

GULF COUNCIL

DATA COLLECTION COMMITTEE

The Lodge

Gulf Shores, Alabama

April 7, 2025

VOTING MEMBERS

- 10 Ed Walker.....Florida
- 11 Kevin Anson (designee for Scott Bannon).....Alabama
- 12 Kesley Banks.....Texas
- 13 Dave Donaldson.....GSMFC
- 14 Troy Frady.....Alabama
- 15 Dakus Geeslin (designee for Robin Riechers).....Texas
- 16 Michael McDermott.....Mississippi
- 17 John Sanchez.....Florida
- 18 Chris Schieble (designee for Ryan Montegut).....Louisiana
- 19 Joe Spraggins.....Mississippi
- 20 Andy Strelcheck.....NMFS
- 21 C.J. Sweetman (designee for Jessica McCawley).....Florida
- 22 Troy Williamson.....Texas

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

- 25 Billy Broussard.....Louisiana
- 26 J.D. Dugas.....Louisiana
- 27 Tom Frazer.....Florida
- 28 LT Jason Morton.....USCG
- 29 Jason Osborne.....Mississippi
- 30 Anthony Overton.....Alabama

STAFF

- 33 Assane Diagne.....Economist
- 34 Matt Freeman.....Economist
- 35 John Froeschke.....Deputy Director
- 36 Lisa Hollensead.....Fishery Biologist
- 37 Sarah Gardiner.....Fishery Biologist
- 38 Mara Levy.....NOAA General Counsel
- 39 Emily Muehlstein.....Public Information Officer
- 40 Ryan Rindone.....Lead Fishery Biologist/SEDAR Liaison
- 41 Bernadine Roy.....Office Manager
- 42 Camilla Shireman.....Administrative & Communications Assistant
- 43 Carrie Simmons.....Executive Director

OTHER PARTICIPANTS

- 46 Frank Helies.....NOAA
- 47 Christopher Liese.....SEFSC
- 48 Charlie Phillips.....SAFMC

1 Clay Porch.....SEFSC
2 David Records.....NOAA
3 Jessica Stephens.....NOAA
4
5 - - -
6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3 Table of Motions..... 4
4
5 Adoption of Agenda and Approval of November 2024 Minutes..... 4
6
7 Action Guide and Next Steps..... 4
8
9 Discussion: Loss of Southeast Region Headboat Survey Dockside
10 Sampling..... 6
11
12 Discussion of Southeast For-Hire Integrated Electronic Reporting
13 (SEFHIER)..... 11
14
15 Adjournment 52
16
17 - - -
18

TABLE OF MOTIONS

PAGE 37: Motion in Actions 1 and 2 to make Alternative 2 the preferred. The motion carried on page 42.

PAGE 43: Motion in Action 3 to include for-hire in Alternatives 2 and 3. The motion carried on page 44.

PAGE 46: Motion in Action 3 to make the modified Alternative 3, to include Options a and b, the preferred. The motion carried on page 47.

PAGE 48: Motion in Action 4 to make Alternative 3 the preferred. The motion carried on page 50.

- - -

1 The Data Collection Committee of the Gulf Council convened at The
2 Lodge in Gulf Shores, Alabama on Monday morning, April 7, 2025,
3 and was called to order by Chairman Ed Walker.
4

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

9 **CHAIRMAN ED WALKER:** I will call to order the Data Collection
10 Committee. Committee members consist of myself, Mr. Anson, Dr.
11 Banks, Mr. Donaldson, Captain Frady, Dr. Sweetman, Mr. McDermott,
12 Mr. Schieble, Mr. Geeslin, Mr. Sanchez, General Spraggins, Mr.
13 Strelcheck, and Mr. Williamson. The first order of business --
14 First, are there any additions to the agenda? Seeing none, can I
15 get a motion to adopt the agenda? Motion by Dr. Banks, and a
16 second by Mr. Sanchez.
17

18 Okay. The second order of business is Approval of the November
19 2024 minutes. Can I get a motion? Dr. Sweetman. Second by Dr.
20 Banks. Thank you. Okay. First up is the Action Guide and Next
21 Steps going forward. Dr. Hollensead.
22

23 **DR. LISA HOLLENSEAD:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. So before the
24 committee today are sort of two overarching things. Of course,
25 the SEFHIER program and its development through the document, as
26 well as a summary report from the Ad Hoc AP, the Charter-for-Hire
27 Ad Hoc AP. They met on February 24th, and so we'll also discuss
28 their summary and the highlights from that meeting.
29

30 Sort of within that larger umbrella, we're going to have a little
31 bit of discussion, and so, if you all recall, at our last meeting,
32 there was an announcement from the Science Center indicating that
33 there had been a loss of funding to support the dockside sampling
34 for the Southeast Region Headboat Survey, and so from Texas all
35 the way through Alabama. Florida still has funding for that, but
36 the other Gulf states do not.
37

38 Certainly one of the overarching themes throughout discussing
39 SEFHIER and those sort of things is validation, right, the
40 importance for validation in a survey program, including that
41 dockside validation, and so that component is largely absent now
42 from the Southeast Regional Headboat Survey, and so, upon hearing
43 this, the council requested a little bit more information from the
44 Science Center about what might be happening there, and what does
45 this mean for the future of the program, and is that loss and
46 funding temporary, or do we expect any funds to come through, and,
47 if so, what might be prioritized, and that sort of thing?
48

1 So for each one of those questions, the Science Center did come
2 back with a letter to address those questions that they had, and
3 that is available in your briefing materials. I believe Dr. Porch
4 is online, and he can speak to certainly the letter. I would allow
5 him to speak at that point, or if he would like to designate
6 anybody from his office to do so, but certainly the committee
7 should ask any questions about what this might mean.

8
9 The headboat survey is one of the longest-running surveys in the
10 Gulf, since the 1980s. It's pretty instrumental in looking at
11 stock assessments for things like lane snapper, and, for just about
12 every stock assessment we do, that is data put in there, and so
13 it's a very important program. Mr. Chair, I would let it over to
14 anyone from the Science Center that would like to speak to the
15 letter they provided.

16
17 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Certainly. Science Center? Not seeing any.
18 Andy.

19
20 **MR. ANDY STRELCHECK:** Clay is available to speak. He may just be
21 muted.

22
23 **DISCUSSION: LOSS OF SOUTHEAST REGION HEADBOAT SURVEY DOCKSIDE**
24 **SAMPLING**

25
26 **DR. CLAY PORCH:** Okay. Now I'm unmuted. All right. Well, thank
27 you, everyone, for a chance to address this, and my apologies for
28 not being there, but, at the present time, my presence at the
29 council meeting is not deemed mission critical, and so I was unable
30 to attend, but, in any case, just to address the question at-hand,
31 historically, the Southeast Regional Headboat Biosampling Program
32 was covered through the FIN Program, the Fisheries Information
33 Network, at the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission.

34
35 A few years ago, the Gulf States indicated that inflation was
36 taking its toll and that they would no longer be able to support
37 the biosampling program, and Dave Donaldson can probably address
38 that timeline better than I can, as it happened before I took the
39 helm, but, for a few years after that, we were able to cobble
40 together some supplementary funds to keep it going.

41
42 Last year, the Regional Office chipped in and kept it going. This
43 year, I think, owing to some salary lapse, particularly Ken
44 Brennan, with the hiring freeze, we weren't allowed to backfill
45 that position, and so, with that salary lapse, we were able to
46 make some contribution toward it, or at least we have the money to
47 get it over there, and then the National Recreational Fishing
48 Program also contributed about \$50,000.

1
2 Between those two, I think we have enough funds to cover about
3 half the cost, but it's not cheap. It costs typically about
4 \$500,000 a year.

5
6 Now, moving forward, we're not confident we're going to have those
7 funds. Inflation has taken its toll with us as well, but then, on
8 top of it, both Congress and the administration has signaled that
9 there will likely be fairly substantial budget cuts, in addition
10 to the staffing cuts that have already happened.

11
12 Depending on how severe those cuts are, we may be able to
13 reposition some of our commercial port samplers so that they can
14 help supplement the biosampling program for the headboat survey,
15 and we'll do the best we can to work that out, and so that's the
16 bottom line, in terms of future possibilities. Are there any
17 particular questions about that?

18
19 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Dr. Porch, it's Ed Walker. Along those same
20 lines, I've had a conversation with some folks, and what are the
21 chances there's going to be some funding available for some of
22 these SEFHIER things that we're considering?

23
24 **DR. PORCH:** That path is not clear to me. I mean, it's typically
25 been -- The previous one was run through the Regional Office, and
26 I don't know if they have any insights into it, but I have not
27 heard, from my end, of any funding that might come to that. I
28 think it's just early in the process right now.

29
30 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Mr. Anson.

31
32 **MR. KEVIN ANSON:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Dr. Porch, just a
33 clarification. You might be able to utilize the port samplers to
34 collect some of the biological information, and that would just be
35 in the State of Florida, with those folks that are remaining after
36 the cuts to the rest of the Gulf?

37
38 **DR. PORCH:** No, and, if we get some additional funding, which could
39 be, you know, from salary lapse, or any other way, we can cobble
40 together funding. What we would probably do is rotate between
41 Florida one year and then Alabama through Texas another year. It's
42 more or less equivalent.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Dr. Sweetman.

45
46 **DR. C.J. SWEETMAN:** So, obviously, concerns with loss of this
47 funding, uncertainty with how this moves forward, and I don't want
48 to get ahead of ourselves here relative to SEFHIER 2.0, but, in

1 the absence of losing this legacy program here, or at least the
2 utility of the data, in terms of the assessment process, Dr.
3 Hollensead, you had mentioned lane snapper, and that the headboat
4 survey index is utilized, and can you expand upon the amount of
5 species that losing this data stream could potentially impact,
6 because I do think that -- I don't want to get ahead of myself
7 here relative to our discussion in the next agenda item here, but
8 I do think that there's some tie-ins relative to the potential
9 loss of this program and the loss of the data that we would use in
10 an assessment and management process. Can you just expand upon
11 the number of species, and I doubt you have an exact number, but
12 --

13
14 **DR. HOLLENSSEAD:** Yes, and I will look to Dr. Froeschke, if I
15 misspeak, but it's almost all of them. I think it's a lot, and,
16 even if it's something that, you know, you don't really always see
17 on a headboat or something, because it's such a long-term survey,
18 going back to the 1980s, it's something that I believe the analysts
19 always check on, you know, whether or not they determined through
20 the SEDAR process if it's something appropriate for that species
21 or not, but, largely, more often than not, it is. They put it in
22 there some way, and if they have to downweight it for whatever
23 reason, but it's a substantial number of the species that we manage
24 that that data input is at least looked at through a SEDAR process.

25
26 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Mr. Dugas.

27
28 **MR. J.D. DUGAS:** Thank you, Mr. Walker. I don't know if my question
29 is for Dr. Porch or Dr. Hollensead, and can you remind us of the
30 total number of vessels that are in this sample, and my second
31 question, Dr. Hollensead, is how many are we going to lose now,
32 with losing this funding and only Florida is involved going
33 forward?

34
35 **DR. HOLLENSSEAD:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and so, in 2023, for
36 example, the number of headboat vessels reporting landings to the
37 program, there were eight in Alabama, forty-one in Florida, one in
38 Louisiana, two in Mississippi, sixteen in Texas, for a total of
39 sixty-eight vessels throughout the Gulf. That's very similar in
40 2022 and 2021. Those numbers have been very similar since 2019
41 with this report.

42
43 Somebody can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe the dockside
44 sampling, and maybe Dr. Stephen is online and could help, but I
45 believe they're anywhere from like 8 percent, 8 to 10 percent I
46 believe, is intercepted by a dockside sampler, of the number of
47 trips.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** I'm not sure if it would make a difference, but,
2 Andy, would it even make any sense for the council to put something
3 together asking somebody to see if they could find the funds to
4 keep this program going, or is that kind of already unspoken and
5 understood?
6

7 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Well, I'll let Clay respond. I mean, our letter
8 did indicate, obviously, you know, the challenges with funding the
9 program, and that certainly we could pursue, you know, more
10 permanent sources of funding in the long-term, if they became
11 available. As Clay pointed out, we're in a very challenging time
12 right now, and we don't know what our budget is going to look like
13 next year, let alone the rest of this year at this point.
14

15 We're at a crossroads with regard to making some very tough
16 decisions with regard to not only science programs that are going
17 to have to be cut back, but also regulatory programs, and how those
18 changes are going to impact stakeholders, and so I think, if you
19 did write a letter, I mean, certainly it would be important to
20 note the value of the program, what you see is the value and how
21 it's used for management.
22

23 Then I think, you know, the focus would be emphasizing then the
24 tradeoffs here, right, because, if Clay or someone funds the
25 program, that means likely something else won't be funded, right,
26 and so really having to have the conversation in that context is
27 important, because you might look at the headboat program and say,
28 well, we want to fund it until we offer up the next program that
29 you would also want to fund, right, and so evaluating that, you
30 know, balance is really critical.
31

32 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Dr. Frazer.
33

34 **DR. TOM FRAZER:** Thank you. Thank you, Andy, for that input. I
35 guess, given the uncertainty that lies ahead, right -- I mean,
36 fisheries management is inherently a data-driven endeavor, and so
37 if you're trying, the agency is trying, to develop a rationale, or
38 a justification, for a budget request or a spend plan, how are
39 data collection programs prioritized in that process, and how would
40 the council weigh-in on that?
41

42 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I'll let Clay jump in. You know, we have,
43 obviously, a president's budget that is announced each year,
44 obviously, with the new administration. We haven't kind of had
45 that official rollout of a president's budget, but, you know,
46 that's where is our opportunity to work with Commerce and NOAA and
47 the Fisheries Service as a whole to then push forward key
48 priorities for the administration to pursue.

1
2 It's typically done at a national level, and not a regional level,
3 right, in terms of priorities and planning, and so the focus,
4 obviously, is really on expanding or increasing kind of our, you
5 know, larger programs, and so the survey enterprise, or the data
6 collection, you know, of, you know, fisheries for stock
7 assessments.

8
9 I don't have a good answer for you, obviously, because I don't
10 understand, at this point, how the administration will consider,
11 obviously, that input, what our priorities will be based on the
12 administration at this point, but what I can say is that it's not
13 going to be at the headboat survey level. It will be at a much
14 greater level, in terms of substantiating plus-ups, increases, for
15 scientific purposes. Clay, do you have anything to add?

16
17 **DR. PORCH:** Yes, and I think you covered it, for the most part. I
18 just wanted to mention -- That it was actually a part of the
19 Fisheries Information Network program at Gulf States, and so it's
20 a different source of funding ultimately coming through one of our
21 headquarters office, the Office of Science and Technology, I
22 believe, and so we just tried to keep it afloat, when funds were
23 not sufficient to keep it going within the thin budget line, but
24 I think it always helps to have folks advocate if they think that's
25 an important activity to continue, and I can't lobby, but other
26 individuals can.

27
28 Within our own budget, yes, we go through whatever is handed down
29 to us as part of our base budget. We go through a fairly labor-
30 intensive process to prioritize all the funds, looking at
31 congressional direction and everything else, and it's at the point
32 now where we just don't have the excess funds to cover added costs
33 like this.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Mr. Donaldson.

36
37 **MR. DAVE DONALDSON:** Thank you. Just there's a benefit of being
38 around. I just celebrated my thirty-fifth year at the commission.
39 Clay, you said that this was always a GulfFIN program, and,
40 actually, back in the late 1980s, it was funded through the Science
41 Center, but they were having issues with both headboat and menhaden
42 port sampling, and GulfFIN stepped in kind of as a placeholder, to
43 ensure that we would continue these programs, and then we started
44 funding those probably in the early 1990s. Then, as you pointed
45 out, we got to a point where we could no longer support it, and so
46 it actually did start out as a Science Center program.

47
48 **DR. PORCH:** Yes, and that's way before my time, Dave.

1
2 **MR. DONALDSON:** It just shows how old I am.
3

4 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** So I know that, at some level early on, the
5 charter industry itself, and some partners it had, went to Congress
6 and helped get some funding initially for this, and so maybe, you
7 know, some folks could continue that program, after we come up
8 with it. I'm sure it's a tough time to go ask Congress for
9 something right now, but it's been done in the past, to my
10 knowledge, with some success, and so maybe that's something that
11 we could get rolling. More comments on this? Dr. Sweetman.
12

13 **DR. C.J. SWEETMAN:** Yes, and thanks, Mr. Chair, and, obviously, I
14 view this survey as pretty darn important for a lot of the work
15 that we do here, but, as we're sitting here, you know, collectively
16 thinking about the new situation that the federal government is
17 in, and relative to what programs they can stand up, I think we
18 just need, as a council, to be cognizant of the fact that we can't
19 just ask for everything to be funded, and we would, in some
20 capacity, would need to prioritize what we think is probably the
21 most relevant, and so I would just offer that for the council's
22 consideration.
23

24 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Noted. Additional comments, or input? Okay. I
25 think it's back to you, Dr. Hollensead, and is it not?
26

27 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Yes, Mr. Chair. If the committee is ready to
28 move on, we can go to the next item.
29

30 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Yes.
31

32 **DISCUSSION OF SOUTHEAST FOR-HIRE INTEGRATED ELECTRONIC REPORTING**
33 **(SEFHIER)**
34

35 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Okay. Bernie, if you wouldn't mind pulling up
36 the scope of work for me, please, and scrolling down to that Agenda
37 Item V, and so, next on the agenda, we're going to get sort of
38 focused on the development of SEFHIER 2.0, as well as reviewing
39 the summary from the AP meeting. Captain Jim Green is in the room
40 to field any questions. He's the AP chair.
41

42 First, before we get to that, there has been quite extensive
43 discussions, in developing this document, of what to do with the
44 economic data collection, and so we've spent a substantial amount
45 of time on that.
46

47 Very broadly, very quickly, just a refresher, that's Action 4.
48 There's three alternatives in that action, as it stands. The first

1 would be to, you know, the no action, and don't collect any
2 economic information, and the second would sort of be a census
3 level, and so, after every trip, you would be asked those three
4 economic questions, and you would have to report it along with
5 your logbook. Then the third alternative would be some sampling
6 approach to go ahead and still collect that information, but not
7 at a census level.

8
9 Just to give some context, before we jump into the document, or
10 look through the AP summary, we have staff, and Dr. Christopher
11 Liese is going to give us a presentation looking at some of the
12 admin tradeoffs between -- Sort of a cost analysis between those
13 alternatives, just to provide you all some information as you begin
14 those deliberations, and so I would let Dr. Liese provide his
15 presentation at this point.

16
17 **DR. CHRISTOPHER LIESE:** Okay. Good morning. Thank you. I'm an
18 economist in Miami, with the Social Science Research Group, and I
19 was asked to sort of come up with an estimate of what these
20 different economic data collections would cost us at the center.

21
22 Lisa has just gone over the three alternatives in Action 4, and
23 it's fine skipping over them. I'll say that, first and foremost,
24 when we're saying economic data, we are interested in the charter
25 fee, sort of the price for the for-hire service, and all the other
26 costs, and there's only two, which is fuel price and fuel gallons,
27 are sort of conditional on getting the price and are secondary to
28 that in importance.

29
30 We economists, we need the price of something to do any research,
31 and so if we go -- So these are -- Lisa had just mentioned these
32 three alternatives, and I'll jump right to the next slide, please,
33 where these are the consequences of these alternatives, in terms
34 of economic data collection.

35
36 The Alternative 1 is the status quo, which is what we currently
37 have, and that basically means we have no systematic economic data
38 collection of the fee in this sector, and so it's a very data-poor
39 fishery.

40
41 What we've done in the past is just, when funding and the stars
42 align in labor and effort and those sort of things, we would do ad
43 hoc self-standing voluntary surveys, and sometimes this -- Every
44 five years, or every seven years, it would come together, and we
45 do something. Sometimes it would be a mail survey. Most recently
46 in the past, it's been in-person interviews and those sort of
47 things.

1 Alternative 2 is basically adding the econ question, the fee
2 question and the fuel questions, to the logbook and treating it as
3 a data point in the logbook, and so there's basically -- It's fully
4 integrated with the logbook, and there is no separate economic
5 data collection.

6
7 Then the third alternative would be integrating the implementation
8 of that, of our econ questions into the logbook, but we would only
9 be sampling a subset of respondents, and so there would be --
10 Partly, it would be a separate data collection from the design and
11 the way we analyze the data and such, but the implementation would
12 be on the logbook.

13
14 I tried to estimate and predict sort of what staff hours the
15 Science Center would be putting into these data collections over
16 the next years on an annual basis. I should note that the hours
17 are not continuous. They usually occur across a year, an hour
18 here, a meeting there, and those sort of things.

19
20 I started with Alternative 2, which is putting the economic data
21 -- You know, treating it as a part of the logbook. This is the
22 cheapest, and so I use it sort of as the baseline to show the other
23 costs relative to that one. You know, in terms of setup, we are
24 pretty already integrated into the logbook system, given that there
25 was the SEFHIER 1.0, and that's being run for the South Atlantic,
26 and so I put zero there, in terms of extra work needed. Then,
27 annually, we would still need to coordinate the fact that there's
28 economic data there, and we would extract the data, and process it
29 for our needs, and so I put some hours there.

30
31 Then, finally, you know, we would probably be putting out economic
32 reports, and I put like a Gulf for-hire economic tech memo, but,
33 you know, since it would be census data coming out of that data
34 collection, it would be pretty straightforward, and I'm setting
35 that to zero for this data collection, and so you can see,
36 annually, it would not add a lot of costs doing -- Adding, you
37 know, for Alternative 2, which is just straightforward adding the
38 econ questions to the logbook.

39
40 Alternative 3 would only be a sample, and so this would require
41 more coordination. We would have to develop an update, a sampling
42 frame, every year. We told the IPT team, and the AP and the
43 council, that we would try to minimize the sample size as much as
44 possible. This would require more upfront work, using sort of the
45 data from one year to, you know, target our sampling the next year
46 to those vessels that are most interesting from a policy
47 perspective, you know, fishing those species that management will
48 be focused on.

1
2 We need to develop the sampling frame. We need to sample and
3 select and track that, those strata, somewhere. We would send out
4 selection letters early in the year. We have some material costs,
5 and none of this is huge.
6
7 We would have to integrate the sample into the app somehow. This
8 would not be a government cost, per se, and so it would be the app
9 developers, and so I can't really put a price on that, and then
10 there would be tracking compliance and enforcement, and that would
11 very much depend on how deeply this sample would be integrated
12 into the app, and so it's hard to say.
13
14 If it's a very low-level integration in the app, where it's more
15 or less voluntary for those who have been selected to -- Well, if
16 the question is there, but there's no validations and checks on
17 it, then we would have to probably do that externally from the
18 app, and that would require more, you know, validation and
19 compliance testing, and maybe some enforcement, but I can't really
20 estimate those at this point in time.
21
22 Then, finally, for the analysis, since we would be working with
23 these more complex sampling frames and designs, there would be a
24 little bit more complexity to the analysis, but not too much, and
25 so this would be the third alternative, the sampling up to 20
26 percent for a year, and so, again, not that much money in the big
27 picture.
28
29 This is actually Alternative 1, the status quo. This is where we
30 do not have an economic data collection, and, you know, really,
31 costs could be anything, because we don't know what we would be
32 doing, and so I modeled these costs based on the most recent we
33 did. That was a voluntary mail survey, which are cheaper than in-
34 person surveys, and it was done in 2017, and so I did -- You know,
35 again, these are estimates.
36
37 You know, we have to start by raising funds, which means writing
38 proposals. We need to develop new survey methods, questionnaires,
39 and materials. You know, we have some experience, and so that's
40 not -- You know, those twenty-four hours are based on adapting
41 things we had and not just coming up entirely new, with focus
42 groups and those sort of things. That would raise the cost a lot.
43
44 We would be using logbook data, since that's a new thing. We
45 haven't had that, and so we could possibly target these surveys
46 better than we did in the past, since that would exist, but, you
47 know, that takes a little bit more development time.
48

1 A big thing is, if we do surveys of anyone, we always have to get
2 OMB PRA, which is Paperwork Reduction Act, approval, which, you
3 know, is a lead time of about a year, to make it sure we get it
4 done. It's you publish an FRN, and you write, you know, thirty-
5 page documents, and those sort of things, and so that's an
6 additional cost.

7
8 To actually implement the survey, we would probably hire a
9 contractor, and just hiring someone takes time. You know, I put
10 down \$100,000 for a contractor to work across a year. If we do it
11 a little bit seasonal, or with the MRIP waves, we would have to
12 update the sampling frame and sample at that time, because we did
13 it one year before with the -- You know, given the PRA lag, and
14 then supervise the contract, and, for the analysis, it's a sample,
15 but it's a simpler sample, since we designed it, and so I just
16 added a little cost to the analysis, and so the total for this
17 might be \$114,000 to run it, in terms of time and cost.

18
19 Since I wanted to compare it with the annual costs of the other
20 two, I, you know, say we do this once a year, and that would be an
21 annual cost of, you know, over \$20,000 a year. Again, not a very
22 big deal.

23
24 So, just again, the pros and cons of the three data alternatives,
25 and putting Alternative 2 first and the status quo last. The
26 sample size for these, for the logbook, is probably going to be
27 sort of 40,000 to 50,000 trips a year, and so, if it's on the
28 logbook, it's going to be a huge sample size.

29
30 We wouldn't be doing statistical estimates, because, you know,
31 it's -- We would be getting the data. We could do -- You know,
32 it's annually updated with the logbook. We would have spatial
33 resolution for all the trips in the Gulf.

34
35 We would have temporal resolution across the year, and -- Sorry.
36 Species resolution, because the logbook basically collects that
37 too, and so that would be like almost perfect data, very good. If
38 we sample, we would still have a large sample size, because, you
39 know, 10 percent of 40,000 is still 4,000 trips, and now it's
40 statistical data.

41
42 We would have confidence intervals, but they probably would be
43 reasonable for the bigger things, and, because it's still linked
44 to the logbook, we could still, you know, analyze the cost data,
45 and the revenue data, in the context of all the logbook variables,
46 and so that would still give us a lot of -- It's very useful.

47
48 Then the status quo, the final one, it's a tiny sample size. It's

1 voluntary. We don't get that -- You know, it's a 40 percent
2 response rate, if we're lucky, and it takes a lot of work, huge
3 confidence intervals, and none of this spatial resolution that,
4 you know, and temporal resolution. It's one number for the Gulf
5 of Mexico. I call that data quality minimal. It's what we've
6 been doing, but it's, you know, the best we could do, given the
7 funds and the existence of no logbook in this fishery.

8
9 Now the cost comparisons, again, sort of the three in that row.
10 Here are the annualized costs from the -- That's the third column.
11 You know, it's under \$2,000 for just Alternative 2, and maybe
12 \$8,000 for a sampling approach, and then the other one might be
13 \$22,000, and so it's not really a big difference, in the context
14 of the federal government's money, but, if you look at the number
15 of fee observations that we would be getting, and I'm using the
16 2022 number here, 44,000 trips, then you see that the number of
17 observations we get are very, very different.

18
19 You know, they go down as the cost goes up, and so, if you do a
20 cost per observations, it might be five-cents, if it's on the
21 logbook always, and it might be a dollar or two if we do a sample,
22 and both of those seem very reasonable, but then, if you go to an
23 independent survey, because it's -- You know, you need a lot of
24 staff time to do that, and then, you know, the price for one fee
25 observation and -- Well, there would be other, and we would collect
26 more than just a fee, but we would only get one fee observation to
27 estimate revenue in this sector, and it would jump up to \$450 or
28 more, and so, in conclusion, there is a lot of uncertainty in my
29 time and cost estimates.

30
31 I'm not great at that, but I do feel, you know -- So I could be
32 off, but I feel comfortable about sort of the relationship between
33 these different alternatives, and so, you know, Alternative 3, the
34 sample versus the census is more, takes more time, is more effort,
35 but it's still reasonable, as it generates very good data for us
36 that we can use and answer many of the management-related
37 questions, like, you know, how much is the fishery worth, and, you
38 know, maybe the hurricane impact stuff by regional perspectives,
39 you know, in one state, or even a smaller unit.

40
41 The alternative 1, the status quo versus the census, is going to
42 be much more expensive, maybe ten-times in effort and funds, and
43 it's really more unreasonable, given the limited data and the
44 results it produces, and especially if the agency spends a lot of
45 money, which I'm not counting here, to run a logbook data
46 collection.

47
48 So, you know, in general, the status quo is not very efficient,

1 and not very integrated. It is messy for us, because we have to
2 run a separate survey. It's -- You know, fishermen will be
3 contacted separately, and so there's just one more thing out there,
4 and, you know, in light of staff costs and all that, even small
5 costs and simplifications are useful. That's it. Thank you very
6 much. Questions?

7
8 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** I have one question, and survey implementation
9 -- The biggest number on this whole thing was \$100,000. Did I
10 understand that's just to hire a contractor to essentially run the
11 program? Is that what that number is for?

12
13 **DR. LIESE:** Yes. I mean, again, I based this on like -- I think,
14 the last time we ran it, we had \$85,000, but that was in 2017,
15 and, you know, I hired a student, but we did it seasonal, and over
16 waves, and so he was hired for the whole year, and, you know, he
17 was working on it. I mean, he was an ex-student. He was a
18 temporary hire, and, yes, we designed the survey. We did --
19 Actually, we did focus groups early on, and those sorts of things,
20 and so you know --

21
22 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Okay. Very good. Thank you. Comments for Dr.
23 Liese? Mr. Anson.

24
25 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you for the presentation. I recognize your --
26 I agree with your comment about the cost of this, these different
27 alternatives relative to the overall budget that NOAA receives,
28 but I'm just curious about the calculation for staff time. What
29 goes into that?

30
31 **DR. LIESE:** You mean the hours or turning that into dollars?

32
33 **MR. ANSON:** Yes, and the dollar amount. What comprises the -- Is
34 it salaries and benefits?

35
36 **DR. LIESE:** Yes. I just used the salaries of like at the cost of
37 a ZP4 scientist, sort of myself doing this stuff, since it has
38 been me in the past doing it, and so there's -- You know, that's
39 pretty much where that number comes from, and so a fully-loaded
40 salary divided by the 2,080 hours per year, for an hourly wage.

41
42 **MR. ANSON:** All right. Thank you.

43
44 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Anyone else on this topic? Okay. I don't see
45 any. To me, as a -- You know, we've been going back and forth on
46 this a long time, and I've always been kind of a naysayer on
47 economic data, but I think we have come to a reasonable place here,
48 in the middle, or close to the middle, that seems to have -- You

1 know, I went to the -- I attended the AP meeting, and I've talked
2 to a lot of charter guys, and I think we've found a reasonable
3 middle ground that's acceptable to the charter fleet and meets the
4 requirements, you know, the economic data requirements.

5
6 I kind of like where we're at. Obviously, there's an alternative
7 to be picked, or a vote to be taken here, but I think we've gotten
8 -- In my mind, we've gotten to where we need to go here, and I
9 would like to see us come out of this meeting with something and
10 keep stepping forward on SEFHIER, and that's all I have to say
11 about that. Dr. Hollensead, I think you're still up. Let me
12 bring up my agenda here.

13
14 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Sure thing, Mr. Chair. If there's no more
15 questions for Dr. Liese, I can move on.

16
17 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** More questions? I don't see any. You have the
18 floor.

19
20 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Okay. Mr. Chair, if you're amenable, I think
21 what we'll do is we'll pull up the advisory panel summary, and go
22 through that just a little bit, to show what they had suggested
23 and recommended, and then we can dig into the document, if you
24 would like, and so, Bernie, if you wouldn't mind pulling up the
25 summary, Tab F, Number 5(b). Okay. Thank you.

26
27 I'm going to just run through this real quick, and then certainly
28 I'll pause at places in the summary where there were AP motions,
29 and we can discuss those and have the chair weigh-in as you all
30 would like.

31
32 So, first, to start off the meeting, again, they met on February
33 24 of this year. The first presentation was just sort of give
34 them a background and to review what it was that the council had
35 been working on in the meantime, and so to sort of bring them up-
36 to-speed fairly quickly.

37
38 The next thing we did was go through the discussion of the program
39 validation method, and so, the last time this group met, there was
40 a little bit of -- Nothing was on paper yet, right, and so there
41 were still some ideas of what worked before, what didn't work, and
42 so the AP had discussed that at their first meeting, and several
43 things that they had mentioned were sort of these electronic
44 approaches, perhaps for validation, you know, some sort of
45 geofencing or something, where a magnet is engaged when you come
46 off your dock.

47
48 They had several ideas and things to think about, and this council

1 has discussed those throughout the year, and Regional Office staff
2 had brought back some pros and cons and tradeoffs for various of
3 those, and, if you all recall, a little bit towards mid-year of
4 last year, the committee had sort of recommended moving forward
5 with a non-technical approach to validation.

6
7 It allows the program to go up a little bit quicker, instead of
8 exploring, and maybe the technology isn't quite there yet, but
9 using sort of a suite of reporting requirements, which had been in
10 the old program, with the additional of the did-not-fish reports
11 to help with that validation, you know, sort of move through that
12 sort of approach for validation, and it seemed to work for
13 everybody there, and so that was a general consensus.

14
15 We updated the AP with that. We also did update them that, within
16 the document, we do have discussions within there about some
17 frequent time period of reviewing the program, such that, if new
18 technologies become available, and perhaps electronic reporting
19 approach for validation may be feasible in the future, that that's
20 something that could be integrated as it becomes available, and so
21 they were made aware of that, and they seemed to be fine with that.

22
23 The one thing that they did certainly want to speak to is they're
24 happy to sort of do this reporting, but understanding that, if
25 you've got multiple permits, having to report frequently for things
26 that -- You know, maybe you feel redundant, or something like that,
27 and it gets to be burdensome, and so, the more we can do to
28 streamline these reportings for multiple permit holders, it's very
29 much something that's desired, as is, I think, also by the agency,
30 and so, as much as we can work towards that, they recommended that.
31 That was sort of one of their overarching comments to that.

32
33 This next thing that we discussed is certainly -- Bernie, if you
34 wouldn't mind scrolling down to the discussion of the economic
35 data collection, and so we also received a presentation from Dr.
36 Liese going through reasons for the data collection, what it's
37 used for, and so there was a lot of discussion there, as you can
38 see through the summary, and this is sort of a substantial part of
39 the report.

40
41 You know, there was certainly -- There's a lot of feelings among
42 stakeholders, you know, ranging from, you know, don't sort of want
43 it at all to the, you know, understanding of, like, hey, this is
44 okay, and I'm fine doing it after every trip, and everything sort
45 of in between, and so, as Captain Walker had mentioned, he attended
46 that meeting and spoke to some of the folks there, and some other
47 people, and there's a sort of a general consensus that perhaps
48 some sampling of that would work.

1
2 However, the term "trip fee" is something that I think a lot of
3 people are sort of still trying to wrap their head around, in terms
4 of wanting to report that, with the feeling this is a fisheries
5 logbook, and so getting into some of the economic questions is
6 something that they feel, you know, may not be appropriate for
7 this program.

8
9 With that, after those discussions and deliberations, the AP then
10 moved into looking through the document. Chapters 1 and 2 is all
11 that's up there right now, but it certainly gives the background,
12 and then a suite of actions and alternatives, and so, in reviewing
13 the document, and having these discussions, and having to think
14 about it for a year, they were ready to recommend some preferred
15 alternatives within those actions.

16
17 If you recall, Action 1 and 2 says, hey, establish an electronic
18 logbook and have the frequency of that logbook either be, you know,
19 for the charter boat folks either after every trip or daily, at
20 the end of the day, and, at the previous meeting to this one, the
21 sentiment was that reporting after every trip is good, because
22 memory retention is better.

23
24 Sometimes you take multi-day trips, and it's easier to just
25 remember what you have just offloaded, versus what was in the
26 morning, versus the afternoon, and, with that, and to also stay
27 consistent with what the headboat survey was doing, and they
28 currently report weekly, but, to keep them all sort of
29 standardized, and so that was the rationale that the AP had to
30 recommend that the council select Alternative 2 as the preferred
31 in Actions 1 and 2, so that the logbook would report it after each
32 trip. Is there any questions about that motion, or certainly we
33 could have the AP chair speak to it.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** I know that they discussed, you know, it makes
36 sense to report -- If you do two trips a day, and, I mean, I've
37 even heard there's some people that do three trips a day, and so
38 it makes sense to report by trip, versus per day, or you would be
39 missing some data, and so that one -- To me, that's kind of an
40 easy one, and I think that was -- I don't remember how it voted,
41 but I think it was probably a unanimous vote on that one.

42
43 **DR. HOLLENSHAD:** Yes, Mr. Chair, and that's correct. So, if
44 there's no questions on that, we can scroll back down, because the
45 AP also discussed Action 3, and so Action 3 would be when requiring
46 a trip declaration, and so, if you recall, in the first iteration
47 of this program, there was a little consternation of -- Because
48 the regulations had any type of trip, and so there was concern

1 that, you know, I would have to hail-out anytime, you know, I took
2 my family out fishing, or if I was moving for gas or bait or that
3 sort of thing, and so a framework action was developed, right
4 before the program was set-aside, to sort of address that.

5
6 The AP was interested in taking, you know, sort of what was in
7 that alternative and moving it forward here, such that you only
8 had to declare your hail-out for your fishing trip, and so they
9 wanted this language for Alternative 2 to be modified as to what
10 you see right there, and so what's underlined there, that will be
11 engaging in any type of for-hire fishing or for-hire activity, and
12 so that's what they wanted to change for Alternative 2, so that
13 that's explicit within the document.

14
15 Then, after that modification, if that modification was to be
16 accepted by the council, the AP would then have recommended that
17 that would be the preferred alternative in that action.

18
19 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Any input on that one? There was definitely
20 some discussion on those definitions. Dr. Banks.

21
22 **DR. KESLEY BANKS:** So I guess I just have a clarification question
23 with this for-hire activity. Vessels that -- Like, in our area,
24 the headboats, as well as some of the charter vessels, run like
25 dolphin watches, after they're done like their fishing trips, and
26 so would that be a no-fishing hail-out, or would that have to fall
27 into some other kind of reporting?

28
29 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** So I might -- If Dr. Stephen is on the line, just
30 to make sure that --

31
32 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Do we have Dr. Stephen?

33
34 **DR. JESSICA STEPHEN:** Can you guys hear me?

35
36 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Yes, we have you. Go ahead.

37
38 **DR. STEPHEN:** So, when we're looking here at the type of fishing
39 trips, at this point in time with SEFHIER, we were not considering
40 an out of fishery, which is what we typically call those
41 declarations.

42
43 Now, I will state that, if a fisherman in the for-hire industry
44 also has a commercial, for commercial, they are required to do the
45 declarations for any fishing trip, and so that was originally the
46 thought of the agency, was to match that to commercial, so that we
47 could eventually streamline how the declarations are done between
48 the commercial and the for-hire.

1
2 **DR. BANKS:** Right, and so my question is actually for the for-hire
3 activity outside of the fishing trip, and so, for example, our
4 headboats will run a fishing trip in the morning, come back in,
5 and then pick up dolphin watch passengers, and so would that for-
6 hire activity, because they're getting paid for it, be a no-fishing
7 report, or would that be a separate category they have to report,
8 because it's obviously not a did-not-fish report for the day. They
9 fished that morning.

10
11 **DR. STEPHEN:** Okay. Thanks for that clarification. So, for the
12 declaration, they would have a declaration that they were doing a
13 non-fishing for-hire trip. Because of that declaration, there
14 would be no logbook that would be required for that trip. If they
15 had done a for-hire fishing trip earlier in the day, right, that
16 would have a for-hire fishing declaration, and that trip itself
17 would require a logbook.

18
19 **DR. BANKS:** Thank you.

20
21 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Great question, Dr. Banks, and great answer to
22 that question, and so that -- I think that ironed out a lot of
23 things for a lot of us, and so thank you for that. Mara.

24
25 **MS. MARA LEVY:** Was there -- So, right now, the requirement for
26 the potential requirement for the report, like the actual fishing
27 report, right, reads like it would be required for each trip, each
28 fishing trip, right, and so it's not limited, as it reads right
29 now, to for-hire fishing trips.

30
31 I guess I would just ask like, if the council is going to consider
32 the modification to the declaration, and the declaration is only
33 going to consider for-hire fishing trips, then you have -- There's
34 a disconnect between that, if the council changes it, and what the
35 reporting requirement is, which is for every fishing trip, and so
36 I don't know if the AP discussed that or not.

37
38 I didn't listen to the whole meeting, and so, moving forward, if
39 we're going to limit the declaration to for-hire fishing trips,
40 that's not the same as what the reporting requirement is in terms
41 of the logbook. That's every fishing trip, and so you go out to
42 collect bait, whatever, and, without passengers, you wouldn't be
43 doing a declaration, but you would be submitting a logbook. If
44 that's not the intent, as the council moves forward with
45 considering these changes, then we need to be clear about that,
46 and so I'll just throw it out there for now.

47
48 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Okay, and I think something to think about there,

1 but I do think they were trying to get at the for-hire getting
2 paid part in the fishing trip declaration, but, Dr. Banks.

3
4 **DR. BANKS:** I was just going to see if maybe Troy, who was the
5 council rep for that, might give us some insight on what they
6 talked about for that discussion, particularly around bait trips,
7 or Jim, either one.

8
9 **MR. TROY FRADY:** Well, thank you, Dr. Banks. You know, the biggest
10 thing that the AP was talking about is trying to minimize too much
11 reporting, not over-reporting, and then we had Dr. Stephen, from
12 NMFS, trying to make sure that we collected economic data, and so
13 we've got Mr. Green, Captain Green, here, that just came up here,
14 and he could give us a little bit more detail.

15
16 **MR. JIM GREEN:** Yes, I think the whole intent was is to -- You
17 know, before SEFHIER was taken, was removed, we were working on
18 this very topic, and the idea is that we only want to require the
19 hail-in and the trip report and the harvest report when it has to
20 do with going on a for-hire fishing trip, and not catching the
21 bait, not doing -- You know, not going to get fuel, and not going
22 to get ice, or go pull the boat out of the water, and I think the
23 big thing was is that we were trying to capture the idea of when
24 the boat was conducting commerce.

25
26 When you're going to pull a bait pen -- We're not using any federal
27 permits when we're pulling a bait pen, and so, you know, the idea
28 was to -- Anytime the boat was conducting commerce, and the boat
29 was making money, that's when we wanted to require, if that makes
30 sense.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** That does make sense, and I knew there was a
33 term that was being thrown around, and that was what it is, and
34 that kind of sums it up. Dr. Banks.

35
36 **DR. BANKS:** Okay. Well then I'm confused on the for-hire activity
37 with like some of these dolphin watch or sunset cruises, because
38 there is no federal permit required for that, and so, if we're not
39 going to ask you to account for bait, do we care if your vessel is
40 going to look at dolphins? That said, I understood, when we had
41 the VMS, because now you're telling whoever is monitoring that I'm
42 not going fishing, with the VMS, but, without the VMS, this just
43 seems like more reporting, and so I'm kind of confused in that
44 logic.

45
46 **MR. GREEN:** If I may, and not that I would think anybody would be
47 so underhanded, but someone might try to game the system in saying
48 that they're going out for a dolphin cruise, and they might be

1 going fishing, and so, if you declare, under penalty of perjury,
2 that you are on a for-hire activity trip, but you're not fishing,
3 then, if you're boarded, then you should have no fish on the boat.
4

5 That was -- Not only is it collecting the complete aspect of what
6 the economic contribution of that vessel was in all, but it also
7 would help make sure that there isn't fishing going on when you're
8 -- Just for-hire activity and not a for-hire fishing trip.
9

10 **DR. BANKS:** Then the same logic could be for your bait trips,
11 because now you have fish on the boat, and so, to me, it's just a
12 disconnect there.
13

14 **MR. GREEN:** I'm not going to die on the hill, on this hill. I
15 think the idea was just to limit the reporting burden, and I don't
16 feel -- I feel like, and it may be different for other people,
17 but, me personally, I feel like there's so few of the for-hire
18 activity trips, in my area, that it wouldn't be a big burden, but
19 it might be for you, and, like I said, I'm not trying to die on
20 that hill of this, as long as it's not going to get bait, or going
21 to get fuel or something, you know, that aspect, and I think that's
22 -- You know, I think that's acceptable, in my eyes, and also in
23 the intent of the discussion at the AP.
24

25 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** All right. Thank you, Captain Green. Captain
26 Frady.
27

28 **MR. FRADY:** Thanks, Captain Green for that. You know, one thing,
29 in today's society, is we want to simplify our lives, and not
30 complicate our lives. My thoughts were to simply collect economic
31 data when we are generating revenue for the vessel. Now, since we
32 didn't really specify whether we're going on a dolphin cruise
33 generating revenue or catching bait or something like that, we do
34 have the flexibility, right here amongst us, to go ahead and add
35 the language in there to say, if you're generating revenue fishing,
36 and not generating other revenue, which dolphin cruises could come
37 up under other revenue, but we could easily simplify this, and not
38 wrap it around the axle, by simply being flexible and not trying
39 to penalize someone for catching bait, or someone who has a second
40 trip in the afternoon, which is a dolphin cruise. We could easily
41 do that. Thank you.
42

43 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** I like it. Dr. Banks.
44

45 **DR. BANKS:** Well, I think then that -- Correct me if I'm wrong,
46 but I think that's what the alternative already said. This one
47 would add those extra activities, which is where I think we would
48 get convoluted.

1
2 **MR. GREEN:** I would just like to add, if I may, you know, I think
3 the intent was to make sure we just get for-hire activity, and, if
4 some people take pause with the idea of it being for-hire activity,
5 then I would say, me personally, take it out, and just stick to
6 the fishing, but the idea was not to get -- Not to burden the
7 fishermen with going to the fuel dock or getting ice or going to
8 check bait traps and that sort of thing. This was an addendum to
9 that discussion, and so the idea was to limit the hail-outs for
10 all the non-for-hire fishing activity. Thank you.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Mr. Frady.

13
14 **MR. FRADY:** Coming from the transportation world, the logbooks
15 that we used to have in transportation were off duty, on duty not
16 driving, and then we had on duty driving. We can mirror what the
17 DOT already has in the transportation world by simply having
18 categories where you throw yourself in that simple category of I'm
19 on duty, but I'm not fishing. Then, when you are fishing, you go
20 into a category called I'm fishing, and it could keep it so simple
21 and not complicate things. Thank you.

22
23 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Okay. Good talk. Any more comments? Andy.

24
25 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and, I mean, I appreciate the discussion and
26 the intent of the AP. You know, the challenge, obviously, here is
27 we don't have VMS to, obviously, validate trips, and so that was,
28 obviously, I think why we wanted for-hire activity to be included,
29 so that we would know, if a trip was made, but they were doing
30 something other than fishing, that we wouldn't expect a
31 corresponding logbook associated with that, right?

32
33 I also appreciate the intent of trying to simplify the reporting
34 requirements, and we were working toward this, and, obviously, it
35 was already mentioned about avoiding having to report when a boat
36 is being moved to a fuel dock, or in a non-for-hire fishing
37 activity, and so I do appreciate the intent.

38
39 I think the key really comes down to making sure everyone is clear
40 in terms of the definitions and what we're referring to here if
41 we're going to continue to include for-hire activity or not, and
42 then whether or not for-hire fishing would constitute including
43 bait fishing or not. With HMS, bait fishing is included in their
44 proposed logbook rule.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Okay. Let's move it along here. Have we covered
47 both of those? I think we did, right, Dr. Hollenstein?

48

1 **DR. HOLLENSTEIN:** Yes, Mr. Chair. It sounds like we're through
2 Actions 1, 2, and 3. If you would like, we could go into Action
3 4. That's the economic analysis, and the AP did have a
4 recommendation there for some language, and there was some
5 substantial discussion at the AP about that.
6

7 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Yes, please.
8

9 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Okay, and so, Bernie, if you wouldn't mind
10 scrolling down to the top of page 5, and so, again, the AP had
11 discussed Action 4, which Dr. Liese just sort of reviewed for you
12 the cost analysis of those alternatives in this action, and so I
13 guess, just not to get too confounded, so Dr. Liese just went
14 through sort of the mechanism for collecting the economic data,
15 right, and either don't do it, do it all the time for everyone, or
16 do some sampling when you've been selected, and so that's one
17 little thing.
18

19 The second portion is, okay, what is being asked, and, right now,
20 what's being proposed is the trip fee, the price per gallon of
21 gas, and then the amount of gallons used, okay, and so that's the
22 other sort of component, is those three questions, within that
23 mechanism, sampling or census, that kind of thing.
24

25 This is what the AP focused on, was that three questions, and
26 specifically the trip fee, and so, you know, there is -- We heard
27 it from the first initiation of SEFHIER, that, you know, that was
28 information that, you know, a lot of program participants didn't
29 really understand, or didn't want to necessarily provide.
30

31 Most of it, from the general sentiment, is, if you found yourself
32 in some sort of audit situation, the idea that you may have to
33 produce a receipt that matches something exactly that says, well,
34 lots of things can happen, and sometimes fuel is included, and
35 sometimes, you know, a tip is included, or those sorts of things,
36 and so there might be some -- They wanted to have a little bit of
37 wiggle room, such that nobody ever comes and says, hey, produce
38 this receipt for this day, for this trip, and then it has to match
39 exactly.
40

41 The AP thought of some perhaps ways to get around that, to give
42 the economists what they would need about the trip fee without
43 beholding a program participant to something like that, and so
44 that's what the motion on the board is right here, and so they
45 recommended a new alternative in that action.
46

47 They wanted to keep the stratified random design, and so this would
48 be, you know, you're selected, based on something you would have

1 to report for a while, and that those three questions -- That trip
2 fee question would be modified to instead ask for the trip market
3 value, and would be used in place of trip fee, and will include a
4 box to check if fuel is not included, to capture the total trip
5 value and not count fuel twice, because, if you recall, that's one
6 of the questions, or two questions, being asked, is what was the
7 price of fuel and how much did you use.

8
9 Some captains roll that into their trip fee, and so they wanted to
10 be able to break that out, so the economists weren't double-
11 counting, or that sort of thing, to make it as clear as possible
12 for interpretation for the economists, and so that is what they
13 had sort of proposed.

14
15 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Dr. Sweetman.

16
17 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I don't understand what trip market value means.

18
19 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** So, fortunately, we have the AP chair here, and
20 so I think he can expand upon that for you.

21
22 **MR. GREEN:** All right, and so I didn't either a few days before
23 this AP meeting, and I actually took like a three-day deep dive
24 into a rabbit hole on the internet about economist terms and how
25 economists think differently than the average human being. No
26 slight to any economists, but, basically, I was taking the -- This
27 presentation that Dr. Liese did was very pared down.

28
29 Ours was, I think, almost nineteen pages, and it went into how the
30 trip fee is determined, and it had a lot to do with supply and
31 demand, and whenever I started going into it -- I didn't understand
32 all of it, but I started seeing these reoccurring things, whenever
33 I was -- When I was studying this, and market value came into
34 effect very blatantly when it talked about supply and demand and
35 what someone is willing to pay for a trip.

36
37 So, with that, in the discussion, we and Dr. Liese talked back and
38 forth about it, because I was pressing him on this, that, you know,
39 he didn't quite understand why we can't just put trip fee. I
40 explained to him that, you know, running a business is different
41 than working for a government agency, that there's liabilities,
42 and these are things that could come up, and, by getting more buy-
43 in, by addressing this problem, is what we were trying to do.

44
45 He actually conceded that this would be a good idea. The idea of
46 the trip fee, or the market value of the trip, is that it is
47 essentially what the public would pay for the trip, and, in all
48 essence, that's what the economist is trying to do. They're trying

1 to put a value on our fishery, on the for-hire fishery.

2
3 By finding the market value, you are able to get around the idea
4 of having to write a specific number down, but it also provides
5 all the information that the economist is trying to find. Maybe
6 I didn't answer it, but --

7
8 **DR. SWEETMAN:** No, and follow-up, and so I guess I'm still a little
9 confused, and so let's say someone pays \$2,000 for a trip.

10
11 **MR. GREEN:** Okay.

12
13 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Are you saying like the market value is what they
14 would be willing to pay at a higher amount than that? I'm confused
15 still.

16
17 **MR. GREEN:** No, and it's just the supply and demand. You know, a
18 good point was this, and so, during the pandemic, the years
19 following, and everybody had the stimulus checks, and so the
20 prices, because of the ability -- We had to lower the amount of
21 people we could put on our boat, for social distancing, and we had
22 to raise our prices, and, as we did that, the people were willing
23 to pay more to be social distanced.

24
25 Now, as the stimulus money is gone, and people are using their own
26 money, they're being more discretionary with it, and prices are
27 having to come down, and so I'm using it as an example, a pretty
28 simplified example, but it's basically there's a willingness to
29 pay more, because of social distancing, and then, as we got through
30 the pandemic, the prices had to come down, because it was more
31 discretionary on the amount of money the supply that was able to
32 -- The money that was available for people to pay to go fishing,
33 because the stimulus was no longer part of the equation.

34
35 We're seeing that with fisheries. We're seeing charter boats in
36 our area have to lower prices, because there's not as much money,
37 and so the idea of the market value was to capture what the going
38 rate was and what the actual value of that trip is.

39
40 That's determined by the fishermen, by fuel costs, bait costs, ice
41 costs, insurance costs. There's a lot of things that go into what
42 we have to require, and then we've got to balance that with the
43 willingness to pay, and that comes into the supply and demand, and
44 so, whenever we were talking about this with Dr. Liese, I asked
45 him if a trip market value is what we were trying to get, and he
46 said, if I remember, essentially, yes. With that, an economist
47 actually agreeing with me, I took it as a gold star, and I went
48 forward with this motion.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Does that answer your question?
3

4 **MR. GREEN:** It's hard to explain something that I don't completely
5 understand, but I got an economist to agree with me.
6

7 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Mr. Anson, and then Dr. Banks.
8

9 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you. So, Captain Green, if you have a booking,
10 and you take that party fishing, and you agreed upon a price
11 beforehand, and, at the end of the fishing trip, the check was
12 written, or the cash was given for that agree-upon price, isn't
13 that essentially what you'll be putting into the logbook? Is that
14 value, that price, for that trip?
15

16 **MR. GREEN:** For that circumstance, I would say yes, sir. There's
17 also different things. You know, a lot of fishermen I know barter
18 and trade with other businesses, whether it's a hunting trip or an
19 air conditioner for their home, or I just donated ten passes to
20 the fishing museum for their silent auction.
21

22 There's a lot of generosity and bartering that goes on in our
23 industry, because it's a service, and, you know, if you give away
24 two ten-hour trips, or three three ten-hour fishing trips, for a
25 new air conditioner in your home, and I have to put zero, because
26 I didn't collect anything, that doesn't negate the value, the
27 market value of that trip.
28

29 The market value of that trip is ten-times whatever the hourly
30 rate is for that boat, and so we're conceptually not capturing
31 exactly what the value of the fishery is by a technicality, and
32 this kind of threads that needle.
33

34 It keeps the people that are worried about audits, and worried
35 about liabilities, as business owners, and giving up their
36 proprietary information of what they charge to somebody, but it
37 also allows the economists to get their job done and capture the
38 value of the fishery, which is what I thought the AP really evolved
39 in this long discussion, and it was really good, because I think
40 a lot of people started to understand why it was important to
41 collect this information.
42

43 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Sure, and follow up.
44

45 **MR. ANSON:** Thank you, and so, in that example you provided about
46 providing services, bartering, and it was an air conditioner. An
47 air conditioner costs \$10,000, and you agreed upon three trips,
48 and, in that, each of those trips then, you would put down \$3,300,

1 or zero, and what are you -- What should a captain be putting down?

2
3 **MR. GREEN:** They essentially want to see what the value is. I
4 would want the \$3,300. I would want it to show that, even though
5 this trip went, and we went out fishing, and I collected zero
6 dollars, because of a barter, that doesn't negate the fact that,
7 if I didn't have to buy an air conditioner, and I sold a ten-hour
8 trip, that trip is still worth \$3,300, for example purposes.

9
10 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Dr. Banks.

11
12 **DR. BANKS:** So, just my personal opinion, and you've got Andy's
13 hand up, I would think that you could just put the cost of the
14 trip, and, if people are worried about the bargaining that they've
15 done, then add another box, like they're saying, saying this trip
16 was bargained for, and this is the approximate cost, and so it's
17 still just a cost, but I am going to throw over to my counterpart
18 in Louisiana, Chris. I do agree that this fuel is included or not
19 included, because, in my area, fuel is typically included, but
20 it's my understanding is it's not in Louisiana.

21
22 **DR. CHRIS SCHIEBLE:** Yes, and so, in certain geographic locations
23 in Louisiana, that's the case, but not necessarily every single
24 charter trip in Louisiana, but it's imperative that that would be
25 included for that particular reason, and so, yes, and I -- Our two
26 representatives on this committee voted in favor of this.

27
28 **DR. BANKS:** Yes, and so I think that's something that this council
29 should strongly consider, because I was actually not aware that
30 that happened in our area.

31
32 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Andy, please.

33
34 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and so my supervisory economist has had his
35 hand raised, and so I want to call on David Records.

36
37 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** All right.

38
39 **DR. DAVID RECORDS:** Hello, council. This is David Records. I'm
40 the Social Science Branch Chief at SERO. The IPT discussed this
41 in great detail, and we have a number of concerns about using the
42 term "market value". Essentially, what we're interested in is the
43 price that was paid for the trip. Now, Christopher made that very
44 clear. That's the most important variable that we economists are
45 interested in.

46
47 Now, I understand the concern about, you know, the risk of having
48 incorrect information in a logbook that's been picked up during a

1 tax audit and that, you know, it could cause problems for
2 fishermen.

3
4 However, to the extent that we obscure the data, such that it can't
5 be used for audit purposes, it also obscures the data for our
6 purposes, and so it limits what we're able to do with the data,
7 and it reduces the accuracy of that data, and so we need to know
8 what the total revenue from that particular trip was and not the
9 fair market value, or an average price across trips throughout the
10 whole market, or anything like that.

11
12 We want to know specifically what was collected for that trip, and
13 now that revenue information is crucial for estimating the benefits
14 of the fishery. It's also crucial if we're going to be looking at
15 disaster recovery assistance requests. We need the total revenue
16 that was earned by that fishery, and we need to be able to compare
17 that to the past five years of revenue.

18
19 If we try to roll in let's say cost data with the revenue data,
20 it's not clear to us what that field means, and it's going to be
21 less useful to us, and so, to the extent that we can get the most
22 accurate information that was actually what was paid for the trip,
23 that's what we want.

24
25 We don't care what it's called, necessarily, but the definition of
26 that field needs to be consistent with price or revenue, and so
27 that's how we feel about it, and I don't know if there's another
28 way that the council could consider putting in some disclaimer in
29 there that, you know, this is the approximate value, or something
30 like that, that would help in the event of an audit, and that would
31 be up to -- You know, you would have to talk to legal counsel about
32 that, and see if that would cover you in some aspect, but that's
33 how we feel.

34
35 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Okay. Thank you. I know we have Dr. Diagne on
36 the line. Did you want to add to that, Assane?

37
38 **DR. ASSANE DIAGNE:** Okay. I'm unmuted now. Thank you. Thank
39 you, Captain Walker. Essentially, Dave Records really, you know,
40 said what it is that all of us economists would have said on this.
41 Perhaps just a small addition would be because some folks add fuel,
42 some don't, and some add ancillaries, et cetera, and maybe, just
43 on the form, then say something like estimated trip fee, because,
44 at the end of the day, it seems to me that, you know, the charter
45 captains are looking for some wiggle room, quote, unquote, and so,
46 to the extent that we can call it an estimated trip fee, with the
47 clear understanding that what we are interested in is the price of
48 the trip, then they will get the wiggle room that I guess they are

1 looking for, but as Dave Records said, I mean, we could really,
2 really stay away from this term "market value" because it means
3 different things to different people. Thank you.

4
5 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Thank you, sir. Dr. Overton, I have your net.

6
7 **DR. ANTHONY OVERTON:** I'm not on the committee. Along with what
8 Dr. Diagne said, I wondered, and would it be prudent to put cost
9 versus revenue, because if the cost was \$4,000, and you donated a
10 trip, it's zero, and so we know that was a donated trip, or you
11 paid half cost, or half price, but it seems like economists are
12 interested in the cost, and not the total revenue driven, and so
13 that may be a very easy way to simplify this reporting and make it
14 clear that, you know, there was some bargaining involved.

15
16 **MR. GREEN:** I think also that, if it's clearly stated, through an
17 estimated cost or something like that, as long as -- Because, if
18 it was the estimated cost of the trip, you know, and it's in
19 barter, and it's -- In Mr. Anson's example, you could put \$3,300
20 there, but as long as it's not going to come back on the business
21 owner feeling there's a liability of me signing my name, and
22 penalty of perjury that the trip fee was \$3,300, and someone says,
23 well, where's the \$3,300, and it's like it's in my house, in that
24 closet over there.

25
26 As long as there's a way of producing that, and putting that at
27 ease, you can call it whatever you want. You know, I think that
28 the idea is to just -- It's not so much wiggle room, and it's make
29 sure that this data is not being used for what a majority of our
30 industry feels trip fee means, and so, you know, I think that's
31 the big thing.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Dr. Frazer.

34
35 **DR. FRAZER:** I guess my question is for the SERO economist, and so
36 what I heard you say was that the most important piece of
37 information is the revenue generated during a trip, and so is that
38 essentially the net profit? I mean, to everybody else's points
39 around the table, I mean, at some point we have to identify where
40 the costs were, right, and how much money, or value, was generated.
41 Those are the two most important pieces of information, but I just
42 want to make sure that I heard you correctly.

43
44 **DR. RECORDS:** Yes, and if I may weigh-in, and so profit is the
45 calculation of revenue minus cost, as you know, very simple, but,
46 if we're given a profit value, then we don't necessarily have the
47 revenue value, unless we know one of those other variables, and
48 so, if we know cost, then we could use the profit to figure out

1 the revenue, and vice versa.

2

3 We do need the actual revenue data as well for disaster recovery
4 determinations, and so that's important there. It's also important
5 for other types of analyses that we do, and so we wouldn't want
6 just profit. It would be better to get those separate variables,
7 and then do the calculations the way we need them for our purposes,
8 than to have it kind of rolled in, and, if it wasn't consistently
9 done, such that some people reported profit, some people reported
10 just the trip fee, and some people just reported cost, you know,
11 it gets very confusing.

12

13 The best thing for us is to have those broken out and reported to
14 us as simply as possible, such that we can do the calculations
15 that we need, and then just the last thing I wanted to bring up
16 is, in terms of the bartering trips, I think, if there is a quid
17 pro quo going on, we do want the estimated value of that trip, but
18 it would be based on specifically what the traded service or good
19 was.

20

21 If it was an air conditioner that cost \$10,000, I agree with
22 whoever brought up the point that it would be -- You know, and it
23 was across three trips, it would be \$3,300, and it would be the
24 actual revenue for that trip, but, if it was a trip that was say
25 donated to a charity, or something like that, we would want zero
26 dollars there, because there was no revenue received. I hope that
27 answered your question.

28

29 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Thank you. Dr. Frazer.

30

31 **DR. FRAZER:** Yes, and I think so. Again, I'm just trying to bring
32 the discussion back to, you know, what's of importance to the
33 council, and, ultimately, the reason I think that we have pushed
34 on the, you know, the acquisition of this economic data is because,
35 when we're trying to make an allocation decision, right, on --
36 Whether it's the recreational sector, the for-hire sector, or the
37 commercial sector, a lot of it comes down to what's the value,
38 right, of those specific fisheries.

39

40 Again, I just wanted to know what's the most critical information
41 that an economist needs to collect, right, and so it's, and this
42 is what I'm understanding now, the net value of the trip, or the
43 profit of that trip, you know, the costs, because you need those
44 costs in order to say, hey, you know what, we bought gas, and
45 here's the multiplier effect, right, and I'm just -- I want us to
46 get to the most simplest data collection possible.

47

48 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Thank you, Dr. Frazer, and I agree. The more we

1 talk about this, the more complicated it gets, and the more things
2 we're starting to say maybe what about this, and what if I got an
3 air conditioner, and should I get some gas, or on this or that,
4 and so I'm leaning -- In the interest of keeping this thing moving,
5 and not bogging it down anymore, I personally am leaning towards
6 just putting down what the guy pays you for the day, and keeping
7 a box if that includes fuel or not, and keeping it simple, because
8 we could spend two more meetings ironing out these kind of, you
9 know, personal issues, if you will, or defining what profit is or
10 whatever, and I don't think we need to do that. I think we need
11 to keep moving on this, but that's my opinion. Mara.

12
13 **MS. LEVY:** Thank you. Just a couple of points. Whatever we call
14 it and ask people for, we need to be clear about what it means.
15 This discussion is indicating that there is not clarity about what
16 we mean, and so we can't just say it, throw it in a rule, and then
17 expect people to give us what we're asking for, and so we're going
18 to have to develop exactly what we're asking for, regardless of
19 what we name it.

20
21 I guess, just to Tom's point, I feel like that was maybe a little
22 bit of a simplification about what the council's interest is in
23 this economic data, because there are so many other things that
24 need to be considered, in terms of Magnuson Act requirements, in
25 terms of economics, in terms of rulemaking, and so I get where
26 you're coming from, but it's much broader than an allocation,
27 right? There are a lot of things, even within the council's
28 business, that require economic information and consideration of
29 economics. Thanks.

30
31 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Okay. Anyone else? Captain Green.

32
33 **MR. GREEN:** I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you all today,
34 and I want to say the simplicity is probably the best road on this,
35 and, whatever we call it, I think it really just needs to be clear,
36 and it needs to be known that -- The people turning in this data,
37 that it will be protected from their concerns, to get the buy-in
38 on this program.

39
40 What I found is, and, you know, I'm picking on economists today,
41 but, you know, it doesn't matter what it is. If you collect data,
42 you want as much and as specific as possible. This per-trip thing
43 is about whether it's targeted to a certain species. That's why
44 economists want it on per trip, you know, instead of just an
45 overall annualization of what the business made.

46
47 You know, I don't even -- I don't even fathom to figure out how
48 they can do this for the private recreational fishery. It has to

1 be some really big, gross numbers that they throw in the pot, but
2 I want to be clear too that, when we had this discussion with Dr.
3 Liese, I asked him how this data is validated, because we're all
4 hung up on data and validation, and he said it isn't, and so, you
5 know, what are we really arguing here?

6
7 We're just trying to find an estimate, and maybe Dr. Diagne is on
8 the right track with the estimated trip cost. Call it whatever it
9 is, but I think we're working with data that is not validated, and
10 we're putting a lot of time into it, and so please keep that in
11 mind when you all deliberate this, and thank you for the
12 opportunity.

13
14 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** All right. Dr. Diagne, a comment to that?

15
16 **DR. DIAGNE:** Yes, and thank you, Captain Walker. I think the IPT
17 and, I mean, the economy subgroup, really did try to ask the
18 minimum number of questions and to get really at the heart of the
19 matter here.

20
21 Dave Records did mention that, you know, at the end of the day,
22 what is needed is the net revenue, and net revenue, of course, has
23 two sides, the revenue side and the cost side. That is why, on
24 the economic side here, we only have three questions of how much
25 did the customers pay, and that would take care of the revenue
26 side, and what is the price of fuel and the number of gallons, and
27 the fuel cost, of course, would be the most important cost for a
28 trip.

29
30 There are some other ancillary costs, as you all know, but, for
31 simplicity's sake, the questionnaire is limited to these three
32 questions, and, as Ms. Levy said, we use these data in a variety
33 of settings.

34
35 Just, for example, case in point, there is a change in the season
36 for the charter-for-hire. How do you evaluate the various
37 alternatives, based on the change in the number of trips, and how
38 do you do that for certain species, and so on and so forth, and so
39 the trip fees, or the average -- The net revenue, if you would,
40 per trip, would help us address some of that, and there are
41 numerous examples in which, in the amendments that you see, we
42 would need to use this information to provide a complete -- I mean,
43 as complete as we can analysis in Chapter 4, the environmental
44 consequences.

45
46 For the time being, as Dr. Liese mentioned during his presentation
47 to the AP and to others, we use really ad hoc estimates that were
48 generated, some of them, a very, very long time ago, and so what

1 is important to us, let's say, economists, who write these
2 documents, would be to have the price of the trip, the number of
3 gallons of fuels, and the price per gallon.

4
5 The rest of it, you know, the Science Center, namely Christopher
6 and other economists, will use it and provide the information that
7 we need, and so we know clearly what it is that we are looking
8 for, and we are asking the minimum number of questions to get
9 there. Thank you.

10
11 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Thank you. I like the clarification, the three
12 items, very specific and clear. So, in the interest of keeping
13 things moving here, maybe we go to the document and see if the
14 committee can pick some alternatives here to present to the
15 council. Dr. Hollensead.

16
17 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Bernie, if you wouldn't mind pulling up the
18 document, please, and so, for the interest of time, you know, the
19 purpose and need hasn't really changed since the last time we saw
20 it, and so it would probably just be okay to go right into Chapter
21 2 and go straight to Action 1, Bernie.

22
23 So, as you recall, this action would establish the frequency and
24 mechanism of data reporting for for-hire vessels, and so this
25 action would pertain to those that do not participate in the
26 Southeast Region Headboat Survey. You have Alternative 1 that
27 would keep the status quo, and so they report to the programs
28 they're already reporting to.

29
30 Alternative 2 would establish electronic reporting, such that the
31 logbook has to be reported after each trip. We've also put in
32 here that a did-not-fish report would be required, and so that
33 would be on a weekly period. I think in the previous provisions,
34 you had seen it at the monthly, but we put it at weekly here, the
35 idea being that that is standard with like what the South Atlantic
36 is doing.

37
38 If you had somebody who was for-hire dual-permitted in the Gulf
39 and the South Atlantic, that would be the same timeframe, and so
40 to try to bring that in line, since they already have established
41 did-not-fish reports in their program, and we do not, and this
42 would establish it, and it would put it on the same timeline.

43
44 Then that third alternative would be for each trip daily. I've
45 already spoken to the AP's, you know, recommendations on that. In
46 this case, they had recommended that Alternative 2 was the
47 preferred, with the reporting of a logbook after each trip.

48

1 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Okay, and I thought 3 was the one that was a
2 logbook after each trip, but I --
3
4 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** So Alternative 3 would be all of your trips at
5 the end of the day, and so, if you took two trips within that day,
6 you would have to aggregate all that together at the end of the
7 day, whereas, Alternative 2, you know, you get back around
8 lunchtime, noon, and you can go ahead and do your report, and go
9 out for the afternoon, and you knock out your afternoon report,
10 and so you would have to do it twice, but the idea being that it
11 would actually go a little quicker with --
12
13 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Right. Right. Okay. I've got you, and so I
14 think consensus around the committee here, and the AP, was for
15 Alternative 2 to be the preferred, and so, if somebody on the
16 committee on the wanted to make a motion to that effect, that would
17 be interesting, and a step forward. I guess I'll make it, if
18 nobody wants to.
19
20 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I can make a committee motion here for Action 1 and
21 2, or do they need to be separate? Can I just say Action 1 and 2,
22 to make Alternative 2 the preferred? Can I do 1 and 2 at the same
23 time, or do you need separate motions?
24
25 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** No.
26
27 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Okay. There you go. Thank you, Bernie.
28
29 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Motion on the board for Alternative 2 as
30 preferred, and seconded by Mr. Sanchez. I'll wait until it's on
31 the board all the way. Discussion? Dr. Banks.
32
33 **DR. BANKS:** Just a clarification for me. This is just for fishing
34 trips, and this is not including for-hire activity.
35
36 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Yes, and I believe that's what it says, right?
37
38 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Yes, Dr. Banks, and so I think what would happen
39 here, since we're putting the cart before the horse, because we
40 haven't gotten to Action 3 yet, is, if you do decide to take that
41 modified language as suggested, and so it's like for-hire fishing,
42 and we could put that into Alternative 3 at that point, and that's
43 just what it would be, and that would also not include the for-
44 hire charter activities, if that's something you're interested in
45 doing. That's still in the purview, and that's still on the board.
46
47 I would make sure then, if you wanted to make that change in
48 Alternative 3, or, excuse me, in Action 3, and make it the

1 preferred, that the IPT -- I would come back and report, and we
2 have to then make sure that Actions 1 and 2 align with that language
3 change, as Ms. Levy was saying, such that we either explicitly put
4 it in the action itself, or in the discussion, such that those are
5 better aligned. Does that make sense?
6

7 **DR. BANKS:** Okay, and so we don't -- Whatever we do in Action 3,
8 you will then just mirror in 1 and 2.
9

10 **DR. HOLLENSHAD:** Correct, but I guess just as -- Or procedural,
11 and, since you hadn't decided on that modification yet, I didn't
12 want to do that, but, once you do that, I'll have explicit
13 direction then to make sure that's all in line.
14

15 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Is that going to -- If it has to go back to the
16 IPT, is that going to hold things -- Is that going to slow things
17 down? No? Not necessarily?
18

19 **DR. HOLLENSHAD:** Gosh, I hope not. It shouldn't. I think what
20 we're -- What the IPT would get at is we had been working with
21 Action 3, the language that was in there, with the modification
22 that was suggested by the AP, which is something certainly you can
23 put in there, and we would just go through and make sure that, as
24 it's written, it's all in line together. I don't think that that
25 should cause any major headaches.
26

27 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Okay. Good. Captain Frady.
28

29 **MR. FRADY:** I wanted to have a little bit of discussion with this
30 here. I mean, I don't disagree with having a did-not-fish report,
31 but the requirement of doing it weekly could be a bit cumbersome
32 to the fleet. My vision of doing a did-not-fish report goes in
33 line with my previous career in transportation, to where the did-
34 not-fish report comes before you can go fishing.
35

36 If you require everybody to start doing a did-not-fish report every
37 week, from say -- We finish up up here maybe at the end of October,
38 and we don't start again until March, and we've got to do that
39 weekly report, and that puts a burden on the fishermen.
40

41 Would it be possible to possibly change this from being a weekly
42 period to doing a did-not-fish report prior to you starting back
43 up for the year, because a lot of us are shut down for six months,
44 but, in the transportation world, before we got to go operating in
45 commerce, what we did was we're required to do a previous seven-
46 day logbook, or a previous -- Say we've been off this length of
47 time, and, by doing a weekly report, it's too much, but, if we
48 wanted to go fishing, and we knew March 1 we're going to start

1 fishing, we could do a fish report before we started fishing on
2 March 1, saying we've been off since October 31.

3
4 My thing is that -- My thoughts are to simplify this process, and
5 not put a burden on all the fishermen, and so, you know, what if
6 they forget their weekly fish report? I mean, I have to set up
7 another thing, and you have to go in there and say I'm not fishing,
8 and I'm not fishing again, but would it not suffice to say, before
9 you start fishing, to have that report required? Then it sets
10 your date. It's just another way of looking at it without
11 complicating it for the fishermen.

12
13 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Andy.

14
15 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and so what's I think missing here is the
16 weekly fishing reports would be required, but there would be a
17 monthly window in which you could submit those did-not-fish
18 reports, right, and so you could do it thirty days in advance, and
19 so, essentially, what you're talking about, and maybe it's not as
20 long of a period as you would like, but you could submit four
21 reports, for the next four weeks, to say you're not going to be
22 fishing during that time.

23
24 **MR. FRADY:** Well, that would be fine, Andy, but the thing is
25 Christmas time comes down, and I may have some kids come into town,
26 and, all of a sudden, they want to go for a boat ride, or go do
27 something, and then, all of a sudden, I've got this report. What
28 I'm saying is real simple.

29
30 Most of us here in the northern gulf are shut down for a long
31 period of time. Before you start fishing, do your report and
32 backdate it, and say this is the day that I'm going to start
33 fishing, and let's backdate, and this will give you the time off.

34
35 Just the consistency of even once a month having to do a did-not-
36 fish report, because, most of these old boys, they're in the
37 hunting woods, and they may forget. Then the next thing we know,
38 we don't want to hear somebody saying you're going to be penalized
39 for failing to report, or having someone call you and going, oh,
40 I forgot, or I'm not in front of a computer. I'm just trying to
41 simplify this, so we don't -- That there's not a penalty later,
42 but where people don't have to remember to do it. I've got to
43 fish March 1, and let's just say, well, I've been off that previous
44 time. Thank you, sir.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Ms. Levy, or Andy.

47
48 **MS. LEVY:** Well, so there is a discussion in the document, on page

1 14, about the did-not-fish report, and part of the reason that
2 it's written the way it is, and that it's for a month, is because
3 that's consistent with the headboat survey, and it's consistent
4 with the current South Atlantic requirements for did-not-fish
5 reports, and so we're trying to have some consistency. It's also
6 consistent with commercial vessels and did-not-fish reports.

7
8 So all of this did-not-fish up to a month in advance makes
9 everything consistent, in terms of the did-not-fish report, and
10 so, if you think about doing what you've suggested, you're now
11 throwing in an inconsistency with respect to those vessels that
12 might then be dually-permitted, and so now they're like doing all
13 different types of did-not-fish reports, and so just something to
14 consider.

15
16 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Andy, did that cover yours?

17
18 **MR. STRELCHECK:** I'm also being told that, based on how our system
19 is set up, that a logbook would override a did-not-fish report,
20 and so let's say you put a did-not-fish report in, but then you
21 ultimately get a fishing trip. Well, that would override it, at
22 some point in time.

23
24 The big problem we're having, and less so in the Gulf, and more in
25 the South Atlantic, right, is with a fishing activity, right, if
26 they're not reporting, and then, all of a sudden, their permit
27 comes up for renewal, guess what happens? Everyone puts in a did-
28 not-fish report, right, and so that's the idea here, is to try to
29 have some accountability, with a reasonable period of time set up
30 for people to put things -- You know, put those reports in advance,
31 so we would expect no fishing activity, but, in the event that a
32 trip pops up, that overrides, obviously, that did-not-fish report.

33
34 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Right, and, Troy, I can tell you that what maybe
35 you don't get on this is you actually you have like a thirty-day.
36 It's weekly reporting, but you can do it at the end of the month,
37 if I'm not mistaken, and it's the same. I'm not a fan of did-not-
38 fish. I don't like being -- Potentially getting a violation for
39 not doing anything, but I do recognize, having South Atlantic
40 permits, and commercial permits, that's the way it's done pretty
41 much all across, and so I've kind of reluctantly come around, as
42 we're probably going to have to do this if we want this program.
43 Troy.

44
45 **MR. FRADY:** Okay, and are you sent a reminder saying you have to
46 do a did-not-fish report? All I'm doing is being defensive of
47 those people who their minds go into the turkey woods, or the
48 hunting woods, and they're going to forget about it, and so are

1 there reminders or is there something, and what do you all do to
2 remind yourself?

3
4 I mean, because I don't want to set up this thing where, all of a
5 sudden, we've got people getting -- I mean, rightfully so, if
6 they're ignoring it, but some people just overlook things. How -
7 - Is there a reminder, and how do you remind yourself? Is it your
8 own responsibility, which I would say yes, and I don't mind doing
9 that.

10
11 I'm diligent enough to where I can put a reminder in my phone, and
12 do my own reporting, but I'm just thinking about those people who
13 do not pay attention to deadlines or, I mean, their calendars, and
14 so I'm just asking it for clarification. Is there a penalty, and
15 how do you remind yourself?

16
17 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** From my personal perspective, I would tell you
18 that, at least thus far -- There's definitely no reminders, but
19 they've been pretty lenient. Like Andy was saying, when your
20 permit is up for renewal, and you realize that you're two months
21 behind on your did-not-fish reports, they accept them, and they
22 don't rap you with a violation, at least thus far has my
23 experience. Captain Green, did you have some comments to this,
24 and then Kevin.

25
26 **MR. GREEN:** Yes, and so we've been doing -- As a headboat operator,
27 we've been doing did-not-fish reports since the headboat went
28 electronic logbook. I respect you, Captain Frady, but I'm going
29 to disagree with you on it. It literally takes less than an
30 Instagram reel in time to put in a month. It's really -- The only
31 reason why I wanted to speak to it is this was the tradeoff for
32 not having VMS.

33
34 This is the validation tool for effort that the agency agreed that,
35 if we don't want to do VMS, this is what we need to do, and I don't
36 think that it's too much of a burden. Most smartphones have
37 reminders. I'll help you set up yours. It really does not take
38 that long, and it's really important for the validation of this
39 program, for the effort part. Thank you.

40
41 **MR. FRADY:** Mr. Green, it's okay to disagree with me, okay, and
42 I'm just doing this for validation, to make sure we cover all of
43 our bases before we get to this. Unlike yourself, we have not
44 ever seen a did-not-fish report. We don't do electronic logbooks
45 in the charter-for-hire world, and so this is the first time I'm
46 ever hearing it. I've never been on a headboat, except when I was
47 sixteen years old, and so I don't know what you do. I know what
48 you're doing, but I've never seen you do it.

1
2 **MR. GREEN:** Gotcha.
3
4 **MR. FRADY:** Thank you.
5
6 **MR. GREEN:** Just so you know, on the VESL app, you go inactivity
7 reports, and it pulls up each week. It numbers the week. You check
8 box, check box, check box, submit report, and it's that quick.
9
10 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** All right. We have a motion on the board. Let's
11 get back to it, if there's no more discussion. Kevin. Sorry.
12
13 **MR. ANSON:** I do have another question, or comment, related to the
14 did-not-fish report. I don't know necessarily if it will relate
15 to the motion, although it might, after my comment, and so --
16
17 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** You're welcome to --
18
19 **MR. ANSON:** Well, just, in the document, Mara referred to page 14
20 for description of the did-not-fish reports, and I think there
21 needs to be some rewording, in the second paragraph of that
22 section, to help explain that it is a weekly report that can be
23 submitted for up to a thirty-day period, and that should be a
24 thirty-day advance, and so, right now, it reads that one report
25 could be submitted, in my mind, to account for that thirty-day --
26 Up to a thirty-day period, and it will be actually four reports,
27 essentially, or maybe five, depending upon the calendar and such,
28 and how they interpret the thirty days, and so, anyways, that's
29 just my comment.
30
31 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Yes, and I agree. It's not -- Maybe it's
32 understood, but's not specifically written there, but it does
33 follow -- Probably in my mind, it follows the current did-not-fish
34 reports, and so maybe we're okay going forward with this one as
35 written. Okay, and so the motion is on the board. I think we've
36 all read it enough. **Is there any opposition to the motion on the**
37 **board to make Alternative 2 our preferred? Seeing no opposition,**
38 **motion carries.** We'll move on to the next action.
39
40 **DR. HOLLENSHAD:** Okay. Thank you, Bernie, and so this is Action
41 3, and so this deals with the trip notifications for reporting,
42 and so this is the trip declarations.
43
44 If you recall from our discussion of the AP summary, Alternative
45 2, the AP had recommended, in that last line of the alternative,
46 they would put any type of for-hire fishing, or for-hire activity,
47 and so they had selected, after that modification, that that would
48 be their preferred.

1
2 If you look down at Alternative 3, similarly, you know, the
3 committee could recommend putting any type of for-hire fishing
4 activity, and so modifying that alternative slightly, and then it
5 would just be for for-hire fishing and would remove anything to do
6 with for-hire activity, or dolphin cruises, your sunset cruises,
7 those sorts of things.

8
9 You know, that suggestion by the AP to sort of try to alleviate
10 some of the burden for the trip declarations for moving your vessel
11 on any fishing trip that you may be taking with your family or
12 something, and leaving it just for-hire activity, that wording
13 would explicitly lead to that. That's what they had recommended
14 for Alternative 2.

15
16 They also wanted to keep in the for-hire activity, but, similarly,
17 you could take their suggestion for putting in the for-hire
18 activity into Alternative 3, to modify that, and then, depending
19 on the desire of the committee, if you would like a declaration
20 made anytime there was for-hire activity of any kind, your dolphin
21 cruises, but also for-hire fishing, that would be encompassed in
22 Alternative 2 for the charter vessels and the headboats.

23
24 Alternatively, if you're only interested in just the for-hire
25 fishing, and so that's when you're out, and fish will be on the
26 boat, and your dolphin cruises and things would not be included,
27 then that would be Alternative 3, and so there's kind of two things
28 happening here.

29
30 You could recommend to include that modification of the language
31 of the for-hire, for the word "fishing" on the last lines of
32 Alternatives 2 and 3, and then, of course, potentially select, if
33 amenable, either one of those that you may want to see move
34 forward.

35
36 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Dr. Banks.

37
38 **DR. BANKS:** I'll happy to make the motion to include "for-hire
39 fishing" in Alternative 2 and 3.

40
41 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** All right. Is there a second to that motion?
42 Second by Dr. Sweetman. We'll get it on the board. I'm kind of
43 jumping back and forth between the two here. Action 3 -- Yes, and
44 I like that term. Okay. Right. For-hire fishing. I'm trying to
45 comprehend, and so don't they say two different things?

46
47 **DR. SWEETMAN:** It's literally just adding the word "for-hire" into
48 "fishing".

1
2 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** But the first one still has for-hire activity.
3
4 **DR. SWEETMAN:** But not for-hire fishing.
5
6 **DR. BANKS:** So Alternative 2 is for-hire fishing and any for-hire
7 activity, and so that would include dolphin watches, sunset
8 cruises, and not your bait trips, if I understand that correctly.
9 Alternative 3, by adding "for-hire" in front of it, also eliminates
10 the bait trips. It's just the chartered trips, and it does not
11 include dolphin, sunset, booze cruise, whatever.
12
13 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Okay. Discussion on the motion on the board?
14 **Seeing none, is there any opposition to the motion on the board?**
15 **Okay. Seeing none, the motion carries.** Is that the last one? A
16 question?
17
18 **DR. HOLLENSHAD:** Well, I just wanted to make a note that, given
19 that this language has now been modified, that the IPT would then
20 go back and make sure that Actions 1 and 2 are aligned with this
21 language.
22
23 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** I'm sorry, and I thought we were selecting those
24 as preferred. Dr. Banks.
25
26 **DR. BANKS:** I'll make the motion for preferred, to make Alternative
27 **3 the preferred.**
28
29 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** We have a motion to I make Alternative 3 the
30 preferred, and seconded by Dr. Sweetman. Discussion on that
31 motion?
32
33 **DR. BANKS:** **Modified Alternative 3.**
34
35 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Modified Alternative 3, yes.
36
37 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Mr. Anson.
38
39 **MR. ANSON:** Yes, and so I don't really have a heartburn for either
40 of the two. I'm just wondering, to the extent that the additional
41 revenue gained by charter boat and headboat operators from those
42 non-for-hire activities, whether or not that actually helps those
43 businesses stay in business, and to know that if -- You know, if
44 it's important for the council to know what the relative value of
45 that is, just in terms of, again, having a successful business, in
46 that, if they did not have those, they may not be able to be in
47 business for for-hire fishing.
48

1 I'm just -- Again, I can go either way. I just wonder about the
2 utility, and the value, of having the additional information, and
3 does it help us make better decisions.
4

5 **DR. BANKS:** So I would argue then you would ask the same person
6 that has a federally-permitted boat that's not fishing, and so, in
7 our area, they move to duck hunting, and are you now going to ask
8 them when are they going to start -- You're no longer fishing in
9 the fall, and now you're duck hunting, and so you wouldn't be
10 fishing? To me, it's just an extra thing their business does,
11 and, in our area, those are under the same business model.
12

13 They just offer multiple trip types, and so, for me, they don't
14 need a federal permit. It's not a fisheries-related thing, unless
15 we're going to start counting how many people are watching
16 dolphins, and so, for me, that's not something that SEFHIER should
17 be looking at. Now, if we would like to do a study and see do you
18 have a secondary, I'm all for it. I just don't think it needs to
19 be in the daily reporting.
20

21 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Right, and I agree. I'm sorry, but I'll throw
22 it out there. You know, you're being measured here on what you're
23 permitted for from the government, and what you do outside of that
24 permit I don't believe applies to your federal permit. Kevin,
25 please.
26

27 **MR. ANSON:** Again, I was just throwing my comment out, and just my
28 only argument would be, based on your response, would just be that
29 it is the vessel that's permitted, and so it's an activity that's,
30 you know, garnered, or you're able to access because of the vessel,
31 and that's all. Again, I don't -- I'm just throwing it out there
32 for discussion.
33

34 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Sure. Thank you. Ms. Levy.
35

36 **MS. LEVY:** So, I mean, I don't know how this impacts certain
37 things. There's just certain questions that come to mind that
38 I'll just throw out there, and so, if you're not capturing
39 declarations every time there's a for-hire activity, then
40 potential enforcement implications --
41

42 You know, if a vessel is out with passengers, and there's no
43 declaration, it requires some sort of boarding to determine whether
44 they're actually fishing or not, versus just a call back to see if
45 there was a declaration for something else, and I don't know how
46 it would also potentially impact the validation, right, and so you
47 have a vessel out there with passengers, and it's a piece of
48 information that seems to potentially help a number of different

1 components, and so I guess I would just consider whether there are
2 other reasons for requiring the for-hire trips, and I thought we
3 had it in there because there were other reasons, and so I guess
4 I would just say the implications maybe should be considered and
5 weighed. Thanks.

6
7 **DR. BANKS:** I've just been told that I need to put on the record
8 to include Options a and b in this motion, and so I'm looking at
9 you, Dr. Sweetman, as my second. It would make it for both charter
10 and headboat.

11
12 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Noted. I would also throw out there, to me, you
13 declare, you declare. That's what you're doing. You're not
14 presumed guilty until some guy comes on your boat and proves you're
15 not fishing, and so I think a declaration is sufficient, as far as
16 the enforcement discussion, and so I personally speak in favor of
17 the motion. Dr. Banks.

18
19 **DR. BANKS:** Well, to that logic too, we have a federally-permitted
20 boat, and I can take it state water fishing with my family, and
21 not on a for-hire trip, and so, if we're going by that logic, we
22 would need to go back to the original definition, which I don't
23 agree with, because, again, that's not getting to the point of
24 SEFHIER. I'm going to have to report to the state my personal
25 catch, in state waters or federal waters, since I'm not using it
26 for-hire. It's not coming out of the for-hire quota, and so am I
27 thinking about that wrong, Kevin, as you look at me puzzled?

28
29 **MR. ANSON:** Well, I guess, if you have a state vessel, that's where
30 I just -- I lost you in the beginning. I'm sorry.

31
32 **DR. BANKS:** I have a federally-permitted vessel. I'm going to go
33 with my family fishing on that vessel, but it's just a family trip.
34 It's not a for-hire trip, and so my declaration then would be not
35 a for-hire trip, but that quota, the snapper that comes out of
36 that, or trigger or whatever, is not coming out of the for-hire
37 quota at that point, right?

38
39 It should be coming out of my state quota, and so, in my mind,
40 SEFHIER is looking at the charter quota, because I would be
41 reporting elsewhere, and so, to me, I think this is okay leaving
42 it that way, because, like Ed said, now it's the game warden, or
43 OLE officer, has to determine I'm not guilty when they get on the
44 boat.

45
46 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** I'm not sure how that all works, but that's a
47 different discussion. Let's go ahead and go with the motion,
48 unless there's more pressing discussion. Seeing none, let's take

1 a vote. **Is there any opposition to the motion on the board?**
2 **Seeing none, the motion carries.** I believe that's it for Data
3 Collection, and is it not? No?
4

5 **DR. HOLLENSHAD:** Yes, Mr. Chair, and nice try, but you've got one
6 more, and so this is Action 4, and this last action has to deal
7 with the reporting of economic data. Again, there's kind of two
8 things going on here. There is the discussion that was recommended
9 by the AP of changing, you know, the trip fee, to say something
10 along the lines of, you know, trip value, or, as we've heard from
11 the economists, something like estimated trip fee, and so just
12 understanding that, if that's what you wanted to do, as the IPT,
13 we could certainly explore that, to change it to something like
14 that, and estimated trip fee seems to be the way that seems to
15 work for lots of folks.
16

17 The thing that's in here though, the alternatives for this action,
18 is the mechanism with which that information will be collected,
19 and so either Alternative 1, you don't do it, or Alternative 2
20 would be some sort of census, and you would do it after every trip,
21 and then Alternative 3 would be some annually-stratified random
22 sampling design, and Dr. Liese went through the cost analysis for
23 all those in his previous presentation.
24

25 One thing that I will report back from the AP is they did seem to
26 have -- Their general recommendation is the sampling approach, and
27 so rather than a census after every trip, and they did sort of
28 have a recommendation of what they would rather have the trip fee
29 called, but certainly, in terms of the methodology with which this
30 data is collected, they were interested in seeing some sort of
31 sampling design, rather than a census.
32

33 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Discussion? Dr. Sweetman.
34

35 **DR. SWEETMAN:** So a question here, and so, based on kind of what
36 we just selected as preferreds for the previous actions, I'm
37 looking at like Alternative 2, and it says any type of charter
38 activity economic information. Do we need to align Action 4 with
39 that as well, with what we've previously done, just for -- If the
40 council ultimately chooses just for fishing activities, in terms
41 of reporting and everything like that. Do we need to align the
42 economic information on that?
43

44 Then I also have a secondary question here, but this action is for
45 vessels that do not participate in the headboat survey. What about
46 vessels that do, considering what we just talked about and
47 potentially where that survey is going?
48

1 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** So I think, to get at your first question, the
2 way it's written now, the economic portion would be as part of
3 your logbook, and so, given, you know, what we've just established
4 then, this looks like it would just be for for-hire fishing.
5 That's as I'm interpreting it right now, a little bit on the fly.
6

7 In terms of the headboat permit, you know, those that are
8 participating in the regional headboat survey, and I might look
9 over to the Regional Office, just for some clarification of, as
10 it's written now, how that would be incorporated.
11

12 **DR. SWEETMAN:** I ask the question just because we've got, you know,
13 Actions 1 and 2 as do and do not participate in that. I just
14 didn't know if we needed something equivalent here.
15

16 **DR. HOLLENSEAD:** Right, and somebody can certainly -- Jessica can
17 leap through the webinar and correct me if I'm wrong, but the
18 charter folks -- They have a per like head trip fee that they
19 account for, like the number of people, paying passengers, on their
20 boat, and so they kind of get at their trip fee already through
21 that survey, whereas, for the charter folks, they do not, and it's
22 calculated a little different, right? The headboat is price per
23 head, and the charter vessels, it's -- You know, you're taking out
24 six folks, or whatever the case is, and it's an umbrella fee.
25

26 This part of this document would be looking specifically at that.
27 I don't believe we have any desire to necessarily change what's
28 happening in the headboat survey, in terms of their economic
29 analysis, I don't believe, and so that's why it's not explicitly
30 mentioned here.
31

32 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** I personally like the random sampling idea. I
33 think it's a great compromise, and middle ground, in what's been
34 a contentious argument between the charter industry and our
35 beleaguered economists over there. We appreciate you guys.
36

37 I think I like Alternative 3 on this one, myself. I think we've
38 put a lot of work into it, and come to that, and so if somebody
39 wanted to pick that as preferred, or pick any preferred, actually,
40 and let's do that.
41

42 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Yes. **Sure, and I'll make a motion for, in Action**
43 **4, to select Alternative 3 as the preferred.**
44

45 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Is there a second to the motion to select
46 Alternative 3?
47

48 **MR. FRADY:** Second.

1
2 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Captain Frady seconds. Discussion on Alternative
3 3? Dr. Sweetman.
4

5 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Yes, and just I recognize that economic reporting
6 is kind of a sensitive issue amongst our constituents here. I
7 also recognize that there are components of this that could
8 ultimately help us better manage the fishery, as well as dealing
9 with disasters, like the Science Center had previously highlighted
10 and so, while I recognize that this is not an ideal thing, from
11 a fisherman's perspective here, I think we kind of thread the
12 needle to minimize the burden, to the degree that we can here, and
13 I think that this will probably be the best that we can get, which
14 will actually be somewhat useful, from a management perspective,
15 as we've kind of gone over with the economists to try and figure
16 out where that needle is threaded. Thanks.
17

18 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Great. Any more discussion? Andy.
19

20 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and I know we will talk some about this in
21 our shrimp discussion as well, with National Standard 7. You know,
22 I think there's an important point that was just raised by C.J.,
23 right, and so we just talked about it earlier, with Christopher
24 Liese, that this would result in some modest additional costs to
25 the agency.
26

27 What wasn't discussed, obviously, is the burden on the industry,
28 and so there is a cost savings, obviously, for reporting that comes
29 from not requiring them to submit this with every single logbook,
30 right? There's an efficiency that comes along with submitting it
31 with the logbooks, but there's also a cost to each fisherman, and
32 the huge number of reports that come along with that, and so I
33 just wanted to note that.
34

35 Then, given we removed chartered activity, I wasn't sure if that
36 was still something that should be included here or not, as part
37 of the alternative, and so I wanted clarification from IPT members.
38

39 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Lisa.
40

41 **DR. HOLLENSHAD:** To Mr. Strelcheck's point, yes, and we had
42 mentioned that it was linked to the logbook, and so, if there's a
43 logbook required for for-hire fishing, if that's the definition,
44 I would imagine that that's what you would loop in your economic
45 survey as well, would be into that, but, of course, as the IPT, we
46 can discuss that and make sure that that's very clear.
47

48 The other thing too is we've got the vessel headboat permit. Based

1 on what Dr. Sweetman has just brought up, we might modify that as
2 well, to make sure that it's very clear that that's not headboats
3 that participate in the regional headboat, although some headboats
4 are not included in the regional headboat, even though by Coast
5 Guard definition they are, and so we'll make sure that that
6 language is all clear, so that everybody understands what it
7 pertains to.

8
9 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Very good. Thank you. More discussion on the
10 motion on the board? Seeing none, all right. **Is there anyone**
11 **opposed to the motion on the board? Seeing none, the motion**
12 **carries.** So we're almost done, and Dr. Sweetman has something he
13 would like to say.

14
15 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Yes, and, just kind of tying this in, I think we're
16 going to have to have some hard discussions here relative to where
17 all this is going, and it's relative to some of the situations
18 that are out of our control, but, you know, we talked about the
19 loss of funding for validation in the headboat survey.

20
21 In the past, you know, SEFHIER, the original version of SEFHIER,
22 was cut, in terms of funding, and so I really, really would hate
23 to spend all this time and effort on putting together a SEFHIER
24 program if ultimately it can't get funded and put forward at the
25 end of the day.

26
27 I know this is an impossible question for our federal colleagues
28 to answer right now, given the uncertainty, but I just kind of
29 want to put that out there for everyone to really consider, because
30 it's challenging times that we're in here.

31
32 I think we all recognize the importance of putting together
33 something like this, and so this kind of factors into my discussion
34 earlier about us at the council, we're -- In light of this
35 uncertainty, we're going to need to prioritize what we think is
36 most important too to put up. This is a really tricky, and quite
37 frankly crappy, situation that we're in, but it's the situation
38 that we're in, and so just putting that forward. Thanks.

39
40 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Andy.

41
42 **MR. STRELCHECK:** Yes, and thanks for that C.J., and I can't,
43 obviously, at this point, speak to what our budget will or won't
44 look like, what funding may be available for the program.

45
46 I'm planning on discussing in more detail, later during this
47 council meeting, about the Executive Order Unleashing Prosperity
48 Through Deregulation, right, and I think this is one of those

1 actions that might get caught up, in terms of how we proceed
2 forward, and so just a couple of things to note, right, and so one
3 is, at least for FY25, all costs related to new regulations, right,
4 have to essentially be significantly less than zero, right, and so
5 we're not talking about this going into effect in FY25, right,
6 and, you know, there's a 2026 budget calculation that we'll have
7 to deal with going forward.

8
9 The bottom line is the agency is going to have to make decisions
10 with regard to what we implement, in terms of regulatory actions
11 and how we offset those through deregulatory actions, right, and
12 so we've been given some initial guidance with regard to is it
13 statutorily required, right, and is it mandated, and, if so, what
14 is the mandate that we're leaning on for that.

15
16 You can go into Magnuson, you can look, in terms of some of the
17 specific requirements for data reporting in management plans, and
18 point to that, but, when you think about, obviously, mandated
19 activities are things like ending overfishing and rebuilding
20 plans, that have these time schedules, that likely will take
21 priority across the country for us to implement, in terms of
22 regulatory actions, and then figure out how to offset those with
23 deregulatory work.

24
25 I say all this because I'm not trying to, you know, tell you that
26 we shouldn't be moving forward with SEFHIER, but it's going to
27 have to be a consideration with regard to, if the council takes
28 final action, whether we will move forward with SEFHIER, and any
29 sort of regulatory development, simply because of that executive
30 order and the things that the agency has to balance going forward
31 considering that executive order.

32
33 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Captain Green would like to throw something in
34 on this discussion.

35
36 **MR. GREEN:** I appreciate the opportunity to speak again. C.J., I
37 wish you would have said that two hours ago. We could have
38 addressed it then, but, when SEFHIER passed, it didn't just get
39 passed and get funded. We went and fought for that. Like we went
40 to D.C., and we wrote letters, and we made phone calls.

41
42 Give us that opportunity, you know, and I know that we're very
43 uncertain in this time, but I don't want to -- Like this is over
44 a decade of my life that I've been talking about for-hire data
45 collection. We got one, and it got taken away, and we redesigned
46 it, and we're retooling it, and we're going to -- You know, we're
47 in a very uncertain time, but, if things change, and in a year
48 we're sitting here, and then we have to go back and revisit this,

1 give me something to go fight for, please.
2
3 After all this investment of time, effort, and money of the staff,
4 of you all being so willing to work with us, give us that
5 opportunity, please, and so that's all. I appreciate, again, being
6 able to speak to that.
7
8 **DR. SWEETMAN:** Yes, and I just want to be clear, Captain Green, I
9 am fully supportive of SEFHIER 2.0. I'm just trying to be
10 cognizant of things that are beyond our control right now.
11
12 **MR. GREEN:** Thank you, sir.
13
14 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** All right. I think we're done, are we not? All
15 right. Kevin.
16
17 **MR. ANSON:** Just a minor point. There was something I would like
18 to potentially address in the ad hoc charter report. Can I do
19 that offline with the staff, or can it be changed, I guess, just
20 for clarification purposes? It's one sentence in there, I think,
21 that needs to --
22
23 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Sure, and so we have one minute.
24
25 **MR. ANSON:** Can I do it after? Okay. Thank you.
26
27 **CHAIRMAN WALKER:** Very good. All right, Mr. Chair, and I suppose
28 this concludes the committee's report.
29
30 (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned on April 7, 2025.)
31
32 - - -