Standard 7, to avoid redundancy and duplication of  
5 things if they're already being done or paid for, and we also have  
6 a requirement to put together the best cost estimates for a fishery  
7 management plan, as a specific section of the fishery management  
8 plan, and so that's our purpose and need for why we're doing this.

9  
10 This slide identifies the costs for the three units that are part  
11 of the Early Adopter Program, and so these are the units that  
12 vessels are right now currently installing on their boats as part  
13 of that Early Adopter Program that is paying for the installation  
14 fees, for the unit, and then for two years of the cellular service.

15  
16 LGL Environmental has the contract to do that. They are here. If  
17 there are questions about the Early Adopter Program. They've  
18 expressed that they are quite willing and able to talk to people,  
19 or answer any questions, and so we thank them for being here.

20  
21 The Early Adopter units all have received type-approval on other  
22 fisheries, and likely, if there's a process set up for shrimp,  
23 would submit for type approval for shrimp-specific. Remember  
24 that type -pproval is fishery-specific, but, in general, once the  
25 hardware can meet that type-approval for another fishery, it can  
26 likely meet the requirements for another one, in particular because  
27 shrimp requires ten-minute reporting. That's one of the main  
28 hurdles for them, and almost all of them now can meet that.

29  
30 You see the costs range from \$845 to \$499 between the three units.  
31 Those are approximate. They could change. I think we've all seen  
32 costs for anything have been changing, sometimes in ways we haven't  
33 liked in the last couple of years, and so the cost may change for  
34 these units, and particularly for cell service, because cellular  
35 service also changes, but that is a ballpark range for them, with  
36 total costs between \$678 and \$1,049 for the installation and then  
37 for annual cell service.

38  
39 104 shrimp vessels have a satellite VMS already, due to having  
40 other permits on their vessel. They're either permitted for, I  
41 believe, rock shrimp or reef fish, and so one of the thoughts here  
42 was that the vessels that had satellite units could continue to  
43 use those satellite units for shrimp, and they wouldn't have to  
44 buy a duplicative system, and so that was just simply trying to  
45 not duplicate what was already in existence, again National  
46 Standard 7.

1  
2 This was just to allow that option, should they choose that, the  
3 challenge being that satellite transmission fees are often more  
4 expensive, and so we looked into the costs there, in terms of what  
5 the reef fish costs, and, now, they're at an hourly reporting rate,  
6 and so that's about \$35 to \$65 a month.

7  
8 A ten-minute ping rate would increase costs, but likely not six-  
9 times the rate, and we've got a number of costs here down for  
10 SkyMate and MetOcean, based on an informal survey of ten-minute  
11 position tracking, and it's somewhere between \$21.99 and \$125 a  
12 month for transmission, and maybe \$120 a month for transmission  
13 for MetOcean. Again, these are approximate costs.

14  
15 There may be ways to get those costs down, in terms of archiving  
16 data for bundled transmission, and that's something that I think  
17 some of the providers are looking into, because we don't, remember,  
18 need this to be real-time reporting. There's nothing in the  
19 fishery manager plan that says that. It could simply be bundled,  
20 and then, when you're at one location, where it can transmit all  
21 of it quickly to a satellite, maybe every day or every other day,  
22 and there's options that might be able to reduce costs.

23  
24 A concern was raised about malfunction of the units, and, again,  
25 that's certainly something that happens at-sea. When you've got  
26 anything that goes on at-sea -- I think a number of these units  
27 have come back, and I think they were actually stored underwater  
28 at the dock, because they were completely disintegrated, and that  
29 certainly happens to anything you put on a boat, and so satellite  
30 units apparently have a fairly low rate of failure.

31  
32 We did, in the Early Adopter Program, have two cellular units that  
33 had a higher rate of failure. Those have been discontinued by the  
34 vendor. The Early Adopter Program has allowed us to beta test a  
35 number of these units, and presumably they're doing well, and  
36 working through some of the kinks, and vendors have generally  
37 estimated that they've got little downtime overall.

38  
39 Other fisheries, in terms of -- There's been questions about are  
40 vessels going to require having functional units on, and, given  
41 that the shrimp fishery often fishes for thirty days at a time,  
42 what do you do if a unit breaks? Do you have to end the trip, and  
43 so that's something that's going to have to be addressed, probably  
44 somewhere in the rulemaking, but other fisheries require  
45 functioning units to achieve the program requirements.

46

1 I think there was some concern that there would be an out for a  
2 vessel that would just be able to say that it's not working, and,  
3 therefore, they don't need to have it, and the 3G system allowed  
4 vessels who chose to not have a unit onboard to not get a unit.  
5 If they were selected, they actually could opt out, which did not  
6 allow for a representative sample of the fleet.

7  
8 We've talked about that we need, at minimum representative, a  
9 sampling of the fleet, to be able to say that the effort we've got  
10 is representative of the fleet as a whole, for any number of  
11 reasons, but primarily to meet mission number one, which is to  
12 accurately estimate total fishing effort.

13  
14 In some cases for other fisheries, the cost for missed fishing  
15 days is more than the cost for a backup unit, and so those boats  
16 might actually have two units onboard, so they've got some  
17 redundancy, and I think those are details that can be dealt with  
18 specifically for shrimp as we move further along.

19  
20 The cost of a malfunction really depends on the fisherman. It  
21 depends on the type of trip. If it's a longer trip, that might  
22 slow them down, and it depends on what specifications, or  
23 allowances, might be made if the malfunction happens when you're  
24 in fifteen days of a thirty-day trip, but the vendors have been  
25 quite responsive, from what I've heard about being able to provide  
26 replacement in units. The question is, I think, sometimes  
27 installation challenges. However, if I can install this on my  
28 boat, I'm guessing every shrimp captain can install one of these  
29 things, because I'm not good with electronics, but I could hook up  
30 a couple of wires.

31  
32 Agency costs, and here we had a very detailed description of the  
33 agency costs. Thank you, Leann. I didn't have to do that here,  
34 because we already had that. It's clear that the agency costs are  
35 lower under Alternative 2 than under Alternative 3, because of the  
36 fact that they're additional.

37  
38 Whether the agency costs are as high as we initially calculated on  
39 Alternative 3 is probably something that could be debated. It  
40 could be evaluated, and we'll know eventually, when we implement  
41 it, but the bottom line is 3 is going to cost the taxpayer more  
42 than 2, because we've already paid for it.

43  
44 Then, for Alternative 3, the additional costs are what were  
45 outlined for the data collection and storage, the help desk, and  
46 type-approval process, which we would have to stand up a separate

1 duplicative type-approval process to be administered likely by the  
2 Southeast Fisheries Science Center. We're not in the business of  
3 type-approval, approving of these kind of units. If we were, we  
4 would have to develop the -- Bring the staff on, develop the  
5 process, and do something that is additionally quite duplicative  
6 of what's already happening.

7  
8 This is probably the most important slide, in terms of what the  
9 costs for a permit holder would be, and, here, we've used the Nemo  
10 unit, which is the most expensive one, just to illustrate it. If  
11 we were to use either one of the other units, the difference would  
12 simply be the cost of the unit, because you could get that unit  
13 reimbursed under VMS type-approval under Alternative 2, and  
14 Alternative 3 would not be responsive to that type-approval, and  
15 so the cost differential is really the cost of the unit, \$574 for  
16 Nemo, \$490, I think, for Zen, and \$195, I think, for the Boat  
17 Command.

18  
19 Now, one of the other things, that are really the carrots in all  
20 of this, is that the Early Adopter really provides us the  
21 opportunity to get a lot of these units out on boats and be able  
22 to move forward with at least trying to ensure that we're going to  
23 be able to meet the terms of the Shrimp Biological Opinion.  
24 Reasonable and Prudent Measure Number 1, which says we must monitor  
25 effort equal to or greater than the last ten years. We don't want  
26 to miss that, because then bad things happen.

27  
28 That's why the Early Adopter Program is helping us to meet that,  
29 so that when, eventually, the rulemaking goes into place, a number  
30 of vessels will already have units, but that offset from the Early  
31 Adopter Program could be quite valuable for fishermen to get those  
32 units, cell service, and installation, and so we've been asked to  
33 develop a design plan for the allocation of units to the vessels.

34  
35 Right now, we haven't fully briefed either the AP or the council  
36 on that design plan, but, conceptually, it would be a plan that  
37 would provide representative coverage of the fleet, representative  
38 coverage of the entire fleet, which means that everyone is part of  
39 the universe to be sampled, just like the observer program is,  
40 which might also mean that, at some point, when your name is  
41 called, then you would have to install a unit and actually report  
42 your effort, which would mean after a several years' timeframe, if  
43 something like that was phased-in, every vessel would probably  
44 need to have access to units, and then report when their number's  
45 called, and/or it could simply be a census of the fleet.

46

1 There's ways to phase that in, for sure, in terms of using the  
2 Early Adopter money, VMS, accessing the VMS reimbursements, such  
3 that, with a multiple-year phase-in, nearly all the vessels could  
4 get units likely through reimbursement, and so I think that's one  
5 of the things that we could, as we move forward, provide a more  
6 fleshed-out plan for that, such as selecting the vessels that might  
7 be first up on getting units, and those could be targeted for Early  
8 Adopter. I think that might be it, correct? Okay. So, with that,  
9 thank you for the time briefing you, and I'm happy to take any  
10 questions from the council.

11  
12 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Dr. Walter. I appreciate  
13 the concise presentation. Anyone have any questions for Dr. Walter  
14 around the table in the committee? Mr. Dugas.

15  
16 **MR. DUGAS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Dr. Walter, I guess I'm puzzled,  
17 a little bit, with the costs on the last page for Alternative 2,  
18 versus 3, when the AP is saying they prefer Alternative 3, which  
19 is more expensive, and, in their situation today, the struggle  
20 they're in to stay in the business, I guess I'm confused why they  
21 want to take the path that's more expensive to them.

22  
23 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Walter.

24  
25 **DR. WALTER:** Chair, I can't speak for the shrimp fishery, other  
26 than what I've heard, which is what you've heard about their  
27 economic plight. Thanks.

28  
29 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. I have a couple of questions, and so  
30 help me out with this, Dr. Walter. The bi-op stated that we had  
31 to get equal or better effort than we had over the past ten years.  
32 Is that correct, and, if the shrimp fleet basically has been  
33 reduced, because of the current economic situation, I'm struggling  
34 to figure out why we need full census coverage to maintain that  
35 bi-op, if it's less effort to begin with, compared to what it used  
36 to be.

37  
38 **DR. WALTER:** The reason for the all vessels are part of the  
39 sampling, and whether that is a census or that that is a random  
40 sample, and the census would be everyone gets selected, versus we  
41 could probably get equal to or greater from a random representative  
42 sample of the existing active vessels, and that would meet the --  
43 I would hope it would meet the terms of the bi-op.

44  
45 The challenges are, as we've heard, and even mentioned on the AP,  
46 that we may not be getting a representative sample of certain

1 times, and locations, because, once you break it down, as we saw  
2 for the aquaculture opportunity areas and other things, you might  
3 not cover all the effort that's in that location, and so vessels  
4 have said, wait, you're missing this.

5  
6 Well, yes, we're missing it, because we have a sample that's right  
7 now not random and not guaranteed to be representative. When we  
8 saw Kyle's presentation, we saw some concerning issues, where we  
9 were likely to not be representative, in terms of the vessels that  
10 are part of the ELB had different numbers of nets than all of the  
11 vessels in the fleet, which means that maybe they're fishing  
12 differently, and so we want it to be representative.

13  
14 The rationale for the census is, well, the census would ensure  
15 that we get that. It would also speed up the time at which we get  
16 the effort data, because we now have to back-calculate the effort  
17 data by raising it to the entire fleet using the landings, and so  
18 you would have it faster, and be able to incorporate it into our  
19 stock assessments on a more rapid basis, but, really, the main  
20 reason to go for a census is such that that would ensure that we're  
21 representative in all of the space and time areas that we might  
22 need that data, and one could envision that, with the two other  
23 bi-ops that are coming along for smalltooth sawfish and giant  
24 manta, that we're going to need much more precise, spatially-  
25 explicit information in the times and areas where there might be  
26 overlap for those species.

27  
28 That right there is probably a reason that we would need greater  
29 coverage for vessels that might be fishing in those areas of  
30 overlap. A lot of these are arguing for the census. However, we  
31 would meet the current existing bi-op with simply a representative  
32 sample. Thanks.

33  
34 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Dr. Walter. My second question is  
35 regarding on this table here. If there is a reimbursement from  
36 the department, and the agency, for \$574 per unit in Alternative  
37 2, there is no reimbursement in Alternative 3, and doesn't that  
38 cost savings go back to the department? I haven't seen the table  
39 that shows, if Alternative 3 were selected as preferred, what that  
40 difference would be that the agency would not have to pay out in  
41 reimbursements, and so it wouldn't be part of the Early Adopter  
42 funds being utilized, correct?

43  
44 **DR. WALTER:** So that \$475 is paid for by the VMS program here.  
45 This would be reimbursement by the national VMS program, and then  
46 your question is would that money that would not be paid out --

1 That would go to another fishery, some other fishery across the  
2 country, because all fisheries compete for that pool of  
3 reimbursement money.  
4

5 From talking to the VMS program administration, if they knew that  
6 the shrimp fishery was going to go this route, we could set up a  
7 plan where we say, hey, we're going to likely have this many  
8 vessels per year applying for it, and so they could then make the  
9 case that they need that additional money to cover that. However,  
10 if the shrimp fishery goes a different route, then that money will  
11 go to other fisheries across the nation. Thanks.  
12

13 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. That clarifies my question. So, if  
14 there's roughly about 1,200 active shrimp permits out there, then  
15 \$574, and we're looking at over \$600,000 that could be used for a  
16 different fishery then, if Alternative 3 were selected.  
17

18 **DR. WALTER:** Correct. Like in Alaska or somewhere, or another  
19 fishery that would be applying for that money for reimbursement.  
20

21 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** All right. Do we have any other questions for  
22 Dr. Walter? Not seeing any, we can move, Dr. Freeman, to the next  
23 section, please.  
24

25 **DR. FREEMAN:** So Bernie, if you could go ahead and pull up my  
26 presentation. Okay, and so, first, we'll go through an overview  
27 of the council timeline to-date, review the purpose and need  
28 statements, review Alternatives 2 and 3, and then discuss the  
29 tentative timeline moving forward for the document.  
30

31 I prepared some of this information for the Shrimp AP meeting that  
32 we had in December, given that that had been repopulated, but I  
33 thought it was worthwhile to bring forward some of this information  
34 to the council as well, particularly for some of the newer members  
35 that might not have been here for the iterations of the document  
36 and discussions around the data collection program.  
37

38 This first originated back at the September 2020 council meeting,  
39 and so over four years ago. A presentation was given by the  
40 Science Center, noting that the 3G cellular coverage for the cELBs  
41 would be continuing effective January 1 of 2021, and that new  
42 shrimp effort data collection methods would be warranted, and so  
43 that sort of initiated the position we're in now, which is that  
44 the existing cELB devices -- They're still collecting the data.  
45 It's just a matter of they're no longer transmitting the data,  
46 hence why, you know, every six months, they're receiving new SD

1 cards, and they're putting them in their existing cELB devices on  
2 their vessels, and then mailing ones into the commission with six  
3 months' worth of data.

4  
5 Following that, and that actually spanned over two months, because  
6 it was at the end of November, the November/December 2020 council  
7 meeting, and, following a presentation from Dr. Gallaway, there  
8 was a motion for a letter to the Science Center supporting  
9 development, implementation, and funding of a P-Sea WindPlot  
10 program, which is a navigation software that a high percentage of  
11 shrimp vessels have, that would acquire and transmit shrimp fishing  
12 effort.

13  
14 The council then conducted a competitive RFP, in 2021, for \$350,000  
15 to test P-Sea WindPlot to see if it could be modified to collect  
16 and transmit the data that the current cELB devices had been doing  
17 when they still had the 3G cellular coverage. The final results  
18 from LGL, which was the council-funded contractor, were presented  
19 at the April 2023 council meeting, with a recommendation to not  
20 further invest in P-Sea WindPlot as a method to record shrimp  
21 vessel positions for calculating effort.

22  
23 At the April 2021 council meeting, there was a motion directing  
24 staff to begin a framework action to set up reporting requirements  
25 for the expiring 3G cELB program to transition to a new platform  
26 for effort reporting of the Gulf of Mexico federal shrimp fishery.  
27 That's the document in front of you all today.

28  
29 At the October 2021 council meeting, there was a motion for NMFS  
30 to test a sample of approved cellular VMS units on federally-  
31 permitted commercial shrimp vessels. Following that motion, there  
32 was an initial deployment in 2022, testing two devices alongside  
33 the current cELB units, with a second deployment in 2023, which  
34 tested Zen and Nemo. Of note, the Nemo device that was tested  
35 then was a solar-powered unit, again alongside the existing cELB  
36 units, again for proper comparison of that collection data, with  
37 the results presented at the April 2023 council meeting.

38  
39 At the April 2023 council meeting, there was a motion to bring  
40 back the draft shrimp framework action after NMFS completed side-  
41 by-side testing of cELB units, with a minimum of the following  
42 devices listed there, and I'll note offhand as well that a number  
43 of these motions originated with the Shrimp AP.

44  
45 The committee received them, and then they went forward to the  
46 council, and so that's the origination of a lot of those motions

1 and the particular devices listed. I will note there one of the  
2 devices -- In this case, they were requesting that the Nemo being  
3 tested would be hardwired to the vessel, as there were some issues  
4 with the solar-powered version.

5  
6 Those results were presented at the October 2023 council meeting.  
7 Data was provided on estimated effort, in terms of tow days for  
8 Boat Command Nemo, Tracker One, and Zen, and they found that Boat  
9 Command, Nemo, and Zen produced similar results, when they  
10 functioned appropriately, and I state that with the caveat that  
11 there was, I believe, like one or two device failures, as well as  
12 I believe there was at least one issue where the device had been  
13 disconnected at some point.

14  
15 That's a little bit of history, and it brings us to the current  
16 meeting. The purpose and need statements, we all have seen at the  
17 last few meetings. The language has not changed here, but I still  
18 want to present it to you, just as another refresher, the main  
19 thing being that the purpose is to transition from the expired 3G  
20 cellular electronic logbook program to a system that would maintain  
21 the council's and NMFS' scientific ability to estimate and monitor  
22 fishing effort in the Gulf shrimp fishery while minimizing the  
23 economic burden on the industry to the maximum extent practical.

24  
25 There is one action in the document. Again, you all have seen  
26 this note before. I'll just highlight the first sentence, that  
27 the types of data and the amount/timing of data collection would  
28 not vary between alternatives.

29  
30 Alternative 1, which is our no action, would be to maintain the  
31 current method to collect vessel position data through the cellular  
32 electronic logbook units supplied by NMFS. NMFS would collect the  
33 memory cards from the units via mail, noting, of course, that this  
34 is not intended to be a long-term solution.

35  
36 You know, hearing from NMFS, the cELB devices do fail over time.  
37 There are other issues, such as when the memory cards are returned  
38 every six months. You know, some of them have missing data, or  
39 incomplete data, and/or are not returned.

40  
41 Alternative 2 would be to implement a vessel monitoring system  
42 requirement for the Gulf shrimp fishery that provides, at a  
43 minimum, archived position data compatible with the Science  
44 Center's shrimp effort algorithm to a NMFS server. If selected by  
45 the Science and Research Director, the owner or operator of a  
46 vessel with a Gulf Shrimp moratorium permit would be required to

1 install a type-approved VMS unit.

2

3 Alternative 3 is to implement a cellular VMS requirement for the  
4 Gulf shrimp fishery that provides archived position data  
5 compatible with the Science Center's shrimp effort algorithm. If  
6 selected by the SRD, the owner or operator of a vessel with a  
7 shrimp moratorium permit would be required to install a NMFS-  
8 approved cellular VMS that archives vessel position when on a  
9 shrimp fishing trip in the Gulf and automatically transmit that  
10 data via cellular service to a non-OLE NMFS server. NMFS-approved  
11 cellular VMS would be type-approved through a process external to  
12 50 CFR 600.1501.

13

14 I added two bullets here. What we've heard from industry members,  
15 in terms of Alternative 3 versus Alternative 2, is that they do  
16 not want their data sent to or stored with OLE. However, what  
17 we've heard from the agency is that OLE would still retain access  
18 to any data that's collected under Alternative 3.

19

20 We've also heard, at previous meetings, that NMFS has suggested  
21 that Alternative 3 may not potentially be viable, due to the  
22 duplicative process and standing up a program similar to the  
23 existing VMS program under Alternative 2.

24

25 This is a short summary table of some of the differences between  
26 Alternatives 2 and 3 as they stand right now. The allowed data  
27 transmission type, Alternative 2 would allow both cellular and  
28 satellite. The inclusion of satellite, as mentioned in Dr.  
29 Walter's presentation, is that there are 104 vessels that currently  
30 have satellite VMS, due to permits that they hold in other  
31 fisheries, and so that would not require them to then purchase an  
32 additional device as well, in this case also being a cellular VMS.  
33 Alternative 3 would allow for cellular VMS or, depending on the  
34 AP's motion, cellular electronic logbook only.

35

36 The data recipient, under Alternative 2 would be NMFS, broadly.  
37 As it stands right now, that would be directed to NOAA OLE.  
38 Alternative 3 specifies it would go to a non-OLE NMFS server.  
39 Again, as mentioned in Dr. Walter's presentation, under  
40 Alternative 2, they would be eligible for an initial VMS device  
41 reimbursement, up to \$950, if cellular and satellite are options  
42 under Alternative 2. Under Alternative 3, they would not be  
43 eligible for device reimbursement.

44

45 As far as field tests and at-sea trials for VMS devices, the  
46 current regulations under Alternative 2 says that those may be

1 performed on devices, whereas Alternative 3 says that those would  
2 be mandatory, and then, again, coming from agency presentations,  
3 would there be additional NMFS costs from not utilizing the  
4 regulation of 50 CFR? Under Alternative 2, there would not be.  
5 Under Alternative 3, there would be.

6  
7 This table goes through some of the industry costs that were  
8 prepared in Chapter 4, and so, again, noting that, between last  
9 time the committee and council saw this document to today, Chapters  
10 3 and 4 have been completed, and so there's a lot of information  
11 compressed into this table.

12  
13 The total number of permitted vessels is 1,257, and I'll run  
14 through that first row first. Under Alternative 2, with the  
15 analysis, we're looking basically at 949 permitted vessels that  
16 would be still needing a device, taking that initial 1,257 and  
17 subtracting out the budgeted amount to supply devices to 204  
18 vessels under the Early Adopter Program, which is abbreviated as  
19 EAP, and then also subtracting out the 104 vessels that already  
20 have a satellite VMS.

21  
22 Then, under Alternative 3, there would be 1,053 vessels requiring  
23 a device, and so that 1,257, again subtracting out the 204 devices  
24 supplied under the Early Adopter Program.

25  
26 The initial device costs for the permit holders, under Alternative  
27 2, would be zero for those 949 that I just discussed, because they  
28 would be eligible for the national VMS reimbursement. Under  
29 Alternative 3, since they would be ineligible for national VMS  
30 reimbursement, the costs for the devices that are being used in  
31 the Early Adopter Program -- They range from \$199 to \$574.

32  
33 As far as recurring annual transmission costs, under Alternative  
34 2, for cellular, that could range from \$99 to \$179. For satellite,  
35 again bearing in mind the 104 vessels that currently have satellite  
36 devices, they would have to increase frequency of data  
37 transmission, and so the annual cost could range anywhere between  
38 \$360 to \$1,440, and that's assuming a range on a monthly level of  
39 \$30 to \$120.

40  
41 I do want to pause there, with that asterisk that says it's an  
42 overestimate, because current satellite VMS users are already  
43 paying some level of annual transmission costs, and so my  
44 simplistic way to describe that is I'm going to use Hulu TV  
45 streaming as an example.

1 If everyone was required to have Hulu without ads and you were  
2 told that is going to cost you \$30 a month, that is basically what  
3 we have plugged in here. However, we know, because those 104  
4 vessels already had the satellite VMS -- Again going to my  
5 comparison, we might say, okay, they're already paying for Hulu  
6 with ads, and so they might be paying \$10 a month already, and so,  
7 really, that increase in cost, that marginal increase, is only  
8 \$20, and not \$30. However, we don't know what they're currently  
9 paying, and so it's an overestimate that we're putting that full  
10 amount there.

11  
12 Under Alternative 3, because cellular is the only transmission  
13 avenue allowed, similar to what we saw under Alternative 2, and,  
14 again, we used that range of \$99 to \$179.

15  
16 The last row, it looks like a lot of money. Please keep in mind  
17 that that is over a ten-year range, and so this is not an annual  
18 cost to industry, and we're also, again, assuming here that this  
19 is a census, and so, if some level less than a census is chosen,  
20 that's going to also reduce the numbers under both Alternative 2  
21 as well as under Alternative 3.

22  
23 Under alternative 2, in that last row, I went through two different  
24 scenarios, and so I kept the 949 vessels that would need to buy  
25 cellular VMS and the 104 vessels that already have satellite VMS,  
26 and I took the low end of the cost and the high end of the cost  
27 and calculated out, in this case primarily due to the transmission  
28 cost, what that would result in, and we're seeing that it could  
29 range anywhere between \$1.6 million to \$3.5 million, and,  
30 obviously, a large part of that is coming from the satellite  
31 transmission, and, you know, you see that in the row above. That  
32 can range from \$360 to \$1,440 for those 104 vessels. Again, keep  
33 in mind that that's an overestimate.

34  
35 The flip side is those folks with the satellite devices might look  
36 at that transmission cost and say that's a lot of money. Now, if  
37 they already received national reimbursement for those satellite  
38 devices, they would be ineligible to receive reimbursement for a  
39 cellular VMS, and so that second range of numbers is saying, those  
40 104 folks, if they said I'm fine paying for a VMS, cellular VMS,  
41 device out of pocket, because I will have a cheaper annual  
42 transmission cost associated with it. That last range, with the  
43 \$1,053, is that scenario, and so that is the \$1.5 million to the  
44 \$2.4 million range.

45  
46 Alternative 3, and so a little more simpler calculation here,

1 because everyone is having to purchase a device, and it's being  
2 paid for out of pocket, without reimbursement, and they all are  
3 going to have that same cellular transmission cost range of \$99 to  
4 \$179 annually.

5  
6 In that case, under Alternative 3, it could range between just  
7 over \$2 million to just over \$2.5 million, again, over a ten-year  
8 range, and, again, assuming that's a full census in that sample.

9  
10 This is the last slide I've got, which is a tentative timeline for  
11 the council, and so, if the council were to select a preferred at  
12 this meeting, staff would develop a YouTube video, as well as an  
13 informational mailout to federal permit holders, notifying them of  
14 this proposed regulatory change prior to the April meeting.

15  
16 One thing I will add is that it is contingent on receiving the  
17 mailing addresses for those permit holders from NMFS. We've been  
18 in communication with them, trying to ensure that that would be  
19 something that would be available, so that we could complete that.

20  
21 One question associated with that is, if a preferred were to be  
22 selected, and this can -- You know, not now, and it could be  
23 potentially discussed at Full Council, would be if council would  
24 like for staff to also hold a virtual webinar for public feedback,  
25 and then, again, assuming a preferred is selected, then the council  
26 could potentially take final action at its April meeting. The  
27 last slide, just says "questions", but I will stop there and field  
28 any questions.

29  
30 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Dr. Freeman, and thank you  
31 also for the very detailed breakdown of the costs. I think that's  
32 probably the most detailed version of that we've seen so far, and  
33 it's very helpful, going through this document, to have that table  
34 in there as well. Do we have any questions for Dr. Freeman in  
35 this presentation, regarding costs or the need for a public hearing  
36 webinar? J.D.

37  
38 **MR. DUGAS:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Regardless which alternative is  
39 chosen, preferred, I think it's a good idea to have a virtual  
40 webinar.

41  
42 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** I would agree. I think, as long as this has  
43 taken, it would be a good way to cap this off, just to make sure  
44 we haven't missed anything in the end, and so, if there's no  
45 objection to that, I guess I'll make a motion that -- Do we need  
46 a motion? No?

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

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR CARRIE SIMMONS:** I think we can just capture that in the report, Mr. Chair, if that's okay.

**CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** I'm good with that. I think that would be helpful. Do we have any other questions regarding the cost table in the presentation we just saw from Dr. Freeman? Otherwise, we can move to the document itself. We're good to go, Dr. Freeman.

**DR. FREEMAN:** I'm going to assume either I did a really good job or I just overwhelmed everybody with the economic information, and so, if there's no questions, Bernie, if you would like to go to the document, and I don't have specific items to address in the document, but I did want to make it available, as part of this agenda item, so that, if there were any questions specific to the document as well, that I could answer any questions.

**CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. I guess, going forward here, early on, we had a committee member that requested the ability to review the language in Alternative 3 from the motion that the Shrimp AP made. Maybe we could pull that up, subsequently, alongside the current language for Alternative 3. Would that be helpful? I think it's on page 6 of AP summary.

**DR. FREEMAN:** They're getting it up. It will just be one moment.

**CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Good. That's very helpful, Bernie. So we have the document up above, with the current language for Alternative 2 and 3 listed there. The Shrimp AP made a motion to modify the language in Alternative 3 as written in that lower portion that's there.

Of note, the Shrimp AP did not make any motion to request a modification of Alternative 2, and so that would stay the same in the document, unless anybody has any preference to change anything there, and so, for now, we'll start with the Alternative 3 language and look at that side-by-side. Does anyone have any motions there? Mr. Sanchez.

**MR. SANCHEZ:** Yes, and I would like to make a motion that we adopt the Shrimp AP's recommended language for Alternative 3 and we revise it in the draft amendment accordingly for Alternative 3.

**MR. BILLY BROUSSARD:** Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** It's seconded by Mr. Broussard. Do we have

1 some discussion around the committee regarding that, while we get  
2 the motion brought up, and I'll read it.

3  
4 The motion is to adopt the Shrimp AP recommended language for  
5 alternative 3. Alternative 3 would be revised as follows, and  
6 then, below, we have the language pasted in from the Shrimp AP  
7 report. Any comments, or discussion, regarding the motion? All  
8 right. Well, seeing no other -- Sorry. Mr. Strelcheck.

9  
10 **MR. STRELCHECK:** We've spoken about this a number of times on the  
11 record before. The Fisheries Service, when we were developing the  
12 SEFHIER program, actually worked with our VMS programs to modify  
13 the regulations to encompass cellular vessel monitoring system  
14 units, and, by definition, what is referred to here as a cELB is  
15 the same thing as a cellular VMS unit, right, and so it is, to me,  
16 semantics and, to me, inconsistent to then rename it something  
17 that already is in the regulations and referred to as a cellular  
18 VMS unit.

19  
20 I recognize that that's been a point of contention, and not  
21 necessarily in agreement with the shrimp industry, but naming it  
22 an ELB really isn't reflective of the current regulations, with  
23 regard to cellular VMS devices, and they are one of the same  
24 devices.

25  
26 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. I guess, for me,  
27 it seemed like consistency with Alternative 1, because it still  
28 the cELB in Alternative 1, even though that's the outgoing data  
29 system, but anyway, and do we have any other comments regarding  
30 the motion? Mara, please.

31  
32 **MS. MARA LEVY:** Thank you. Just briefly, to that point, and I'm  
33 not going to get into it, but, I mean, at the time the no action  
34 was put into place, we didn't have cellular VMS regulations, and  
35 so maybe, at that sense, at that time, it didn't make sense to  
36 call it a cellular VMS, because those national regulations were  
37 not in place.

38  
39 My comment here is I'm not sure how this happened, but the language  
40 here is a little bit different than the language that's in the  
41 document, in that it says, "when on a shrimp fishing trip in the  
42 Gulf". So, back in April of last year, we talked about changing  
43 that to just be on a trip, or a fishing trip, which then actually  
44 happened, and the way it's written now, and the way that it was  
45 written in November, was on a fishing trip, which is not reflected  
46 here, and it's not part of the language that's proposed being

1 changed, but I just wanted to note it, so that every -- So there  
2 wasn't any confusion as we moved forward.

3  
4 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** So help me out. I think I missed it. Are you  
5 talking about Alternative 2 or 3?

6  
7 **MS. LEVY:** I'm talking about 3. the language that may have been  
8 given to the Shrimp AP, and actually the language that's in the  
9 presentation, says that this alternative says "when on a shrimp  
10 fishing trip", but, when you look in the document, the actual  
11 alternative says "went on a fishing trip", and we changed that  
12 last April, was when we talked about changing it, and, when it  
13 came back in November, it was actually changed to "fishing trip",  
14 and not "shrimp fishing trip", and so this isn't reflective of  
15 what's in the document, is what I'm saying, on that one point.

16  
17 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Mara. We'll look into that  
18 and see if we need to adjust this, I guess, during Full Council.  
19 So, for those virtual, we're reviewing the language, real quick,  
20 and so bear with us while we double-check the language, and then  
21 we will put this motion up for a vote shortly after.

22  
23 Okay, and so, in reviewing the current document we have posted,  
24 versus the language in the motion here, the word "shrimp" is  
25 missing from Alternative 3 in the current document, as Ms. Levy  
26 pointed out, and so there's a basically a typo. We need to include  
27 the word "shrimp" in there. Go ahead, Mara.

28  
29 **MS. LEVY:** We can sort it out after or during lunchtime, but it's  
30 not a typo in the document. It's a -- It's missing. It's a missed  
31 here, because we talked about it in April of 2024, about whether  
32 it should be shrimp fishing or just trip, and those committee  
33 reports say -- The council never voted on it, but the committee  
34 report say that a council member stated that it would be up to the  
35 IPT's discretion about how to word the alternatives.

36  
37 When it came back in November -- I think, if we look at November's  
38 version of this document, it still says it says, "fishing trip",  
39 and it doesn't say "shrimp fishing trip", and now that's carried  
40 over here, because we changed it consistent with the discussion in  
41 April of 2024, which is consistent with the rockfish VMS, and like  
42 it's on any fishing trip, and not just a shrimp fishing trip.

43  
44 I think if we want to discuss it further, and narrow it back again,  
45 that's fine, but I think we need to be kind of clear of the  
46 timeline, and what happened, and, if we want to look at it over

1 the break, and come back at Full Council and deal with it, then  
2 then that's fine too.

3

4 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Mr. Sanchez.

5

6 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I'm fine with -- I'm fine with "when on a shrimp  
7 fishing trip in the Gulf", and I don't know what -- You know, maybe  
8 it got lost, fishing, or shrimp fishing, and that's fine with me.  
9 Is it that there isn't a definition of shrimp fishing, per se? Is  
10 that the --

11

12 **MS. LEVY:** So, if you only require it when shrimp fishing, then  
13 the boat could be out there -- I mean, it's much narrower, right?  
14 If you require it to actually ping, or collect the data, on any  
15 fishing trip, that's broader than just a shrimp fishing trip right,  
16 and so we talked about that in April of last year, and the fact of  
17 comparing it to the rock shrimp in the South Atlantic and what's  
18 required for their VMS, right, and so then it got -- The "shrimp"  
19 got taken out of this, and so it says "fishing trip" in the  
20 document. It said it in November, and it says it now. This is  
21 not reflective of what's in the document, is all I'm saying, on  
22 that one point.

23

24 **DR. FREEMAN:** So we were checking to make sure that that wasn't  
25 there in the version that went in front of the AP in December, and  
26 it's not, and so this must have been suggested by the AP, and that  
27 word "shrimp" was just simply not highlighted when they made their  
28 recommended change, and so it's a matter of simply that needs to  
29 be highlighted, or put in blue text, because that was a change  
30 that was not noted by the AP, but it was a change to the language.  
31 Thank you for bearing with us. Just give me one moment, and I  
32 will work with the admin staff to make that change on what's in  
33 front of you.

34

35 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Sanchez, you're good with that modification  
36 to your motion, if we put the word "shrimp" in blue as a highlighted  
37 change from the AP?

38

39 **MR. SANCHEZ:** Blue works for me.

40

41 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Thank you. Thank you. The seconder? Okay.  
42 Now we're good to go. Any other further comments about this  
43 motion, or questions? Seeing none, I'll do -- **Is there any**  
44 **opposition to the motion on the board? We have one opposition.**  
45 **The motion passes.** Okay. While we get that captured correctly,  
46 Mr. Strelcheck.

1  
2 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I would like to go back to Alternative 2. So we  
3 just talked about when on a shrimp fishing trip. With Alternative  
4 2, and this came up during the AP meeting, in terms of need for  
5 clarification.

6  
7 **The text -- The discussion section says, "when on a fishing trip",**  
8 **and so I would like to make a motion to modify Alternative 2 as**  
9 **follows. So to modify Alternative 2 as follows, and so then the**  
10 **additional language would be after "archived position data" add**  
11 **"when on a fishing trip that is", and then just, I would say,**  
12 **underline or highlight that, so that -- If I have a second, I'll**  
13 **explain my recommendation.**

14  
15 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Seconded by Mr. Broussard. Go ahead, Andy.

16  
17 **MR. STRELCHECK:** So, as I mentioned, this is already in the  
18 discussion. To me, it provides further clarification, so that,  
19 you know, if this is selected as a preferred for rulemaking, that  
20 the intent is clear, and it's obviously understood by industry, as  
21 we go out to any sort of further public input and comment as to  
22 when that vessel position data would need to be collected.

23  
24 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Any other questions or comments on the motion  
25 on the board? Dr. Frazer.

26  
27 **DR. TOM FRAZER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Andy, I'm just seeking  
28 little clarity here. I mean, I'm accustomed to thinking about  
29 reef fish trips, right, and hailing-in and -- Hail-out and hail-  
30 in, and things of that nature. On a shrimp fishing trip, you know,  
31 so you depart on a trip, and when is the trip over? When you  
32 offload the catch?

33  
34 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Ms. Levy.

35  
36 **MS. LEVY:** Well, so "trip" has a definition in the regulations,  
37 which is basically when you end at the berth dock. I mean, unless  
38 we define it differently, a trip is already defined as a fishing  
39 trip that starts when you leave and ends you get back at the berth  
40 dock, or whatever that language is. I can read it to you, if you  
41 want. We don't have any further definition about what it means in  
42 terms of shrimp.

43  
44 **DR. FRAZER:** Sure. I'll talk to you online. It's probably a  
45 little deeper. Thanks.

46

1 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Dr. Freeman.  
2

3 **DR. FREEMAN:** So a question, again, to make it a little more  
4 consistent with Alternative 3, as well as to reflect what's -- How  
5 it reads in the discussion for Alternative 2 in the document, and  
6 could I suggest specifying that says, "when on a fishing trip in  
7 the Gulf"? Okay, and I'm getting a nod from Mr. Strelcheck.  
8

9 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Is the seconder good with the revision? Dr.  
10 Simmons.  
11

12 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** It doesn't quite make sense to me,  
13 because we talked about archived position data, and then it's  
14 inserted "compatible with algorithm", and so I don't -- This is a  
15 footnote, right, Matt, in --  
16

17 **DR. FREEMAN:** It's in the discussion.  
18

19 **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SIMMONS:** In the discussion for the alternative?  
20 Maybe, just towards the end, after we talk about the shrimp effort  
21 algorithm, or something. It doesn't quite make sense to me right  
22 now.  
23

24 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Well, maybe it's something we can hash out  
25 before we get the Full Council, maybe, but we have this on the  
26 board. Is there any other questions regarding, or comments  
27 regarding, this motion? **Seeing none, anyone opposed to the motion**  
28 **written on the board is, as drafted? No opposition, and the motion**  
29 **passes to modify Alternative 2.** Okay. We're almost to the end of  
30 the document. I guess, going forward, Dr. Freeman, do we have any  
31 further actions needed for the document, anything that you --  
32

33 **DR. FREEMAN:** No, sir, not at this point, unless the committee  
34 wants to select a preferred at this point or wait until Full  
35 Council.  
36

37 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Mr. Sanchez.  
38

39 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I make a motion that we move to select Alternative  
40 3 as the preferred.  
41

42 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. The motion is to select Alternative 3  
43 in the document as preferred. Do have a second?  
44

45 **MR. BROUSSARD:** I'll second it.  
46

1 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Billy Broussard seconds. Okay. We'll get  
2 that drafted up. Any discussion regarding Alternative 3 as the  
3 preferred? Mr. Sanchez.

4  
5 **MR. SANCHEZ:** I put that out there, and it's the will of the AP,  
6 and then we can properly vet this in Full Council with everybody  
7 chiming-in.

8  
9 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Sounds good to me. I think, if anything,  
10 it will help us to push this a little closer to the goal line,  
11 since we're five years in on the project here, and we can possibly  
12 stir up a little more discussion during Full Council regarding  
13 this, but any other comments, or questions, regarding Alternative  
14 3 as preferred? Mr. Strelcheck.

15  
16 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I would like to make a substitute motion to select  
17 Alternative 2 as the preferred.

18  
19 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. We have a substitute motion for  
20 Alternative 2 as the preferred on the board. Can we get a second  
21 for that motion? Once, twice. No one seconds this motion for  
22 Alternative 2 as the preferred? The substitute motion has failed  
23 for no second. Back to the original motion for Alternative 3 as  
24 the preferred. Mara.

25  
26 **MS. LEVY:** Thank you. I'll just say that, if this passes, and  
27 then you intend to - If the Full Council intends to adopt it and  
28 move it forward eventually for preferred, there's going to be need  
29 to be, from my perspective, a lot of discussion and rationale about  
30 how this is consistent with National Standard 7, which requires  
31 that management measures shall, where practical, minimize costs  
32 and avoid unnecessary duplication, and so I would just encourage  
33 everyone to think about how this meets the mandates of the statute,  
34 particularly in that regard. Thank you.

35  
36 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Mara. I appreciate the  
37 comment. Do we have any other comments regarding the Alternative  
38 3 as the preferred motion on the board? **Seeing none, is anyone in**  
39 **opposition to the motion to make Alternative 3 as the preferred?**  
40 **We have one in opposition. The motion passes with one opposition.**  
41 Dr. Freeman.

42  
43 **DR. FREEMAN:** A question directed to NMFS staff. If this gets  
44 transmitted with Alternative 3 as the preferred, and, even with  
45 rationale, if it's deemed to be in conflict with National Standard  
46 7, what would result? The document would be sent back to the

1 council, or what happens in that scenario?

2

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

4

5 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Well, it's certainly pre-decisional, but, anytime  
6 the council provides an amendment, or a recommendation, to the  
7 Fisheries Service, we have to, obviously, review it consistent  
8 with federal laws, right, and so we're going to look at the whole  
9 suite of federal laws and evaluate it for that consistency.

10

11 If we determine it's inconsistent with federal law, we can either  
12 partially approve it or disapprove it, and that would then require  
13 it to come back to the council for reconsideration, right, and we  
14 would, obviously, give you an opportunity, at that point, to  
15 address any issues or concerns that we've identified, and so I'm  
16 not saying that's the case now, but that's the process, and we  
17 have, on occasion, had to either partially approve or disapprove  
18 amendments because they're inconsistent with federal law.

19

20 **CHAIRMAN SCHIEBLE:** Okay. Thank you, Mr. Strelcheck. Do we have  
21 any other further discussion regarding the document? If not, I  
22 will conclude the committee meeting and turn it back over to Mr.  
23 Chair.

24

25 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on January 27, 2025.)

26

27

- - -